United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 158 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 21, 2012 No. 95

Senate

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable TOM UDALL, a Senator from the State of New Mexico.

PRAYER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Today's opening prayer will be offered by Rev. Ronald McCrary, Deputy Director of Chaplaincy Services at the Cobb County Sheriff's Office in Marietta, GA.

The guest Chaplain offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Lord God, from whom we come and to whom we belong, may Your kingdom come. Use our lawmakers today to do Your divine will on Earth, as it is in Heaven. Give them Your wisdom so that justice rolls down like water and righteousness like a mighty stream.

This we pray, in the matchless Name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable TOM UDALL led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. INOUYE).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, June 21, 2012.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable TOM UDALL, a Senator from the State of New Mexico, to perform the duties of the Chair.

DANIEL K. INOUYE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

WELCOMING THE GUEST CHAPLAIN

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, it is my honor to introduce to the Senate Rev. Ron McCrary, who just gave the prayer on the floor of the Senate. He is here with Chaplain Black.

Reverend McCrary is a great individual from my home county, Cobb County, GA. He is the chaplain to the Cobb County Board of Commissioners, the fourth largest county in Georgia. He is chaplain of the Police Officers Standards and Training facility in Georgia, which covers 40,000 law enforcement offices. He is a great preacher, a great leader, and a great chaplain. He was recommended to me by Sheriff Neil Warren, the sheriff of Cobb County, who because of his graciousness allowed Ron to come and be with us today.

Ron is a father, a minister, and a great witness. He witnessed as an athlete through the Campus Crusade for Christ and Athletes in Action. He witnessed as a pastor by ministering churches. He witnessed to the community by delivering great sermons—one of them about voting, in honor of Coretta Scott King, delivered in 2006 at the Turner Chapel in Marietta, where he empowered everyone to honor Coretta Scott King's life's work by making sure they participated in the political system.

It is an honor and a privilege for me to welcome and host Rev. Ron McCrary of Cobb County, GA, and the Cobb County Sheriff's Department.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

FLOOD INSURANCE REFORM AND MODERNIZATION ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED—Resumed

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now move to proceed to Calendar No. 250, S. 1940.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 250, S. 1940, a bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, to restore the financial solvency of the flood insurance fund, and for other purposes.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following leader remarks, the time until 11 this morning will be equally divided and controlled. At 11 o'clock a.m., we will begin up to 10 rollcall votes. We will complete the farm bill today in the early afternoon. We also hope to have a cloture vote on the motion to proceed to the flood insurance bill today.

WORKING TOGETHER

Mr. President, we come here and lament all the bad things happening in the Senate. It is not out of order once in a while to talk about some of the good things happening in the Senate. I think we should look at it as if, as difficult as it has been to get things done, we are making progress. We had that postal bill, which was good work on behalf of the Senate. The highway bill worked out extremely well. We have this 5-year farm bill—very difficult, but it is now near passing, which is good for the country.

We have to make sure before the end of the month we finish our work on the Flood Insurance Program, which is so extremely important to the country. With the construction picking up a little bit everyplace, we have to make sure when a loan is to close it can be

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

closed. Thousands of them each day cannot be closed unless we do a renewal of the Flood Insurance Program.

I had a meeting with the Speaker on Tuesday, with Senator BOXER, chairman of the committee, Chairman MICA, her counterpart in the House, and Senator INHOFE, and we are making progress on the highway bill. I feel good about that. Whether we get it done remains to be seen. But the House, in an overwhelming vote yesterday—totally bipartisan or they could not get the 384 votes—instructed the conferees to come back with the bill by tomorrow. Contentious issues have been resolved, and I believe we have a shot at getting the highway bill done. That would be good for the country and good for the Senate.

So I appreciate everyone working together. As the Republican leader and I have talked, as difficult as it is to work out agreements on the bills I have just mentioned—including the farm bill—it is good for the Senate.

I appeared before a committee chaired by Senator CARPER, and there as the ranking member was Senator COLLINS. They both indicated today before everybody that the spirit on the Senate floor was good yesterday.

That is because everyone can feel we are accomplishing something. Some of the votes were difficult, and some we all wish we had not taken because they were tough votes. But that is what the Senate is all about. So I feel comfortable with the last bit, that we are trying to work together for the good of the country.

I have said lots of times, if we are able to accomplish good as a body, everyone can take credit for it. We can go back to our States and claim we are part of a victory for the country. But if we do not get it done, we are part of the blame and people can go home and lament the fact that we have not been able to get our work done. People point fingers at us: Why can't you get more done?

So, hopefully, this summer, which started yesterday—in fact, today is the longest day of the year—will bring good tidings to the Senate.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

TRADITIONAL SENATE OPERATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, before the majority leader leaves the floor, let me just say I agree entirely that the Senate, it seems to me, is sort of getting back to operating the way the Senate traditionally has. I think the way Senator ROBERTS and Senator STABENOW have handled the farm bill has been exemplary. Members on both sides have gotten opportunities to offer amendments. We have had a lot of votes, but it is an important bill.

So I commend all of those who have been involved in beginning to work us back in the direction that I think most of the Senate would be comfortable with.

I also want to thank my friend, the majority leader. He has a tough job setting the agenda and deciding how to go about moving legislation. I think the way we have handled the farm bill and other measures to which he has referred in recent months has been a very important step in the right direction.

STUDENT LOAN RATES

Mr. President, 3 weeks ago today, Republican leaders in the Senate joined Republican leaders in the House in calling on the President to resolve a pending increase in student loan rates.

Drawing on some of the President's own ideas, we proposed multiple good-faith solutions to this problem before it is too late. We have been waiting ever since for the President's response. He has actually been missing in action. He has yet to offer a concrete solution. So you can understand our surprise upon learning this morning that the President plans to call on Congress later today to do something about student loan rates.

Mr. President, the Republican-led House of Representatives already passed a bill that would solve the problem. As I said, Republican leaders in the Senate have been on record supporting multiple—multiple—good-faith solutions to this problem for literally weeks. It is actually the Democratic-led Senate that has failed to act, and the President who has failed to contribute to a solution. The reason is pretty obvious.

It was reported yesterday that the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee is launching a Web site with a student loan countdown clock aimed at raising money off this issue. The implication is that Republicans are the ones dragging their feet.

As for the President? Well, this is just another sad example of the election-year strategy of deflection and distraction—deflection and distraction.

College graduates are struggling to find work and pay their bills in the Obama economy. He would like them to believe it is somebody else's fault.

Latinos are struggling with high unemployment. He would like them to believe the Republicans are the problem.

Middle-class moms are struggling to make ends meet. He wants them to think we are engaged in some phony war on women.

The President does not have a positive message to send to any of these folks, so he is cooking up false controversies to distract them from his own failure to turn the economy around.

Well, on the student loan issue, we could solve this problem in a sitting. Republicans have acted quickly, and on a bipartisan basis, to help prevent these rates from going up. We have passed a bill out of the House. We have reached out to the President. We have proposed multiple—multiple—solutions.

The only reason this issue is not already resolved—the only reason—is that the President wants to keep it alive a little while longer. He thinks it benefits him politically for college students to believe somehow we are the problem.

It is time to stop playing games. It is time for the President to act.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

Under the previous order, the time until 11 a.m. will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, good morning to you. Good morning to my colleagues.

PTC FOR WIND ENERGY

I am here again on the Senate floor to urge all of my colleagues to vote for an extension of the production tax credit for wind energy, otherwise known as the PTC.

Today, as I have been doing, I will focus on an individual State. I am going to look at the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and show all of us the promise it holds as a wind energy manufacturing hub, as well as the negative effects that will occur if we do not extend the production tax credit.

Pennsylvania has a strong blue-collar background and an extraordinary number of highly skilled workers. With those factors, those positive elements in Pennsylvania, it has seamlessly transitioned into a wind energy powerhouse.

Look at this map I have in the Chamber of the State of Pennsylvania. You will see, from Philadelphia to Rockwood, from Pittsburgh to Scranton, there are wind projects all over the State. Those wind projects have created good-paying jobs and stability for Pennsylvania families.

Pennsylvania, as I have alluded to, has long been a center of manufacturing in the United States, and the wind industry has taken note.

You can see these green circles on this map. Each one of those indicates a manufacturing facility that makes parts for wind turbines in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. That represents over 20 plants and hundreds of employees in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

I would suggest that the State of Pennsylvania is only beginning to realize its potential when it comes to the wind energy industry.

My colleagues know I have been on the Senate floor talking about the economic benefits of wind energy. I want to highlight what has happened in Pennsylvania.

If we look at this chart, in Pennsylvania, the wind energy industry supports 4,000 jobs. There are 180,000 homes that are powered by wind, and there is a conservative $1.4 million in property taxes from wind projects that go to local communities.

So this is an important set of numbers. It is money, particularly on the

tax side, that helps local communities pay for basic services, and it is critical in this time of decreasing local and State budgets.

If we think about it, all of these figures—the jobs, the revenues, the investments—are prime for significant growth going forward. But that future and that growth are going to be threatened unless we act, unless the Congress acts to extend the production tax credit.

Just last week, Gamesa—which is a global leader in the manufacturing of wind turbines—announced it is ending the development of the Shaffer Mountain Wind Farm, which is in northeastern Somerset County. This project would have ultimately ended up with 30 new wind turbines, and it was planned to come online in 2013. That is just 6 months from now. But because of the uncertainty tied to Federal policies, such as the production tax credit, Gamesa has sidelined this project.

In short, our inaction is costing this community jobs, this Commonwealth of Pennsylvania jobs. It does not make any sense in the current economic environment we now face and as our Nation is desperately focused on becoming more energy independent.

The Pittsburgh Post-Gazette made the point that this is the third wind project under development that has been stopped—all in the last month—just because of the uncertainty we have created here by not extending the PTC. These are on-the-ground examples of how congressional inaction is costing American jobs and investment.

I know the Acting President pro tempore knows this is not a partisan or regional issue. There is strong bipartisan support for extending the production tax credit, and the wind industry has a presence in almost every single State in our country. So if we look at the overall picture, this is not the time for companies such as Gamesa to grow, reluctant to invest in the future. So we have to expand the PTC. It will incent this industry to continue its rapid growth, and it will build a strong foundation for a 21st-century clean energy economy.

So I am again on the floor urging my colleagues to work with me to extend the wind production tax credit as soon as possible.

As I close, I want to highlight an event that is on Capitol Hill today where Members, staff, and others can learn more about the potential of wind energy, as well as other types of renewable and energy-efficient technology.

That event is the 15th Annual Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency EXPO. It is underway all day in the Cannon Caucus Room on the House side.

The bipartisan Senate Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Caucus, which I cochair along with Senators LIEBERMAN and CRAPO, is an honorary cohost of the event. I encourage all of us to go over there, look at the technologies. They are awe inspiring. They are awesome. They are truly the future. When we implement policies that will help these technologies penetrate all of these various markets, we are going to continue to be a leader in the clean energy economy.

So I will be back next week to talk about the wind production tax credit. I will be here every day until we pass it and extend it.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN of Ohio.) The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

AGRICULTURE REFORM, FOOD, AND JOBS ACT OF 2012

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 3240, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3240) to reauthorize agriculture programs through 2017, and for other purposes.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, before reading our order of amendments, I wish, one more time, to say thank you to everyone. We have had two very productive, hard-working days. I thank my ranking member for his incredible leadership and all our staffs.

Today, we have an opportunity to show that the Senate can come together—and we have been doing that—to pass a significant piece of public policy for Americans. I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the previous order, the amendment votes occur in the following order and that all other provisions of the previous order remain in effect: Boxer amendment No. 2456; Johanns No. 2372; Toomey No. 2247; Sanders No. 2310; Coburn No. 2214; Murray No. 2455; McCain No. 2162; Rubio No. 2166.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

AMENDMENT NO. 2456

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 2456.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER] proposes an amendment numbered 2456.

The amendment is as follows:

On p. 1009, after line 11, add the following:

SEC. 122___. REQUIREMENTS FOR AERIAL OVERFLIGHTS OF AGRICULTURAL OPERATIONS TO PROTECT PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY.

The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, pursuant to her responsibility to protect public health and safety, shall only conduct aerial overflights to inspect agricultural operations if the EPA Administrator determines that aerial overflights are more cost-effective than ground inspections to the taxpayer and the Agency has notified the appropriate State officials of such flights.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, on the amendment.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, Senator JOHANNS has an amendment which would stop the EPA from ever using any kind of airplanes—including manned small planes, which is all they do use—to check on serious pollution spills.

I wish to say this is about life and death. I hope the Senate will support the Boxer amendment and vote no on the Johanns amendment because the Boxer amendment says the EPA can only use these overflights if it has to do it to protect the health and safety and if it has been approved by the State.

This pollution could cause serious illness, and they want to make sure they can track the plume. We have heard of cryptosporidium, E. coli, and giardia. That is what we are talking about—terrible bacteria that sometimes comes from animals.

In 1993, at least 50 people died from the bacteria cryptosporidium in Milwaukee, and it came from animal waste. The EPA has never used a drone, and they don't plan to, but don't stop them from using small aerial oversight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. JOHANNS. Mr. President, given the EPA's recent track record with agriculture—if not downright contempt for it—farmers and ranchers simply don't trust the EPA. They could have done this program right and reached out to the congressional delegations in Nebraska and Iowa and said: Here is what we are doing. Here is the plan. They did not.

I found out about this accidentally. I have requested information—in fact, our entire delegation has—and the administrator has been nonresponsive. That is why the amendment is here. It is an amendment based on a lack of trust for the EPA. This maintains the status quo. This will change nothing. It will rubberstamp what they are doing.

I ask my colleagues to oppose the amendment and support the next amendment, which I will call up in due time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. JOHANNS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll. This is a 60-vote threshold.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) are necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

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

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 158 Leg.]

YEAS—47

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

NAYS—48

Alexander	DeMint	McCain
Ayotte	Enzi	McCaskill
Barrasso	Graham	McConnell
Blunt	Grassley	Moran
Boozman	Hatch	Murkowski
Brown (MA)	Heller	Nelson (NE)
Burr	Hoeven	Paul
Chambliss	Hutchison	Portman
Coats	Inhofe	Risch
Coburn	Isakson	Roberts
Cochran	Johanns	Rubio
Collins	Johnson (WI)	Sessions
Conrad	Kyl	Snowe
Corker	Landrieu	Thune
Cornyn	Lee	Vitter
Crapo	Lugar	Wicker

NOT VOTING—5

Johnson (SD)	Menendez	Toomey
Kirk	Shelby	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for passage of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 2456 TO S. 3240 VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, I was unavoidably detained and unable to vote on the Boxer amendment No. 2456 this morning. If I had been present, I would have voted in favor of this amendment. It is important that the use of overflights to monitor compliance with the Clean Water Act be limited to circumstances where ground inspections of large industrial agriculture operations would not be as cost effective or sufficiently protective of public health and safety.•

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

AMENDMENT NO. 2372

Mr. JOHANNS. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 2372 and ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. JOHANNS] proposes an amendment numbered 2372.

Mr. JOHANNS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To prohibit the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from conducting aerial surveillance to inspect agricultural operations or to record images of agricultural operations)

On page 1009, after line 11, add the following:

SEC. 122____. PROHIBITION ON AERIAL SURVEILLANCE OF AGRICULTURAL OPERATIONS.

The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall not conduct aerial surveillance to inspect agricultural operations or to record images of agricultural operations.

Mr. JOHANNS. Mr. President, low-altitude surveillance flights over farmers' and ranchers' private property has caused bipartisan concern, and it is happening—EPA is flying these flights. Senator NELSON and I and the entire Nebraska delegation wrote to Administrator Jackson saying, ''What is going on? What are you doing?'' Their response was kicked down to the Regional Director. It was incomplete. It was totally unacceptable.

This is not about drones, this is about flights over feed lots, trying to determine if there is a violation and then pursuing that action. What we are asking for is for the public to be advised of what they are doing. Until that happens, this amendment simply says: Stop. You can't do this anymore until you let us know how you are using this information and for what purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. JOHANNS. I ask for support of the amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, may I be recognzied?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognzied.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, this amendment is very serious. It is about life and death. It is true that on occasion EPA will use small manned aircraft to inspect a bacteria spill.

Let me recall for you: Wisconsin, 1993, at least 50 people lost their lives from the bacteria cryptosporidium from animal waste. When you are following a plume, the way to do it is from the air. It is much more expensive in many cases to do ground inspection. EPA estimates that on-the-ground inspection may cost $10,000, but it could cost $2,500 to survey the same area by air.

This is life and death. We are talking about E. coli. We are talking about giardia and cryptosporidium. We are talking about the health and safety of the American people that is compromised from these kinds of animal waste.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

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

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 159 Leg.]

YEAS—56

Alexander	Enzi	Moran
Ayotte	Graham	Murkowski
Barrasso	Grassley	Nelson (NE)
Baucus	Hagan	Paul
Begich	Hatch	Portman
Blunt	Heller	Pryor
Boozman	Hoeven	Risch
Brown (MA)	Hutchison	Roberts
Burr	Inhofe	Rubio
Chambliss	Isakson	Schumer
Coats	Johanns	Sessions
Coburn	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Cochran	Kyl	Snowe
Collins	Landrieu	Tester
Conrad	Lee	Thune
Corker	Lugar	Toomey
Cornyn	McCain	Vitter
Crapo	McCaskill	Wicker
DeMint	McConnell	

NAYS—43

Akaka	Harkin	Nelson (FL)
Bennet	Inouye	Reed
Bingaman	Johnson (SD)	Reid
Blumenthal	Kerry	Rockefeller
Boxer	Klobuchar	Sanders
Brown (OH)	Kohl	Shaheen
Cantwell	Lautenberg	Stabenow
Cardin	Leahy	Udall (CO)
Carper	Levin	Udall (NM)
Casey	Lieberman	Warner
Coons	Manchin	Webb
Durbin	Menendez	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Merkley	Wyden
Franken	Mikulski	
Gillibrand	Murray	

NOT VOTING—1

Kirk

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 2247

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 2247.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), for himself, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. SESSIONS, proposes an amendment numbered 2247.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To reduce unnecessary paperwork burdens on community water systems)

On page 1009, after line 11, add the following:

SEC. 122___. CONSUMER CONFIDENCE REPORTS BY COMMUNITY WATER SYSTEMS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) community water systems play an important role in rural United States infrastructure; and

(2) since rural water infrastructure projects are routinely funded under the rural development programs of the Department of Agriculture, Congress should strive to reduce the regulatory and paperwork burdens placed on community water systems.

(b) METHOD OF DELIVERING REPORT.—Section 1414(c)(4)(A) of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300g–3(c)(4)(A)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking ''The Administrator, in consultation'' and inserting the following:

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator, in consultation'';

(2) in clause (i) (as designated by paragraph (1)), in the first sentence, by striking ''to mail to each customer'' and inserting ''to provide, in accordance with clause (ii) or (iii), as applicable, to each customer''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(ii) MAILING REQUIREMENT FOR VIOLATION OF MAXIMUM CONTAMINANT LEVEL.—If a violation of the maximum contaminant level for any regulated contaminant has occurred during the year concerned, the regulations under clause (i) shall require the applicable community water system to mail a copy of the consumer confidence report to each customer of the system.

''(iii) MAILING REQUIREMENT ABSENT ANY VIOLATION OF MAXIMUM CONTAMINANT LEVEL.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—If no violation of the maximum contaminant level for any regulated contaminant has occurred during the year concerned, the regulations under clause (i) shall require the applicable community water system to make the consumer confidence report available by, at the discretion of the community water system—

''(aa) mailing a copy of the consumer confidence report to each customer of the system; or

''(bb) subject to subclause (II), making a copy of the consumer confidence report available on a publicly accessible Internet site of the community water system and by mail, at the request of a customer.

''(II) REQUIREMENTS.—If a community water system elects to provide consumer confidence reports to consumers under subclause (I)(bb), the community water system shall provide to each customer of the community water system, in plain language and in the same manner (such as in printed or electronic form) in which the customer has elected to pay the bill of the customer, notice that—

''(aa) the community water system has remained in compliance with the maximum contaminant level for each regulated contaminant during the year concerned; and

''(bb) a consumer confidence report is available on a publicly accessible Internet site of the community water system and, on request, by mail.''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 1414(c)(4) of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300g–3(c)(4)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''mailing requirement of subparagraph (A)'' and inserting ''mailing requirement of clause (ii) or (iii) of subparagraph (A)''; and

(2) in subparagraph (D), in the first sentence of the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''mailing requirement of subparagraph (A)'' and inserting ''mailing requirement of clause (ii) or (iii) of subparagraph (A)''.

(d) APPLICATION; ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section take effect on the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall promulgate any revised regulations and take any other actions necessary to carry out the amendments made by this section.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 2 minutes of debate.

Senator TOOMEY.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, water systems are currently required to mail reports every year that detail in great specificity all the minute trace chemicals that are inevitably in the water supply. This is at a great cost and it is a problem, particularly for rural water systems. What my amendment would do is permit the water companies, provided there are no violations, to inform their customers in each and every monthly bill that they can obtain this information on the Web site. There are absolutely no changes whatsoever in water standards, of course, and every company would still have to mail these detailed reports if the water failed to comply with the State or Federal standards. This is a way we can free up tens, even hundreds of thousands of dollars in unnecessary mailing costs and make that available for infrastructure investment.

I am happy to yield to my colleague, the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. This is very simple. This is the information age. In my rural State of Oklahoma, sometimes they have to drive 30 miles to a post office. This will make it a lot easier as an accommodation and nothing is lost.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 1 minute.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, today our families receive in the mail just once a year a report about the safety of the water their kids drink every single day. The Toomey amendment repeals that important right to know. There are 70 regulated dangerous contaminants in our water. For example: arsenic, benzene, vinyl chloride, asbestos, cadmium, mercury, radium, and uranium. Some of these dangerous toxins are deemed unsafe at any level. Yet under Toomey you would no longer receive that information.

Senator TOOMEY says go to the Web site. One thousand water districts have no Web site. And right now, under the current right-to-know law, the Governor can say he waives this requirement for the small rural districts.

Please vote no. Our people have a right to know what their kids are drinking.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. TOOMEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

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

The result was announced—yeas 58, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 160 Leg.]

YEAS—58

Alexander	Hagan	Murkowski
Ayotte	Hatch	Nelson (NE)
Barrasso	Heller	Nelson (FL)
Blunt	Hoeven	Paul
Boozman	Hutchison	Portman
Brown (MA)	Inhofe	Pryor
Burr	Isakson	Risch
Casey	Johanns	Roberts
Chambliss	Johnson (WI)	Rubio
Coats	Kohl	Sessions
Coburn	Kyl	Shelby
Cochran	Leahy	Snowe
Collins	Lee	Thune
Corker	Levin	Toomey
Cornyn	Lugar	Udall (CO)
Crapo	Manchin	Vitter
DeMint	McCain	Webb
Enzi	McCaskill	Wicker
Graham	McConnell	
Grassley	Moran	

NAYS—41

Akaka	Feinstein	Murray
Baucus	Franken	Reed
Begich	Gillibrand	Reid
Bennet	Harkin	Rockefeller
Bingaman	Inouye	Sanders
Blumenthal	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Boxer	Kerry	Shaheen
Brown (OH)	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cantwell	Landrieu	Tester
Cardin	Lautenberg	Udall (NM)
Carper	Lieberman	Warner
Conrad	Menendez	Whitehouse
Coons	Merkley	Wyden
Durbin	Mikulski	

NOT VOTING—1

Kirk

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

Ms. STABENOW. I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

AMENDMENT NO. 2310

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I call up amendment No. 2310.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS], for himself and Mrs. BOXER, proposes an amendment numbered 2310.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To permit States to require that any food, beverage, or other edible product offered for sale have a label on indicating that the food, beverage, or other edible product contains a genetically engineered ingredient)

On page 1009, after line 11, add the following:

SEC. 12207. CONSUMERS RIGHT TO KNOW ABOUT GENETICALLY ENGINEERED FOOD ACT.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Consumers Right to Know About Genetically Engineered Food Act''.

(b) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) surveys of the American public consistently show that 90 percent or more of the people of the United States want genetically engineered to be labeled as such;

(2) a landmark public health study in Canada found that—

(A) 93 percent of pregnant women had detectable toxins from genetically engineered foods in their blood; and

(B) 80 percent of the babies of those women had detectable toxins in their umbilical cords;

(3) the tenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States clearly reserves powers in the system of Federalism to the States or to the people; and

(4) States have the authority to require the labeling of foods produced through genetic engineering or derived from organisms that have been genetically engineered.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) GENETIC ENGINEERING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''genetic engineering'' means a process that alters an organism at the molecular or cellular level by means that are not possible under natural conditions or processes.

(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term ''genetic engineering'' includes—

(i) recombinant DNA and RNA techniques;

(ii) cell fusion;

(iii) microencapsulation;

(iv) macroencapsulation;

(v) gene deletion and doubling;

(vi) introduction of a foreign gene; and

(vii) changing the position of genes.

(C) EXCLUSIONS.—The term ''genetic engineering'' does not include any modification to an organism that consists exclusively of—

(i) breeding;

(ii) conjugation;

(iii) fermentation;

(iv) hybridization;

(v) in vitro fertilization; or

(vi) tissue culture.

(2) GENETICALLY ENGINEERED INGREDIENT.—The term ''genetically engineered ingredient'' means any ingredient in any food, beverage, or other edible product that—

(A) is, or is derived from, an organism that is produced through the intentional use of genetic engineering; or

(B) is, or is derived from, the progeny of intended sexual reproduction, asexual reproduction, or both of 1 or more organisms described in subparagraph (A).

(d) RIGHT TO KNOW.—Notwithstanding any other Federal law (including regulations), a State may require that any food, beverage, or other edible product offered for sale in that State have a label on the container or package of the food, beverage, or other edible product, indicating that the food, beverage, or other edible product contains a genetically engineered ingredient.

(e) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commissioner of Food and Drugs and the Secretary of Agriculture shall promulgate such regulations as are necessary to carry out this section.

(f) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, shall submit a report to Congress detailing the percentage of food and beverages sold in the United States that contain genetically engineered ingredients.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, this amendment is cosponsored by Senators BOXER and BEGICH and is supported by over 40 pro-consumer organizations throughout the country, including Public Citizen, U.S. PIRG, the Center for Food Safety, and many others.

This is a very conservative amendment. It says the American people should have the right to know what is in the food they and their children are eating and if that food contains genetically engineered products.

This amendment grants States the authority to label genetically engineered food. It is not a mandate. It grants States that right—something which, by the way, is now taking place in 49 countries throughout the world. If the people in England, Germany, France, and dozens and dozens of other countries have labels allowing their people to know if they are eating food with genetically engineered products, States in the United States should have that right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. SANDERS. I ask for a ''yes'' vote on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, first I want to thank the Senator from Vermont for his wonderful leadership on so many issues in this bill. I must, reluctantly, ask for a ''no'' vote.

Consumers certainly need to have available information. We need to make sure it is accurate, according to the FDA, after they determine that.

I would make one other point: American farmers are feeding the world, with 7 billion mouths to feed. This is harder every day. Science and innovation are very important to that.

Recently, I talked with Bill Gates, with the Gates Foundation, for example, which is doing incredible work around the globe: with drought-resistant crops in Africa, with innovative rice in the Philippines and Bangladesh, and so on.

This is an issue that needs to be thoroughly studied to make sure we are not hurting those efforts. I know the chairman of the HELP Committee has asked that we not do this. It is within his jurisdiction.

Madam President, I yield time now to Senator ROBERTS.

Mr. ROBERTS. Very quickly, we all wear coats and ties in this body. This amendment would put us in lab coats. Don't wear a lab coat. Vote ''no'' on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

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

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 73, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 161 Leg.]

YEAS—26

Akaka	Cardin	Leahy
Begich	Feinstein	Lieberman
Bennet	Inouye	Manchin
Blumenthal	Johnson (SD)	Merkley
Boxer	Kerry	Mikulski
Cantwell	Lautenberg	Murkowski
Murray	Sanders	Whitehouse
Reed	Tester	Wyden
Rockefeller	Udall (NM)	

NAYS—73

Alexander	Franken	Moran
Ayotte	Gillibrand	Nelson (NE)
Barrasso	Graham	Nelson (FL)
Baucus	Grassley	Paul
Bingaman	Hagan	Portman
Blunt	Harkin	Pryor
Boozman	Hatch	Reid
Brown (MA)	Heller	Risch
Brown (OH)	Hoeven	Roberts
Burr	Hutchison	Rubio
Carper	Inhofe	Schumer
Casey	Isakson	Sessions
Chambliss	Johanns	Shaheen
Coats	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Coburn	Klobuchar	Snowe
Cochran	Kohl	Stabenow
Collins	Kyl	Thune
Conrad	Landrieu	Toomey
Coons	Lee	Udall (CO)
Corker	Levin	Vitter
Cornyn	Lugar	Warner
Crapo	McCain	Webb
DeMint	McCaskill	Wicker
Durbin	McConnell	
Enzi	Menendez	

NOT VOTING—1

Kirk

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

AMENDMENT NO. 2214

Mr. COBURN. I call up amendment No. 2214 on behalf of myself and the Senator from Colorado, Mr. UDALL. I ask unanimous consent that we be given 3 minutes for each side to be divided between myself and Senator UDALL.

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

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN], for himself, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. BURR, Mr. MCCAIN, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mr. MORAN, proposes an amendment numbered 2214.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prohibit the use of public funds for political party conventions, and to provide for the return of previously distributed funds for deficit reduction)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. PROHIBITING USE OF PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN FUNDS FOR PARTY CONVENTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 95 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking section 9008.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections of chapter 95 of such Code is amended by striking the item relating to section 9008.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) AVAILABILITY OF PAYMENTS TO CANDIDATES.—The third sentence of section 9006(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking '', section 9008(b)(3),''.

(2) REPORTS BY FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION.—Section 9009(a) of such Code is amended—

(A) by adding ''and'' at the end of paragraph (2);

(B) by striking the semicolon at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting a period; and

(C) by striking paragraphs (4), (5), and (6).

(3) PENALTIES.—Section 9012 of such Code is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(1), by striking the second sentence; and

(B) in subsection (c), by striking paragraph (2) and redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2).

(4) AVAILABILITY OF PAYMENTS FROM PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY MATCHING PAYMENT ACCOUNT.—The second sentence of section 9037(a) of such Code is amended by striking ''and for payments under section 9008(b)(3)''.

(c) RETURN OF PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED MONEY FOR DEFICIT REDUCTION.—Any amount which is returned by the national committee of a major party or a minor party to the general fund of the Treasury from an account established under section 9008 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 after the date of the enactment of this Act shall be dedicated to the sole purpose of deficit reduction.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to elections occurring after December 31, 2012.

Mr. COBURN. I yield 1½ minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

I rise in support of this important amendment.

I would also like to note that this provision is included in a larger bill I introduced this week to reform our Presidential public financing system. I would welcome support for that broader initiative.

This is a bipartisan short-term step we can take to preserve more money for publicly funded candidates who are running for President instead of using that money to fund what we know now as expensive parties in our conventions. So I would urge a ''yes'' vote. This is a way to get our fiscal house in order. It is a small step, but it is an important step.

I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for his leadership in this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Madam President, 99 percent of the American public has no idea that when they check the box, we are going to take actual American taxpayer dollars and subsidize party conventions for candidates who have already been decided.

If we are going to lead as a body on starting to solve some of our problems, this is where we should start. This is $34.6 million that gets doled out that is not spent in the best interests of the American public but spent in the best interests of the politicians for the American public. It needs to be changed. It has no effect on security. It has no effect on the present allocation that was made in January to each party. If we cannot do this, this little simple thing of leading by example, then our country is doomed because that means we cannot solve the very significant problems in front of us either.

I would appreciate your support and vote on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I yield back all time.

Mr. COBURN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

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

The result was announced—yeas 95, nays 4, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 162 Leg.]

YEAS—95

Akaka	Franken	Moran
Alexander	Gillibrand	Murkowski
Ayotte	Graham	Murray
Barrasso	Grassley	Nelson (NE)
Baucus	Hagan	Nelson (FL)
Begich	Harkin	Paul
Bennet	Hatch	Portman
Bingaman	Heller	Pryor
Blumenthal	Hoeven	Reed
Blunt	Hutchison	Reid
Boozman	Inhofe	Risch
Brown (MA)	Inouye	Roberts
Brown (OH)	Isakson	Rubio
Burr	Johanns	Sanders
Cantwell	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Cardin	Johnson (WI)	Sessions
Carper	Kerry	Shaheen
Casey	Klobuchar	Shelby
Chambliss	Kohl	Snowe
Coats	Kyl	Stabenow
Coburn	Lautenberg	Tester
Cochran	Leahy	Thune
Collins	Lee	Toomey
Conrad	Levin	Udall (CO)
Coons	Lieberman	Udall (NM)
Corker	Lugar	Vitter
Cornyn	Manchin	Warner
Crapo	McCain	Webb
DeMint	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Durbin	McConnell	Wicker
Enzi	Menendez	Wyden
Feinstein	Merkley	

NAYS—4

Boxer	Mikulski
Landrieu	Rockefeller

NOT VOTING—1

Kirk

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is agreed to.

The Senator from Washington.

AMENDMENT NO. 2455, AS MODIFIED

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I call up my amendment No. 2455 and ask that it be modified with the changes at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be so modified.

The clerk will report.

The Senator from Washington [Mrs. MURRAY] proposes an amendment numbered 2455, as modified.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require the Office of Management and Budget, the President and the Department of Defense to submit detailed reports to Congress on effects of defense and nondefense budget sequestration for fiscal year 2013)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. REPORTS ON EFFECTS OF DEFENSE AND NONDEFENSE BUDGET SEQUESTRATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The inability of the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction to find $1,200,000,000,000 in savings will trigger automatic funding reductions known as ''sequestration'' to raise an equivalent level of savings between fiscal years 2013 and 2021.

(2) These savings are in addition to $900,000,000,000 in deficit reduction resulting from discretionary spending limits established by the Budget Control Act of 2011.

(b) REPORTS.—

(1) REPORT BY THE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall report upon the impact of sequestration of funds with respect to a sequestration under paragraphs (7)(A) and (8) of section 251(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901a) for fiscal year 2013 on January 2, 2013, using enacted levels of appropriations for accounts funded pursuant to an enacted regular appropriations bill for fiscal year 2013, and estimates pursuant to a current rate continuing resolution for accounts not funded through an enacted appropriations measure for fiscal year 2013 as the levels to which the sequestration should be applied.

(B) ELEMENTS.—The report required by subparagraph (A) shall include the following:

(i) Each account that would be subject to such a sequestration.

(ii) Each account that would be subject to such a sequestration but subject to a special rule under section 255 or 256 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (and the citation to such rule).

(iii) Each account that would be exempt from such a sequestration.

(iv) Any other data or information that would enhance public understanding of the sequester and its effect on the defense and nondefense functions of the Federal Government including the impact on essential public safety responsibilities such as homeland security, food safety, and air traffic control activities.

(C) CATAGORIZE AND GROUP.—The report required under this paragraph shall categorize and group the listed accounts by the appropriations Act covering such accounts

(2) REPORT BY THE PRESIDENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, or by October 30, 2012 whichever is earlier, the President shall submit to Congress a detailed report on the sequestration required by paragraphs (7)(A) and (8) of section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901a) for fiscal year 2013 on January 2, 2013.

(B) ELEMENTS.—The reports required by subparagraph (A) shall include—

(i) for discretionary appropriations—

(I) an estimate for each category, of the sequestration percentages and amounts necessary to achieve the required reduction; and

(II) an identification of each account to be sequestered and estimates of the level of sequestrable budgetary resources and resulting outlays and the amount of budgetary resources to be sequestered and resulting outlay reductions at the program, project, and activity level, using enacted levels of appropriations for accounts funded pursuant to an enacted regular appropriations bill for fiscal year 2013, and estimates pursuant to a current rate continuing resolution for accounts not funded through an enacted appropriations measure for fiscal year 2013;

(ii) for non-defense discretionary spending only—

(I) a list of the programs, projects, and activities that would be reduced or terminated;

(II) an assessment of the jobs lost directly though program and personnel cuts;

(III) an estimate of the impact program cuts would have on the long-term competitiveness of the United States and its ability to maintain its lead on research and development, as well as the impact on our national goal to graduate the most students with degrees in in-demand fields;

(IV) an assessment of the impact of program cuts to education funding across the country, including estimates on teaching jobs lost, the number of students cut off programs they depend on, and education resources lost by States and local educational agencies;

(V) an analysis of the impact of cuts to programs middle class families and the most vulnerable families depend on, including estimates of how many families would lose access to support for children, housing and nutrition assistance, and skills training to help workers get better jobs;

(VI) an analysis of the impact on small business owners' ability to access credit and support to expand and create jobs;

(VII) an assessment of the impact to public safety, including an estimate of the reduction of police officers, emergency medical technicians, and firefighters;

(VIII) a review of the health and safety impact of cuts on communities, including the impact on food safety, national border security, and environmental cleanup;

(IX) an assessment of the impact of sequestration on environmental programs that protect the Nation's air and water, and safeguard children and families;

(X) assessment of the impact of sequestration on the Nation's infrastructure, including how cuts would harm the ability of States and communities to invest in roads, bridges, and waterways.

(XI) an assessment of the impact on ongoing government operations and the safety of Federal Government personnel;

(XII) a detailed estimate of the reduction in force of civilian personnel as a result of sequestration, including the estimated timing of such reduction in force actions and the timing of reduction in force notifications thereof; and

(XIII) an estimate of the number and value of all contracts that will be terminated, restructured, or revised in scope as a result of sequestration, including an estimate of potential termination costs and of increased contract costs due to renegotiation and reinstatement of contracts;

(iii) for direct spending—

(I) an estimate for the defense and nondefense functions based on current law of the sequestration percentages and amount necessary to achieve the required reduction;

(II) a specific identification of the reductions required for each nonexempt direct spending account at the program, project, and activity level; and

(III) a specific identification of exempt direct spending accounts at the program, project, and activity level; and

(iv) any other data or information that would enhance public understanding of the sequester and its effect on the defense and nondefense functions of the Federal Government including the impact on essential public safety responsibilities such as—

(I) homeland security, food safety, and air traffic control activities;

(II) an assessment of the impact of cuts to programs that the Nation's farmers rely on to help them through difficult economic times; and

(III) an assessment of the impact of Medicare cuts to the ability for seniors to access care.

(3) REPORT BY THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than August 15, 2012, the Secretary of Defense shall report on the impact on national defense accounts as defined by paragraphs (7)(A) and (8) of section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901a) using enacted levels of appropriations for accounts funded pursuant to an enacted regular appropriations bill for fiscal year 2013, and estimates pursuant to a current rate continuing resolution for accounts not funded through an enacted appropriations measure for fiscal year 2013 as the levels to which the sequestration should be applied.

(B) ELEMENTS OF THE DEFENSE REPORTS.—The report required by subparagraph (A) shall include the following:

(i) An assessment of the impact on ongoing operations and the safety of United States military and civilian personnel.

(ii) An assessment of the impact on the readiness of the Armed Forces, including impacts to steaming hours, flying hours, and full spectrum training miles, and an estimate of the increase or decrease in readiness (as defined in the C status C–1 through C–5).

(iii) A detailed estimate of the reduction in force of civilian personnel, including the estimated timing of such reduction in force actions and timing of reduction in force notifications thereof.

(iv) A list of the programs, projects, and activities of the Department of Defense that would be reduced or terminated and the expected savings for each program, project and activity.

(v) An estimate of the number and value of all contracts that will be terminated, restructured, or revised in scope, including an estimate of potential termination costs and of increased contract costs due to renegotiation and reinstatement of contracts.

(vi) An assessment of the impact on the ability of the Department of Defense to carry out the National Military Strategy of the United States, and any changes to the most recent Risk Assessment of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff under section 153(b) of title 10, United States Code, arising from sequestration.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the 60-affirmative threshold be waived, since it is my understanding that we will adopt this by voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, the amendment we are going to vote on is bipartisan, fair, and it will make sure Congress gets a report on the impact of all aspects of the scheduled automatic cuts. We all agree the bipartisan sequestration agreed to in the Budget Control Act is a terrible way to cut spending. It was included as a trigger in order to bring both sides to the table ready to compromise.

I am hopeful we can get together and get the bipartisan deal required to replace these automatic cuts responsibly and fairly. But as we work toward that we all should know exactly how the administration would enact sequestration if we don't get a deal.

I was very proud to work with Senators MCCAIN, LEVIN, and THUNE to come together on a bipartisan compromise to make sure Congress has the information we all need on sequestration from the painful cuts to the Defense Department, border security, food safety, education, and programs for middle-class families, on which the most vulnerable Americans depend.

So I thank all my colleagues for working with me on this bipartisan compromise, and I thank the families and advocates who called and wrote letters urging us to examine all aspects of sequestration.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, if sequestration comes to pass at the end of this year, many of us believe it could derail the economic recovery and do immense damage to important programs throughout the government, making our Nation less safe and our government less responsive to the needs of the people we serve.

But at this point, while our concern is deep and widespread, it is not specific. We know only in the most general terms what impact sequestration might have. And while that is enough to encourage many of us to seek the compromises needed to avoid sequestration, the Congress and the American people deserve a more complete picture of what we face.

That is why I am a cosponsor of the amendment offered by Senators MURRAY and MCCAIN, which would help give us and all Americans that more complete picture.

I thank Senator MCCAIN and Senator MURRAY for the leadership and hard work, on a bipartisan basis, that produced this amendment. It deserves broad bipartisan support, and not only because it will provide valuable information to us and our constituents. We must find ways to work across party lines more often and compromise for the common good. I hope this amendment can serve as one step toward the larger and more difficult compromises we must accomplish to avert the deep and lasting damage of sequestration.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, it is my understanding that Senator MCCAIN will not speak at this time, so I urge a ''yes'' vote on this voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2455) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, given the work that has been done, I wish to thank Senators MURRAY and MCCAIN for their efforts. Senator MCCAIN will not be offering his amendment, just for the information of the Senate. So we will move on now to the Rubio amendment, when Senator RUBIO is prepared.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on an amendment I have introduced—with a dozen cosponsors to require the Secretary of Defense to provide to Congress a detailed

report by August 15, 2012, on the impacts on national security of the automatic budget cuts, also known as sequestration. These cuts will be imposed upon the Defense Department 6 months from now unless Congress acts.

My amendment makes no changes to the Budget Control Act and should be non-controversial. It simply requires the Secretary of Defense to detail for us the implications of these cuts so that we may consider legislative options. My colleagues are well aware of how budget sequestration became the law of the land, of the failure of the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction, and of the enforcement mechanism of automatic cuts. But none of us fully understand the specific consequences of the across-the-board spending reductions should they be triggered on January 2, 2013.

We know from statements and testimony from the Secretary of Defense and high-ranking DOD and military officials that the impact of sequestration on the Department of Defense would be disastrous. I need not remind my colleagues that one of government's foundational responsibilities is to defend the Nation. Our constituents entrust us to do so. Allowing budget sequestration to occur in the Department of Defense would dramatically increase risk to our national security and undermine our ability to protect our interests at home and abroad.

I agree that our current fiscal climate demands that we reduce annual deficits and pay down the massive Federal debt. I also recognize that the demands placed on our Armed Forces are beginning to diminish at least insofar as current operations in Afghanistan are concerned. The administration and the Congress have acknowledged as much, reducing war funding by almost half since 2011. The President's withdrawal plan for Afghanistan will reduce that funding need even further. In addition, the President has already put in place a plan to cut the defense budget by $487 billion over the next 9 years.

I have reluctantly supported these planned cuts in the interest of deficit reduction, and we have scrutinized their impact on the Armed Forces. Many of my colleagues on the Senate Armed Services Committee joined me in expressing concerns to the Secretary of Defense about significant troop reductions in the Army and Marine Corps, major program curtailments, and proposed base closures.

Army Chief of Staff GEN Odierno told us that his service could perform its mission with 80,000 fewer troops. Commandant of the Marine Corps General Amos echoed those sentiments when describing his plan to reduce by 20,000 marines. My point is that the Department of Defense has already undertaken major budget reductions which will impact our forces for a decade or longer. While I do not agree with every reduction proposed by the administration, I acknowledge that we all need to tighten our belts and that the Defense Department is not sacrosanct.

It is in the context of the nearly $½ trillion of reductions that have already been levied against the Defense Department that we should consider the impact of additional automatic budget cuts. Budget sequestration would cancel an additional $½ trillion from the defense budget and would do so in a thoroughly arbitrary and destructive way. It is one thing for the Department to make planned reductions to troops, equipment, training, and operations, and to keep these reductions synchronized; it is quite another to apply an across-the-board percentage reduction to every defense program. The law does not provide flexibility; it dictates that budget sequestration must be applied in equal percentages to each ''program, project, and activity.'' That means equal percentage cuts in every research project, weapons program, and military construction project. Assuming military personnel accounts are exempted, we understand that cut to be about 14 percent. A 14-percent cut in a military construction project would render it unexecutable. How can you buy 86 percent of a building or 86 percent of an aircraft carrier? This is the danger of sequestration. The law mandates that cuts be taken equally across every budget line. It is absolutely senseless and will have enormous primary and secondary effects.

As an example, hundreds, perhaps thousands, of contracts for services and equipment will have to be renegotiated. Contracts with specific delivery quantities will have to be rewritten to reduce the quantities, which will increase the cost per unit to the government. More likely, management decisions will be taken out of the hands of managers and put into the hands of lawyers, as companies sue the government for breach of contract and termination costs. Legal proceedings could stretch out over years, at enormous expense to the taxpayer. ''Savings'' from budget sequestration would be consumed by the cost of implementing it. Maybe we should think of sequester as an earmark for lawyers.

Beyond the cost of implementing a dysfunctional system for budget cutting, the impact of sequestration on the capability of the Armed Forces would needlessly increase risk to national security. I am very concerned about the recent decision by the administration to apply sequestration to accounts supporting our military operations in Afghanistan. In November 2011, I was assured by the Secretary of Defense that this account would not directly be affected. Now, the Department is conceding that funds we are using to defeat our enemies and to build a secure and self-sufficient Afghanistan will be subject to immediate reductions. Despite this potentially grave risk to our military forces engaged in combat, the Department cannot tell me with any assurance to what extent our deployed forces will be affected. We must have a detailed assessment of the impact of these mandatory cuts to the support of our forces engaged in hostilities on behalf of our Nation.

We know that the President has decided to exempt veterans programs from budget sequestration but to include war funding under sequester. This demonstrates that the administration is actively deliberating the implementation of the Budget Control Act, which makes it all the more surprising that the President is reluctant to provide even a preliminary estimate of the impact of sequestration. If the President is making decisions regarding sequestration, why not reveal the impacts to Congress and the public?

The leaders of the Department of Defense have consistently stated that threats to the national security of the United States have increased, not decreased. Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta said that these automatic reductions would ''inflict severe damage to our national defense for generations.''

General Odierno testified that sequestration would force the Army to cut an additional 100,000 troops, half of which would come from the Guard and Reserve on top of the 80,000 soldiers already planned to be separated from service. General Odierno stated that the damaging effects of sequestration would force the Army to ''fundamentally re-look [at] how we do national security.''

The Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Greenert, testified that the Navy fleet would shrink from 285 ships to 230 to 235 ships, well below the 313 ships the Navy has said it requires. The Navy will be forced to absorb a cut equivalent to the entire annual shipbuilding budget. According to the Vice Chief of Naval Operations, ''The force that comes out of sequestration is not the force that can support the current [defense] strategy.''

Chief of Staff of the Air Force GEN Schwartz testified that sequestration ''would slash all of our investment accounts, including our top priority modernization program such as the KC–46 tanker, the F–35 Joint Strike Fighter, the MQ–9 remotely piloted aircraft, and the future long-range strike bomber.''

We would be left with a much more expensive, much less capable national defense program.

The irony in all this is that defense spending is not the reason we are in a fiscal mess. The United States spends about 20 percent of its annual budget on national defense. Since one of the principal responsibilities of government is to protect the Nation, I consider this amount to be quite modest. The real driver of our national debt is mandatory spending, which consumes 58 percent of the annual budget and is projected by the Office of Management and Budget to be over 62 percent by 2017—growth of almost a percentage point per year. However, under budget sequestration, half of the total amount of cuts would be levied from defense and the other half from all other government programs. Let me repeat that.

Defense is 20 percent of the budget but will take 50 percent of the cuts. It simply doesn't make sense.

In addition, these cuts will impact jobs in the defense industry as well as countless counties and towns around the country at a time when millions of Americans are still seeking employment. I appreciate the work of my friend Senator AYOTTE to bring this issue of industrial and economic impact to the forefront.

We must receive a clear assessment from the Department on the extent of the risk to our military operations in Afghanistan, to our military programs, and to readiness here at home if the automatic cuts are allowed to occur. Only when we have a clear picture of the impact of current law will we be able to consider alternatives to sequestration that reduce the deficit but do not imperil our Nation's security.

Some have suggested that the Congress wait until after the election to address possible alternatives to sequestration. Mr. President, we all know that nothing good happens in a lame-duck session. We cannot wait for an election to muster the courage to make difficult budget decisions. This amendment to the farm bill is meant to inform the debate about the perils we face if we do not take action.

I thank my colleague from Washington, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, there is nothing pending now on the Senate floor other than the farm bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. REID. We are in between votes; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Correct.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 1940

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that upon disposition of S. 3240, which is the farm bill, the Senate proceed to the cloture vote on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 250, S. 1940, which is the flood insurance bill; further, if cloture is invoked on the motion to proceed, notwithstanding cloture having been invoked, it be in order for the majority leader to lay before the body the House message with respect to S. 3187.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, if I might indicate to colleagues, we have one final amendment, the Rubio amendment, and Senator RUBIO will be coming to the floor shortly. Following his amendment, we will then be going to final passage.

I do want to take a moment to thank the leader. In the midst of an extremely demanding schedule, with things that need to get done in the Senate, he has given us this opportunity to complete this work. We will talk more about who has been involved in it later, but with all the demands of the Senate—whether it be flood insurance or addressing the concerns of student loan interest rates, the issues of small business and jobs and a whole range of issues that are very important for us to get done—our leader, with the support of the Republican leader, has been willing to allow us to move through 73 amendments. Now, I would note that we started with the possibility of 300, so 73 is certainly better than 300, but we know it was a major piece of work, and we very much appreciate our colleagues coming together to get this done.

Let me remind everyone that 16 million people work in jobs related to agriculture and our food systems, and they are watching us to see if we do the right thing and to see us work together to get this done and to create economic certainty for them and food security for our Nation. So I just would like to thank our leaders for their patience and willingness to stand with us.

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I have come to the floor to speak in favor of Senator RUBIO's amendment No. 2166, the Rewarding Achievement and Incentivizing Successful Employees Act, known as the RAISE Act. It is a catchy title, and sometimes here in Congress catchy bill titles can be very misleading. Sometimes the bill title means the exact opposite of what the bill would do, such as the Employee Free Choice Act, which actually would have taken away the right to make a free choice through a secret ballot. But in this case, I congratulate my colleague Senator RUBIO for a title that conveys precisely what the amendment aims to do.

The RAISE Act would allow employers to give employees raises, bonuses, incentive payments, and other monetary rewards whenever they are earned, whether the union boss approves or not. As all of us know, we are in extremely difficult economic times. Unemployment has been above 8 percent for over 40 months, now and a striking number of individuals are dropping out of the workforce altogether. When we do recover, as I know we will, we are likely to face a skills gap that will further hamper hiring and growth. One of the keys to our economic recovery is the health of small businesses.

For small businesses to reach their full potential, and grow into job-creating machines, they need the flexibility to maintain and attract the key employees who will get them there. Any small businessperson will tell you that their employees are their most important asset. They literally make the difference in whether the business succeeds or fails.

Once your company is unionized, you learn one way or another that it is now an ''unfair labor practice'' under section 8(a)(5) of the National Labor Relations Act to give an employee a raise or a bonus or an incentive or even a gift card for a job well done without the approval of the union boss. All compensation issues must be negotiated with the union, which allows the union to take credit for securing the raise. We have come across scores of cases where employers wanted to thank employees for good customer service, impressive sales growth, or attract employees to fill a critical manpower shortage, and the National Labor Relations Board, NLRB, penalized the employer for it. In a time of global competition, the last thing we need is a Federal agency punishing companies for trying to perform better by rewarding employees.

Believe it or not, there is opposition to this amendment. At least four of our largest labor unions AFL–CIO, AFSCME, SEIU, and the International Brotherhood of Teamsters—have opposed allowing employers to give raises.

Critics of this bill have said that if employers want to be able to reward employees beyond the union-approved wage floor, they can negotiate that provision into their contract. This is true. An employer can make the ability to incentivize employees one of their ''asks'' in negotiations, and they probably have to give up something else in order for the union to agree to that. But it is also true that getting such a provision in the bargaining agreement is not enough to protect employers from a charge of unfair labor practice from the union and penalty from the NLRB. In my research on this issue, I came across several cases where employers had negotiated a raise clause, but since the collective bargaining agreement expired and was in renegotiation, the NLRB ruled that the provision did not apply.

Let me cite an example from just a few years ago. A Montana water and mineral drilling company had negotiated a contract clause with their union to ensure that union-negotiated wages were only a floor and superior wages could be given with or without the consent of the union. When the company's orders increased, the company wanted to share the profits and decided to give employees unilateral raises, increase the per diem for meals, and raise the clothing and safety allowance reimbursement by 167 percent. But the union objected, and the NLRB agreed and stopped the raises. Why? Because although the company had negotiated the right to give raises, they were currently in the process of renegotiating their collective bargaining agreement and there had been no explicit extension of the clause allowing for superior wages and benefits. *O'Keefe Drilling*, Case 19–CA–29222(2005)

Unfortunately, this is not an isolated case. NLRB has repeatedly punished employers in similar situations.

An Oregon newspaper publisher had historically offered commission for sales of certain long-term advertisements. As it was adapting to having an online edition, it decided to qualify internet ad sales for commissions, as well, and added signing bonuses for new advertising clients. Although the newspaper had specifically negotiated for a

contract provision allowing it to pay wages in excess of the established wage, the bargaining agreement was in renegotiation. The NLRB sided with the union. *Register-Guard,* 339 NLRB 353 (2003)

The fact that raise provisions are negotiated into union contracts negates another criticism I have heard about this proposal. Some say that it would allow an employer to favor employees based on gender or race. This is entirely false—all race, sex, national origin and religion Federal discrimination statutes are and would remain in full effect.

I would like to share a few more examples of why this legislation will not just benefit American workers but everyone who relies on the services they provide. For example, there is a great deal of concern about the quality and availability of health care services in this country. You would think that any Federal agency would congratulate hospitals that strive to improve the service they provide. Unfortunately, that was not the case in these two examples.

During the nationwide nursing shortage we experienced in the last decade, a nonprofit New Mexico hospital was desperate for nurses. It was concerned about the ability to provide care and comply with mandatory staffing levels, so the hospital decided to offer $8000 signing bonuses and $2000 relocation bonuses. These generous bonuses were available for new applicants as well as current nurses—union members—who transferred to fill critical needs. But the union objected and the hospital was ordered to stop offering bonuses. *St. Vincent Hospital,* Case 28–CA–19039(2004)

In another case, a Brooklyn hospital was concerned about poor reviews of their nursing staff from patient satisfaction surveys, which had been an ongoing problem. The hospital decided to reward its best nurses, so it honored high-performing nurses with a breakfast, a pin, and gave them $100 gift cards since it was the winter holiday season. Unfortunately, the union objected to this honoring of exceptional nurses and filed charges with the National Labor Relations Board. Although these nurses earned $67,000 to $150,000 a year, the NLRB found that the gift card was not a one-time, de minimis gift but, rather, should be considered compensation and should have been a subject of negotiation with the union. The hospital was banned from giving such bonuses again. *Brooklyn Hospital Center*, Case No. 29–CA–29323(2009)

Clearly something has gone very wrong here, and I want to thank Senator RUBIO for offering us the ability to make it right. The ability to reward and incentivize employees is critical to the success of any enterprise. Instead of fixating on who gets credit for anything beneficial, our national labor-management policy should be to strengthen unionized and nonunionized businesses and encourage job creation. This will be good for all Americans, no matter what their union membership status.

I urge the Senate to support the Rubio amendment and adopt this commonsense change to allow American companies and their employees to thrive.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I see Senator RUBIO is on the floor, and I will now defer to him to offer his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

AMENDMENT NO. 2166

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to call up amendment No. 2166.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Florida [Mr. RUBIO] proposes an amendment numbered 2166.

Mr. RUBIO. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the National Labor Relations Act to permit employers to pay higher wages to their employees)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. PAYMENT OF HIGHER WAGES.

Section 9(a) of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 159(a)) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(1)'' after ''(a)''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) Notwithstanding a labor organization's exclusive representation of employees in a unit, or the terms and conditions of any collective bargaining contract or agreement then in effect, nothing in either—

''(A) section 8(a)(1) or section 8(a)(5), or

''(B) a collective bargaining contract or agreement renewed or entered into after the date of enactment of the RAISE Act,

shall prohibit an employer from paying an employee in the unit greater wages, pay, or other compensation for, or by reason of, his or her services as an employee of such employer, than provided for in such contract or agreement.''.

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, this amendment would amend the National Labor Relations Act to allow employers to give merit-based compensation increases to individual employees, even if those increases are not part of the collective bargaining agreement. Essentially, this will make the union contract wage a minimum, while giving employers the flexibility to reward diligent employees for their hard work. The bottom line is that today, if you work at one of these firms and the employer wants to give you a raise, they can't do it because it goes against the collective bargaining amount. So this amendment would allow them to do that.

That is a brief explanation of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, this amendment is a solution in search of a problem. I don't know—have any of my colleagues here had unionized businesses come to them complaining that they can't give a raise? Have any of my colleagues ever heard of that—they have complained they can't give a raise?

The fact is collective bargaining agreements already provide—many of them—for merit-based performance increases. That is part and parcel of a lot of the agreements today. So what this amendment basically does is it undercuts the National Labor Relations Act. That is exactly what it does. If you think we should do away with the National Labor Relations Act and all the benefits and all the protections it has both for businesses and for workers, this is your amendment right here. Quite frankly, I can't think of anything that would be more disruptive of a workplace than this amendment. When a business and workers have agreed on a collective bargaining agreement, this would destroy that kind of comity in the workplace.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, I disagree. And I know we are now going to vote on this matter, so I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 54, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 163 Leg.]

YEAS—45

Alexander	DeMint	McCain
Ayotte	Enzi	McConnell
Barrasso	Graham	Moran
Blunt	Grassley	Paul
Boozman	Hatch	Portman
Brown (MA)	Heller	Risch
Burr	Hoeven	Roberts
Chambliss	Hutchison	Rubio
Coats	Inhofe	Sessions
Coburn	Isakson	Shelby
Cochran	Johanns	Snowe
Collins	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Corker	Kyl	Toomey
Cornyn	Lee	Vitter
Crapo	Lugar	Wicker

NAYS—54

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

NOT VOTING—1

Kirk

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

Under the previous order, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

2501 PROGRAM

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Madam President, I have filed an amendment relating to the Socially Disadvantaged Farmers and Ranchers Program that I would like to bring to Senator STABENOW's attention.

As the Senator knows, the Outreach and Assistance to Socially Disadvantaged Farmers and Ranchers Program, also known as the ''2501 Program,'' helps our Nation's historically underserved producers gain access to the U.S. Department of Agriculture's credit, commodity, conservation, and other programs and services.

The program provides competitive grants to educational institutions, agriculture extension offices, and community-based organizations to assist African-American, Native American, Asian-American, and Latino farmers and ranchers in owning and operating farms and participating in USDA programs. The Outreach and Assistance to Socially Disadvantaged Farmers and Ranchers Program has served more than 100,000 rural constituents in over 400 counties and more than 35 States.

In my State many farmers and ranchers have benefited from projects funded through the 2501 Program.

I will just mention a few.

The New Mexico Acequia Association uses a 2501 grant to improve the sustainability and economic viability of small-scale agriculture among the farmers and ranchers who are part of the historic acequias and community ditches in New Mexico. With this funding the association supports centuries-old irrigation systems and agricultural traditions.

The Northern New Mexico Outreach Project, run by the New Mexico State University Cooperative Extension Service, is also working in my State to develop an education network system between northern New Mexico Hispanic and American Indian farmers and ranchers.

And with the help of 2501 funding, the Taos County Economic Development Corporation is revitalizing ranching and farming traditions that support the cultures of the area, utilizing new technologies and marketing opportunities.

Thanks to the efforts of the committee, the Socially Disadvantaged Farmers and Ranchers Program can now also extend benefits to veterans.

My amendment would have provided additional funds to support the traditional and new constituencies of the program by increasing direct funding for the program to $150 million over 5 years.

It would continue assistance to disadvantaged farmers and ranchers. And ensure that veterans are fully able to benefit from the program.

The committee mark of the Agriculture Reform, Food and Jobs Act of 2012 includes $5 million in annual mandatory funds for the Socially Disadvantaged Farmers and Ranchers Program and $20 million in annual discretionary funds for the program.

I hope that the Senator and her committee will work with me and with the Appropriations Committee to ensure adequate funding is allocated to the 2501 Program through the Appropriations process in the coming years.

Ms. STABENOW. I want to begin by thanking the Senator from New Mexico for his thoughtful work on this issue. This is an important program, and I commend the Senator for offering his amendment. As we move forward, I am happy to work with the Senator to engage the Appropriations Committee to provide adequate annual funding for the program in the coming years.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. I thank the Senator. I am certain she is aware that the USDA's Office of Inspector General released a preliminary audit report in May finding a level of mismanagement of the 2501 Program within the Office of Advocacy and Outreach, or OAO. The report found that OAO officials had not adhered to the agency's draft policies and procedures and did not carry out proper documentation during the selection of 2012 grant recipients.

The OAO has had an immediate and deliberate response to the report. The previous manager of the Socially Disadvantaged Farmers and Ranchers Outreach Program has been replaced, the office is putting in a more long-term staff, and the 2012 applicants and grant recipients are being reevaluated.

As the Senator knows, the 2501 Program is vital to ensuring that historically underserved farmers and ranchers have access to USDA programs. And, with the new mission to also serve veteran farmers and ranchers, it is more important than ever that the outreach program be properly administered.

I look forward to working with the Chairwoman and the committee in its oversight role to ensure that the Outreach and Assistance to Socially Disadvantaged Farmers and Ranchers Program is properly and effectively administered.

Ms. STABENOW. I, too, am concerned by the recent administration of the program, and I thank the Senator for addressing some of those issues in his amendment. I am hopeful that the positive steps already taken by the Office of Advocacy and Outreach will ensure the 2501 Program's continued success. I know that the Senator will continue to monitor this situation closely, and I look forward to working with him to ensure that the office fully complies with the recommendations of the OIG report and that the most qualified applicants are awarded grants.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. I thank the Senator. In closing, I would like to thank the Senator, the members of the Senate Agriculture Committee, and dedicated staff for all of the efforts to negotiate a good farm bill, one that provides significant savings and eliminates antiquated subsidies but seeks to ensure a sound future for agriculture and access to healthy food for families across the Nation.

Madam President, I rise today to discuss the farm bill. First, I wish to thank Senator STABENOW and Senator ROBERTS for their efforts in crafting a bill that will strengthen our agricultural and rural economy as well as one which reflects fiscal realities. Chairwoman STABENOW and Ranking Member ROBERTS reached across the aisle. They relied on common sense and they found common ground, with compromise and with a focus on results. They, and the members of the Agriculture Committee, worked together and created this bipartisan legislation.

We all know how important this bill is for the 16 million Americans whose jobs are in agriculture and for the consumers who depend on safe, affordable food. It is also important for the families who need nutritional assistance and for the prudent stewardship of our lands. The importance of this legislation cannot be understated.

Like so many New Mexicans, farming and ranching are in my blood. My grandmother drove cattle through New Mexico in the late 1800s. Ranching and farming is a part of my heritage, and of New Mexico's. And it is vital to our economy. More than 20,000 farms are in New Mexico.

The people in my State know that ranching and farming is hard work. The only thing one can count on is uncertainty. It is a uniquely risky business, vulnerable to calamities of weather, subject to global fluctuations in prices and unfair competition. But, American agriculture is the world's leader. It is second to none. It is crucial to our economy and to our national security.

This legislation is truly a reform bill. It is the most significant reform of our agriculture policy in decades. For years, Congress has reauthorized confusing and inequitable farm subsidies, and the public looked on in wonder. The subsidies have in some part helped to keep sectors of US Agriculture vibrant, but, there have been blatant inefficiencies and waste. The rules surrounding direct payments is one example. Such rules do not even require that the recipient grow the covered commodity to receive their payment. The result is an inequitable flow of Federal funds. This hinders new producers and short changes producers who were not lucky enough to own ''base acres'' when they were identified in the 1980s.

For decades, farm bills have come and gone without the subsidy reforms Americans have been calling for. But Chairman STABENOW and Ranking Member ROBERTS have taken that unprecedented bold step. Their bill ends direct payments and other major subsidies once and for all.

The 2012 Senate farm bill offers a more equitable insurance that producers buy into. It is not mandatory, but it is a sound safety net that will support American producers.

Chairman STABENOW and Ranking Member ROBERTS also set new precedent in turning more attention to

crops historically left on the sidelines. Their bill boldly supports fruits, vegetables, nuts and other products so important to creating healthy living. The bill promotes access to nutritious food through farmers markets and locally grown produce. And it strengthens specialty crop provisions. My State is justly famous for its green chile. This bill will help chile and other specialty crops find export markets. And it provides for more research to keep these crops vibrant and competitive.

This legislation will create a more even playing field for dairy farmers, providing a safety net that has no regional or size bias. The bill also continues essential support for livestock producers. In my State, ranchers face grave threats from severe drought and fires and from the continued loss of grazing lands.

This farm bill streamlines and consolidates programs and it reduces the deficit by over $23 billion. Let me repeat: $23 billion in deficit reduction. That is twice the amount recommended by the Simpson-Bowles commission.

This is a strong bill overall. It is not perfect. It consolidates and simplifies conservation programs. But, unfortunately, there are significant cuts in funding. There are cuts in programs that protect watersheds, grasslands, soil, and habitats. These are programs that producers depend on. There are cuts in programs to restore forage, ensure compliance with environmental laws, and maintain healthy soil. It is truly unfortunate to lose such vital funding.

The farm bill covers a very large canvas and addresses many diverse needs. There will be, and should be, healthy debate.

I want to speak today about three specific amendments that I believe will improve this bill.

First, I have filed an amendment to restore mandatory funds for the Outreach and Assistance to Socially Disadvantaged Farmers and Ranchers Program. Thanks to the efforts of the committee, this program can now extend benefits to veterans. My amendment would ensure that the necessary funds are there. This program has helped our Nation's historically underserved producers for over 20 years by providing better access to Department of Agriculture credit, commodity, and conservation services and by providing technical assistance. It has worked and it deserves continued support.

The Outreach and Assistance to Socially Disadvantaged Farmers and Ranchers Program has served more than 100,000 rural constituents in over 400 counties and more than 35 States. With adequate funding, it can also provide critical support for veteran farmers and ranchers.

Specifically, my amendment would restore direct funding to $150 million over 5 years.

It would continue assistance to disadvantaged farmers and ranchers and ensure that veterans are fully able to benefit from the program.

Second, I have proposed an amendment for rural development funding for frontier communities. Across our Nation, including in my home State, there are many very small, very rural communities with a population density of less than 20 people per square mile. These are great communities, proud communities, with rich histories. But, they have a hard time competing for rural development loans and grants. Often, they don't have the personnel. They don't have the resources. But, their need is just as great as that of larger communities.

My amendment would create a setaside for frontier communities allowing them to access USDA funds targeted for these very small, very rural communities. It would allow the USDA to reach our Nation's most rural and underserved communities. The setaside would be a minimum of percent of rural development programs and it would allow frontier communities to qualify for up to 100 percent grant funding, with no minimum grant or loan requirement.

My amendment would also create a grant program for technical assistance and planning for frontier communities, making sure that funding goes as far as possible. Financing for this program would be from overall rural development funding of no more than 5 percent.

And, third, I have filed an amendment for a rural development setaside for community land grants. These land grant Mercedes are part of a unique and important history in the southwest dating back to the treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo. These were grants of land made by the governments of Spain or Mexico to entire communities.

These community land grants have a history of loss of land, a history of manipulation and unkept commitments, and a recognized need for increased economic opportunities. My amendment proposes to respond to this unfortunate history. Rural development assistance is crucial to these unique communities.

I wish to again commend my colleagues for this bipartisan legislation. It will continue building our economy by providing jobs and by providing the certainty that producers need for innovation and growth and by providing for the safest, healthiest, and most abundant food supply in the world.

Mr. KOHL. Madam President, I rise to support and encourage passage of this farm bill.

Farm bills are difficult measures to shepherd through this chamber. There has never been—and never will—be a 'perfect' one in the eyes of every Member of this body. But American agriculture needs a new farm bill and this one deserves our support for a variety of reasons.

For starters, it delivers over $23 billion dollars in savings at time when our Nation's balance sheet needs it most.

It improves nutrition programs by curbing fraud and improving program integrity. Hungry Americans—many of whom are children—need a food safety net when times are tough. These changes support that safety net and deliver more accountability to taxpayers.

This bill also responds to concerns articulated by dairy farmers who are hugely important to me and to Wisconsin. Long-time farm policy observers know of my enduring interest in dairy policy. The MILC program, which I co-authored with several of my colleagues in this chamber, was the first comprehensive safety net for American dairy producers. It provided payments in time of low prices and cost the government nothing when we had robust dairy prices. Dairy farmers today face new and different challenges. In recent years they have seen situations where, despite robust milk prices, their input prices dramatically escalated and their margins evaporated. The dairy policy embodied in this bill recognizes that challenge and establishes margin protection insurance. Participants will be given the option to choose the level of margin protection that makes the most sense for their dairy operations.

I supported a number of amendments to this farm bill. Among them were modifications to enhance rural development and programs for beginning farmers. Farm bills touch our Nation in many different ways, and these are two areas that merit more attention and continued diligence. I also opposed a number of amendments because I feared they would undermine agriculture exports, our ability to innovate, and our organic agriculture sector.

Finally, I want to congratulate the chair and ranking member of the Senate Agriculture Committee for their diligent work. It takes an enormous amount of effort to move a farm bill. They worked hard to find consensus and deserve our thanks. I also want to acknowledge with thanks their staff, including Cory Claussen and Jonathan Coppess of the majority and Eric Steiner from the Republican staff. They worked very hard on a variety of topics, including the dairy provisions.

I encourage my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I support passage of the 2012 farm bill, S. 3240, the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2012.

I have made it a priority to keep Pennsylvania's agricultural industry and our rural economies strong to support Pennsylvanian families.

Agriculture is the Commonwealth's largest industry. Pennsylvania's farm gate value that is cash receipts to growers, in 2010, was $5.7 billion. Agribusiness in Pennsylvania is a $46.4 billion industry, and 17.5 percent of Pennsylvanians are employed in the food and fiber system. What does this mean?

It means that the Senate MUST pass this farm bill, that the House must pass a farm bill, and that the President

must sign a farm bill into law before it expires at the end of September.

The farm bill creates economic opportunities in our rural areas and sustains the consumers and businesses that rely on our rural economy. When the cows need to be milked, dairy farmers go out to the barn and do their jobs. We should follow their example and reauthorize the farm bill in a responsible way that helps contribute to deficit reduction.

If passed into law, this farm bill would reduce the deficit by approximately $23 billion through the elimination of some subsidies, the consolidation of programs, and producing greater efficiencies in program delivery.

Dairy is the Commonwealth's No. 1 agricultural sector. The dairy industry annually generates more than $1.6 billion in on-farm cash receipts, which represent about 42 percent of Pennsylvania's total agricultural receipts.

I introduced two dairy bills this Congress: the Federal Milk Marketing Improvement Act, S. 1640, and the Dairy Advancement Act, S. 1682. These bills are aimed to ensure that farmers receive a fair price for their milk to increase price transparency, to protect against price volatility, and to encourage processor innovation.

I am concerned that while the proposed dairy program to manage the Nation's milk supply will reduce the volatility of dairy farming, that program will discourage innovation and exports, as well as send the wrong signals to our trading partners.

I secured language which requires USDA to thoroughly examine if the dairy market stabilization program is working, and if it is not working, make recommendations on how to fix it. This bill also contains my amendment to codify the frequency of dairy product reporting that is important for the dairy industry to make business decisions. It would also require USDA to examine whether it would be practical to move to a two-class system for milk that could help to simplify the Federal milk marketing orders.

Dairy farmers deserve the best dairy program possible. The Senate bill contains many improvements that I support.

Making risk management and crop insurance products work better for Pennsylvanians, especially small farmers, specialty crop farmers, and organic farmers is very important.

This bill contains language similar to an amendment that I offered during the Agriculture Committee's markup that would help to improve crop insurance for organic farmers.

Providing funding through risk management, conservation, and agricultural marketing agencies to underserved States, the Agricultural Management Assistance, AMA, Program helps to make the farm bill more equitable among regions.

I sincerely appreciate the chairwoman's and ranking member's work to enhance the Agricultural Management Assistance Program, including support for organic transition assistance.

The improvements in this bill to crop insurance delivery are critical.

We have worked to address the unique concerns of specialty crop farmers and beginning farmers—and we have done so in a bipartisan way.

Specialty crops are very important to Pennsylvanian agriculture.

After working with the chairwoman and ranking member, I was able to ensure improvements in promotion programs within the farm bill and direct USDA to assess the feasibility of allowing organic producers to participate in an organic foods promotion program.

The Specialty Crops Research Initiative, SCRI, Specialty Crops Block Grant Program, and Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Snack Program all advance the specialty crops industry, playing a key role in ensuring that this important agricultural sector receives continued acknowledgement in the farm bill. These programs remain strong under this bill.

In addition, the Nation's organic industry has grown exponentially from $3.6 billion in 1997 to $29 billion in 2010, with an annual growth rate of 19 percent from 1997 to 2008. In 2008, Pennsylvania was ranked sixth in number of organic farms with 586 and third in sales at $212.7 million.

Through research, we develop more efficient and effective farming methods. Research also helps producers maintain a competitive edge in the global market by fighting threatening diseases and pests.

I am pleased that the farm bill invests in relevant and targeted research and maintains the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service programs that work to eradicate the invasive species that threaten our Nation's forests and farms.

The U.S. Forest Service's State and private forestry programs are essential for assisting forest landowners in managing threats and enhancing stewardship. I am pleased that the farm bill continues the Forest Stewardship Program, FSP, so that forest owners can create long-term management plans with the technical assistance of State forestry agency partners.

I am also grateful to the chairwoman and ranking member for working with me to fix USDA's Biopreferred Program to even the playing field for Pennsylvanian forestry products. Revenues from Pennsylvania's forest products industry exceed $5.5 billion annually. Over 10 percent of the State's manufacturing workforce is involved in the forest products industry.

I am appreciative to the committee for the inclusion of my provision directing USDA to work with the Food and Drug Administration toward the development of a standard of identity for honey, a tool which will promote honesty and fair dealing and serve the interest of consumers and Pennsylvania's honey industry. The majority of our honey is imported, but because there is no standard, contaminated, low-quality honey continues to pass through customs and undercut our domestic product. Pennsylvania is a major player in the honey industry. Honey bee pollination can be directly attributed to the production of about $60 million of agricultural produce in Pennsylvania annually.

I am committed to keeping Pennsylvania's rural communities strong and support rural development programs that provide access to capital for rural businesses to provide economic opportunities and create jobs. A rural community's viability in attracting and keeping businesses is often directly related to the condition of its infrastructure and facilities. USDA's rural development programs empower rural communities, transform local economies, and preserve the quality of life in small towns across the Commonwealth. A rural economic development program that saves and creates jobs in rural economies and improves rural life is extremely important for Pennsylvanian families.

I introduced the Growing Opportunities for Agriculture and Responding to Markets, GO FARM, Act, which will help to enhance local food systems and encourage production of food for local communities. The GO FARM Act would provide loans to third parties to lend to producers growing products for local markets. In addition to the GO FARM Act, I support increasing the availability of healthy foods, addressing the issue of food deserts and developing and improving local food systems.

Farmers are the original stewards of the land and continue to lead the charge in protecting our natural resources. I believe the voluntary conservation programs in the farm bill provide important tools to help farmers comply with Federal and State regulations while keeping farmers in business. I am committed to making conservation programs more efficient, effective, and relevant to farmers.

Conservation programs are an extremely important resource for many Pennsylvanian farmers. I worked with my Senate colleagues to support enhancements to conservation programs through this process in an effort to ensure that these remodeled programs would better serve the needs of Pennsylvanians.

Pennsylvania's watersheds contribute more than half of the fresh water flowing to the Chesapeake Bay. While Pennsylvania does not border the bay, activities in the Commonwealth profoundly affect the bay's health. The bay, the largest estuarine ecosystem in the U.S., and its tributaries, such as Susquehanna and Potomac Rivers, are important to the region's economy, culture, and outdoor recreation.

Under the 2008 farm bill, the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Initiative, CBWI, provided essential support to farmers facing Federal and state regulations

concerning water quality and helped to meet demand for conservation programs. In advance of the Agriculture Committee's consideration of the 2012 farm bill, I introduced the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Fairness Act, which among other things reauthorized the CBWI, because I know Pennsylvania farmers used this program very well.

I am grateful that the 2012 farm bill contains portions of this legislation which are aimed at equipping farmers with the tools necessary to better meet water quality goals. However, in this bill, CBWI is not continued. Due to the committee's desire to reduce the number of conservation programs, the farm bill consolidates four different programs into one that will provide competitive funds to regional partnerships and will also provide conservation funding directly to producers. CBWI was one of the programs that got folded into this new program.

I worked very closely with other Senators from the watershed to strengthen the conservation title to better benefit our region. Together we secured significant policy improvements. The current bill focuses on the most critical conservation areas and will help farmers in the Chesapeake Bay watershed participate in conservation programs so that they can help the region meet water quality standards.

Pennsylvania's agricultural producers and forestland owners use the Environmental Quality Incentives Program, EQIP, to implement conservation practices, which might otherwise be cost prohibitive, to protect valuable natural resources.

Further, the Farmland Protection Program, FPP, protects prime farmland from development. FPP should remain a permanent easement program to keep working lands preserved as farm land; should keep State, local governments, and nongovernmental organizations as partners; and should certify successful entities like the Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture's Bureau of Farmland Protection to improve the efficiency of this program. We worked very hard to make improvements to FPP during the last farm bill and those developments continue.

While I do not mention all of the farm bill conservation programs, I do believe that each serves an important purpose.

Ending hunger remains one of my top priorities, as it cuts across all of the major challenges we face as a country. There is no better opportunity to strengthen nutrition policy and programs than through a well-crafted farm bill.

The Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program, SNAP, is the Federal Government's primary response to the food insecurity experienced by so many people. SNAP is an integral part of the overall safety net, which enables people to get back on their feet.

Similarly, The Emergency Food Assistance Program, TEFAP, enables food banks, shelters, and other providers to deliver necessary food packages and meals to people with emergency food needs. The Senior Farmers' Market Nutrition Program and the Commodity Supplemental Food Program also provide vital food resources to low-income seniors who are often not helped by other food assistance programs. I support these programs as they assist the most vulnerable of our society—children, seniors, and families experiencing food insecurity.

As Congress works to authorize the 2012 farm bill, I will continue to fight to protect the needs of Pennsylvanians.

I urge my colleagues in the Senate to pass this farm bill.

Mr. REED. Madam President, the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2012, also known as the farm bill, makes some strides in reforming agriculture policy and subsidies. However, in my view, these reforms are not sufficient. Moreover, the bill contains cuts to nutrition and conservation programs and changes to eligibility for rural communities that when taken together make it worse than current law. As such, I will oppose the bill, although I do so reluctantly.

Indeed, despite my conclusions, I commend Chairwoman STABENOW for crafting a bill that delivers $23.6 billion in taxpayer savings over 10 years, cracks down on abuse, and eliminates egregious payments to nonfarmers, millionaire farmers, and farmers for crops they aren't growing.

The bill also makes several positive changes to programs important to my home State of Rhode Island that help small farms, farmers markets, and local food production. Rhode Island is a model example of the small and local farm movement. Since 2002, the number of farms has increased from 858 to 1,220 farms, whereas the average farm size in the State has actually decreased from 71 to 56 acres. That is why I am pleased that the bill includes many measures from Senator SHERROD BROWN's Local Farms, Food and Jobs Act that I cosponsored and increased funding for specialty crop block grants to support research and promotion of fruits, vegetables, and other specialty crops.

The bill also initiates new hunger-free communities incentive grants by providing funding of $100 million over 5 years for a national pilot to incentivize the purchase of fruits and vegetables at farmers markets by SNAP participants. A similar privately funded program has already been successfully implemented in Rhode Island where every $5 in SNAP benefits spent at a farmers market allows low-income individuals to receive an additional $2 in fruits and vegetables. It is good to see the ingenuity of our States replicated at the national level in ways to help low-income families have access to nutritious local foods.

Another positive measure is the enhancement of the Farmers Market and Local Food Promotion Program to aid direct producer-to-consumer marketing channels and local food sales to retailers and institutions. The bill also doubles mandatory funding for this program.

However, as a recent Washington Post editorial stated, ''The current bill achieves some reform. There is still much more to be done.''

While the current bill cuts direct payments by $44.6 billion, it restores $28.5 billion of those cuts by creating a new market-based program called Agriculture Risk Coverage and adds an additional $5 billion for crop insurance.

Indeed, many of the reform measures in the bill do not go as far as those in the Lugar-Lautenberg Fresh Act of 2007, which I cosponsored during the last farm bill debate.

At the time, that measure would have increased funding by $2.5 billion for nutrition programs, SNAP, and specialty crops, and $1 billion more for conservation programs. In contrast, the Senate bill we are currently debating cuts SNAP by $4.5 billion and conservation programs by $6.4 billion.

The nutrition cuts are particularly challenging for Rhode Island, where roughly 1 in 6 people receives SNAP benefits and the unemployment rate remains at a too-high rate of 11 percent, the second highest in the country.

SNAP usage is unfortunately very high right now as Americans are struggling along with the economy to get back on track. No one wants to see such a high need, but at the same time SNAP assistance is the lifeline for these families to be able to put food on the table. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle shouldn't be trying to cut these funds; they should be working with us instead of thwarting our efforts to pass meaningful jobs bills that could help many of these SNAP beneficiaries find work and lessen their need for assistance.

That is why I cosponsored and voted in favor of Senator GILLIBRAND's amendment that would have restored the nutrition cuts, which the Congressional Budget Office, CBO, estimates would result in an average benefit cut of $90 per month for 500,000 households nationwide. According to RI Department of Human Services, approximately 20,000 households could see an average SNAP cut of $95 per month if the cuts were implemented.

The Gillibrand amendment was paid for by reducing the subsidies that the Federal Government pays the crop insurance companies for administration and operating expenses and lowering their guaranteed rate of return from their current level of 14 percent to 12 percent. That is certainly a reasonable rate of return in this economy.

I was very disappointed that this amendment was not agreed to as this proposed cut of $4.5 billion starts us down the wrong path in future farm bill negotiations with the House, which is expected to have even deeper SNAP cuts in their bill.

Another provision I am concerned could negatively impact Rhode Island is the change in the definition of rural that could decrease the eligibility for Rhode Island communities to be able to apply for loans and grants under Rural Development programs. I appreciate Chairman STABENOW and Ranking Member ROBERTS working with Members from affected States to include in the managers' package a 3-year grandfathering of existing communities and an important stipulation that thereafter communities shall remain eligible unless ruled otherwise by the Secretary of Agriculture. However, the change in the definition does not completely remove the uncertainty for Rhode Island rural communities to be eligible in the future as they look to make needed improvements to their water and waste disposal systems or community facilities.

We need to help out the small farmers and businesses in this country, not continue to help the large, wealthy farmers. And we certainly should not pay for expansive farm programs by placing additional burdens on those who are struggling to make ends meet.

It is for these reasons that I am unable to support this bill in its current form. While I fear the bill will only get worse as negotiations begin with the House, I certainly hope the matters that I have raised can be addressed during that process.

Mr. LEVIN. I am pleased to vote for passage of the Agriculture Reform, Food and Jobs Act. The bill before us makes important reforms to farm programs by helping agricultural producers manage their risk, invests funding to protect our natural resources, and provides food assistance to families in need.

America's agricultural economy is responsible for 16 million jobs. There are over 2 million farms in this country that contribute nearly $80 billion to the Nation's economy. Americans and people all over the world depend on America's farms to feed their families. So passage of a farm bill that protects the food supply, gives farmers the support they need, and combats hunger is of high importance.

I want to congratulate Senator STABENOW, the chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee and my Michigan colleague, for managing this important legislation so skillfully.

This bill marks important change in how we assist our Nation's farmers. Instead of making direct and countercyclical payments to farmers, sometimes for crops they haven't even grown, this bill ends those practices and instead focuses on working with farmers to manage risks.

My home State of Michigan is second only to California in the number of crops grown and second to none in tart cherry production. Unusually warm weather in March resulted in an early bloom for many of our fruit crops, including tart cherries. These crops were then heavily damaged by a series of freezes during April and May.

I visited a cherry orchard in northern Michigan last month and viewed the damage. The damage from these freezes is severe; many trees and entire orchards will bear no fruit at all. Growers still need to maintain their orchards, spraying for bugs and disease, but can expect no payment for their crop. I am particularly concerned about tart cherry growers as they cannot currently purchase crop insurance.

The bill we are voting on today directs the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation Board to develop new crop insurance policies for underserved crops, including specialty crops like cherries. The bill also increases funding to help develop these policies. These new policies are sorely needed in Michigan.

The bill also includes $58 billion over a 10-year period for conservation programs that protect our Nation's waters, soil quality and wildlife habitats, prevent erosion, and help alleviate other natural resource problems. These programs have benefitted Michigan by protecting sensitive lands and waters and preventing polluted runoff and sediments from getting into our precious Great Lakes, where they can create problems such as harmful algae blooms. Preventing runoff and controlling erosion can also lower costs for water treatment and dredging of Great Lakes harbors. To create a more efficient system for accessing and implementing these conservation programs, the bill consolidates more than 20 existing programs into 10 programs.

One new program in the bill, the Regional Conservation Partnership Program, in particular could benefit the Great Lakes. This program would provide funding through a competitive process for conservation projects that improve soil quality, water quality or quantity, or wildlife habitats on a regional or watershed scale. Because the Great Lakes region already has a regional plan in place, our region should be able to effectively compete for the $250 million in annual funding that would be provided for this program. We have made some solid progress in cleaning up our Great Lakes and other waters in Michigan, but there is still much more to be done. The conservation funding provided in the farm bill would help with the efforts to protect and restore the Great Lakes, as well as protect sensitive lands and wildlife, conserve open space and forests, and provide economic benefits.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, as is evident from the amount of debate and attention devoted to it, the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2012 is an enormously important piece of legislation for our Nation, as it certainly is for my State of Iowa. Although the measure is commonly referred to as the farm bill, that name captures just a fraction of what it contains to benefit all Americans and millions of others around the world.

Despite the severe economic challenges over the past half decade, agriculture and agriculture-related jobs and economic activity have been a real source of hope, opportunity, and recovery. That is especially so in my State, where agriculture generates about one of every five Iowa jobs and about a fourth of our State's economic output.

Iowa is well known, of course, for its distinctive farm state and smalltown character and for producing corn, soybeans, hogs, cattle, eggs, and other commodities. We have enjoyed tremendous benefits from greater diversification in agriculture and the rural economy. Take for example the boom in biofuels such as ethanol and biodiesel and in wind power.

It is critical for us to enact this bill in order to continue and enhance the contributions of agriculture and agriculture-related industries to our Nation's economy, to jobs, and to meeting ever-growing global demands for food, fiber, and energy.

I commend Chairwoman STABENOW and Senator ROBERTS, the ranking Republican member, for all of their hard, conscientious, and successful work on this bill. I also thank them for their efforts to take into account and reflect in this bill the circumstances, views, and needs of both rural and urban America as well as the various regions and types of agriculture across our Nation. I certainly appreciate their task. This is the eighth farm bill I have worked to enact, starting as a member of the House Agriculture Committee. Since 1985 I have served on the Senate Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Committee and am proud to have been the chairman of that committee during the writing and enactment of the most recent two farm bills.

This legislation, approved by our committee in April, is a sound, balanced, and bipartisan bill crafted under budget conditions that have necessitated difficult decisions, judgments, and compromises. According to scoring by the Congressional Budget Office, this measure will reduce spending over the next 10 fiscal years by more than $23 billion from budget baseline levels.

The spending reductions in programs encompassed in this bill thus appear to be several billion dollars larger than the automatic spending cuts slated to begin in January of next year under the sequestration mechanism in the Budget Control Act of 2011. Hence, this farm bill is a serious, good-faith effort going significantly beyond the minimum to reduce our budget deficits and curtail our Nation's debt. Again, these spending reductions will have very real impacts, and frankly I regret them and their consequences. We are not as a Nation investing too much in the future of our Nation's agriculture and food system, in fighting hunger and malnutrition, in conserving our Nation's soil, water, and other resources for future generations, in securing our future with renewable energy and biobased materials, or in strengthening and growing jobs in our Nation's small towns and rural communities. Unquestionably, because of our Federal budget

situation and choices that have been made in dealing with it, there is less money to respond to national needs and priorities in the Federal policies and programs covered in this bill.

Given the budgetary hand dealt it, the Agriculture Committee, with the bipartisan leadership of our Chairwoman and Ranking Member, reported a bill combining budget savings with genuine reforms throughout its various titles. The most significant reform—in fact, pivotal reform—lies in the substantial changes in the commodity and farm income protection programs.

To help farm families and rural communities survive and manage the inevitable vagaries of weather and markets, the new farm bill continues a strong system ensuring a degree of stability and protecting against significant losses in farm income. The legislation contains major reform in terminating the existing direct and countercyclical Payments Program and replacing it with the Agriculture Risk Coverage, or ARC, program. ARC is designed to compensate for a portion of farm revenue losses and to supplement the revenue insurance policies that farmers typically rely upon to manage risk.

Because farm income protection based on revenue accounts for the fact that farm income is the product of crop yield times its price in the market, ARC is an improvement over the direct and countercyclical payments program in current law. Direct payments are made in fixed amounts according to each farm's base acreage and program payment yields, which in general were established decades ago. Consequently, the direct payments do not accurately reflect or respond to existing economic circumstances in agriculture because they are made without regard to a farm's current planted acres of crops or to whether crop prices and yields are high or low. The existing countercyclical payment program compensates for a portion of losses when the national average price of a covered commodity falls below a statutory target price. But the countercyclical program's target prices are well below current market prices and costs of production for commodities, and of course, a price-based system does not account for yield losses.

Agricultural producers have been divided over the direct payments since they were adopted in the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 as a replacement for the then-existing target price income protection system. Supporters of direct payments note that they are considered not to be production or trade distorting and that they provide income assistance to farmers who may not benefit much from other commodity programs or crop insurance.

From their beginning, I believed that the direct payments were not sound policy. Within a few years, after they were enacted during a period of strong commodity prices, the direct payments proved inadequate to protect farm income in the face of a sharp falloff in commodity prices, and so we had to resort to enacting ad hoc emergency legislation to make up for the shortcomings of the direct payments.

To restore better protection against farm income losses, I introduced legislation in November 2001 to create a new countercyclical target revenue program. As chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, I was pleased that we then reinstated a countercyclical income protection program in the 2002 Farm Security and Rural Investment Act. In 2007 and 2008, with the leadership of Senator DICK DURBIN and Senator SHERROD BROWN, I was pleased that we included the Average Crop Revenue Election, or ACRE Program, in the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008. ACRE is, of course, the forerunner of the ARC program in the pending new farm bill.

The reform and evolution reflected in this new farm bill is very greatly facilitated by the significant improvement and strengthening of the Federal Crop Insurance Program. Crop insurance, particularly the revenue policies, are now vitally important to agricultural producers, their lenders and creditors, and to the rural economy. So it is an important feature of this bill that it further strengthens and improves the Crop Insurance Program, building upon the Agriculture Risk Protection Act of 2000 and additional improvements in the past two farm bills.

The pending bill also continues a strong conservation title with highly effective programs and funding for them, along with extensive reforms, streamlining, and updating of their structure and functioning. The Department of Agriculture's conservation programs have an outstanding record of success in helping America's farmers and ranchers produce an abundant supply of food, fiber, and fuel, while conserving and protecting our Nation's soil, water, wildlife, and other natural resources. Again, I very much regret that budget circumstances have imposed spending reductions in the conservation title of this bill. There is far more conservation work to be done and demand for USDA conservation assistance than can be met with existing levels of funding. But, as I have noted, these funding reductions are the reality for the crafting of this bill.

In the past two farm bills, as chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, I made a very strong push for strengthening the full range of USDA conservation programs and for increasing funding to respond to the need and demand for conservation assistance to farmers and ranchers across our Nation. In the 2002 and 2008 farm bills, we very substantially increased our Federal investment in agricultural conservation, building upon successes in preceding farm bills, especially owing to the leadership of the former chairmen of the Senate Agriculture Committee, Senator LEAHY and Senator LUGAR.

For many years, I have emphasized the necessity of promoting and assisting sound conservation practices on land in agricultural production, often referred to as ''working lands''. Agricultural producers are striving to produce much more food in the coming decades to nourish billions more inhabitants of the the Earth. If we hope to produce more and more food in the coming years, it is critical to conserve the underlying resources that support agricultural production.

My objective has been to enact and invest in programs that compensate and assist agricultural producers for their costs, foregone income, and environmental benefits associated with adopting and maintaining practices that protect and sustain soil, water, wildlife, and other resources. In the 1990 farm bill, the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act, we included the Agricultural Water Quality Incentives Program, which I had authored, to provide incentive and cost share payments for practices addressing water quality issues in agricultural production.

In the 1996, 2002, and 2008 farm bills, we substantially expanded and improved conservation programs covering land in agricultural production. I am especially proud of the Conservation Stewardship Program, CSP, which I authored and worked successfully to include in the 2002 farm bill, where it was then named the Conservation Security Program. CSP now has enrolled nearly 50 million acres of agricultural land across our Nation, including crop land, pasture land, range land, and forest land.

CSP and the Environmental Quality Incentives Program, EQIP, both focus on promoting and supporting conservation on land that is in agricultural production. They are not land-idling programs. Agricultural producers voluntarily enroll in CSP and EQIP because they are committed to good stewardship and these programs help them fulfill that commitment. CSP and EQIP also help farmers and ranchers to take voluntary action to solve environmental and conservation challenges and thereby avoid regulations. Participants in both programs contribute their own money, time, and effort, so the Federal funds leverage a significant amount of added private money. The level of interest in and demand for both EQIP and CSP greatly exceeds the funding now available and that which is provided in this bill.

To be clear, America's farmers and ranchers have done a tremendous amount of excellent conservation work. Even so, they know that a good deal more conservation work is needed, and they are dedicated to carrying it out. Providing them assistance through the several USDA conservation programs included in this farm bill is a tremendously important investment in conserving and protecting our Nation's vital natural resources for future generations.

This agriculture and food legislation also continues, with reforms and spending reductions, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, SNAP, and related programs that help low-income families put food on their tables. No title of this bill is more critical to those who rely upon its benefits, nor is any title more important to our Nation in meeting our responsibilities to our fellow citizens. We hear criticisms of Federal nutrition assistance, but let us not forget that the vast majority of Americans who receive this help are children, seniors, people with disabilities, or working families. Indeed, recent years have shown how vitally important SNAP and related nutrition assistance are to enabling working families and especially the children in these families avoid hunger and malnutrition.

The reforms in this bill reduce Federal spending by limiting eligibility and benefits. I regret that our budget circumstances have led to this outcome, but again I give credit to Senator STABENOW and Senator ROBERTS for holding these cuts to nutrition to much lower levels than other proposals that have been made, including the budget resolution adopted in the House of Representatives. It is also gratifying that this body has in recent days rejected several amendments that would have drastically reduced food assistance for the most vulnerable Americans.

Because the nutrition title in this bill is responsibly and carefully crafted, it continues important reforms and improvements that I am proud we were able to enact in the most recent two farm bills. In the 2002 legislation we restored certain benefits for legal immigrants, restored a portion of benefits that had been cut in previous legislation, increased incentives for work, simplified and increased integrity in nutrition assistance, increased emergency food assistance, dedicated mandatory funding to the Farmers Market Nutrition Program, and adopted a pilot program I authored to provide free fresh fruits and vegetables to children in schools. In the 2008 bill we likewise included key improvements to nutrition assistance, such as further restoring previously cut benefits, encouraging savings by recipients, adopting a pilot program of incentives for healthier eating through SNAP, improved benefits for families with high childcare costs, expanded the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program to a national program, dedicated mandatory funding for community food projects, increased mandatory funding for the Senior Farmers Market Nutrition Program, allowed a preference for purchasing locally produced food for child nutrition programs, and dedicated mandatory funds to the Farmers Market Promotion Program.

To promote energy efficiency on farms and in rural businesses and the production and use of renewable energy and biobased products, this legislation extends, improves, and strengthens programs in the energy title in the 2002 and 2008 farm bill. I am proud to have included the first farm bill energy title in the 2002 legislation, to strengthen and expand the energy title in the 2008 bill, and to continue the energy title as a prominent part of this bill. And thanks to the cooperation of Senators STABENOW, ROBERTS, LUGAR, and CONRAD, we were able to dedicate about $800 million in new funding to these critical energy initiatives in the bill reported from the Agriculture Committee.

In March of this year, I introduced S. 2270, the Rural Energy Investment Act of 2012, in order to extend the programs in the energy titles of the 2002 and 2008 farm bills and to provide mandatory funding for the energy title of this new farm bill. So I am very pleased that it includes a strong energy title and dedicates mandatory funding to it.

The bill continues the requirement I authored and we enacted in the 2002 farm bill for Federal departments and agencies to purchase biobased products and to create a ''BioPreferred'' labeling program to encourage private markets for biobased products. Also included in this bill are grants to assist pilot-scale biorefineries and loan guarantees for commercial biorefineries.

This bill appropriately continues the Biomass Research and Development Program, which is a joint initiative of USDA and the Department of Energy that awards grants for research on the full spectrum of bioenergy supply chains, from biomass feedstock development and production, to harvesting and handling, to biomass processing and fuels or products manufacturing.

The Rural Energy for America Program, REAP, the most popular program in the energy title because it provides direct financial support to many farmers, ranchers, and rural small businesses for rural energy systems or energy efficiency projects, is also continued. And this bill extends the Biomass Crop Assistance Program, BCAP, that supports establishment of biomass crops for bioenergy use and provides cost-share payments for harvest and delivery of biomass to user facilities in the initial years.

I am also very pleased that the bill continues, improves, and strengthens a number of initiatives that we included in previous farm bills to assist and promote opportunities for farmers and good nutrition for consumers through farmers markets and increased local production and marketing of food.

In this bill, the Farmers Market Promotion Program is renamed as the Farmers Market and Local Food Promotion Program, and it provides competitively awarded USDA grants to improve and expand farmers markets, roadside stands, community-supported agriculture marketing, and other direct producer-to-consumer marketing, including funding for mobile electronic benefits transfer technology. The grants may also be used to help develop local systems focused on serving low-income communities. This bill increases the mandatory funding dedicated to the program to a total of $100 million.

The bill also extends and increases funding for community food projects through grants to nonprofit organizations to be used in improving access to healthy, nutritious food in communities, which can include assistance to farmers markets and other local food marketing systems. We included $5 million a year in mandatory funding in the 2008 farm bill, and this bill doubles that to $10 million a year.

For the Hunger Free Communities Initiative, the bill dedicates $100 million in new mandatory funding for incentive grants to support increased purchase of fruits and vegetables by families participating in SNAP in underserved communities.

To help farmers cover the cost of obtaining certification as qualified organic producers, the bill includes an increased level of mandatory funding, and it continues and funds the organic research and extension initiative. Also continued are the program of block grants to the States to assist fruit, vegetable, and horticulture crop producers and a special program supporting research projects focused on helping these producers. The bill continues the initiative I was pleased to include in the 2008 farm bill to provide cost-share assistance through EQIP to farmers who are making the transition to organic food production.

Mr. President, these are only some of the important features in this new farm bill. It is a strong bill, with substantial reforms and continued progress toward improved food, agriculture, conservation, energy, and rural policies for our Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 10 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on passage of S. 3240, as amended.

The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I thank my colleagues for their patience and for supporting this bipartisan effort on the agriculture reform, food, and jobs bill.

I thank Senator REID for his incredible patience and willingness to give us this time, and the Republican leader for joining in that effort as well. I especially thank my ranking member Senator ROBERTS for long hours and hard work on this bill to get to this point. It has been truly a partnership. Senator ROBERTS is my friend and my partner in this effort, and I am very grateful.

I have said all along in this debate that there are 16 million people in this country whose jobs depend on the strength of the American agricultural economy and our food systems. The agriculture reform bill is about standing up for our Nation's farmers, our small businesses, our manufacturers, our exporters, and others whose livelihood depends on us getting the policy right.

This represents significant reform. It cuts subsidies, it cuts the deficit, and it creates jobs. We are ending direct payments and three other subsidy programs that pay farmers regardless of losses or whether they are even planting a particular crop. We are putting in place the most significant payment reforms ever.

I thank Senator GRASSLEY for his tenacity and Senator JOHNSON for his partnership in that effort as well. We are cutting Federal spending by $23 billion by streamlining and consolidating programs. Therefore, we are going to have an opportunity to vote on $23 billion in deficit reduction—probably the only opportunity to vote on debt reduction in a bipartisan way on the floor of the Senate in the next number of months.

We are eliminating more than 100 authorization programs and streamlining others, strengthening crop insurance, consolidating conservation programs and innovative energy programs, and we are continuing the critical work around nutrition to give temporary help to families who have fallen on hard times. We are also creating more opportunities for families to buy healthy, local food and the opportunity to put fresh fruits and vegetables in our schools and on our tables.

Agriculture is one of the few parts of our economy where we are running a trade surplus, and we need to recognize it is also a job creator. The men and women who work hard from sunrise to sunset to give us the bounty of safe, nutritious food that we put on our tables deserve the certainty of this bill. I urge my colleagues to vote yes on a very important bipartisan effort and yes to the 16 million men and women who bring us the safest, most affordable, most reliable food system in the world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam President, when you go back home or if you conduct a press conference or if you have any contact with anybody about what we are doing here in Washington, the No. 1 question is: Why can't you all get along? Why can't you quit pointing fingers of blame? Why can't you end the rhetoric? Why can't you work together? Why can't you get something done?

We knew we had something special when we had a farm bill and the current farm bill was going to expire and you would go back to a farm bill that nobody wanted, or the 1949 act, which is ridiculous, and that we had to move. Farmers and ranchers and their lenders and everybody concerned with agribusiness knew we had to have a farm bill.

We went to work and we got a 16-to-5 vote out of committee, it was bipartisan, and we did it in 4½ hours. That set a record. I don't know of any time where in an Agriculture Committee, House or Senate, that it has been moved in 4½ hours.

Now 2½ days, with 73 amendments, opening it up to everybody regardless of circumstance, regardless if they voted for the bill or not? That is what we have accomplished—2½ days, 73 amendments. It is what can happen if we break the logjam of partisanship and work together to get something done. A tremendous amount of credit goes to the leadership of the Senator from Michigan. I feel very privileged to have worked with her and to work with her staff. They have been like Musketeers, every night, every morning, meeting: What can we do; how can we fix this?

It has worked. So after 2½ days and 73 amendments I thank you all for your patience. If anybody did not get an amendment, I am terribly sorry, I don't know how I missed you; consequently, on that side as well.

Let me say again, $23 billion provided in deficit reduction through reduced mandatory spending. The chairwoman is right, this is probably the only time on the Senate floor we will actually have a reduction in Federal spending and make our deficit contribution.

This is a good bill. Is it the best possible bill? No, it is the best bill possible. We should move it and we should vote for it. I urge you to vote for it.

I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, the Republican leader and I have spoken privately. We would be remiss if we did not say something to the entire Senate about how we feel about this bill and the leadership that was shown by these two fine Senators. Also behind the scenes—we know how hard they worked to get where we are—we have had such good staff involved. These staff people are not fighting with each other. They have causes they are trying to protect for their Members but they do it in a way that is cordial. There has been nothing but courtesy shown for weeks.

I have managed quite a few bills in my day. This is a difficult bill to have in the position we have it in now. I hope our friends in the House see what we have done. We are working together. I know they can. I cannot say enough—although I will try—to applaud and compliment Senator STABENOW and Senator ROBERTS. They are both my friends but my view of them has risen appreciably in their legislative methods of getting this done.

They have done it on their own. Senator MCCONNELL and I have done what we can, but we have been bystanders to much that has gone on. It has been the work of these two fine Senators and the cooperation of every Member. I am grateful we are at the point where we are today—2 o'clock. We are going to be able to finish this bill and it is 2 o'clock in the afternoon, not in the morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Let me echo the remarks of my good friend. This bill has been handled in a way entirely consistent with the norms and traditions of the Senate. Members have had an opportunity to express themselves in a whole variety of ways, both relevant to the amendments and a few not relevant to the amendments. Senator STABENOW and Senator ROBERTS have worked together very skillfully. This is one of the finest moments in the Senate in recent times in terms of how you pass a bill.

I think we are all feeling good about the way this has been handled. I think we are moving back in the direction of operating the Senate in a way that we sort of traditionally understood we were going to operate the Senate.

I also thank my good friend, the majority leader. I think this has been a good cooperative effort, to have a process that respects the traditions of the Senate. This is a very fine day in the recent history of the Senate. Again, my congratulations to the chairman of the committee and the ranking member. They did a fabulous job.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? All time is yielded back?

The question is on passage of the bill, subject to a 60-vote threshold.

Ms. STABENOW. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

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

The result was announced—yeas 64, nays 35, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 164 Leg.]

YEAS—64

Akaka	Feinstein	Mikulski
Alexander	Franken	Moran
Barrasso	Gillibrand	Murray
Baucus	Grassley	Nelson (NE)
Begich	Hagan	Nelson (FL)
Bennet	Harkin	Reid
Bingaman	Hoeven	Roberts
Blumenthal	Hutchison	Rockefeller
Blunt	Inouye	Sanders
Boxer	Johanns	Schumer
Brown (MA)	Johnson (SD)	Shaheen
Brown (OH)	Kerry	Snowe
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cardin	Kohl	Tester
Carper	Leahy	Thune
Casey	Levin	Udall (CO)
Coats	Lieberman	Udall (NM)
Collins	Lugar	Warner
Conrad	Manchin	Webb
Coons	McCaskill	Wyden
Durbin	Menendez	
Enzi	Merkley	

NAYS—35

Ayotte	Crapo	Kyl
Boozman	DeMint	Landrieu
Burr	Graham	Lautenberg
Chambliss	Hatch	Lee
Coburn	Heller	McCain
Cochran	Inhofe	McConnell
Corker	Isakson	Murkowski
Cornyn	Johnson (WI)	Paul

Portman	Rubio	Vitter
Pryor	Sessions	Whitehouse
Reed	Shelby	Wicker
Risch	Toomey	

NOT VOTING—1

Kirk

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for passage of the bill, the bill (S. 3240), as amended, is passed.

The bill will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. REID. I move to lay that motion upon the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act, or the 2012 farm bill, represents the most significant reform of U.S. agriculture in decades. This bill is the product of many months of policy discussions and late night deliberations guided by the steady leadership of Chairwoman STABENOW and Ranking Member ROBERTS. I commend their efforts in successfully navigating this bill. All Americans stand to benefit from their hard work and commitment to reform agriculture policy and strengthen our rural communities.

There is a reason why people across the country—farmers and business owners, faith leaders and county commissioners—have been paying attention to what we are doing.

This bill benefits all Americans, including in Ohio, where 1 in 7 jobs is related to the food and agriculture sector. From making the farm safety net more fiscally responsible, ensuring communities have access to broadband, protecting nutrition and conservation programs, to strengthening initiatives for healthy, nutritious food—this legislation touches all Ohioans.

Also, at a time where there is too much gridlock, this bill is a welcome change.

Many thanks to Leader REID and Senator MCCONNELL for their patience, their cooperation, and for allowing time for proper consideration of the farm bill.

Many of the policies I proposed as legislation and worked to include in this farm bill were made at the suggestion of Ohioans. Traveling across the State on my ''Grown in Ohio'' listening tour, I learned what is working and what needs to be changed from people whose primary job is to grow our food, feed the hungry, and run small businesses and small towns. Thanks to the many Ohioans who have shared their opinions, ideas, and provided feedback over the past several months. This farm bill is better because of their involvement.

This legislation would not have been possible without the dedicated work of the Senate Agriculture Committee's leadership of Chairwoman STABENOW, Ranking Member ROBERTS, and that of its members. In particular, I enjoyed the opportunity to work with a number of my Agriculture Committee colleagues. Their willingness to reach across party lines ensured that this bill had a much-needed dose of Midwestern pragmatism. I would like to thank Senators THUNE and GRASSLEY, as well as Senators HARKIN, NELSON, LUGAR, JOHANNS, KLOBUCHAR, and CASEY. Their continual engagement in the farm bill process has made a stronger product and I am grateful for their efforts.

The 2012 farm bill has been many months in the making and was made possible by the work of Senate staff, often in a bipartisan manner. Mike Seyfert, Joel Leftwich, and Tara Smith of Ranking Member ROBERTS' staff were invaluable resources in this process, as well as Jared Hill for Senator GRASSLEY and Lynn Tjeerdsma with Senator THUNE, whose work with my staff was indispensable.

I was continually impressed with the open and collaborative nature of Senator STABENOW's staff. This farm bill was written in a unique and challenging process—all of which made the efforts by Chris Adamo, Jonathan Coppess, Joe Shultz, Tina May, Brandon McBride, Jacklyn Schneider and others to remain engaged and open to suggestions all the more invaluable. Their hard work has not gone unnoticed.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on S. 3240, legislation to reauthorize the farm bill. It is important to reflect on the process and the debate we just had, as well as consider the final product. First, I wish to commend Chairwoman STABENOW and Ranking Member ROBERTS for their diligent efforts in bringing this bill to the Senate floor for consideration and debate. It is no small achievement and there have been countless hours expended by Members and staff on this very important effort. However, in spite of this, as I weigh the bill and its impact on the State of Georgia and the Southeast, I am truly disappointed that I am not able to support it.

This bill does include significant reform with the elimination of direct payments and it makes several improvements to crop insurance. I have always been an advocate of risk management delivered through the private sector. However, the bill establishs a one-size-fits-all program rather than recognizing the limitations of crop insurance for certain regions of the country, namely, the Southeast, and whether the new commodity title program, the Agriculture Risk Coverage, ARC, program can work as a safety net for crops other than corn and soybeans. Leaving producers without an effective safety net provides very little protection and certainty for those outside of the Midwest.

A good idea often stumbles by asking it to do too much. Crop insurance is a tool that addresses risk in an individual crop year. It does not work as a safety net by insuring against multiple-year price declines. This is simply beyond its design and capabilities. Crop insurance is a critical part of a producer's risk management program, but it is not a cure-all to a commodity market that can expand and contract based on the vagaries of weather, disease, and international events. That is why farm policy in the past encouraged programs such as the marketing loan and the countercyclical program to work with, not in competition, to crop insurance.

This week we have had the opportunity to debate and improve the bill. We made some important changes, but it still lacks the balance I have advocated for the past several weeks. It is still my hope to support the bill at the end of the legislative process. Perhaps after action by the House of Representatives and a conference of the two Chambers, we will see the changes necessary to gain my support.

Chairwoman STABENOW has assured me on several occasions that my concerns will be addressed and I know she will keep her commitment. I would rather have dealt with the issues during the Senate debate, but that was not possible.

We must remember that the farm bill should help farmers and ranchers manage a combination of challenges—much out of their own control. We must also remember that the farm bill is not an entitlement for any one region or any one commodity. Policymakers must remember that the bill needs to serve all producers in all parts of the country equitably and effectively. To fail in this endeavor means we as legislators have failed to produce a bill worthy of the people we represent. I am proud of the work we did on the 2008 farm bill and its ability to provide a strong safety net program for producers. I am confident that the next farm bill will adhere and honor that same commitment we made 4 years ago.

While I could not support the bill in front of us, I look forward to working with my colleagues in the weeks and months ahead.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I am very pleased that the Senate today passed the Farm bill. This is bipartisan legislation that is critical to all Americans—from the farmers who grow our food, to the consumers who purchase that food, to kids who get school lunches, and to the neediest in our Nation who deserve access to adequate nutrition. I especially want to commend Senator STABENOW and Senator ROBERTS for their yeoman bipartisan work to craft this important legislation.

As Senator STABENOW has so eloquently put it time and again, this bill is a jobs bill. One in every 12 American jobs is tied to agriculture and this legislation represents an opportunity to create more jobs.

In my home State of Oregon, agriculture is now more than a $5 billion a year industry and it reflects a wide array of crops, mirroring the diversity in America's agriculture.

As I like to say, Oregonians do a lot of thing well, but what we do best is

grow things and add value to those things. This bill has a lot in it to help Oregonians do that even better and in turn create more opportunities to sell those products better locally, nationally and abroad.

I was particularly pleased to have been successful in adding two amendments to the Farm bill. These are amendments to make it easier to provide healthier foods for children in schools and to help address the problem of hunger in our country.

One of my amendments would for the first time test out direct farm-to-school approaches to provide healthier foods for children in our schools. It will do this through a competitive pilot program with at least five farm-to-school demonstration projects in all regions in the country.

While there are currently some farm to school programs in place, it's a patchwork system and, according to the Agriculture Department's own Economic Research Service, ''data and analysis of farm to school programs are scare.'' This pilot program will fill in the information void about what works and what doesn't, and it will provide a way to improve and replace ineffective programs.

What is more, under these demonstration projects, innovative States and school districts will truly be able source fresh, high-quality local produce for our schoolchildren to enjoy. No more having to purchase faraway food from a Federal warehouse hundreds of miles away when there is healthy food just down the road.

Under my amendment, schools win. Farmers win. And most importantly, our children get to enjoy the delicious, local produce that they should be able to enjoy—every day—for breakfast, or for lunch, or for a snack. That is why the American Academy of Pediatrics the Nation's pediatricians supported my no cost farm-to-school amendment.

With the adoption of this amendment, it will be easier for delicious pears, cherries, and other healthy produce, grown just a few miles down the road, to make it into our schools.

Schools and school food authorities from all over the country with innovative ideas can now begin drawing up novel plans of action to purchase fresh, local produce for their kids.

New ideas will come forth, and the existing farm-to-school infrastructure will improve as new and better distribution models begin to emerge.

I am heartened that the farm-to-school movement has truly become national in scope, as more people recognize both the health and economic benefits that derive from these efforts. My amendment will make this movement not only bigger but better.

I thank Senator STABENOW and her staff for working with me on this amendment and helping me get this passed.

Fewer folks will be hungry thanks to the Senate's passage of my microloan for gleaners amendment.

These gleaners are mostly volunteers who collect food from grocery stores, restaurants, and farms—food that would otherwise be wasted—and distribute it to agencies or nonprofit organizations that feed it to the hungry.

These good Samaritans who save food from being tossed into landfills or burned in incinerators will finally be able to access the capital they deserve to expand and improve their operations.

At a time when food waste is the single largest category of waste in our local landfills—more than 34 million tons of food, even a portion of that wasted food could feed a lot of people. By redistributing food that would otherwise go to waste to the hungry—again, without spending extra taxpayer money—we can do more to ensure that this unwanted food is used to tackle hunger in America.

Instead of burning this food in incinerators, gleaners can help more people in need burn this food as calories.

This is just one more step in the right direction to help alleviate food insecurity in our country.

I again thank Senator STABENOW and her staff for their assistance in getting this amendment passed. It will provide real help to a group of selfless folks that are trying to bring some commonsense solutions to the hunger crisis.

As happy as I was to get the Farm Bill passed and get these amendments included, an opportunity to encourage healthier eating by recipients of SNAP benefits—what was previously known as food stamps—was unfortunately not able to come up for a vote.

This is disappointing. Not disappointing for me, but for the millions of SNAP beneficiaries, public health officials, and others who know we can do better to encourage healthier eating and increase consumption of healthy fruits and vegetables.

The existing waiver authority for SNAP is extremely restrictive and has resulted in a number of innovative State proposals being denied. It makes no sense to continue to stifle innovation and progress when it comes to incentivizing beneficiaries to eat healthier.

I will continue to push for ways to promote healthier eating through the SNAP program, given that it will improve public health, increase the consumption of healthy food, boost local farmers' incomes, and give taxpayers the confidence that their tax dollars are being spent on food that is really food.

I was also very disappointed that my amendment to legalize industrial hemp was also not granted a vote.

I firmly believe that American farmers should not be denied an opportunity to grow and sell a legitimate crop simply because it resembles an illegal one.

I fought for an amendment that would have recognized industrial hemp as a legitimate crop, but since doing so requires amending the Controlled Substances Act it was considered non-germane to the current debate and could not be brought up for a vote.

However, just my raising this issue has sparked a growing awareness of exactly how ridiculous the U.S.'s ban on industrial hemp is and I feel that important progress was made in advancing this dialogue.

I am confident that if grassroots support continues to grow and Members of Congress continue to hear from voters, then commonsense hemp legislation can move through Congress in the near future.

I plan to continue to keep fighting for this and hope to reintroduce this as a stand-alone bill.

I also want to raise concerns with language that was passed in the bill that amended the Healthy Forests Restoration Act. It is my hope that this issue will still be addressed in conference. I understand Senator BENNET made remarks expressing that same desire.

The language in the forestry title of the Farm bill amended an Act which I played a key role in helping pass originally in the Senate a decade ago.

As part of efforts to pass that legislation, which streamlined National Environmental Policy Act requirements, as well as appeals and judicial review, a carefully balanced compromise was reached. Environmental protections and clear limitations for appropriate places for the use of that authority were enacted as part of that legislation.

The language in the Farm Bill creates a sweeping new authority to use the Healthy Forest Restoration Act for areas potentially threatened with insect or disease infestations but fails to include any of the environmental protections or clear limitations in the original legislation. Additional, the way those areas that are threatened by insects and disease are defined is very broad.

I worked very hard with several of my colleagues to try to reach a compromise. It is my hope that given a little more time, we will be able to reach a compromise before a final Farm Bill becomes law.

I hope we will have a chance to perfect this language to address these concerns as the bill goes to conference.

Lastly, I want to touch the labeling of genetically modified foods.

I have always believed that consumers benefit from having more information about the food they consume, and that is why I supported an amendment offered by Senator SANDERS regarding the labeling of such foods. However, I continue to believe that the most realistic way to improve consumer information about genetically modified foods is to take a national approach and I will continue to work towards that goal. That is why I cosponsored Senator BEGICH's legislation to ensure that genetically modified fish are labeled.

In sum, I again want to reiterate my strong support for the Farm Bill passed

in the Senate and my great pleasure at having successfully gotten two amendments into this bill.

I raised several additional issues and it is my hope that there will be continued opportunities to address these issues going forward.

I yield the floor.

FLOOD INSURANCE REFORM AND MODERNIZATION ACT——MOTION TO PROCEED——Continued

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 250, S. 1940, an original bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, to restore the financial solvency of the flood insurance fund, and for other purposes.

Harry Reid, Tim Johnson, Al Franken, Patrick J. Leahy, Christopher A. Coons, Tom Harkin, Barbara A. Mikulski, Kent Conrad, Robert Menendez, Jack Reed, Barbara Boxer, Ben Nelson of Nebraska, Michael F. Bennet, Max Baucus, Mark Begich, Richard Blumenthal, Kay R. Hagan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S. 1940, an original bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, to restore the financial solvency of the insurance fund, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) is necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 96, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 165 Leg.]

YEAS—96

Akaka	Carper	Franken
Alexander	Casey	Gillibrand
Ayotte	Chambliss	Graham
Barrasso	Coats	Grassley
Baucus	Coburn	Hagan
Begich	Cochran	Harkin
Bennet	Collins	Hatch
Bingaman	Conrad	Heller
Blumenthal	Coons	Hoeven
Blunt	Corker	Hutchison
Boozman	Cornyn	Inhofe
Brown (MA)	Crapo	Inouye
Brown (OH)	DeMint	Isakson
Burr	Durbin	Johanns
Cantwell	Enzi	Johnson (SD)
Cardin	Feinstein	Johnson (WI)
Kerry	Merkley	Sessions
Klobuchar	Mikulski	Shaheen
Kohl	Moran	Shelby
Kyl	Murkowski	Snowe
Landrieu	Murray	Stabenow
Lautenberg	Nelson (NE)	Tester
Leahy	Nelson (FL)	Thune
Lee	Portman	Toomey
Levin	Reed	Udall (CO)
Lieberman	Reid	Udall (NM)
Lugar	Risch	Vitter
Manchin	Roberts	Warner
McCain	Rockefeller	Webb
McCaskill	Rubio	Whitehouse
McConnell	Sanders	Wicker
Menendez	Schumer	Wyden

NAYS—2

Paul	Pryor

NOT VOTING—2

Boxer	Kirk

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 96, the nays are 2. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The Senator from Louisiana.

CHANGE OF VOTE

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I rise for a procedural request and a statement on the farm bill. On Rollcall Vote No. 153, yesterday, I voted ''yes.'' It was my intention to vote ''no.'' I therefore ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to change my vote since it will not affect the outcome of the amendment or the bill.

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

Ms. LANDRIEU. Thank you, Mr. President.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Ms. LANDRIEU. I had the Rollcall Vote number wrong. It is not Rollcall Vote No. 153. It is Rollcall Vote No. 143. I voted ''yes.'' I would like to change my vote to ''no.'' I ask unanimous consent that be the order.

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

Ms. LANDRIEU. Thank you Mr. President.

AGRICULTURE REFORM

Mr. President, I will be brief. I know other Members are on the floor who want to speak on other subjects.

First, I want to thank the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Kansas for an extraordinary job on a very difficult bill, a very complicated bill—and difficult because it is not just a Republican-Democratic debate or a Democratic-Republican debate, it is a regional debate that has to take place, and there is a lot of give-and-take.

I have been proud to vote for every farm bill that has been before the Senate to my knowledge, but I voted ''no'' today, and I want to say why.

Despite the great work of Senator STABENOW and Senator ROBERTS, there was a weak part of this bill, in my view, related to rice farming, and it is such a significant and important part of our farming structure in Louisiana that I cast a vote against the bill to send a signal that more work needs to be done.

This bill passed the Senate with an overwhelming vote. I voted for many of the amendments that I think helped to shape it to be even better than when it came out of committee.

We beat back several attacks to uproot, destroy, or significantly modify the U.S. Sugar Program, which has been very important to the State of Louisiana—one of the Nation's great sugar growers. As I have tried to explain to people who continue to attack this program, why would you want to end a program in this bill that does not cost the taxpayers a single dime?

There are no direct subsidies for sugar, as there are for all the other crops. The U.S. Sugar Program provides American consumers with low, stable sugar prices and ensures that our sugarcane and sugar beet growers receive a fair price for their crop.

I am happy to say that American growers of sugar can provide almost 85 percent of domestic demand. So why not use domestic sugar if we can supply our domestic demand? We only import what we need to import. We do not want to flood the market with cheap imports coming into America and undermining our jobs. I was proud to stand with our sugar industry and beat back those amendments.

Louisiana farmers and ranchers make a significant contribution to our State, generating over $10.8 billion in economic activity alone. Agriculture—including fisheries and, of course, forestry—and energy are the backbone of Louisiana's economy.

This farm bill is an important bill. As I said, I was happy to vote for literally dozens of amendments that strengthened it. But I held out my final support, hoping that, as it travels to the House and goes through the conference process, the farm provisions related to our rice growers could be perfected.

People like to say the United States grows the cheapest, safest, and most abundant food, fiber, and energy supply in the world. They are right. The people in my State who do that day in and day out are proud. They have every reason to be proud because farming is more than a business, it is more than a job; it is a way of life. It is a way of life that is important and precious and should be honored. There are many families—cousins and aunts and uncles and fathers and mothers and children who are involved in farming. In Louisiana, in our forest lands, and along our coastal lands, these families follow a preferred way of life, even though it means hard work, long hours, high risks, and sometimes heart-breakingly limited returns.

So from sugar and rice in the south to cotton and poultry in the north, and all the areas in between, Louisiana needs a farm bill that supports all of

our farmers. This one failed in one important area, which is why I cast a ''no'' vote.

This bill did not support adequately, in my view, the 2,000 rice farmers we have in Louisiana. Our rice industry generates $638 million in our State alone. Along with Arkansas, we are one of the major rice producing states. Nationally, U.S. rice supports about 128,000 jobs. It is $34 billion of economic input each year.

This bill did reduce the deficit by $23 billion, and that is something I support. However, it took a larger chunk out of rice than was asked for any other commodity. Rice took a 65% reduction when the other crops, on average, took a 30% reduction. And I know some of the peanut growers in Georgia have some of the same concerns we do.

So let me end by saying that I hope the position of our rice farmers and the important industry that rice represents can be strengthened in the House. If so, I will proudly put my name on this bill, because there is some very good that was done to protect our nutrition programs, to help our middle-class families who find themselves in the unusual situation of having to get some food relief in these difficult times. I want to thank Senator STABENOW particularly for her help in that way.

But for my rice growers, my rice producers, the important mills we have from Crowley, LA, to other places, for companies such as Kellogg in Battle Creek, MI, that depend on strong rice production from Louisiana, I cast a ''no'' vote.

Finally, I will say, I hope we can find a way to open some more markets for our rice growers. We are interested—very interested—in trade with Cuba. And the politics sometimes prevents us from opening more trade relations with a nation that I know has not met our standard of democracy but most certainly would be an open market for many of my farmers.

So for my farmers who are looking for markets where we can sell and compete on the world market, if you give us an opportunity to compete and open these markets, then we may be able to adjust our program. But until then, our farmers need the support of other farmers and did not receive it in this bill.

I so appreciate my colleague from Rhode Island giving me this opportunity to speak. I thank the chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PELL GRANT

Mr. REED. Mr. President, 1972 was a watershed year for expanding educational opportunities in this country.

The Education Amendments of 1972 included title IX—now known as the Patsy T. Mink Equal Opportunity in Education Act—guaranteeing educational opportunities for women and girls in federally supported educational institutions.

But 1972 also saw, within the Education Amendments, the creation of the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant. Today we know it as the Pell Grant. It was named in honor and in recognition of the extraordinary vision and service of my colleague, my predecessor from Rhode Island, Claiborne Pell. He authored this provision.

Forty years later, we can see how these two key changes to our educational laws have transformed our Nation and transformed the aspirations of millions of Americans.

It is also a good time to reflect on the challenges that remain and to renew our commitment to fulfilling the promise of opportunity represented in the Education Amendments of 1972.

Senator Pell's vision was that no student with the talent, drive, and desire should be denied the opportunity for a post-secondary education solely because of a lack of financial resources. Pell grants have opened the doors to a college education for millions of Americans.

In the 1973–1974 academic year—the first year students received grants—176,000 Pell grants were awarded. In the school year that began in the fall of 2010, that number grew to over 9.6 million.

Pell grants constitute approximately 23 percent of all Federal student aid, which includes grants, loans, and work study programs.

The Pell grant is the cornerstone of our Federal student aid programs. For needy students, it is the foundation for making college affordable. Unfortunately, reduced State support for higher education and rising college costs have eroded that foundation.

In 1976, the maximum Pell grant was $1,400, which was enough to cover 72 percent of the cost of attendance at a public 4-year college. In 2010, the maximum Pell Grant was $5,550, which was only enough to cover 34 percent of the cost of attendance at a public 4-year college.

We have seen an erosion of the buying power of the Pell grant. If we were matching the effort that he initiated in the 1970s, we would be providing more opportunities and more support for college students across this Nation.

Senator Pell understood that grant aid was critical for low-income students and families. The goal was to minimize the need for loans. Frankly, back in the 1970s, most young people with a Pell grant—working through the summer, and working the extra hours they had to during the academic year—could pay their way through school, leave school without huge debt.

Today, regrettably, there are students graduating from school with $10,000, $20,000, $30,000 worth of debt because the Pell grants have not kept up, because college costs have accelerated, and because they have been forced to borrow. Today, low-income students and middle-income students rely heavily on student loans to pay for college.

And we are seeing another burden; and, frankly, this ripples throughout our economy. In the 1970s and 1980s, if you left college owing a few thousand dollars, you could pay that off very quickly. So by your late twenties, you were ready to settle down, to buy the house. Today, we have a generation of students who are struggling with debt that might take them 10 or more years to pay off. Effectively, they cannot begin to buy the home, to settle down, to do the things that are so important to our overall economy.

Unless we are able to come to an agreement over the next several days, we also face the prospect of seeing the rate on subsidized student loans double by July 1.

That would deal another blow to moderate- and low-income families. Leader REID has proposed a very reasonable compromise. I hope that the Republicans will let that compromise go forward. I am hopeful my Republican colleagues can use this opportunity not only to continue to keep the lending rate low for Stafford loans but renew our own pledge on the Pell grant.

It would be ironic to see, on the 40th anniversary of the Pell grant, a further undermining of the ability of middle- to low-income Americans to go to college. In fact, this should be an opportunity to do much more. Senator Pell's words ring as true today as when he spoke them in 1995, one of the last years of his tenure in the Senate.

In his words:

> As I have stated on many occasions, few things in life are more important than the education of our children. They are the living legacy that we leave behind and their education determines the future of the American Nation. . . .

He continued.

> . . . Every day families are making decisions about sending their children to college. Certainly one of, if not the major obstacle they face is how to pay for college. The loan is their last resort. It provides the extra but necessary money they must have after exhausting their own resources and obtaining any grants for which their children might be eligible. Increasing the amount that children owe after graduation may well place the dream of a college education beyond their reach. That, to my mind, would be a tragedy of truly immense proportions. . . .

Senator Pell was right. Increasing student debt, especially during these difficult economic times, would be a tragedy for students, their families, and our Nation. I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, on our side of the aisle, all my colleagues, to work together to prevent an increase in the student loan interest rate from doubling on July 1.

That would, indeed, be a fitting tribute to Senator Pell on the 40th anniversary of the Pell grant.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am honored to join my senior Senator to commemorate such an important milestone as he has described in American education.

It was 40 years ago this week that President Nixon signed into law the

Education Amendments Act of 1972, including a provision establishing for the first time the basic educational opportunity grant, which came to be called the Pell grant for its sponsor, Senator Claiborne Pell of Rhode Island.

Over the next four decades, Pell grants would turn the dream of college education into a reality for millions of Americans. Today, more than ever, a college diploma is important to a young person's success. The unemployment rate for those 25 and older with a bachelor's degree is less than 4 percent and over 8 percent for those with only a high school diploma. The value of that college degree could not be more apparent. Higher education provides the skills and credentials that many employers require in today's economy.

In the decades following World War II, the U.S. Government made college and occupational mobility a reality for more Americans than ever before. Claiborne Pell was a veteran of that war, and he saw how the GI bill enabled millions of his fellow veterans to better themselves through education. He recognized that many of his Coast Guard shipmates had as much talent as his Princeton classmates but not the privilege or resources to go to college.

Given the opportunity, this Greatest Generation would not only provide a better life for their families with that access to college, but they would contribute mightily to the growth of this Nation, a growth we still enjoy today.

Claiborne Pell resolved then that all Americans should have such an opportunity, and his vision would become a reality for millions through the Pell grant. In 1976, the first year the Pell grants were fully funded, a full Pell grant paid 72 percent of the cost of attendance at a typical 4-year public college. Today, a full Pell grant covers just 32 percent of those costs, but still, for many, this vital assistance can mean the difference between being able to attend college or not.

As grant aid has fallen and tuition has soared, families have had to borrow to make up the difference to send their kids to college. The total amount of student loan debt carried by Americans has recently surpassed $1 trillion, more than Americans now owe on their credit cards.

I have talked to students around my State and I have read many heartfelt letters. It is clear Pell grants serve as a gateway to the opportunities available with a college degree, a gate that would be shut if not for Pell grants.

I received a letter from Phil in Wakefield, RI, the oldest of five children. Last year, Phil graduated from Cornell. Phil worked his way through college, including summers. His parents chipped in when they could. Phil's father is still paying off student loans, and Phil was lucky enough to earn private scholarships and receive grants from his school. He said:

> But there's no way my education would have been possible without Pell Grants. We just wouldn't have been able to afford it.

I also heard from Anthony, who has been working as a waiter in Providence. Thanks to the Pell grant, he and his wife Jen have been able to go back to school at the University of Rhode Island for degrees in biotechnology. They say their education will enable them to build a better future together in Rhode Island's rapidly expanding biotech sector.

Leann is a single mother of two from Pawtucket, already carrying student loan debt, although she has not been able to finish her undergraduate program. Last year, Leann enrolled in the School of Continuing Education at Roger Williams University, and when she graduates with a bachelor's degree next year, she plans on opening her own small business. ''None of this would be happening'' she wrote, ''if I were not receiving a Pell Grant.''

The simple fact is this: Pell grants help millions of people achieve the dream of college and improve their prospects for employment. It is a wise investment in the future of our country. Congress has, in recent years, increased the buying power of Pell Grants, increasing the maximum grant from $4,050 in academic year 2006–2007 to $5,550 in 2012–2013.

We also increased the minimum family income that automatically qualifies a student for the maximum Pell grant, a change that better reflects today's economic realities. Sadly, however, we are seeing a truly misguided assault on Pell grants.

The editorial board of the Wall Street Journal marked the 40th anniversary of Pell grants this week by printing claims about the Pell grant that, simply to be polite, do not withstand scrutiny. The Journal says the Pell grant is rife with abuse, with students engaging in ''creative accounting'' to qualify by feigning financial independence.

The most common way one gets deemed independent under the Pell Grant Program is by being 24 years of age or older. It is hard to imagine doing much creative accounting with one's date of birth. The other major proofs of independence are being married and having children. Maybe when they said ''creative accounting'' they meant ''procreative accounting.''

The Wall Street Journal implies that better off students can win larger grants by attending more expensive institutions. But the cost of tuition cannot increase the maximum size of a grant. The maximum Pell grant, as I said, is $5,550, regardless of the school one attends. As we all know, $5,550 is far from sufficient to cover the cost of most higher education.

Perhaps the most misleading claim from the Journal is to pick out the period when Pell grant costs rose significantly, between 2008 and 2010, due largely to the enactment of a funding expansion that has since been repealed and the fact that more eligible students applied for assistance as the economy worsened in those years. What they left out is that the Congressional Budget Office projects almost no average annual growth in program costs over the next 10 years.

The Republican budget in the House of Representatives slashes funding and eligibility for Pell grants and eliminates all mandatory funding for the program over the next 10 years. We all understand the need to find savings in the Federal budget. We all understand the need to make difficult choices. But of all the bad choices we could make, of all unintelligent choices we could make, failing to invest in Pell grants would be among the worst.

It is, frankly, shameful that Federal financial aid has not kept pace with the rising cost of college. It is truly misguided to roll back financial aid for a generation of young Americans preparing to compete in an evermore global economy. We need a highly trained workforce. Pell grants are very often the keystone in the arch that students must build to afford college, as Phil and Anthony and Jen and Leann all showed.

Rhode Island is a small State. But over the years we have had some towering and remarkable Senators. Claiborne Pell was one. Claiborne Pell believed, as he once told the Providence Journal, ''that government—and the federal government in particular—can, should, and does make a positive impact on the lives of most Americans.''

The Pell grant's positive impact is that people who cannot afford college have the chance to go to college, and it lifts off their backs a little bit of that burden of debt. That is something we want in this country, not just for the sake of the individual Pell grant recipient, not just for the sake of the next generation but for the sake of the good of our country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

AGRICULTURE REFORM

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask to be recognized to speak as in morning business.

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

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I wish to talk about the farm bill. As we can see from an open Senate, I think we have done our work, and we have been successful. Most of what we can say on this bill has already been said.

After final passage, I simply wish to reiterate what the chairwoman has said, what I have said all along: This is a reform bill. We cut $23 billion in mandatory spending. These are real cuts, no gimmicks. We have eliminated four commodity programs—four commodity programs. We have streamlined conservation programs from 23 to 13. We have eliminated numerous other authorizations.

In total, approximately 100 authorizations for spending and appropriations are eliminated. This is real reform. I also wish to take a quick moment to thank all the staff who have worked so hard on this legislation, especially the committee staff on both the majority and the minority sides.

I especially wish to thank the legislative magician, if I may call him that—expert—David Schiappa and his staff. They are no longer here, but they guided us through some difficult times, as he always does—as they always do.

I would like to take a few moments to recognize the members of my staff who worked on this bill. For me, this is a very special occasion. We are only as good as our staff. I have been blessed with the very best, and I have been a bucket toter. That is what a staff member is. When someone totes buckets, they try not to spill anything.

Sometimes they are successful and other times they may trip and fall. Other times it is just the way it is. I was administrative assistant to Senator Frank Carlson, the only man in Kansas to serve us as a Member of Congress, as a Governor, and a Senator, prior to our current Governor, Sam Brownback.

I was the administrative assistant for Congressman Keith Sebelius, who was on the House Agriculture Committee, and learned an awful lot about agriculture with Keith as we went through those days. Obviously, if someone is from Kansas, they are a legislative assistant or a bucket toter or whatever description you want for Bob Dole forever.

These people, as far as I am concerned, are not only my staff, they are my family. They have persevered. Anne Hazlett, my chief counsel, in my opinion, is the best chief counsel in the Senate, one of the top legislative drafters in the Senate, former director of the Indiana State Department of Agriculture under Gov. Mitch Daniels. When she is at my door, I know I am going to be told no on something.

I actually had better listen to her.

Eric Steiner. Eric has charged me with cruel and unusual punishment for putting him in the charge of dairy policy. After the 1996 farm bill and all that—and the 2002 and 2008 farm bills—I said I don't do dairy anymore. Then, in came Eric. He also became a dad for the first time earlier this year as we worked on this bill—talk about working 24/7 and giving up your family.

Keira Franz is a former Bob Dole staffer. Bob still tells her what to do so she can tell me what he says I am supposed to be doing.

Autumn Veazey, our southern bell and specialty crop guru, has also had the pleasure of getting to know places such as Dodge City and the inside of a meat processing plant—something that should be required of every agriculture assistant. Don't ask her.

Gregg Doud. Here is a real Kansas cowboy and one of the top agriculture trade experts in Washington, and he still wears his boots.

Tara Smith, our commodities and crop insurance expert, helps me navigate the minefields of both. Thank you so much, Tara. You have been wonderful.

Janae Brady keeps our staff—and, most importantly, my staff—director organized.

Andrew Vlasity, a great young man and a tremendous writer, has helped create a research title for the future.

Max Fisher, our No. 1 crunching guru, also became a dad for the third time as we worked on this bill.

Chris Hicks, our other legal counsel, is a former Senate-confirmed general counsel at the Department of Agriculture and provides the wisdom of that position as we work on complicated matters.

Patty Lawrence is our Department of Agriculture detailee on conservation issues and the ultimate professional.

Also, in my personal office: Ryan Flickner, a young Kansas farm lad who will soon return to Kansas to get married and become my deputy State director.

Wane Stoskopf is another Kansas farm boy who is taking Ryan's position, and Emily Haug.

Also, my communications director, Sarah Little—dear Sarah is never short of work when it comes to cleaning up what I have said and should not have said.

My State agriculture representative is Mel Thompson. I used to work with Mel. He was a legislative assistant and I was administrative assistant with Keith Sebelius. We went through two farm bills. There is no better person to have eyes and ears on the ground than Mel Thompson.

Then, there are Joel and Mike, the ''two musketeers,'' who saw me every morning, every afternoon, and every evening. I have a tendency to wander, to reflect on past farm bill stories, and to occasionally give ranks. These are not particularly helpful in regard to moving legislation forward, and so Joel and Mike would say: Sir—at least they said ''sir''—Sir, keep your eye on the ball. Stay focused. Where there is a will, there is a way. If you rank, if you wander, you will be lost in the midst of the desert farm bill purgatory. Don't be lost in the desert farm bill purgatory. Stay focused.

I tried. I think we succeeded, for the most part.

The chairwoman also has a great staff. Everybody likes to brag on their staffs, and I know she will mention many of them. I especially thank her staff director, Chris Adamo, and chief counsel, Jonathan Coppess, for their outstanding work on this legislation. They have been professional throughout. I don't know what you guys are going to do now that we are not breaking into your office in the mornings, afternoons, and evenings to see your smiling faces—and then we wonder why you are not smiling. Thank you for a top job.

I also thank all those in Senate legislative counsel and the Congressional Budget Office who helped us get to this point today. They all worked behind the scenes, but we could not be here today without them.

I view my staff as family. I thank my family over here for their tremendous work in achieving what I think is a great farm bill and for doing something to restore the Senate back to the Senate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, we have been looking forward to this day to be able to have the opportunity to celebrate a successful conclusion in the Senate. We have more work to do, but for 1 day we can pause and celebrate what is an important and great day after a tremendous amount of hard work that has gone on by our staffs, my ranking member, myself, along with our colleagues on the committee. We are so grateful for the wonderful effort that has gotten us to this point.

I have said this before and I will say it again: 16 million people count on us. They work in agriculture or food-related industries. That is a lot of people. I am not sure we have had a jobs bill that has come before the Senate that we can say addresses 16 million people's jobs, but certainly this is one. It affects every corner of every State.

I thank everyone in the Senate for their patience with us. I thank the majority leader for his incredible patience and leadership. I thank Senator MCCONNELL for working with us and I thank all those who voted on 73 amendments and everybody who was involved in putting those together and making sure we could move through this process.

Of course, I thank Senator ROBERTS again. Kansas is lucky to have him as a champion in the Senate. I have been very lucky to have him at my side throughout this debate and work, starting in the fall with our deficit reduction proposal up until today. We have come together on a bipartisan basis. I hope we can do that more. I have heard so many comments from colleagues in the last few days, saying it feels good to work through issues, debating issues, having votes, working together, and actually accomplishing something. It feels good and we need to continue to do more of it. Frankly, the American people want us to do more of it. So I am hopeful this will be a sign, as other things have been, frankly, in the Senate moving forward.

I am proud we have been the ones doing a bipartisan transportation bill and the ones passing other bipartisan bills. This is a significant milestone in that process of working together.

I am also very proud of the reforms in the bill we have done on a bipartisan basis. This is $23 billion in spending cuts for deficit reduction. It is true that if every committee within their jurisdiction were to focus on analyzing and reviewing the programs under their jurisdiction and making tough

decisions, ending paperwork duplication, and so on, actually it would end up to be a pretty big deficit reduction plan—if we all did it in those areas we control. That is the way we looked at the process.

We have come up with $23 billion in deficit reduction. We have done that by ending four different subsidies that folks have talked about changing for a long time—direct payments and other subsidies that are paid out regardless of losses. We passed a bill that continues support for healthy local food systems, farmers markets, and local food hubs.

We have passed a bill that strengthens conservation and continues protections that maintain healthy soil, clean water, and fresh air.

We passed a bill that supports America's rural communities. Every State has small rural communities, towns, villages, and counties that are counting on us to continue to have their economic development tools—which is the rural development title of the farm bill—as robust as possible. American energy independence is addressed in this bill. We passed the bill in a bipartisan way. This is an incredibly important step.

Now our bill goes to the House of Representatives. I have great confidence in the chairman and ranking member of the committee. I know they will be successful in moving a bill out of committee, and I am sure they are going to do everything humanly possible to pass it in the House. I believe, ultimately, they will because every American is counting on them in order to maintain food security for our country and the ability for us to have a strong, successful, safe food supply, as well as all the jobs connected to that.

I wish to thank my extraordinary staff. They worked from sunrise to sunset and then another few hours. I think we added hours—I think we changed from 24 hours to 30 a couple of times. It has been an incredible experience, and I am very grateful, truly, to all of them.

No team does it without a great captain. I thank Chris Adamo, who was with me on the last farm bill and is now our staff director. He has provided incredible leadership. He has deep knowledge of agriculture, and he brings a tremendous leadership to this process. He put together a tremendous team. I would not be here, and we would not be here in the Senate without his leadership and hard work and the team effort involved.

I also thank Jonathan Coppess, my great chief counsel, who actually helped bring a baby into the world last August, as we were saying, ''Why don't we do deficit reduction.'' When the supercommittee was put into place, he was helping bring a new baby into the world. So we thank Jonathan for his leadership. I have to say this as a point of personal privilege: Even though he is from Ohio, we still welcomed him into the fold—despite the rivalry between Michigan and Ohio.

I thank all our teams as well. I thank our commodities and dairy teams. It is tough work. We changed the commodity title. I think this is the most reform, probably—I don't know ever but in a long time. Moving from subsidy systems to a risk management system is easy to say, but it is hard to put into place in a way that makes sense. It is fair with commodities and will work in a simple way across the country.

I thank our Joe Shultz, who has been amazing. So many times we said: I don't know how we are going to do this, and he pulled another rabbit out of his hat. We thank Joe for all his wonderful work as our chief economist.

Cory Claussen is on dairy. It is not an easy thing to do—focus on dairy. There are large farms and small dairies. It is an incredible job.

Marcus Graham, as well, did amazing work, as did Chelsea Render. There was great teamwork on commodities and the dairy issues. Thank you so very much.

We had a great team on title II. Thanks to the ''T2 warriors'', Tina May, an amazing person, who reminded me every other day that we had 643 conservation groups from every one of the 50 States. I have it in my memory because Tina said it every time I saw her. The truth is we did have 643 different conservation and environmental groups supporting this bill. It is because of Tina May, Catie Lee and Kevin Norton and the incredible work they brought to what I believe is an extraordinary reform in conservation. We are placing conservation as a priority in a way that has not been in other farm bills. We will see our country provide better opportunities around land and water and air quality and quantity issues as a result of their hard work.

Jacqlyn Schneider and Jesseca Taylor deserve a tremendous amount of credit for their work on the nutrition and healthy food issues. A major area of debate that will be going forward, as we address nutrition and healthy foods issues, is specialty crops, which are so important to me. I know in New Hampshire and other parts of the country it is very important. They did incredible work. We had some hard issues to work through on how we could create savings in our bill in nutrition, while maintaining the strong commitment to families. So I would like to thank them for an extraordinary effort as well.

And then each of our team members—let me go through them because there are so many people who did so many wonderful things.

Jonathan Cordone, who kept me out of trouble at most moments, in his work as general counsel, counseled me well and gave me wonderful words of wisdom as we moved along, both on procedure as well as policy.

Brandon McBride on rural development—we worked through many issues on the floor with Members, many issues that Members who were not on the committee had and wanted to work on and develop further, and Brandon's patience and creativity and hard work really created a rural development title that is extraordinary.

One of the things we worked on, which may sound easy but was not easy at all, was the differing definitions of what rural is. The Secretary of Agriculture told me one time we had 11 different definitions of what rural was. He said: You know, you ought to fix that.

We heard from part-time mayors and village presidents and county commissioners and others who said: We would like to figure this out, how we might use these programs to support our communities, but we don't know whether we fit or under which definition we fit.

Well, we have one definition now, and that may sound simple, but, no, it was very hard. And Brandon deserves a tremendous amount of credit, along with our team, for getting us to that point.

Karla Thieman, who is not here at the moment, did a tremendous job on livestock, livestock disaster assistance, and efforts on the energy title. We thank her and wish she were able to be here to actually celebrate. I don't think she is, is she? No, she is not here, but we thank her so much.

Ben Becker made sure that we were communicating effectively with those in the media, that we were communicating what we were doing. He worked extremely hard to make sure that was happening.

Russ Behnam. We thank Russ so much for all his incredible work as we moved through these amendments and moved through this process. He was absolutely invaluable in his work as well.

We thank Hanna Abou-El-Seoud, who was a terrific part of our team, and Maureen James, Alexis Stanczuk, Ryan Hocker, and Jesse Williams, our chief clerk, Nicole Hertenstein, Jacob Chaney, Seth Buchsbaum, and Alvaro Zarco. They are a terrific team, each one of them playing a very important role in getting us to this point and helping me have the information I needed, making sure things were getting done and the team was able to come together.

We had two great fellows, Lauren Reid and Matt Eldred, whom we thank as well. Also, we thank all of the great interns we have had with us since we began this process: Ryan Smoes, Jasmine Macies, Dawn Lucas, and Seth Collins.

This really is a team effort, with an extraordinary breadth of jurisdiction under this bill that created the need to really make sure we had the smartest people in the room, and I really believe we achieved that with this great team.

Also, I couldn't have gotten it done without my great chief of staff, Amanda Renteria, and the great role she played with Chris Adamo putting together our great agriculture team, and Todd Wooten, legislative director, who was on the phone counting votes every moment right up until the final vote. He did such a great job in bringing that together.

Bill Sweeney, my deputy chief of staff, made sure we were communicating in the right way, being able to tell the story of what it means to have a farm bill, what it means to people back home, to every family, every business, and every farmer. He did an extraordinary job of helping me do that.

Cullen Schwarz, who is a terrific communications director, made sure we were communicating effectively what we were doing and why we were doing it.

I also wish to thank our team in Michigan, led by Teresa Plachetka, a wonderful team that made sure we were focused, as I always am, on Michigan. Our great team consists of Mary Judnich, Kali Fox, and Brandon Fewins, who have done terrific work and outreach around the State, and Korey Hall in urban agriculture. All of our team made sure we were communicating at home with our growers.

We are proud to say we have more diversity of crops than any State but California, so I have always had to pay attention to every page. I have always kind of been jealous of folks who had to only pay attention to one title. We have had to pay attention to everything. The good news is that prepared me well for assuming the chair of the committee. But I do want to thank our Michigan staff because they are terrific as well.

This really is a bipartisan effort. It really, really is. And I have such respect and admiration for the staff of Senator ROBERTS on the committee, led by Mike Seyfert, Joel Leftwich, and Anne Hazlett. I thank them all so much for their terrific work and partnership. Everyone involved whom Senator ROBERTS spoke of is professional, smart, and dedicated. We had some tough things we had to work through, both policy-wise and procedurally, and they were terrific, just absolutely magnificent, and I am very grateful for the wonderful way in which we really have a team. It is not a Democratic team or a Republican team—we have a team.

I also wish to briefly mention our CBO farm team, whom we kept up late at night many times as we tried to get scores and work through how we fit this all together and maintain over $23 billion in deficit reduction. So Doug Elmendorf and his terrific team—Jim Langley, Greg Hitz, Dave Hull, Kathleen FitzGerald, Emily Holcombe, Ann Futrell, Dan Hoople, and Jeff LaFave—we call them the farm team—have been magnificent and worked weekends, have gone above and beyond for us, and I thank them, with a shout-out to everybody at CBO who has helped us.

I thank Michelle Johnson-Wieder and Gary Endicott from Legislative Counsel for their invaluable assistance. And on Senator REID's staff, I thank Kasey Gillette and Nathan Engle. I claim Kasey as my former staff person, so I told Senator REID that I trained her well. But we are very grateful for the incredible team effort there.

All our floor staff, Gary Myrick, Tim Mitchell, David Krone, Bill Dauster, Reema Dodin, Stacy Rich, Meredith Mellody, and everyone involved on the majority team who was so absolutely essential to us, putting in very long days and getting this done—everybody hung in there with us, and we are grateful.

Finally, let me mention the Secretary of Agriculture, Tom Vilsack, and the USDA Office of General Counsel. We had a lot of technical needs as we worked through this bill, a tremendous need for technical assistance and support, so that when we were done, as we completed the bill, it actually worked for farmers and ranchers, it worked from a Department standpoint to support farmers and ranchers and those involved in every part of this bill, and we received tremendous help and encouragement and support. So I thank them for their leadership.

To all the members of the Agriculture Committee, Democrats and Republicans, and their staffs, I wish to say how very lucky I am to have such a tremendous team who is so knowledgeable and has so much experience and a committee that has so much experience. It has been quite amazing.

So as I conclude, Madam President, I would just say this is a proud day for those who care about having the Senate work together well, for producing a product that is one that has real reforms in it and something that we can look to the American people with pride and say: We worked hard, we worked together, and we got the job done.

I thank everyone, and now we look forward to working with our House colleagues as they move this measure forward.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SHAHEEN). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded and that I be allowed to speak as if in morning business.

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

TAXMAGEDDON

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I rise to express my growing concern as massive tax increases loom on the horizon, and yet the Senate has not taken a single vote to forestall what many are appropriately calling taxmageddon.

Washington tends to be a place where people speak in hyperbole, but it is hard to overstate the magnitude of the tax increases that will hit our economy starting next year if we do not act. If Congress does not vote to extend the current income-tax rates, the lower tax rates on investment income, relief from the alternative minimum tax, relief from the Federal estate tax, and other expiring tax relief measures, the result will be a tax increase of more than $470 billion on Americans in 2013 alone.

Over the next 10 years this tax increase will result in nearly $4.5 trillion in new taxes on American families and entrepreneurs. This will be the largest tax increase in our Nation's history in absolute dollars and the second largest tax increase since World War II as a percentage of our economy. This massive tax increase does not even take into account the new taxes enacted as part of ObamaCare that will also go into effect in 2013 and that will impose an additional $23 billion in higher taxes on individuals and businesses.

What will these taxes mean to the average American family? The Heritage Foundation recently published a study that estimated the increase per tax return in every State. In my State of South Dakota, Heritage estimates that the average tax increase per tax return will be $3,187 in 2013.

I would say this to my Democratic friends who generally believe in demand-driven Keynesian economics: The average family in South Dakota can do more to stimulate our economy and create new employment by keeping their $3,187 and spending it as they see fit, not as Washington sees fit to spend it on their behalf.

Taxmageddon is an apt description when we consider the impact of these tax increases not just on individual families but on our entire economy. Until recently we could speculate about the impact of these tax increases on our fragile economy, but the magnitude of the damage was not in dispute. Not anymore.

Last month, the Congressional Budget Office gave us the most definitive estimate yet of the impact of the nearly $½ trillion of tax increases in 2013 when combined with the more than $100 billion of spending cuts from the sequester.

The Congressional Budget Office projects that the combination of massive tax increases and the sequester will result in real GDP growth in calendar year 2013 of only one-half of 1 percent. The picture is even bleaker when we consider that the Congressional Budget Office also projects that the economy will actually contract by 1.3 percent in the first half of 2013. According to the CBO, such a contraction and output in the first half of 2013 would ''probably be judged to be a recession.''

So let's be clear about what ''taxmageddon'' means. We are not talking about a slight slowdown in growth of a few tenths of a percent. What we are facing is the difference between positive growth on one hand—which will mean more jobs and higher incomes—and a recession on the other hand.

How big is the difference in economic growth next year if we act to forestall the pending tax increases versus not doing anything about it? According to the Congressional Budget Office, if Congress acted to remove the tax increases and budget cuts, the growth of real GDP in 2013 would be in the range of 4.4 percent.

This sort of robust growth is a far cry from the lackluster economic performance that we have experienced of late. In fact, GDP growth for the first quarter of this year was recently revised downward to just 1.9 percent. This is hardly the magnitude of economic growth necessary to sustain a meaningful recovery that will finally bring the unemployment rate below 8 percent—something the current meager recovery has failed to accomplish.

We can, and must, do better. We can start by providing Americans some certainty as to what their taxes are going to be come next year. Fortunately, we learned recently that the House of Representatives intends to hold a vote on legislation to extend the existing tax rate next month. According to statements by House Speaker BOEHNER and Majority Leader CANTOR, the House is likely to consider a short-term—perhaps for 1 year—extension of existing tax rates as a bridge to fundamental tax reform next year.

Some may question why we need to vote on an extension of the tax rates now because they assume these tax issues can simply be dealt with as a part of the postelection lameduck session. The answer is that we need a vote now because the delay in extending current tax policy is having a very real impact on our economy today.

In fact, the Congressional Budget Office again estimates that the mere possibility of pending tax increases and spending cuts will lower U.S. GDP by one-half of 1 percent in the second half of this year—not next year, this year. The reason for this is simple. Americans, whether they be investors, small business owners, or simply consumers, understand that they may have a larger tax bill come next year, meaning they will have less aftertax income. Faced with that possibility, we should not be surprised if Americans are choosing to consume less or put off business investments until they know what their tax situation is going to be.

Just this week there was a Bloomberg article entitled ''Fiscal Cliff Concerns Hurting Economy As Companies Hold Back.'' The article quoted a senior economist at Bank of America who said, ''You don't board up the windows when the hurricane is there. You board up the windows in anticipation.'' This economist predicted U.S. growth decelerating to 1.3 percent in the third quarter of this year and 1 percent in the fourth quarter.

The moral of the story is clear. The sooner we act to extend the current tax rates, the better off our economy will be and the better off will be the 12.7 million Americans who are currently unemployed. The sooner we act, the better off will be the 5.4 million Americans who have been unemployed long term or the 46.2 million Americans living in poverty or the record 46 million Americans who receive food stamps.

I agree with President Obama when he said in August of 2009, ''You don't raise taxes in a recession.'' End quote of President Obama in August of 2009.

If you should not raise taxes in a recession, it stands to reason you also should not raise taxes that will cause a recession. I also agree with a number of my Democratic colleagues quoted earlier this week in an article about these pending tax increases. I agree with Senator JIM WEBB, who is quoted as saying, ''We shouldn't raise taxes on ordinary income.'' I agree with Senator BEN NELSON, ''My druthers is to extend the tax cuts for everybody.''

I agree with former Senator Pete Domenici and former OMB Director Alice Rivlin, who appeared before the Finance Committee earlier this week, and who both agreed we need a short-term extension of current tax law in order to get us to a place where we can consider fundamental reforms to our Tax Code and our entitlement programs.

Even former President Bill Clinton, a major surrogate for the Obama campaign, admitted the obvious when he said recently that a short-term extension of the tax cuts might be necessary.

Former President Clinton and other Democratic Members whom I mentioned have not suddenly become supply-side tax cutters. But they realize it is simply common sense that with the economy slowing, the last thing the Congress should do is slam on the brakes by allowing massive tax increases.

We were reminded earlier this week just how destructive the proposed income tax rate increases would be on the sector of our economy responsible for the bulk of new job creation, and that is our small businesses. According to an analysis by the nonpartisan Joint Committee on Taxation released on June 18, the tax increases that President Obama has proposed would hit more than half—53 percent, to be precise—of all flowthrough business income. The Joint Tax Committee estimates that 40,000 business owners would find themselves subject to higher tax rates next year.

Does anyone think, with unemployment above 8 percent for 41 straight months, that higher taxes on nearly a million business owners is the right policy? Yet that is exactly where we are headed if we do not act.

Of course, extending current tax law temporarily is only a short-term fix. What is needed is comprehensive tax reform, much like the Tax Reform Act of 1986. Real tax reform will drive economic growth higher, will lead to robust job creation, and result in more revenue to the Federal Government. But real tax reform will require Presidential leadership, something that has been unfortunately lacking over the past 3½ years. Perhaps next year we will have a President truly willing to commit to tax reform, a President who is not content with simply releasing a 23-page framework for corporate tax reform. But until we get to comprehensive tax reform, the least we can do now is ensure that Americans do not face a massive new tax hike.

In conclusion, we are facing a moment of truth. We can choose to put our heads in the sand and pretend as though Taxmaggedon is not real, we can choose to accept slower economic growth for the remainder of this year and a recession in the first half of next year or we can choose to take action in a way that says, loudly and clearly to all Americans, now is not the time for a massive new tax increase.

I am hopeful we will see a bill from the House of Representatives in the coming weeks to extend the tax rates in order to avert Taxmaggedon. If the Senate majority is serious in its rhetoric of getting our economy back on track, they will allow a straight up-or-down vote on this measure. Fundamental tax reform may need to wait until the next Congress, but we can and we should act immediately to forestall the looming tax increases that we know will throw this economy back into a recession. It is not a Republican or a Democratic thing to do, it is simply common sense. I am hopeful the Democratic majority will allow for debate and vote on an extension of the current tax rates sooner rather than later. Every day we wait is another day our economy suffers unnecessarily.

I do not have to tell anybody here, if you look at all the economic data that comes in month after month, we have the weakest economic recovery in 60 years. We have 23 million unemployed or underemployed Americans. We have, as I said, 41 consecutive months now of unemployment over 8 percent, and we have anemic, sluggish growth projections next year by the Congressional Budget Office if in fact we do not take the steps necessary to avert Taxmaggedon.

I hope the House of Representatives will vote. I hope the U.S. Senate will follow suit. I hope the President of the United States will join us in recognizing that we cannot afford to allow taxes to go up—the largest tax increase in American history—on January 1 of next year.

We cannot wait until a lameduck session to address it, because every single day we do, Americans, investors, small businesses are putting off decisions about hiring, about putting their capital to work and growing this economy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

DEBT AND TAXES

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, next week I will probably speak more about this. But looking at tax policy and debt and whatnot—I urge Senators to look at the article written by Walter Pincus in today's Washington Post. The two wars we have been in, Iraq and Afghanistan—the two longest wars in America's history—are noted not just for their length but for the fact that it is the only time America has gone to war where we have not had a special tax to pay for the war. In fact, it is the only time America has gone to war where we not only have not had a tax to pay

for the war but we have ended up with a tax cut, and we ended up trillions of dollars in debt as a result.

I hope we will come to the time that we will say—especially with wars of choice, these were not cases where we were attacked that there was a totally unnecessary war in Iraq—totally unnecessary. We went to war in Iraq and said we will put it on our credit card.

Of course, there were no weapons of mass destruction. Iraq had nothing to do with 9/11. A bad guy was running it, but there are a lot of countries we support with bad guys running them. There are $1 trillion and thousands of American lives—tens of thousands of coalition and Iraqi lives—gone, and our children are going to have a $1 trillion bill to pay for it and we got absolutely nothing out of it.

We went in Afghanistan to get Osama bin Laden. We got him. We have been stuck there for years—another $1 trillion to beef up a corrupt government, and our children and grandchildren will be given the bill. Then we talk about what else can we do that we will not pay for? We should think about it. Let me speak now about a more positive thing.

AGRICULTURE REFORM

Earlier today, the Senate passed legislation to address one of the most significant legislative issues on our agenda this year—making needed reforms to our Nation's agriculture and food systems.

I have been both chairman and ranking member of the Agriculture Committee and I think I can say, probably as well as anybody here, how much thanks the U.S. Senate and the country owe to Chairwoman STABENOW and Ranking Member ROBERTS, who did what Senators are supposed to do. They worked together in a bipartisan way to advance the farm bill, the Agriculture Reform, Food and Jobs Act of 2012.

A lot of what people criticize about the Congress today would disappear if everyone acted the way Senator DEBBIE STABENOW of Michigan did, and Senator PAT ROBERTS of Kansas did, working across party lines, across ideologies, to try to put together a farm bill that is not a Democratic or Republican farm bill, but a farm bill for the United States of America. I am so proud of them.

I mentioned earlier today to Chairwoman STABENOW, I don't know how many times she called me weekends when I was at my home in Vermont, or sent me e-mails late in the evening, because she was trying to keep this coalition going.

The work of these leaders and the passage of this bill proves that the Senate can act in accordance with its greatest traditions and we can reach across the aisle to pass critical legislation that reflects compromise. As a former Chairman of the Agriculture Committee, and having worked closely with Senator LUGAR on many bipartisan Farm Bills, I know how difficult the task can be of forging a comprehensive bill that addresses the many competing needs. I said earlier that Senator RICHARD LUGAR and I traded places back and forth, as either chairman or ranking member on that committee. We passed bipartisan farm bills. We worked closely together, with complete candor and honestness with each other, as one would expect from Senator LUGAR. We forged these comprehensive bills.

The Senate's action today could not have been accomplished without the hard work of many dedicated, wonderful staffers, mine and others, both here in Washington and back home in Vermont. Being such a large and far reaching bill there were many staff involved throughout its development and final passage. I would like to thank in particular Adrienne Wojciechowski, Michelle Lacko, Aaron Kaigle, Kathryn Toomajian, Kara Leene, Tom Berry, Chris Saunders, Emma Van Susteren, Ted Brady, Lauren Bracket, Nikole Manatt, Greg Cota, Will Goodman, Erica Chabot, and John Dowd from my staff.

I would also like to thank both the Chairwoman and Ranking Member's staff on the Senate Agriculture Committee who worked so closely with my office on many different issues and programs including the dairy reforms, conservation consolidation, nutrition, rural development, forestry, food aid, research, organics, energy, and the wonderful improvements we made to the Non-Insured Crop Disaster Assistance Program.

It is not easy to get what we have here, a strong bipartisan bill. So I rise to say I hope the House of Representatives will act swiftly to consider legislation that is going to allow us to move to conference. Because just as it was important to the U.S. Senate to get together and pass this bill by an overwhelming majority, the swift passage of this farm bill is essential. The current Farm Bill expires at the end of September. Before August 31, we must address the serious problem of dairy policy or our dairy farmers will be left without a vital safety net.

Dairy is a crucial industry in Vermont. I hear often from dairy farmers who are worried about the dangerous rollercoaster of price swings that impacts both producers and consumers. This is a roller coaster we have been on in dairy pricing in Vermont since January of 2000. How can any farmer stay in business if this is the way their prices go? How can they plan to buy new equipment? How can they plan to send their children to school? How can they plan to modernize their farm if they never know what day the price will be up, what day prices will be down?

I hear too often from dairy farmers who meet with me or talk to me when I am at the grocery store in Vermont, or just walking down the street. They tell me they are worried about the dangerous roller coaster of prices. These swings impact both consumers and the producers.

For our farmers in Vermont, the dairy reforms included in the 2012 farm bill will bring some relief. We simply must free our dairy farmers from this destructive cycle of volatile price changes.

The current Federal safety net provides no protection for dairy farmers from this roller coaster of price volatility.

The 2009 dairy crisis brought plummeting milk prices and sky-high feed costs that combined to devastate dairy farmers in ways that many were unable to recover from. Many had to close down. Let's stop the roller coaster. Let's give stability to the hard-working men and women who are dairy farmers. Dairy farmers have come together to identify ways to move us away from the regional dairy fights and the constant policy conflicts between small and large farms. The results are the changes included in the 2012 Farm Bill, which will help farmers and consumers move away from these volatile price swings. Now we will have some protection.

The 2012 Farm Bill scraps outdated price supports and the Milk Income Loss Contract Program. It establishes a new risk management plan that protects farm income when margins shrink dangerously, and a stabilization program to allow farmers to take a proactive role in easing the instability in our dairy markets. And it accomplishes this at a lower cost than the current program that it replaces while contributing to the savings to this bill. It is a voluntary program, and can be tailored by the farmer to fit their individual needs.

Dairy is Vermont's largest agricultural commodity. Dairy products account for upward of 83 percent—or 90 percent depending on market prices—of Vermont's agricultural products sales. I am proud the dairy farmers of Vermont have had a voice in developing this farm bill, and enacting it is going to bring long-needed relief to the industry.

I hope that the House can now come together in a bipartisan way, just as we did in the Senate, to quickly pass a bipartisan Farm Bill. Republicans and Democrats alike came together in this body, so surely it can be done. We know the impact of this legislation goes well beyond our farms and forests to our economy, our families, and our kitchen tables.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

TRIBUTE TO GOVERNOR GASTON CAPERTON

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate former West Virginia Gov. Gaston Caperton on 30 years of outstanding leadership as the president of the College Board.

It is my privilege to honor Governor Caperton, a native of Charleston, WV, for his leadership in the field of education. Governor Caperton's own childhood experience instilled in him the importance of education at a very young age. As a child who struggled with dyslexia, he was able to overcome the hurdles he faced in the classroom and truly achieve educational excellence. He earned his bachelor's degree in business from the University of North Carolina and has taught at prestigious institutions, including Harvard and Columbia University. He also holds 10 honorary doctoral degrees.

Governor Caperton returned to the great State of West Virginia and served as Governor from 1989 to 1997. During his two terms in office, Governor Caperton made education a top priority and improved the lives of thousands of West Virginia students. He supported an $800 million school renovation program that directly benefited two-thirds of West Virginia's public school students, facilitating classroom upgrades and additional renovations in all of our schools. Governor Caperton has been recognized nationally for working to upgrade our State's classroom technology to keep West Virginia students competitive in an increasingly global economy. In addition, he helped raise teacher salaries from 49th place to 31st place in the Nation.

Governor Caperton's leadership in education left a lasting legacy in our State, and I am so proud of the work he did for West Virginia schools and all of our students.

In 1999 Gaston Caperton was appointed the eighth president of the College Board. Over the past 13 years Governor Caperton has done such important work to make higher education available to a greater number of students, especially those from underserved areas, and that is truly something of which to be proud. No matter their background, we need to do all we can to help our students achieve a higher level of education if we are going to create the jobs and train the workforce that makes America the greatest Nation in the world.

Since 1999 the College Board has reached a total of 23,000 high schools and 3,800 colleges and has served 7 million students and parents. The organization continues to provide college preparatory materials and has dramatically changed college entrance exams. In addition, the College Board has enabled students' enrollment in advanced placement courses, and Governor Caperton is responsible for more than tripling the number of students from low-income backgrounds taking AP courses.

Governor Caperton has continued to be a champion for students as he supports financial aid policies and programs, while advocating for tuition equity. From his tenure as Governor, to his work at Harvard and Columbia Universities, to his 13 years of leadership at the College Board, providing equal opportunities in the classroom has been the driving force behind Gaston Caperton's career. I am proud to honor this outstanding West Virginian and recognize his achievements in the field of education. I am also extremely proud to call him my friend, as do most all West Virginians.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG ABUSE

Mr. President, I also rise today to express my deep concern and my disappointment that the special interest groups who have a vested financial interest have derailed a strong effort to fight prescription drug abuse. It is an epidemic that is devastating communities all across this Nation. They got their victory—but not at my expense. The people who will pay the price are the young boys and girls in communities all across this Nation who are seeing their families and their schools and their neighborhoods wrecked by abuse and addiction.

What my amendment would do is simply this: It would require patients to get a new prescription to get their pills refilled. What we have right now in trying to schedule hydrocodone from a schedule III to a schedule II is the ease of availability and the prescriptions that are being refilled without any visits to their doctors. It is of an epidemic proportion. The pills would have to be stored and transported more securely, and traffickers would be subject to increased fines and penalties.

I am not trying to put anyone out of business. In fighting for this amendment, I asked anyone and everyone who was opposed to come to see me, and if we could find a way to work together, we would do that. We tried to accommodate the groups who were worried about additional administrative costs, such as new security requirements for storing hydrocodone, or additional paperwork that would come as a result of rescheduling. But at the end of the day these groups seemed more concerned with their business plans and the ability to sell more pills than the responsibility we all have to protect the future of this country and the future of the generation we are counting on to lead and defend this country.

Since the moment the Senate adopted my hydrocodone rescheduling amendment, lobbyists have been turning out in droves to fight this effort to limit people's ability to get pills too easily and abuse them. Yesterday these lobbyists got a victory when the House of Representatives passed a compromise version of the FDA bill that does not contain my amendment, and I assume the Senate will do the same.

Just a few weeks ago it was a different story. I was so proud when the Senate unanimously adopted this amendment because this is a problem that affects every single Member in every single State. I don't know of a person in this country who doesn't have somebody in their immediate family, extended family, or a close friend who has not been affected by the abuse of prescription drugs. Where I come from, that is an epidemic. It is an epidemic we all have and we all are facing. In fact, prescription drug abuse is responsible for about 75 percent of drug-related deaths in the United States and 90 percent in my State of West Virginia. According to the White House Office of National Drug Control Policy, prescription drug abuse is the fastest growing drug problem in the United States, and it is claiming the lives of thousands of Americans every day.

I understand that limiting access to hydrocodone pills doesn't necessarily fit into the model of selling more product, but I also understand this: We have a responsibility to this Nation and, most importantly, to the next generation to win the war on drugs.

I have been a businessperson all of my life. I understand that in business one has to have a good business plan to be successful. One should also have the ability to alter that plan when necessary, while still being successful. I assure my colleagues that this is one of those necessary times. The health of our country and the public good are at stake.

I am hearing on a daily basis from people and businesses—small, medium-sized, and large—that are having a hard time finding qualified workers—qualified workers who can pass a drug test.

We have folks who cannot get the type of education they need to be part of the workforce of the 21st century because they are drug impaired.

I have been in Washington a short time compared to some of my colleagues, but I have been here long enough to know the pressures Members face around here when special interest groups get entrenched—it is no different in the Presiding Officer's beautiful State of Delaware and my State of West Virginia—and it does not look like my amendment will go into this bill. But I can assure you, it will not go away and neither will the problem of drug abuse. I am determined to see this thing through. This measure will pass. It might not be this year, it might not be next year, but I assure you it will pass.

Until we do something, there are going to be families who are separated and torn apart because of drug abuse and little kids who come to me and the Chair and plead for help because their daddy is addicted or their mother is hooked on drugs or they have had a brother or a sister or a friend who has overdosed or died.

I do not pretend this amendment will solve the entire problem of prescription drug abuse. But when every law enforcement agency—listen, every law enforcement agency in America, every

one of them to a T, which we rely on to fight the war on drugs—has supported this amendment openly and spoken out loudly and clearly that it would help them tremendously, I do not know how we can ignore this problem much longer.

The fact is we must act. I can assure you that working together, as we do, we will find a way to move forward with this vital piece of legislation.

I promise the Presiding Officer this: I will continue to fight this war on drugs with him, and I urge all my colleagues to do the same. This is a war we cannot afford to lose.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. I thank the Chair.

A SECOND OPINION

Mr. President, I come to the floor to do what I have done week after week since the health care bill was signed into law by President Obama, to offer a doctor's second opinion about the health care law, a law that I believe is bad for patients, bad for providers—the nurses and the doctors who take care of those patients—and I believe it is terrible for the American taxpayers.

I come to the floor because the Supreme Court is soon going to rule on the constitutionality of the President's health care law.

The Court's decision will revolve around, primarily, the individual mandate, the component of the law requiring all individuals to purchase not just health insurance but government-approved health insurance.

Never in the history of this country has the Federal Government required individuals to purchase a product, to come into our homes and tell us we must buy a government-approved product. Why? Simply because we happen to be a citizen of the United States.

The American people are not happy with this mandate. As a matter of fact, a recent Gallup poll found that 72 percent of Americans believe the mandate is unconstitutional. The results of the Gallup poll, however, are not surprising.

As I travel across Wyoming, I hear constantly from people who are opposed to the mandate.

It is not just the mandate they are opposed to. But, specifically, the mandate is what brings people all across the country together to be opposed to the law.

It is interesting when I go and have meetings and talk to folks. I will ask them: Under the President's health care law—remember, the one where he promised insurance rates would drop by $2,500 per family—how many of you actually believe your own insurance rates will go up, and every hand goes up.

Then, when I ask: How many of you think the quality and availability of care for you and your family is going to go down, again, the hands go up.

It is not just the mandate; it is the entire health care law that is a problem for patients and providers and the taxpayers.

But the mandate is interesting. I bring this to the attention of the Senate because President Obama, at one point, was opposed to the mandate. When he was running for President, during his campaign for the White House, then the Senator from Illinois, Mr. Obama, quipped: ''If a mandate was the solution, we can try to solve homelessness by mandating everybody to buy a house.''

Now the President's tune has obviously changed.

I believe the mandate is unconstitutional. I believe if the Court strikes down the mandate, the rest of the law should also be found unconstitutional.

During the health care debate 2 years ago, supporters of the law repeatedly stated—repeatedly stated—that the mandate was an essential component of the law. So let's review what folks have said.

Secretary of Health and Human Services Kathleen Sebelius and Attorney General Eric Holder, in an op-ed in the Washington Post, wrote: ''Without an individual responsibility provision''—is what they called the individual mandate—the law ''doesn't work.''

The law ''doesn't work.''

Former Speaker NANCY PELOSI also came to this same conclusion. In two separate blog posts, she stated that without the individual mandate, the math, she said, behind the health care law does not work.

The current chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, Senator BAUCUS, also came to this same conclusion during the debate on the health care law.

During a committee hearing, Chairman BAUCUS stated that allowing individuals to opt out of the individual mandate would ''strike at the heart of health care reform.''

Finally, Senate Democrats in their amicus curiae brief filed with the Supreme Court argued that the individual mandate is an ''integral part'' of the health care law.

It seems to me that supporters of the law from the very beginning of this debate recognized that without the individual mandate, the rest of the health care law would need to go away.

Now it seems Washington Democrats are changing their tune and coming to a different conclusion.

In a story published by the Associated Press on June 18 of this year, it was reported that ''the Obama Administration plans to move ahead with major parts of the President's health care law if its most controversial provision''—obviously, the individual mandate—''does not survive.'' In fact, an anonymous, high-level Democratic official declared that the administration would move ''full speed ahead'' with implementation of the health care law.

It seems the administration only views the mandate as essential when it is politically convenient.

As I have stated many times before, I believe the entire health care law needs to be completely repealed and replaced. This law does not address runaway health care spending, it increases taxes, and it hurts job creation at a time of 8.2 percent unemployment across the country, at a time when college graduates are moving back home because they cannot find work, when people are underemployed, people have given up looking for work. Yet the health care law adds to the costs and adds to the uncertainty of these uncertain times and a weak economy.

The American people want a healthy economy, and this health care law is making it worse. If the law's individual mandate is struck down, the President should not implement whatever is left standing. Instead, he should work with Congress—both sides of the aisle—to implement commonsense, step-by-step reforms that will actually lower the cost of health care for all Americans.

It seems to be lost on many that the original goal of health care reform was actually to lower the cost of care. It is what the President talked about in his initial speech to the joint session of Congress. But it is something that was ignored when the 2,700-page health care law was presented to Congress and the American people.

Americans know what they want. They know what they have been looking for in a health care law, and this is not it. Americans deserve a law that helps them get the care they need, from the doctor they choose—not that the government chooses, not that the insurance company chooses: the doctor they choose—and at lower cost.

I yield the floor.

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. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DURBIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION SAFETY AND INNOVATION ACT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House with respect to S. 3187.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the House, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the bill from the Senate (S. 3187) entitled ''An Act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to revise and extend the user-fee programs for prescription drugs and medical devices, to establish user-fee programs for generic drugs and biosimilars, and for other purposes.,'' do pass with an amendment.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now move to concur in the House amendment to S. 3187, and ask for the yeas and nays on my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. I have a cloture motion at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the Reid motion to concur in the House amendment to S. 3187, the FDA Safety and Innovation Act.

Harry Reid, Tom Harkin, Sheldon Whitehouse, Kent Conrad, Jack Reed, Christopher A. Coons, Mark Begich, John F. Kerry, Charles E. Schumer, Barbara A. Mikulski, Benjamin L. Cardin, Robert Menendez, Joseph I. Lieberman, Mary L. Landrieu, Richard Blumenthal, Patty Murray, Tom Carper.

AMENDMENT NO. 2461

Mr. REID. I move to concur in the House amendment to S. 3187 with an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] moves to concur in the House amendment to S. 3187 with an amendment numbered 2461.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end, add the following new section:

SEC. ___.

This Act shall become effective 5 days after enactment.

Mr. REID. I now ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2462 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2461

Mr. REID. I now have a second-degree amendment at the desk I wish to be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 2462 to amendment No. 2461.

The amendment is as follows:

In the amendment, strike ''5 days'' and insert ''4 days''.

MOTION TO REFER WITH AMENDMENT NO. 2463

Mr. REID. I have a motion to refer the House message to the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee with instructions to report back forthwith, with an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] moves to refer the House message to the Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions with instructions to report back forthwith with an amendment numbered 2463.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end, add the following new section:

SEC. ___.

This Act shall become effective 3 days after enactment.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2464

Mr. REID. I have an amendment to my instructions that is also at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 2464 to the instructions of the motion to refer.

The amendment is as follows:

In the amendment, strike ''3 days'' and insert ''2 days''.

Mr. REID. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2465 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2464

Mr. REID. I have a second-degree amendment to my instructions that are at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 2465 to amendment No. 2464.

The amendment is as follows:

In the amendment, strike ''2 days'' and insert ''1 day''.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived with respect to the cloture motion that has just been filed.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

JUNETEENTH INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, today is the culmination of several days of activities across the Nation in recognition of the oldest known observance of the ending of slavery—''Juneteenth Independence Day''.

It was in June of 1865, that the Union soldiers landed in Galveston, TX, with the news that the war had ended and that slavery finally had come to an end in the United States. This was 2½ years after President Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation, which was issued on January 1, 1863, and months after the conclusion of the Civil War.

This week and specifically on June 19, when slaves in the Southwest finally learned of the end of slavery, the descendants of slaves have observed this anniversary of emancipation as a remembrance of one of the most tragic periods of our Nation's history. The suffering, degradation and brutality of slavery cannot be repaired, but the memory can serve to ensure that no such inhumanity is ever perpetrated again on American soil.

I was very pleased that on June 19 of this week the Senate unanimously adopted a resolution, S. Res. 496, recognizing the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day to the Nation. The resolution, which I sponsored along with Senators HUTCHISON, CARDIN, LANDRIEU, CORNYN, SHERROD BROWN, BOXER, STABENOW, HARKIN, BEGICH, DURBIN, WICKER, LEAHY, BILL NELSON, CASEY, WARNER, AKAKA, WEBB, LAUTENBERG, GILLIBRAND, and SCHUMER expresses support for the observance of Juneteenth Independence Day, and recognizes the faith and strength of character demonstrated by former slaves, that remains an example for all people of the United States, regardless of background or race.

All across America we also celebrate the many important achievements of former slaves and their descendants. We do so because in 1926, Dr. Carter G. Woodson, son of former slaves, proposed such a recognition as a way of preserving the history of African Americans and recognizing the enormous contributions of a people of great strength, dignity, faith, and conviction—a people who rendered their achievements for the betterment and advancement of a Nation once lacking in humanity towards them. Every February, nationwide, we celebrate African American History Month. And, every year on June 19, we celebrate ''Juneteenth Independence Day.''

Lerone Bennett, Jr., writer, scholar, lecturer, and acclaimed Executive Editor for several decades at Ebony Magazine, has reflected on the life and times of Dr. Woodson. Bennett tells us that one of the most inspiring and instructive stories in African American history is the story of Woodson's struggle and rise from the coal mines of West Virginia to the summit of academic achievement:

At 17, the young man who was called by history to reveal Black history was an untutored coal miner. At 19, after teaching himself the fundamentals of English and arithmetic, he entered high school and mastered the four-year curriculum in less than two years. At 22, after two-thirds of a year at Berea College [in Kentucky], he returned to the coal mines and studied Latin and Greek

between trips to the mine shafts. He then went on to the University of Chicago, where he received his bachelor's and master's degrees, and Harvard University, where he became the second Black to receive a doctorate in history. The rest is history—Black history.

In keeping with the spirit and the vision of Dr. Carter G. Woodson, I would like to pay tribute to two courageous women, claimed by my home State of Michigan, who played significant roles in addressing American injustice and inequality. These are two women of different times who would change the course of history.

The contributions of Sojourner Truth, who helped lead our country out of the dark days of slavery, and Rosa Parks whose dignified leadership sparked the Montgomery Bus Boycott and the start of the civil rights movement are indelibly etched in the chronicle of the history of this Nation. Moreover, they are viewed with distinction and admiration throughout the world.

Sojourner Truth, though unable to read or write, was considered one of the most eloquent and noted spokespersons of her day on the inhumanity and immorality of slavery. She was a leader in the abolitionist movement, and a ground breaking speaker on behalf of equality for women. Michigan has honored her with the dedication of the Sojourner Truth Memorial Monument, which was unveiled in Battle Creek, MI, on September 25, 1999. In April 2009, Sojourner Truth became the first African American woman to be memorialized with a bust in the U.S. Capitol. The ceremony to unveil Truth's likeness was appropriately held in Emancipation Hall at the Capitol Visitor's Center. I was pleased to cosponsor the legislation to make this fitting tribute possible. Sojourner Truth lived in Washington, DC for several years, helping slaves who had fled from the South and appearing at women's suffrage gatherings. She returned to Battle Creek in 1875, and remained there until her death in 1883. Sojourner Truth spoke from her heart about the most troubling issues of her time. A testament to Truth's convictions is that her words continue to speak to us today.

On May 4, 1999, legislation was enacted which authorized the President of the United States to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Rosa Parks. I was pleased to coauthor this tribute to Rosa Parks—the gentle warrior who decided that she would no longer tolerate the humiliation and demoralization of racial segregation on a bus. I was also pleased to be a part of the effort to direct the Architect of the Capitol to commission a statue of Rosa Parks, which will soon be placed in the U.S. Capitol, making her the second African American woman to receive such an honor.

Her personal bravery and self-sacrifice are remembered with reverence and respect by us all. Over 55 years ago, in Montgomery, AL, the modern civil rights movement began when Rosa Parks refused to give up her seat and move to the back of the bus. The strength and spirit of this courageous woman captured the consciousness of not only the American people, but the entire world. The boycott which Rosa Parks began was the start of an American revolution that elevated the status of African Americans nationwide and introduced to the world a young leader who would one day have a national holiday declared in his honor, the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. In addition, the overwhelming majority of my colleagues in the Senate joined me in sponsoring legislation authorizing the Congressional Gold Medal to be presented to Dr. King, posthumously, and Coretta Scott King in recognition of their contributions to the Nation. Companion legislation was led in the House by Representative JOHN LEWIS.

We have come a long way toward achieving justice and equality for all. We still however have work to do. In the names of Rosa Parks, Sojourner Truth, Dr. Carter G. Woodson, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and many others, let us rededicate ourselves to continuing the struggle of civil rights and human rights.

Mr. President, I was also pleased to join Senator HUTCHISON and other Members of the Senate this week, in sponsoring another measure introduced on June 19th in recognition of Juneteenth Independence Day, which will require further action in the Senate. It is a Joint Resolution, S.J. Res. 45, requesting the President to issue a proclamation each year designating Juneteenth Independence Day as a National Day of Observance, encouraging Americans of all races, creeds, and ethnic backgrounds to celebrate freedom and the end of slavery in the United States.

In closing, I would like to commend the Juneteenth directors and event coordinators throughout my State of Michigan. They have worked tirelessly in the planning of intergenerational activities in observance of Juneteenth, heading up a wide range of activities over several days in Detroit, Flint, Holland, Lansing, Saginaw, and other areas around the State.

EPA EMISSION STANDARDS RULE

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, on December 21, 2011, the Environmental Protection Agency, EPA, finalized the mercury and air toxics standards, MATS, rule for powerplants. These standards, which will be fully in effect in 2016, will require coal-fired powerplants to install pollution controls for mercury and toxic air pollution. When fully implemented, the MATS for powerplants will reduce mercury emissions from powerplants by 90 percent, acid gases by 88 percent, and particulate emissions, including nonmercury toxic metals, by 41 percent. Senator INHOFE's S.J. Res. 37 would disapprove and nullify this rule and, more importantly, make it impossible for the EPA to implement substantially similar rules in the future.

The State of Maine, located at the end of our Nation's ''air pollution tailpipe,'' is on the receiving end of pollution emissions from coal-fired powerplants operating in other States. The pollution reductions required under the rule will improve public health and improve the environment in our State. That is why I will vote to uphold the clean air rule that requires coal-fired powerplants to install pollution controls.

While legitimate concerns have been raised that additional compliance time and more cost-effective options are needed, I have significant concerns with overturning this rule and permanently barring the EPA from issuing any standards in the future that are substantially similar. I will push the EPA to work with utilities to develop reasonable implementation schedules.

Reductions in air pollutants from other States will reduce air pollution in Maine, which has one of the highest asthma rates in the Nation, affecting 1 in 10 adults and over 25,000 children. The EPA estimates that the MATS will prevent 130,000 cases of childhood asthma symptoms.

Every State in the country has issued mercury advisories for human fish consumption because of high levels of mercury in our Nation's streams, lakes, and rivers, and half of U.S. manmade mercury comes from coal-fired powerplants. Mercury is one of the most persistent and dangerous pollutants, particularly harmful to children and pregnant women, and it threatens our health and environment today. Under the new rule, 90 percent of this mercury would be removed. I am a longtime supporter of efforts to reduce mercury pollution and have sponsored legislation to establish a nationwide mercury monitoring system to accurately measure mercury levels.

The rule also includes standards for 186 other hazardous pollutants, including arsenic, acid gases, and toxic metals. Additionally, the equipment installed to control these pollutants will not only reduce these hazardous air pollutants but also capture fine particles, which are linked to cardiovascular and respiratory diseases.

I am a longtime supporter of Clean Air Act protections. This landmark legislation, authored by Maine's own Senator Ed Muskie more than 40 years ago, has helped protect and improve our Nation's air quality and public health for decades.

I also support sensible regulatory reforms and have introduced legislation that calls for Federal agencies to analyze the cost and benefits of proposed regulations, including the impact on job creation and consumer prices. This will help cut the tangle of redtape that is holding businesses back from expanding and adding jobs. But when it comes to the air we breathe, I reject the false choice of pitting the environment against the economy because we

understand that for much of the State of Maine, the environment is the economy.

The people of Maine have always been faithful stewards of our environment because we understand its tremendous value to our way of life. Maine's unique forests, landscapes, waters, and wildlife are an important part of our heritage and have helped shape the economic, environmental, and recreational character of our entire State. Protecting our Nation's air quality will positively benefit the natural beauty of Maine and will improve public health, protecting our children and enriching lives.

BICENTENNIAL OF THE WAR OF 1812

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise today to commemorate the bicentennial celebration of the War of 1812. The U.S. Congress declared war on Great Britain 200 years ago this week. The State of Maryland is proud of its contributions to this ''Second War for Independence,'' which reinforced United States sovereignty and gave birth to our national anthem.

A generation after the United States declared its independence from Great Britain, the mercantilist ties between the two countries were not fully severed. The British impressed American merchant seamen, enforced illegal and unfair trade regulations, colluded with certain Native American tribes to attack frontier settlements, and attempted to block westward expansion. The United States declared war to assert autonomy over its own affairs once again, establish free trade, protect sailors' rights, and ensure that our Nation could prosper from sea to shining sea.

President James Madison eloquently outlined these reasons 200 years ago when he called on ''all the good people of the United States, as they love their country, as they value the precious heritage derived from the virtue and valor of their fathers . . . [to] exert themselves in preserving order, in promoting concord, in maintaining the authority and efficacy of the laws, and in supporting and invigorating all the measures which may be adopted by the constituted authorities for obtaining a speedy, a just, and an honorable peace.''

The contributions of the U.S. Navy were instrumental in repelling the British during the War of 1812. The U.S. Navy hardly had a dozen warships compared to the hundreds of ships comprising the British fleet. British ships were undermanned, however, while well-trained and talented officers and seamen took command of American ships. These men were largely from coastal States, like Maryland, and were accustomed to seafaring. COMO Matthew Perry took on the British Navy on Lake Erie in 1813 with a scrappy fleet of light ships. Even though his force was seemingly decimated by the British, Commodore Perry resorted to paddling a rowboat with a banner that read ''Don't Give up the Ship.'' He then boarded the Niagara, double-loaded the carronades, and sailed directly into the British line, ultimately claiming victory.

The following summer, in 1814, the British Navy sailed up the Chesapeake Bay to attack our Nation's capital and seize the valuable port city of Baltimore. The British dealt heavy blows to Washington, DC, setting both the U.S. Capitol and the White House ablaze. British forces then moved toward Baltimore. Citizens of Baltimore, including free Blacks, quickly mobilized to protect their city. Barricades stretching more than 1 mile long were constructed to protect the harbor, hulls were sunk to impede navigation, and a chain of masts was erected across the harbor entrance. When the British fleet approached Baltimore at North Point, Marylanders fought the British Army and helped repulse the British Navy from Fort McHenry during the Battle of Baltimore. It is important to note that American forces during the Battle of North Point were volunteer militia, heavily outnumbered by the highly trained British infantry, but managed to delay the British forces long enough for 10,000 American reinforcements to arrive, preventing a land attack against Baltimore. Following 25 hours of intense British naval bombardment at Fort McHenry, the American defenders refused to yield, and the British were forced to depart.

During the bombardment, American lawyer Francis Scott Key, who was being held on board an American flag-of-truce vessel in Baltimore Harbor, took notice of the American flag still flying atop Fort McHenry. Key realized then that the Americans had survived the battle and stopped the enemy advance. He was so moved by the sight of the American flag flying following the horrific bombardment, he composed a poem called ''The Defense of Fort McHenry,'' which was published in the Baltimore Patriot and Advertiser newspaper later that year. This poem, and later the song, inspired love of country among the American people and not only helped usher in the ''era of good feelings'' immediately after the war, but became a timeless reminder of American resolve. ''The Star Spangled Banner'' officially became our National Anthem in 1931. The flag that flew over Fort McHenry and inspired this anthem is now a national treasure on display at the Smithsonian Institution, a very short distance from where we are today.

The War of 1812 confirmed the legitimacy of the Revolution and served as a critical test for the U.S. Constitution and newly established democratic government. Our young Nation battled against the largest, most powerful military on the Earth at that time and emerged with an enhanced standing among the countries of the world, both militarily and diplomatically. The U.S. economy was freed of its dependence on British goods, which unleashed domestic manufacturing and spawned the industrial revolution. The U.S. Navy proved its worth and the U.S. Congress rewarded the Navy with funding for a permanent, more expansive fleet. A new generation of Americans too young to remember Lord Cornwallis's surrender at Yorktown, which effectively ended the Revolutionary War, and an older generation proud of defending American independence twice in their lifetimes, were inspired by Francis Scott Key's words, which embody our universal feelings of patriotism and courage.

As a Marylander, I am proud of the contributions of my State in the War of 1812 and I have been involved in legislative efforts to bring greater attention to this bicentennial celebration. My colleague, Representative DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER, and I sponsored the Commemorative Coin Act, which President Obama signed into law in August 2010, directing the U.S. Mint to create coins commemorating this important anniversary. These gold and silver coin designs are emblematic of the War of 1812, particularly the Battle of Baltimore that inspired our National Anthem. The coins are on sale this year only and the surcharges from these commemorative coins will provide support to the Maryland War of 1812 Bicentennial Commission to conduct activities, assist in educational outreach, and preserve sites and structures relating to the War of 1812.

I am proud that Maryland will lead the Star-Spangled 200 celebration, a 3-year celebration that just began with Baltimore's ''Sailabration'' this past weekend. The Navy's Blue Angels treated spectators to dazzling air shows; the Baltimore Symphony Orchestra premiered the ''Overture for 2012,'' composed by Philip Glass; and dozens of tall ships and naval warships from around the world anchored in the Inner Harbor, open for public tours. Through 2014, Maryland will host numerous events along the Star-Spangled Banner National Historic Trail and at Fort McHenry National Monument and Historic Shrine to celebrate the bicentennial. This commemoration is an opportunity to showcase to the world that Maryland is an exceptional place to live, work, and visit.

I am also proud that the U.S. Senate unanimously adopted a resolution I sponsored to mark the bicentennial, to celebrate the heroism of the American people during the conflict, and to recognize the various organizations involved in the bicentennial celebration, including the U.S. Armed Forces, the National Park Service, and the Maryland War of 1812 Bicentennial Commission. As we recognize all of these ongoing efforts during this commemorative period, I encourage all Americans to remember the sacrifice of those who gave their lives to defend our nation's freedom and democracy in its infancy, and to join in the bicentennial celebration of our victory in the War of 1812.

UNIQUE SIGNIFICANCE OF SHELBURNE FARMS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, Vermont boasts many gems that draw visitors to our Green Mountains. Among them is Shelburne Farms, known to many Vermonters—and many visitors to Vermont—for its work on historic preservation, agriculture, sustainability, and nutrition. And so it was with great interest and appreciation that I read an article about the Farm's caretakers in the Burlington Free Press.

I have been proud of the work Alec Webb and his wife, Megan Camp, have done at Shelburne Farms for the last many years. Through their leadership, Shelburne Farms has become a first-rate educational hub, promoting environmental conservation, food education and agriculture sustainability. The partnerships initiated by Alec and Megan with the National Park Service Conservation Studies Institute and with the University of Vermont Center for Sustainable Agriculture have furthered these goals.

Today, Shelburne Farms is a National Historic Landmark, a distinction I was proud to help secure in 2001 because they earned it. During this week's debate on the Farm Bill, I think it is fitting to highlight the important work being done at Shelburne Farms. Others can take a page from their successful playbook as we explore ways to bolster our green economy, put food on Americans' tables, and promote the environmental stewardship that continues to protect our farm lands and environment.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this article, ''A Vision Realized,'' be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Burlington Free Press, June 16, 2012]

A VISION REALIZED

ALEC WEBB IS LIVING—AND MANAGING—A VISION HE RETURNED HOME TO CREATE

(By Sally Pollak)

SHELBURNE.—The summer Alec Webb turned 18, he ran his first camp. He pitched a tent in a field in his backyard—it was a big yard, about 1,000 acres—and camped out for six weeks with kids from Labrador, the Bronx, and a Cambridge, Mass., housing project. There were a couple of locals, too.

''It was a funky group of urban and rural kids,'' said Webb, who will turn 60 next month. It was the summer of 1970 and Webb, now president of Shelburne Farms, was a recent high school graduate. He had left Groton School, a prep school outside Boston, spring semester of his senior year and moved back home. Webb spent his last semester at the Shaker Mountain School, an alternative school in Burlington, where he earned credit to graduate from Groton.

''Instead of going abroad, I went to Burlington,'' Webb joked.

He left Groton because the school had become, to him, irrelevant.

''It was the '60s and that (Groton) environment didn't feel relevant to what was going on in the world,'' Webb said. ''I wanted to be in an environment that was more real, more connected to what was going on in the world. A place that was engaged with more meaningful social issues.'' In that context, Webb pitched a tent, built a campfire, and invited kids over. The campers even spent a solo night in the field, grown-up free (if you can call Webb, a newly minted 18-year-old, a grown-up).

''They all seemed to survive,'' Webb said.

The camp was the original manifestation of Webb's interest in ''meaningful education'' that is an intersection of agriculture, nature and environmental awareness. From these beginnings, at the boyhood home where Webb grew up the fourth of six siblings, Shelburne Farms would become a nonprofit (incorporated in 1972) whose various endeavors bring 140,000 people a year to the farm.

There are so many camps and school programs at Shelburne Farms these days, the child-centric activity prompted Webb to wonder on a recent walk—where packs of happy kids raced around the place—if summer camps had already started.

He's no longer sleeping in a field with the kids.

These days, you can find him in his corner office in a barn, surrounded by big maps and less-glamorous paperwork. He says he's part town manager, part town planner. And full-time fundraiser.

Webb lives with his wife, Megan Camp, the farm's vice president and program director, and their cats Fanta and Stella, in an 1850s shingled farmhouse that predates Shelburne Farms. Other animals sometimes wander onto their lawn. Chickens make regular appearances; goats jump the fence and hang at Webb's place. A donkey came by one morning last week.

The visitors come with the territory when you live where you work and work where you live: a teeming campus with activities including walking trails, a Brown Swiss dairy herd, environmental education programs, harvest festivals and a cheese making facility.

Shelburne Farms, a onetime private estate, was founded by Webb's great-grandparents and designed by landscape architect Frederick Law Olmstead in the 1880s. At the turn of the century, the lakeside property of Dr. William Seward and Lila Vanderbilt Webb encompassed nearly 4,000 acres. The barn they built for work animals was colossal—so big, in its reincarnated life it houses a cheese-making and packing operation, a school, a woodworking shop, a kid's farmyard, a bakery and offices.

In 1972, Shelburne Farms was incorporated as a nonprofit—a decision that was useful in setting the farm on more solid financial ground, Webb said. (His father had to borrow money to pay property taxes, he said.) In seeking a new direction for Shelburne Farms, Webb and his five siblings saw that the property could and should be a community resource and asset, he said. The six young Webbs did not want the dairy farm where they grew up to become a carved-up, high-end suburb of Burlington, Webb said.

''If we all had one-sixth of this place,'' he said, ''we would've spent the rest of our lives dealing with that.''

The common experience of growing up on the farm, a love of the land, and an interest in ''responding to the context of the world we were living in at that time,'' helped shape the siblings' shared vision for Shelburne Farms, Webb said.

''Those threads of agriculture, youth, community, those were our intentions,'' he said the other day, eating lunch at a picnic table in the farmyard.

''We started Shelburne Farms because we were worried about all the things that are more pressing now,'' he said, noting climate change wasn't an issue people were thinking about. ''We wondered: 'How are we going to get ourselves on a path that could be more sustainable for people and the planet.' The farm would be an expression of a pathway to a better future. Not a model for that, necessarily, but an example of how things can work given a different set of intentions, around sustainability.''

They wanted the land whole and accessible to the public.

Their father, Derick Webb, made that possible on his death in 1984 at the age of 70. Derick Webb—who had retired to Florida—rewrote his will before his death from a heart attack. In his revised will, he left the 1,000 acres he inherited to the nonprofit that was established by his kids 12 years earlier. An earlier version had given the property to the six children.

Though Webb and his siblings agitated for this change—including writing letters that Webb says make him cringe to read today—they didn't know their father had gifted the land to the nonprofit until after he died.

Now the integrity of the property was assured. Suddenly, the nonprofit was in a more formidable position.

''At that point, we were playing for real,'' Webb said. That meant fundraising, restoring and managing the property, building an organization and related programming.

Making the world a little bit better is something of a bureaucracy—with custodial work on the side.

''When I'm walking around, I'm always looking for deferred maintenance and potholes,'' Webb said. ''It's not a downer. I kind of enjoy that.''

His primary focuses are finances and farming; his brother, Marshall Webb, manages the woodland and special projects.

The farm was in disrepair when Webb was a kid, but he liked his father's Brown Swiss herd and chores related to dairying. In those days, a milk hauler rumbled up the long driveway to transport the milk to a creamery. Earlier still, the family delivered milk in cans to Shelburne.

Back then, the barn roofs leaked; plumbing didn't work in portions of Shelburne House, now called the Inn at Shelburne Farms; and Alec and his brothers, wearing plain white T-shirts, ate corn on the cob at picnic tables on a terrace, goats sniffing around the table for scraps. ''It's a whole different scene down there now at 6 o'clock at night,'' Webb said.

At 6 o'clock these days, spiffy diners—guests, not family—eat dinner on the terrace at the inn, a dining spot that overlooks formal gardens, Lake Champlain and the Adirondacks. The food they're eating, chef-prepared, was likely produced on the farm. Not counting work-related dinners, Webb said he eats at the inn about once a year.

He still prefers dairying hours, rising by 5 a.m. and eating a bowl of oat bran before heading to work. His commute is walking across the farmyard. With the exception of two years working for the state Department of Education—fulfilling duty required for his conscientious objector status in the Vietnam War—Webb's work has been connected to Shelburne Farms.

In his office is a black and white photograph of a young girl standing at a table of vegetables. It is the summer of 1973, before the existence of the Burlington Farmers Market. The table is set up on St. Paul Street in front of the original Ben and Jerry's.

It holds cabbages, cauliflower, and bushels of beans. Hand-lettered signs describe vegetables that are organically grown and reasonably priced. The girl grew the vegetables at Shelburne Farms. She's an early example of the farm's decades-long yield: sustainable agriculture, community connections, youthful energy and vision.

''We didn't say, 40 years ago, we're going to have an inn,'' Webb said. ''We had the intention of seeing this place being used as a place for learning—creating a living/learning environment for kids and others to increase their awareness of the environment and community.

''There was something that would seem wrong about doing anything other than treating Shelburne Farms as a community asset. Maybe it's Olmstead's design: (But) the importance of conserving this land was not as clear as it is now.''

TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT COLONEL BARRY GASDEK

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, today I wish to honor LTC Barry Gasdek, Retired, for his decades of service to Wyoming and to America.

As Walter Lippmann once said, ''The final test of a leader is that he leaves behind him in other men the conviction and the will to carry on.'' In his 49 years of service to our country, Barry's proven dedication and loyalty have touched hundreds of lives. From his extensive active duty service in the U.S. Army to his quest to aid the veterans of Wyoming, Mr. Gasdek is a true Wyoming hero.

Barry's path to Wyoming is similar to the historic trails that cross Wyoming's terrain—he started out in the east and eventually headed west. Barry showed the strong will and discipline of a natural born leader. Growing up in Pennsylvania, he excelled as an athlete and a scholar. He earned the rank of Eagle Scout in high school. At the Indiana University of Pennsylvania, where he graduated with a B.S. in education, he earned letters in three sports. All of these honors prepared him for a lifetime of service to his country.

Barry's passion and devotion to the armed forces sparked a distinguished career with the U.S. Army. Barry started his career serving in Germany, fresh from the ROTC program, where he gained firsthand experience of Cold War tensions. Later, he was called to serve in Vietnam as the conflict there worsened. Barry proved himself in Vietnam. He flew observation missions and eventually returned for a second tour of duty. One of his commanders joked that he was like a magnet for drawing fire. Despite the adversity he faced, Barry met his challenges head-on and with fortitude. He continued his military service well after Vietnam by training to become both a Ranger and a Pathfinder and by serving at a number of Army bases around the world.

He is a qualified leader, and his military achievements reflect his success. He was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross, an award second only to the Medal of Honor. In addition, Barry received the Silver Star for his service in Vietnam, 5 Bronze Stars, 2 Purple Hearts, the Soldier's Medal, the Legion of Honor, and 17 Air Medals. These awards are but a few of his military accomplishments.

After many years of successfully serving his country, Barry accepted another challenge—this time in Laramie, WY. He was assigned as a professor of military science at the University of Wyoming through its Army ROTC program. Barry was a natural for the title, given his own involvement in the ROTC program in Pennsylvania. He brought the same level of talent and perseverance to this position as he did on the battlefield. For years, he encouraged his students to become our Nation's future leaders.

While many would be comfortable slipping into retirement, Barry knew his mission in Wyoming had not yet been completed. This time, he took up the banner to fight for veterans' issues. He had experienced the lack of support for Vietnam's veterans, and he vowed to keep that from happening again. Barry served in leadership positions with the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and the Military Order of the Purple Heart. His goal was to support the State's current veterans while teaching the next generation about the important sacrifices our Armed Forces make each and every day. Eventually, his passionate advocacy led him to serve as a State veterans service officer for the Wyoming Veterans Commission, the UW Veterans Task Force, and as the Army Reserve ambassador.

LTC Barry Gasdek, Retired, has devoted his entire life to serving his country, his brothers in arms, and the people of Wyoming. He is a fighter, a mentor, a teacher, and a good man. He embodies the cowboy ethics and what it means to be a citizen of Wyoming. It is certain that the legacy of his leadership will inspire new generations of brave soldiers. On behalf of the State of Wyoming and the United States of America, I thank Barry for his service. His boots will be hard to fill.

RECOGNIZING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF TITLE IX

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, this week we celebrate the 40th anniversary of the passage of title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972. For over 40 years, this historic law has furthered gender equality in education and sports in schools so that young women, including my three daughters, Caroline, Halina, and Anne, who all play soccer, may enjoy the benefits that come along with sports participation.

On October 29, 2002, title IX was renamed the ''Patsy Takemoto Mink Equal Opportunity in Education Act'' to honor the tireless determination and leadership of Congresswoman Mink of Hawaii in developing and passing title IX. If Congresswoman Mink was still with us today, I know she would be proud of the remarkable gains that have been made to ensure equal opportunity for women and girls in sports, education, and professionally.

In my home State of Colorado, we are ahead of the curve with regards to opportunities for girls and women in sports. The U.S. Olympic Training Center, located in Colorado Springs, was created by an act of Congress in 1978, just a few years after title IX was passed. It is encouraging to know that women, like Gold Medal Winner Lindsey Vonn, now make up nearly half of all U.S. Olympians competing at the games—representing more than 48 percent of the 2008 team. Jamie Derrieux, a senior at Grand Junction High School, was named to the 5A First-Team All-State team and will be playing basketball at the University of Northern Colorado this fall. The flagship all-girls charter school, GALS, Girls Athletic Leadership Schools, in Denver practices active learning that engages students in health and wellness activities in the belief that these are key contributing factors in optimizing academic achievement and self-development. The Colorado Women's Sports Fund Association works toward increasing the number of girls and women who participate in athletics and reducing and eliminating barriers that prevent participation.

Studies show that participation in sports has a positive influence on the intellectual, physical and psychological health of girls and young women. By a 3-to-1 ratio, female athletes do better in school, do not drop out, and have a better chance to graduate from college. Sports participation is linked to lower rates of pregnancy in adolescent female athletes, and according to a study from the Oppenheimer/MassMutual Financial Group, of 401 executive businesswomen surveyed, 82 percent reported playing organized sports while growing up, including school teams, intramurals, and recreational leagues.

Despite the vast improvements, inequalities and disparities still remain. According to the National Federation of State High School Associations, schools are still providing 1.3 million fewer chances for girls to play sports in high school than boys. These numbers have an even greater impact on Latinas and African-American young women. It is because of such disparities that I signed on to the Senate resolution put forth this week by Senators PATTY MURRAY of Washington and OLYMPIA SNOWE of Maine to show my commitment to working toward a more equal future.

We have work to do. Please join me in celebrating the 40th anniversary of title IX by supporting efforts to expand equality in sports participation and education for women and girls around the country.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING THE 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNITED WAY

• Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I am pleased to congratulate the United Way on its 125th anniversary. The organization began in 1887 as a community

endeavor in Denver, and it spread throughout the country.

Today, the United Way includes almost 1,800 community-based organizations in the United States and 40 other countries and territories. It applies the nearly $5 billion it raises annually to provide for the common good in communities all over the world.

I am proud that my State of Mississippi is home to dozens of nonprofit United Way organizations. With their network of partners, these groups do remarkable work to gather private resources and generate volunteer services from all ages to address the educational, health, and income problems faced by children, families, and seniors.

Projects such as the Back 2 School Resource Fair hosted by the United Way of Northeast Mississippi, the Summer Youth Corps volunteer program run by the United Way of the Capital Area, and the Literacy Kit Workshop sponsored by the United Way of Southern Mississippi are just a very small sample of ongoing activities carried out to help improve our State.

In addition, Mississippians are grateful for the helping hand the United Way provides when disasters strike. United Way volunteers from Mississippi and around the Nation were among the thousands of people who came to the aid of my State following Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. More recently, the United Way stepped up to assist those hurt by tornadoes in northeast Mississippi and historic flooding throughout the Mississippi River delta.

The United Way has recorded an outstanding history of accomplishment in its 125 years. It has done so by joining forces with everyone from the individual giver to Fortune 500 partners.

I am pleased to be able to join in commending this organization for its good works, and I look forward to its continued success.●

SOURIS RIVER FLOOD ANNIVERSARY

● Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, it has been nearly a year since the city of Minot and surrounding communities were devastated by a historic flood along the Souris River in North Dakota.

As we recognize this anniversary, we are reminded of the devastation it brought to thousands of families throughout the Souris River Basin, the extraordinary leadership of local officials, the valiant efforts of residents and businesses, the outpouring of support, and the perseverance and determination of the region to rebuild.

On June 22, 2011, the sirens sounded in Minot signaling the mandatory evacuation of nearly a quarter of the city's residents. A wall of water was coming at us, and we knew the existing levees would be overtopped. Work continued around the clock on temporary, secondary levees to protect as much of the city as possible, but we knew thousands of homes would be impacted by floodwaters. On June 23, the river overtopped the levees in Minot, spilling into neighborhoods and businesses. When the river finally peaked, it had surpassed the record set in 1881 by more than 3.5 feet and crested more than 12.5 feet above flood stage. While the flood damaged homes, businesses, schools, parks, the zoo, and many other things, it did not dampen the spirit of those in Minot and the surrounding communities or their resolve to rebuild.

In those days leading up to and following the flood, many Federal agencies were on the ground assisting the region with response and recovery. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Federal Emergency Management Agency were there from the beginning, and both are still there today helping residents recover and repairing levees. Many other Federal agencies also provided critical support throughout the disaster. For that, we are forever grateful.

I also want to thank my colleagues for the disaster assistance provided through the Community Development Block Grant Program, the Economic Development Administration, and Emergency Relief to respond to this and other disasters in 2011. This funding is providing important resources for the region and a key part of its foundation for recovery.

The city of Minot and surrounding communities, including Burlington, Velva, and Sawyer, have come a long way since those dark days last year. While the recovery will continue for some time, I am so proud of the spirit and can-do attitude of all in the basin as they rebuild their communities.

Officials and residents will gather together this weekend to celebrate a ''Weekend of Hope: Return to Oak Park.'' It will be a time for reflection on how far the region has come and to focus on the region's continuing recovery. Hope is guiding the region's recovery and ensuring that Minot, Burlington, and the other communities will be back better and stronger than ever.●

FULLERTON, NORTH DAKOTA

● Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I am pleased to honor an active community in North Dakota that will soon commemorate its 125th anniversary. From June 29 through July 1, the residents of Fullerton will be celebrating their community's history and founding.

The history of Fullerton is closely connected to early American history. Fullerton was founded in 1887 on land donated by Mr. Edwin F. Sweet, an investor from Michigan. Sweet, who later served as a U.S. Congressman and Assistant U.S. Secretary of Commerce for President Wilson and President Harding, named the town after his wife's family, the Fullers. The Fuller family ancestry includes Dr. Samuel Fuller, who arrived in America on the Mayflower as a physician for the Plymouth Colony. Edwin and his wife Sophia named their first son after one of their ancestors, Charles Carroll, an original signer of the Declaration of Independence.

Fullerton's most famous landmark, the Carroll House, has a wonderful history and has been a focal point of the community from the time its doors opened in 1889. Built by Edwin Sweet and named after Edwin and Sophia's first son Carroll Fuller Sweet, the hotel's ballroom was the meeting spot for all town social gatherings, including concerts, gala balls, and church meetings. Through the years, the Carroll House has undergone extensive renovations and is now recognized as a national historic landmark. Visitors from all over the country stay at the Carroll House, and the hotel continues to host town events, like ice cream socials and silent auctions.

Fullerton is a fun and friendly community. The residents take great pride in their dining, recreation, hotel, and park facilities, in addition to their agricultural background. To celebrate the 125th anniversary, the community is holding an all-school reunion. Other planned activities for the weekend include the memorial tree planting ceremony, an all-community reunion banquet, a community choir concert, an apple pie contest, and a parade.

I ask the Senate to join me in congratulating Fullerton, ND, and its residents on their 125th anniversary and in wishing them a warm future.●

MONROE, SOUTH DAKOTA

● Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the community of Monroe, SD, on reaching the 125th Anniversary of its founding. This tightly knit community will have a chance to reflect on its past and contemplate its future. I congratulate the people of Monroe for reaching this milestone in their history.

The eastern South Dakota townsite that became Monroe was founded in 1887 while it was still the Dakota Territory. Its location along the Chicago and North Western Railroad fueled the town's growth, and it was incorporated as Monroe in 1901. The first building in the town was a grain house, which was soon followed by a general store, which included a post office. In the early 20th century Monroe experienced a great deal of development and growth and that energy is still evident to this day.

Monroe sought to preserve their spirit of togetherness by constructing a community center in 1990. The center houses the senior center and city office and was built using community funds and donations from the alumni of Monroe High School. Many events are held at the center, and it is a point of pride for the community.

The people of Monroe plan to commemorate their town's anniversary with many community events including a craft fair, poker run, all-school

reunion alumni banquet, and fireworks display. In addition, the community will host a tractor drive and ethanol plant tour to conclude the celebration.

Monroe and its residents embody the small town values that make South Dakota a great State to live and work in. I am proud to join with the community of Monroe in celebrating the last 125 years, and look forward to what is, no doubt, a promising future.●

PIERPONT, SOUTH DAKOTA

● Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to the 125th anniversary of Pierpont, SD. The residents of Pierpont exemplify the strong sense of community and welcoming spirit that are defining traits of South Dakotans.

Pierpont is a tranquil town nestled at the foot of the Coteau Hills, in Day County. The early settlers of Pierpont tenaciously petitioned the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul Railroad for a side track, so that farmers would have a nearby market for their grain. Charles Sheldon, a homesteader who later became the second governor of South Dakota, was the spokesman for the Pierpont farmers. Sheldon's negotiation was successful, and the farmers paid $500 to the railroad for the construction of the side track.

In 1887, the first structures of what would become the town of Pierpont were built by the Empire Elevator Company. By 1888, the Post Office had opened and families began settling in the town. The turn of the century found a thriving, booming community with businesses that lined Main Street.

To celebrate Pierpont's historical achievement, residents will join together for a weekend full of fun activities. An all-school alumni reunion, parade, car show, and a children's carnival are just a few of the exciting events that will take place.

I am proud to recognize Pierpont on reaching this milestone and wish them nothing but the best in the future. Pierpont continues to be a prime example of the successful pioneer spirit that built South Dakota.●

SOUTH DAKOTA UNITED WAY

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize the South Dakota United Way. This is the 125th anniversary of the United Way and I would like to specifically acknowledge the South Dakota chapters on this special day. The local United Way has been active in South Dakota since 1929 and has made outstanding contributions to the communities they serve.

There are 11 United Way locations in South Dakota providing services such as educational opportunities, lower income community aid, and health awareness programs. The United Way partners with many local businesses, furthering their community impact.

I would like to offer my congratulations on this monumental day to this program and to all the great men and women whose generosity and service make the United Way a success.●

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–6626. A communication from the Administrator, Rural Utilities Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Substantially Underserved Trust Areas (SUTA)'' (RIN0572–AC23) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 20, 2012; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–6627. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Sedaxane; Pesticide Tolerances'' (FRL No. 9345–8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 20, 2012; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–6628. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Reserve Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a proposed change by the Air National Guard to the Fiscal Year 2012 National Guard and Reserve Equipment Appropriation (NGREA) procurement; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–6629. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Only One Offer'' ((RIN0750–AH11) (DFARS Case 2012–D013)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 19, 2012; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–6630. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Applicability of Hexavalent Chromium Policy to Commercial Items'' ((RIN0750–AH39) (DFARS Case 2011–D047)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 19, 2012; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–6631. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, the report of proposed legislation entitled ''National Park System Critical Authorities Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–6632. A communication from the General Counsel of the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Eligible Obligations, Charitable Contributions, Nonmember Deposits, Fixed Assets, Investments, Fidelity Bonds, Incidental Powers, Member Business Loans, and Regulatory Flexibility Program'' (RIN3133–AD98) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 20, 2012; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6633. A communication from the General Counsel of the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Loan Workouts and Nonaccrual Policy, and Regulatory Reporting of Troubled Debt Restructured Loans'' (RIN3133–AE01) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 20, 2012; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6634. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, the report of proposed legislation relative to amending the Chesapeake Bay Initiative Act of 1998; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6635. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Mississippi; Regional Haze State Implementation Plan'' (FRL No. 9691–9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 20, 2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6636. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Central Indiana (Indianapolis) Ozone Maintenance Plan Revision to Approved Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets'' (FRL No. 9689–6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 20, 2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6637. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; South Carolina; Emissions Statements'' (FRL No. 9689–5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 20, 2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6638. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; South Carolina; Regional Haze State Implementation Plan'' (FRL No. 9691–7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 20, 2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6639. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Alabama; Regional Haze State Implementation Plan'' (FRL No. 9691–8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 20, 2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6640. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Iowa; Regional Haze'' (FRL No. 9687–9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 20, 2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6641. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri; Regional Haze'' (FRL No. 9688–1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 20, 2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6642. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Significant New Use Rule on Certain Chemical Substances; Withdrawal of Significant New Use Rule'' (FRL No. 9353–2) received in the Office of the President of the

Senate on June 20, 2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6643. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances; Withdrawal of Significant New Use Rules'' (FRL No. 9352–7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 20, 2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6644. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Research, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Withdrawal of Regulatory Guide 7.3, 'Procedures for Picking Up and Receiving Packages of Radioactive Material' '' (Regulatory Guide 7.3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 19, 2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6645. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of North Carolina; Regional Haze State Implementation Plan'' (FRL No. 9691–5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 20, 2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–6646. A communication from the Chairman, Medicare Payment Advisory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled, ''Report to the Congress: Medicare and the Health Care Delivery System''; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–6647. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2012–0064—2012–0068); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–6648. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR)—Disability and Rehabilitation Research Projects and Centers Program—Disability and Rehabilitation Research Project—Traumatic Brain Injury Model Systems Centers'' (CFDA No. 84.133A–5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 19, 2012; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–6649. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR)—Disability and Rehabilitation Research Projects and Centers Program—Disability and Rehabilitation Research Project—National Data and Statistical Center for the Burn Model Systems'' (CFDA No. 84.133A–4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 19, 2012; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–6650. A communication from the Chairman of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2011 through March 31, 2012; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LEAHY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 250. A bill to protect crime victims' rights, to eliminate the substantial backlog of DNA samples collected from crime scenes and convicted offenders, to improve and expand the DNA testing capacity of Federal, State, and local crime laboratories, to increase research and development of new DNA testing technologies, to develop new training programs regarding the collection and use of DNA evidence, to provide post conviction testing of DNA evidence to exonerate the innocent, to improve the performance of counsel in State capital cases, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mrs. BOXER for the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

*Kristine L. Svinicki, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for the term of five years expiring June 30, 2017.

*Allison M. Macfarlane, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 2013.

By Mr. LEAHY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Brian J. Davis, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida.

Patrick A. Miles, Jr., of Michigan, to be United States Attorney for the Western District of Michigan for the term of four years.

John S. Leonardo, of Arizona, to be United States Attorney for the District of Arizona for the term of four years.

Jamie A. Hainsworth, of Rhode Island, to be United States Marshal for the District of Rhode Island for the term of four years.

Grande Lum, of California, to be Director, Community Relations Service, for a term of four years.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BEGICH:

S. 3325. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Administrator of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, in coordination with the Secretary of Education, to carry out a 5-year demonstration program to fund mental health first aid training programs at 10 institutions of higher education to improve student mental health; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. COONS, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts, and Mr. THUNE):

S. 3326. A bill to amend the African Growth and Opportunity Act to extend the third-country fabric program and to add South Sudan to the list of countries eligible for designation under that Act, to make technical corrections to the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States relating to the textile and apparel rules of origin for the Dominican Republic-Central America-United States Free Trade Agreement, to approve the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio (for himself, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. SCHUMER, and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 3327. A bill to require the United States Trade Representative to take action to obtain the full compliance of the Russian Federation with its commitments under the protocol on the accession of the Russian Federation to the Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. KERRY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. CARPER):

S. 3328. A bill to provide grants for juvenile mentoring; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MURRAY:

S. 3329. A bill to designate and expand wilderness areas in Olympic National Forest in the State of Washington, and to designate certain rivers in Olympic National Forest and Olympic National Park as wild and scenic rivers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. BEGICH):

S. 3330. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Niblack mining area road corridor in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. KERRY (for himself, Mr. LUGAR, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mr. INHOFE):

S. 3331. A bill to provide for universal intercountry adoption accreditation standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BEGICH (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. INOUYE, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. WICKER):

S. 3332. A bill to provide for the establishment of nationally uniform and environmentally sound standards governing discharges incidental to the normal operation of a vessel in the navigable waters of the United States; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. HELLER):

S. 3333. A bill to require certain entities that collect and maintain personal information of individuals to secure such information and to provide notice to such individuals in the case of a breach of security involving such information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. PAUL):

S. 3334. A bill to protect homes, small businesses, and other private property rights by limiting the power of eminent domain; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEAHY:

S. 3335. A bill to ensure the effective administration of criminal justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. INOUYE (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 3336. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a major medical facility project lease for a Department of Veterans Affairs outpatient clinic at Ewa Plain, Oahu, Hawaii, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mr. DURBIN):

S. Con. Res. 49. A concurrent resolution to direct the Joint Committee on the Library to accept a statue depicting Frederick Douglass from the District of Columbia and display the statue in a suitable location in the Capitol; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 17

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of S. 17, a bill to repeal the job-killing tax on medical devices to ensure continued access to life-saving medical devices for patients and maintain the standing of the United States as the world leader in medical device innovation.

S. 50

At the request of Mr. INOUYE, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 50, a bill to strengthen Federal consumer product safety programs and activities with respect to commercially marketed seafood by directing the Secretary of Commerce to coordinate with the Federal Trade Commission and other appropriate Federal agencies to strengthen and coordinate those programs and activities.

S. 52

At the request of Mr. INOUYE, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 52, a bill to establish uniform administrative and enforcement procedures and penalties for the enforcement of the High Seas Driftnet Fishing Moratorium Protection Act and similar statutes, and for other purposes.

S. 250

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 250, a bill to protect crime victims' rights, to eliminate the substantial backlog of DNA samples collected from crime scenes and convicted offenders, to improve and expand the DNA testing capacity of Federal, State, and local crime laboratories, to increase research and development of new DNA testing technologies, to develop new training programs regarding the collection and use of DNA evidence, to provide post conviction testing of DNA evidence to exonerate the innocent, to improve the performance of counsel in State capital cases, and for other purposes.

S. 504

At the request of Mr. DEMINT, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 504, a bill to preserve and protect the free choice of individual employees to form, join, or assist labor organizations, or to refrain from such activities.

S. 555

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 555, a bill to end discrimination based on actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity in public schools, and for other purposes.

S. 697

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 697, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for amounts paid by a spouse of a member of the Armed Services for a new State license or certification required by reason of a permanent change in the duty station of such member to another State.

S. 866

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 866, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to modify the per-fiscal year calculation of days of certain active duty or active service used to reduce the minimum age at which a member of a reserve component of the uniformed services may retire for nonregular service.

S. 886

At the request of Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 886, a bill to amend the Interstate Horseracing Act of 1978 to prohibit the use of performance-enhancing drugs in horseracing, and for other purposes.

S. 987

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 987, a bill to amend title 9 of the United States Code with respect to arbitration.

S. 1039

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1039, a bill to impose sanctions on persons responsible for the detention, abuse, or death of Sergei Magnitsky, for the conspiracy to defraud the Russian Federation of taxes on corporate profits through fraudulent transactions and lawsuits against Hermitage, and for other gross violations of human rights in the Russian Federation, and for other purposes.

S. 1368

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1368, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to repeal distributions for medicine qualified only if for prescribed drug or insulin.

S. 1454

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1454, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for extended months of Medicare coverage of immunosuppressive drugs for kidney transplant patients and other renal dialysis provisions.

S. 1880

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1880, a bill to repeal the health care law's job-killing health insurance tax.

S. 1882

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1882, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ensure that valid generic drugs may enter the market.

S. 1906

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1906, a bill to modify the Forest Service Recreation Residence Program as the program applies to units of the National Forest System derived from the public domain by implementing a simple, equitable, and predictable procedure for determining cabin user fees, and for other purposes.

S. 1978

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1978, a bill to amend the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to provide for community-based job training grants, to provide Federal assistance for community college modernization, and for other purposes.

S. 1980

At the request of Mr. INOUYE, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1980, a bill to prevent, deter, and eliminate illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing through port State measures.

S. 2036

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 2036, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition and celebration of the National Baseball Hall of Fame.

S. 2103

At the request of Mr. LEE, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) were added as

cosponsors of S. 2103, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

S. 2143

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2143, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that paper which is commonly recycled does not constitute a qualified energy resource under the section 45 credit for renewable electricity production.

S. 2168

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2168, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to modify the definition of supervisor.

S. 2173

At the request of Mr. DEMINT, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2173, a bill to preserve and protect the free choice of individual employees to form, join, or assist labor organizations, or to refrain from such activities.

S. 2179

At the request of Mr. WEBB, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2179, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve oversight of educational assistance provided under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Defense, and for other purposes.

S. 2189

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2189, a bill to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 and other laws to clarify appropriate standards for Federal antidiscrimination and antiretaliation claims, and for other purposes.

S. 2364

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2364, a bill to extend the availability of low-interest refinancing under the local development business loan program of the Small Business Administration.

S. 3234

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3234, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the time period for contributing military death gratuities to Roth IRAs and Coverdell education savings accounts.

S. 3242

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3242, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide Medicare beneficiaries coordinated care and greater choice with regard to accessing hearing health services and benefits.

S. 3270

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3270, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to consider the resources of individuals applying for pension that were recently disposed of by the individuals for less than fair market value when determining the eligibility of such individuals for such pension, and for other purposes.

S. 3289

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3289, a bill to expand the Medicaid home and community-based services waiver to include young individuals who are in need of services that would otherwise be required to be provided through a psychiatric residential treatment facility, and to change references in Federal law to mental retardation to references to an intellectual disability.

S. 3322

At the request of Mr. BROWN of Ohio, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3322, a bill to strengthen enforcement and clarify certain provisions of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act, the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act, and chapter 43 of title 38, United States Code, and to reconcile, restore, clarify, and conform similar provisions in other related civil rights statutes, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 43

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 43, a joint resolution approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 48

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 48, a concurrent resolution recognizing 375 years of service of the National Guard and affirming congressional support for a permanent Operational Reserve as a component of the Armed Forces.

S. RES. 493

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 493, a resolution recognizing that the occurrence of prostate cancer in African-American men has reached epidemic proportions and urging Federal agencies to address that health crisis by supporting education, awareness outreach, and research specifically focused on how prostate cancer affects African-American men.

S. RES. 494

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 494, a resolution condemning the Government of the Russian Federation for providing weapons to the regime of President Bashar al-Assad of Syria.

AMENDMENT NO. 2455

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE), the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2455 proposed to S. 3240, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2017, and for other purposes.

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, her name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2455 proposed to S. 3240, supra.

AMENDMENT NO. 2460

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, her name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2460 intended to be proposed to S. 3240, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2017, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BEGICH:

S. 3325. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Administrator of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, in coordination with the Secretary of Education, to carry out a 5-year demonstration program to fund mental health first aid training programs at 10 institutions of higher education to improve student mental health; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, today I rise to introduce a very important piece of legislation—the Mental Health First Aid Higher Education Act. The bill authorizes a nationwide demonstration program that treats Mental Health First Aid like the first aid training offered by Red Cross chapters across the United States.

Mental Health First Aid teaches the warning signs and risk factors for schizophrenia, major clinical depression, panic attacks, anxiety disorders, trauma, and other common mental disorders, crisis de-escalation techniques, and equips college and university staff with a 5-step action plan to help individuals in psychiatric crisis connect to professional mental health care.

One in four adults and 10 percent of children in the United States will suffer from a mental illness this year. We know what to do if someone has a heart attack, but how do we react to someone having a panic attack? Why do we wait for a tragic event to take notice and then bring out emergency measures?

When I was Mayor of Anchorage, we worked with the local NAMI organization to train our police in Crisis Intervention Teams, great when responding to a crisis by police officers, but now we need to go further. Mental Health First Aid is for the financial aid workers, the dormitory resident advisers, coaches, and faculty members, to name a few. These are the front-line folks who will learn the warning signs and risk factors before tragedy strikes.

You have heard me say this before, an it is not something to be proud of in Alaska: we have one of the highest suicide prevalence rates in the country. Further, we are a very rural State, where access to mental health care and medical services is often very difficult.

Even today, it is not widely known that fully ⅔ of Alaska can only be accessed by airplane. By educating the general public about the warning signs of common mental disorders, we can intervene early, facilitate access to care, improve clinical outcomes, reduce costs, and maybe save lives.

My bill focuses on higher education because many mental illnesses are ''adult onset conditions,'' meaning onset of full symptoms generally occurs in late adolescence or young adulthood—just as young people are headed off to college. Therefore, the audiences for this vital training will encompass on-campus counseling center staff, dormitory resident advisers, university threat assessment teams, members of disciplinary committees, coaches and faculty members. The instruction will highlight available mental health resources in local communities including Community Mental Health Centers, emergency psychiatric facilities, hospital emergency rooms and other programs offering psychiatric crisis beds.

The program may also help to avert violence incidents; Mental Health First Aid gained wide public recognition in the aftermath of the tragic shootings in Tucson, AZ, involving our former colleague Rep. Gabrielle Giffords.

Mental disorders are more common than heart disease and cancer combined and a recent Governing magazine article reports that many states and localities are moving ahead—teaching their employees how to recognize the signs of mental health problems and how to help.

In this time of austerity, the training is not only important, because it will save lives, it is also inexpensive. Courses costs about $180, a small price to pay to potentially save lives.

In closing, yes, we are in a presidential election year and the political season often highlights the issues that divide us as Americans. But the Mental Health First Aid Higher Education Act is not one of them.

In the Alaska tradition, I seek to work across the aisle, and I strongly believe this legislation merits bipartisan support. Please join me in supporting this vital education program that helps to avert suffering, prevent violence and ultimately will save lives.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. BEGICH):

S. 3330. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Niblack mining area road corridor in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation that would potentially help in solving a significant unemployment problem in my home state of Alaska. Today, joined by my colleague, Senator MARK BEGICH, I introduce the Niblack Mining Area Road Authorization Act to permit road access to proposed multi-mineral mines on southeast Prince of Wales Island in Southeast Alaska.

Prince of Wales Island, formerly the main area for timber activity in Southeast Alaska, has fallen on hard times during the past decade. In 1990, when Alaska's timber industry in total harvested more than 1.1 billion board feet of timber, Prince of Wales was the center of activity. In 1994, for example, timber jobs accounted for 32.8 percent of all wages on the island. Six years later, with total regional harvests having fallen to about 350 million board feet, timber accounted for less than 19.8 percent of wages on the island, according to the Alaska Department of Labor and Workforce Development. Today, with total harvests of timber being just above 100 million board feet a year in the region—just 35 million board feet being harvested from federal lands in 2011—and timber jobs statewide having fallen from about 4,000 to just over 400, Prince of Wales has been particularly hard hit. According to the State, timber jobs have fallen by more than 1,700 positions on the island.

As of April, the unemployment rate on the island was ''down'' to 15 percent, compared to 18.1 percent in March. The rate in the Hoonah-Angoon census area, which covers the other potentially significant timber area in Southeast, stood at 20 percent in April, compared to 25.6 percent in March, 2012. Those rates are nearly 8 percent to 12 percent higher than the national average and higher than traditional rates, even after out migration from the island over the past decade.

While the Viking Lumber Co. of Klawock remains the largest private-sector timber employer on the island, the island, the third largest in the United States, is badly in need of new employment opportunities. Fortunately today's high metal prices are encouraging a resurgence of mineral development on the 2,231 square-mile island.

Currently, Heatherdale Minerals of Canada is considering reopening the Niblack Mine, a gold, copper, zinc and silver deposit. The company is in advanced exploration and development study of the estimated 9 million-ton mine, forecast to cost $150 million to $200 million to reopen. The mine, likely to last at least 12 years, is forecast to produce 1,500 tons of ore per day and require 130 workers at the mine site, and another 60 at a processing mill, which could be located near the site, or in Ketchikan, AK, 40 vessel miles away.

The Niblack property is also close to another mineral deposit that is in the advanced stages of economic feasibility review, the Bokan Mountain Rare Earth Elements, REE, mine. Bokan Mountain, being considered for opening by Ucore Inc. of Canada, likely will employ 200 workers. It, too, will involve an investment of between $150 million to $200 million for the mine and a preliminary tailings processing plant to process the heavy rare earths, REEs, located at the site of a former uranium mine. Both mines currently estimate they could be open within three to four years, depending on final economic reviews and current permit approval timeframes. Bokan Mountain is located about 28 miles south of Niblack and can be accessed by boat by traveling down the relatively protected Moira Sound to the end of South Arm.

The two mines could produce substantial numbers of high-paying jobs for the residents of southern Southeast Alaska. Niblack, for example, predicts the average salary for mine workers at its facility will be $80,000 a year. The problem of getting those jobs to people who need them is one of logistics.

There currently is no road access to reach either mine site, both likely to be supplied by boat from Ketchikan, Alaska. That means that potential workers on Prince of Wales will need to travel by boat or more likely by plane to Ketchikan, in order to turn around and take a mine boat back to the island to report for work—a costly, time-consuming, often unpleasant and, sometimes, dangerous process given sea conditions in Southeast Alaska. Or they will need to pilot their own small boats to the mine site, a hazardous process given that reaching Niblack from the community of Thorne Bay to the north—a site that is located on the island's road system—will require a daily 60-mile one-way boat trip down perilous Clarence Strait, a difficult water body during fall, winter, and spring storms when seas can easily top 20 feet waves.

But the problem could be solved, if a road could be extended the roughly 26.3 miles to connect the Niblack mine, by means of existing logging roads, to the State highway system on the island. Such a road will involve at least 2.5 miles of logging road reconstruction and the construction of 26.3 miles of new road. Those roads, if built to existing logging road standards, are estimated to cost $7.075 million—the cost

certainly rising if the roads are built to Federal Aid Urban Highway standards. The issue is that 18.3 miles of that new construction is across federal lands in the Tongass National Forest and, more importantly, across areas classified as inventoried roadless under the 2001 U.S. Forest Service roadless rule, as it was reimposed on the Tongass in 2009.

Looking at the topography of the area, located inside the Eudora inventoried roadless area, the road would begin at the Haida, Hydaburg, Native village corporation's West, Cholmondeley, Arm sort yard and head Southeast through the Big Creek Valley and climb to a mountain pass at the roughly 1,400-foot elevation. From there it will drop onto land owned by the Kootznoowoo Native village corporation of Angoon and follow existing logging roads that lie on the western side of the South Arm. The route then runs south and parallels South Arm on the west side until the southern end of the bay is reached. Then the route follows the shoreline of the south end of the South Arm until the far southeast corner of the bay is reached—the location of existing cabins and a State of Alaska Department of Fish and Game fish weir. From this point, there are two potential route alternatives: the 1A route continues to run in a southerly direction through a mountain pass of slightly more than 500-feet elevation passing two unnamed lakes. Once it reaches the shoreline of Dickman Bay, the road turns in a more easterly direction and runs across the south end of Kugel Lake and Luelia Lake, and the north end of Kegan Lake. From the 900-foot elevation pass on the west side of Luelia Lake, the route continues to run in an easterly fashion and must cross 1,200- and 1,400-foot passes before the route turns north to reach the Niblack mine at tidewater. That total route is 26.3 miles of new construction and a total distance of 28.8 miles. There is an alternative, Route 1B, early in the route corridor to reduce the elevation and add switchbacks required to reach the first pass—an alternative that would add 1.9 miles to the road.

There is another alternative route, Route 2A, that leaves from the same location and runs on the same route until the south end of South Arm. The second route then turns in a northerly direction and continues to follow the eastern shoreline of South Arm, Cholmondeley, for roughly 1.5 miles. The route then turns in an eastern direction and climbs through a mountain pass of about 900-feet elevation. From this pass, the route descends into the existing road system on Kootznoowoo lands near the south shores of Miller Lake. At the eastern terminus of these existing roads, the new route picks up again and continues in a southeast direction along the south end of Clarno Cove and Cannery Cove until Cannery Point is reached. From there the route turns into a southerly direction and climbs to another mountain pass of roughly 1,000-feet elevation. The route then follows the hillside to the west of Niblack Lake and meets another mountain pass of the same elevation and then descends in a southerly direction along the west side of Myrtle Lake to reach the Niblack Mine and tidewater. That route involves 24.6 miles of new construction, 6.1 miles of road reconstruction and involves a total length of 30.7 miles, thus costing more. It involves, however, constructing only one pass higher than 1,200 feet, compared to 3 on the first route, but may have more environmental impacts given its route along Cannery Cove and Niblack Lake.

I mention the two detailed routes only to indicate that substantial work has been done to select a potential road corridor to the Niblack mine and to make clear that I am not prejudging the route with the fewest environmental impacts. I am leaving that to the Forest Service to decide after an environmental assessment or impact statement is undertaken. The legislation I am introducing simply says that the Forest Service should permit development of a road along one of the two routes, picking the route that both minimizes the costs, while also minimizing the effects on surface resources, prevents unnecessary surface disturbances and that complies with all environmental laws and regulations.

This road, I need to point out, will not set a precedent in any way weakening the inventoried roadless rule's implementation in Alaska, regardless of how I feel about that rule. Under the original regulations governing roadless areas in Alaska issued by the Clinton Administration in January 2001, Section 294.12(b)(7) permits roads to be built across inventoried roadless areas if needed ''in conjunction with the continuation, extension or renewal of a mineral lease on lands that are under lease by the Secretary of the Interior. . . . Such road construction or reconstruction must be conducted in a manner that minimizes effects on surface resources, prevents unnecessary or unreasonable surface disturbance, and complies with all applicable lease requirements.''

The patents on the Niblack property certainly predate the creation of the roadless rule. The mine was discovered in the late 19th century, according to the U.S. Forest Service. Modest copper production occurred between 1902 and 1908 and modern exploration on the 2,000-acre site began in 1974, some 150 patented claims being in place at the mine.

The point is that Niblack is certainly a real prospect that offers the likelihood of real employment for many who are unemployed on Prince of Wales Island, if they simply can access the site from their homes in Craig, Klawock, Hydaburg, Thorne Bay, Kasaan, Whale Pass and even Coffman Cove, located on the northeast end of the island. The need for these jobs has prompted the City Council of Craig to formally request Congress to accelerate the approval of a road corridor to the mine site. Such a road could be built by the mine, but more likely funded and built by the Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities at state expense. Workers could then access jobs at the Bokan Mountain facility by workboat, should a route to that mine never be approved.

It makes no sense in a state that already contains 58 million acres of formal wilderness, and in the Tongass National Forest, that already contains nearly 6.4 million acres of parks and wilderness areas, to bar construction of a road that does not cross any wilderness areas, but could provide a good income to a third of all of the people, 363 people, unemployed on the island as of April 2012, according to the Alaska Department of Labor and Workforce Development.

I would hope that this Congress would look favorably on allowing a road to this mining area, so that residents on the island can get the jobs they so desperately need in the years ahead.

By Mr. LEAHY:

S. 3335. A bill to ensure the effective administration of criminal justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today, I am proud to introduce the Effective Administration of Criminal Justice Act of 2012. This legislation takes important new steps to ensure the fairness of our criminal justice system for all participants.

First, this bill seeks to encourage States to adopt a comprehensive approach in using the Federal funds received through the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant, JAG, Program. This will help to ensure that their criminal justice systems operate effectively as a whole and that all parts of the system work together and receive the resources they need. Specifically, the bill reinstates a previous requirement of the Byrne JAG Program that States develop, and update annually, a strategic plan detailing how grants received under the program will be used to improve the administration of the criminal justice system. The requirement was removed from the Byrne JAG grant application several years ago, but groups representing States and victims have requested that it be reinstated in order to improve the efficient and effective use of criminal justice resources. The plan must be formulated in consultation with local governments and all segments of the criminal justice system. The Attorney General will also be required to make technical assistance available to help States formulate their strategic plans.

This legislation also takes important new steps to ensure that all criminal defendants, including those who cannot afford a lawyer, receive constitutionally adequate representation. It requires the Department of Justice to assist States that want help developing an effective and efficient system of indigent defense, and it establishes a

cause of action for the Federal government to step in when States are systematically failing to provide the representation called for in the Constitution.

This is a reasonable measure that gives the States assistance and time needed to make necessary changes and seeks to provide an incentive for States to do so. As a former prosecutor, I have great faith in the men and women of law enforcement, and I know that the vast majority of the time our criminal justice system does work fairly and effectively. I also know though that the system only works as it should when each side is well represented by competent and well-trained counsel. It was persuasive to me when Houston District Attorney Patricia Lykos testified before the Judiciary Committee several years ago when this provision was first considered that competent defense attorneys are critical to a prosecutor's job. Our system requires good lawyers on both sides, and incompetent counsel can result not only in needless and time consuming appeals, but far more importantly, it can lead to wrongful convictions and overall distrust in the criminal process. In working on this legislation, I have also learned that the most effective systems of indigent defense are not always the most expensive. In some cases, making the necessary changes may also save States money.

I remain committed to ensuring that our criminal justice system operates as effectively and fairly as possible. Unfortunately, we are not there yet. Too often the quality of justice a defendant receives in our system depends on whether he or she can pay for an attorney. That is repugnant to the American sense of justice and we must do better. Americans need and deserve a criminal justice system which keeps us safe, ensures fairness and accuracy, and fulfills the promise of our constitution for all people. This bill will take important steps to bring us closer to that goal and I urge all Senators to support this legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 3335

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Effective Administration of Criminal Justice Act of 2012''.

SEC. 2. EFFECTIVE ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE.

(a) STRATEGIC PLANNING.—Section 502 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3752) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(a) IN GENERAL.—'' before ''To request a grant''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(6) A comprehensive State-wide plan detailing how grants received under this section will be used to improve the administration of the criminal justice system, which shall—

''(A) be designed in consultation with local governments, and all segments of the criminal justice system, including judges, prosecutors, law enforcement personnel, corrections personnel, and providers of indigent defense services, victim services, juvenile justice delinquency prevention programs, community corrections, and reentry services;

''(B) include a description of how the State will allocate funding within and among each of the uses described in subparagraphs (A) through (G) of section 501(a)(1);

''(C) describe the process used by the State for gathering evidence-based data and developing and using evidence-based and evidence-gathering approaches in support of funding decisions; and

''(D) be updated every 5 years, with annual progress reports that—

''(i) address changing circumstances in the State, if any;

''(ii) describe how the State plans to adjust funding within and among each of the uses described in subparagraphs (A) through (G) of section 501(a)(1);

''(iii) provide an ongoing assessment of need;

''(iv) discuss the accomplishment of goals identified in any plan previously prepared under this paragraph; and

''(v) reflect how the plan influenced funding decisions in the previous year.

''(b) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—

''(1) STRATEGIC PLANNING.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Attorney General shall begin to provide technical assistance to States and local governments requesting support to develop and implement the strategic plan required under subsection (a)(6).

''(2) PROTECTION OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Attorney General shall begin to provide technical assistance to States and local governments, including any agent thereof with responsibility for administration of justice, requesting support to meet the obligations established by the Sixth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall include—

''(A) public dissemination of practices, structures, or models for the administration of justice consistent with the requirements of the Sixth Amendment; and

''(B) assistance with adopting and implementing a system for the administration of justice consistent with the requirements of the Sixth Amendment.

''(3) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated $5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017 to carry out this subsection.''.

(b) PROTECTION OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS.—

(1) UNLAWFUL CONDUCT.—It shall be unlawful for any governmental authority, or any agent thereof, or any person acting on behalf of a governmental authority, to engage in a pattern or practice of conduct by officials or employees of any governmental agency with responsibility for the administration of justice, including the administration of programs or services that provide appointed counsel to indigent defendants, that deprives persons of their rights to assistance of counsel as protected under the Sixth Amendment and Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

(2) CIVIL ACTION BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.—Whenever the Attorney General has reasonable cause to believe that a violation of paragraph (1) has occurred, the Attorney General, for or in the name of the United States, may, in a civil action, obtain appropriate equitable and declaratory relief to eliminate the pattern or practice.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Paragraph (2) shall take effect 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

By Mr. INOUYE (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 3336. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a major medical facility project lease for a Department of Veterans Affairs outpatient clinic at Ewa Plain, Oahu, Hawaii, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce an authorization measure for the Department of Veterans Affairs to Advance Leeward Outpatient Healthcare Access, ALOHA, lease in Ewa, HI, and to request the facility be named after my dear friend and colleague Senator DANIEL K. AKAKA.

The new facility will provide support to our proud veterans in the State of Hawaii who live in West Oahu. In addition to serving the needs of our veterans, the facility will include a collocated clinic which will serve our military servicemen and women, and their families. Both the Departments of Defense and Veterans Affairs, VA, will also be able to share ancillary and support services.

I believe naming this joint facility after Senator AKAKA is an appropriate and fitting way to honor his commitment to our military personnel and veterans throughout his years in Congress. As a Member of the Armed Services Committee and the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Readiness, he worked to ensure the Armed Services met their obligation to ''man, train, and equip.'' As the Chairman of the Veterans Affairs Committee, Senator AKAKA also kept watch over and labored to improve the quality of care received by our brave men and women who completed their military service and entered into the VA system.

I hope my colleagues will join me in saluting Senator AKAKA who worked on behalf of the people of the State of Hawaii and this nation to improve the quality of life and care of our military personnel and our veterans.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 3336

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF DANIEL KAHIKINA AKAKA DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS CLINIC.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF FISCAL YEAR 2013 MAJOR MEDICAL FACILITY LEASE.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may carry out a major medical facility lease for a Department of Veterans Affairs outpatient clinic at Ewa Plain, Oahu, Hawaii, in an amount not to exceed $16,453,300.

(b) DESIGNATION.—The outpatient clinic described in subsection (a) shall after the date

of the enactment of this Act be known and designated as the ''Daniel Kahikina Akaka Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic''.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 49—TO DIRECT THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY TO ACCEPT A STATUE DEPICTING FREDERICK DOUGLASS FROM THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND DISPLAY THE STATUE IN A SUITABLE LOCATION IN THE CAPITOL

Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mr. DURBIN) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. CON. RES. 49

Whereas Frederick Douglass, born Frederick Augustus Washington Bailey in Maryland in 1818, escaped from slavery and became a leading writer, orator, and publisher, and one of the Nation's most influential advocates for abolitionism, women's suffrage, and the equality of all people;

Whereas the contributions of Frederick Douglass over many decades were crucial to the abolition of slavery, the passage of the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, the support for women's suffrage, and the advancement of African Americans after the Civil War;

Whereas after living in New Bedford, Massachusetts, Frederick Douglass resided for 25 years in Rochester, New York, where he published and edited ''The North Star'', the leading African-American newspaper in the United States, and other publications;

Whereas self-educated, Frederick Douglass wrote several influential books, including his best-selling first autobiography, ''Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass, an American Slave'', published in 1845;

Whereas Frederick Douglass worked tirelessly for the emancipation of African-American slaves, was a pivotal figure in Underground Railroad activities in Western New York, and was an inspiration to enslaved Americans who aspired to freedom;

Whereas as a well-known speaker in great demand, Frederick Douglass traveled widely, visiting countries such as England and Ireland, to spread the message of emancipation and equal rights;

Whereas Frederick Douglass was the only African American to attend the Seneca Falls Convention, a women's rights convention held in Seneca Falls, New York in 1848;

Whereas during the Civil War, Frederick Douglass recruited African Americans to volunteer as soldiers for the Union Army, including 2 of his sons who served nobly in the Fifty-fourth Massachusetts Regiment;

Whereas in 1872, Frederick Douglass moved to Washington, D.C., after a fire destroyed his home in Rochester, New York;

Whereas Frederick Douglass was appointed as a United States Marshal in 1877 and was named Recorder of Deeds for the District of Columbia in 1881;

Whereas Frederick Douglass became the first African American to receive a vote for nomination as President of the United States at a major party convention for the 1888 Republican National Convention;

Whereas from 1889 to 1891, Frederick Douglass served as minster-resident and consul-general to the Republic of Haiti;

Whereas Frederick Douglass was recognized around the world as one of the most important political activists in the history of the United States;

Whereas Frederick Douglass died in 1895 in Washington, D.C. and is buried in Rochester, New York;

Whereas the statues and busts in the Capitol depicting distinguished Americans number more than 180 and include only 2 African Americans;

Whereas that imbalance fails to show the historically significant contributions of African Americans to the United States;

Whereas it is time to display in the Capitol the statues and busts of outstanding African Americans whose contributions to the Nation deserve that recognition; and

Whereas Frederick Douglass's achievements and influence on the history of the United States merit recognition in the Capitol: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That—

(1) not later than 2 years after the date on which this resolution is agreed to by both Houses of Congress, the Joint Committee on the Library shall accept from the District of Columbia the donation of a statue depicting Frederick Douglass, subject to the terms and conditions that the Joint Committee considers appropriate;

(2) the Joint Committee shall place the statue in a suitable permanent location in the Capitol; and

(3) all costs associated with the donation, including transportation of the statue to, and placement in, the Capitol, shall be paid by the District of Columbia.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss a bill that would bring a statue depicting Fredrick Douglass to our Nation's Capitol. The life and deeds of this great American need no introduction. He escaped the shackles of slavery to become a leading writer, orator, publisher, and a leader in the abolitionist struggle towards equality for all. I am proud that Fredrick Douglass called Rochester, NY home for 25 years. But others claim him as well. He was born into slavery in Maryland, and lived as a free adult in Massachusetts and, at the end of his life, in Washington, DC. He died here in the Nation's Capitol and is buried in upstate New York. During his time in Rochester, he published the leading African American newspaper in the country. His influential best-selling autobiography, ''Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass,'' served as a rallying cry for the abolitionist movement and helped bring an end to that cruel institution. It is therefore fitting that this Fredrick Douglass statue should find its home in the Capitol.

The addition of this statue of Frederick Douglass to our Capitol is long overdue. It is important that the Americans depicted in portraiture and in sculpture in the Capitol reflect the true heritage of our nation and the people who have helped to make it great. Today too few of our artworks depict the richness and diversity of great Americans. In fact, of more than 180 statues and busts in the Capitol, only two are of African Americans. This resolution is a small step toward correcting that imbalance. The acceptance of this Fredrick Douglass statue into our Capitol is appropriate both because of who Fredrick Douglass was as an American and because of who we all are as Americans.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2461. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the bill S. 3187, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to revise and extend the user-fee programs for prescription drugs and medical devices, to establish user-fee programs for generic drugs and biosimilars, and for other purposes.

SA 2462. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2461 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 3187, supra.

SA 2463. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the bill S. 3187, supra.

SA 2464. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2463 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 3187, supra.

SA 2465. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2464 proposed by Mr. REID to the amendment SA 2463 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 3187, supra.

SA 2466. Mr. REID (for Ms. COLLINS) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 471, commending the efforts of the women of the American Red Cross Clubmobiles for exemplary service during the Second World War.

SA 2467. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1940, to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, to restore the financial solvency of the flood insurance fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2461. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the bill S. 3187, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to revise and extend the user-fee programs for prescription drugs and medical devices, to establish user-fee programs for generic drugs and biosimilars, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end, add the following new section:

SEC. ___.

This Act shall become effective 5 days after enactment.

SA 2462. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2461 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 3187, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to revise and extend the user-fee programs for prescription drugs and medical devices, to establish user-fee programs for generic drugs and biosimilars, and for other purposes; as follows:

In the amendment, strike ''5 days'' and insert ''4 days''.

SA 2463. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the bill S. 3187, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to revise and extend the user-fee programs for prescription drugs and medical devices, to establish user-fee programs for generic drugs and biosimilars, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end, add the following new section:

SEC. ___.

This Act shall become effective 3 days after enactment.

SA 2464. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2463 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 3187, to

amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to revise and extend the user-fee programs for prescription drugs and medical devices, to establish user-fee programs for generic drugs and biosimilars, and for other purposes; as follows:

In the amendment, strike ''3 days'' and insert ''2 days''.

SA 2465. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2464 proposed by Mr. REID to the amendment SA 2463 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 3187, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to revise and extend the user-fee programs for prescription drugs and medical devices, to establish user-fee programs for generic drugs and biosimilars, and for other purposes; as follows:

In the amendment, strike ''2 days'' and insert ''1 day''.

SA 2466. Mr. REID (for Ms. COLLINS) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 471, commending the efforts of the women of the American Red Cross Clubmobiles for exemplary service during the Second World War; as follows:

In the preamble, strike the third whereas clause through the sixth whereas clause and insert the following:

Whereas thousands of young women, from every State in the United States, volunteered to serve in the Clubmobiles, and were chosen after a rigorous interview process;

Whereas, between July and August 1944, less than 1 month after the invasion of Normandy, France, 80 Clubmobiles and 320 American Red Cross volunteers crossed the English Channel and began providing coffee, doughnuts, and a friendly smile to servicemen fighting on the front lines;

Whereas the Clubmobile volunteers saw service across Europe in France, Belgium, Italy, Luxembourg, and Germany, and later in the Far East, touching the lives of hundreds of thousands of United States servicemen until victory was achieved;

SA 2467. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1940, to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, to restore the financial solvency of the flood insurance fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

SEC. ____. USE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF PORTIONS OF A FLOOD CONTROL LEVEE.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Notwithstanding section 404(b)(2)(B) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170c(b)(2)(B)), Lot 1 of the Morning Heights Subdivision, Lot 2 and PT ST of the Morning Heights Subdivision, Lot 1 and PT ST of the Bayless Addition, and Lot 24 of the Bayless Addition in Findlay, Ohio, shall be available for the construction and operation of portions of a flood control levee if the Chief of Engineers completes a feasibility study that indicates that the construction and operation is the most appropriate and cost-effective flood risk management project for the area.

(b) USE OF PROPERTY.—Any portion of the property described in subsection (a) that is not used for the construction and operation of a flood control levee under subsection (a) shall remain deeded as open space in perpetuity, in accordance with section 404(b)(2)(B) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170c(b)(2)(B)).

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 21, 2012, at 10 a.m., to conduct a committee hearing entitled ''Perspectives on Money Market Mutual Fund Reforms.''

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

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 21, 2012, at 10 a.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 21, 2012.

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

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 21, 2012, at 9:45 a.m., in room SD–215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Russia's WTO Accession—Administration's Views on the Implications for the United States.''

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 21, 2012, at 10 a.m., to hold a hearing entitled ''Implementation of the New START Treaty, and Related Matters.''

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

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet, during the session of the Senate, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Olmstead Enforcement Update: Using the ADA to Promote Community Integration'' on June 21, 2012, at 10 a.m., in room 430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 21, 2012, at 10 a.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 21, 2012, at 10 a.m., in SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct an executive business meeting.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 21, 2012, at 2:30 p.m.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ANTITRUST, COMPETITION POLICY AND CONSUMER RIGHTS

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy, and Consumer Rights, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 21, 2012, at 1:30 p.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''The Universal Music Group/EMI Merger and the Future of Online Music.''

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT, THE FEDERAL WORKFORCE, AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs' Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 21, 2012, at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a hearing entitled, ''Security Clearance Reform: Sustaining Progress for the Future.''

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PERSONNEL

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Personnel of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 21, 2012, at 2:30 p.m.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 1940

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, June

25, at a time to be determined by the majority leader, after consultation with the Republican leader, but no later than 5:30 p.m., the motion to proceed to S. 1940 be agreed to.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, on Tuesday, June 26, 2012, at 11:30 a.m., the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination: Calendar No. 652; that there be 30 minutes for debate equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nomination; that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions to be in order; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; and that President Obama be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, and all nominations placed on the Secretary's desk in the Air Force, Army, Foreign Service, Marine Corps, and Navy; that the nominations be confirmed en bloc; that the motions to reconsider be made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to any of the nominations; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that President Obama be immediately notified of the Senate's action; and that the Senate then resume legislative session.

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

The nominations, considered and confirmed, are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

William B. Pollard, III, of New York, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Military Commission Review.

Scott L. Silliman, of North Carolina, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Military Commission Review.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be Lieutenant General

Lt. Gen. Michael R. Moeller

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be Lieutenant General

Lt. Gen. Mark F. Ramsay

The following named officer for appointment as the Surgeon General of the Air Force and appointment to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., sections 8036 and 601:

To be Lieutenant General

Maj. Gen. Thomas W. Travis

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be Lieutenant General

Maj. Gen. Darren W. McDew

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be Lieutenant General

Lt. Gen. Stanley T. Kresge

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be Major General

Brigadier General Edward M. Reeder, Jr.

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be Lieutenant General

Lt. Gen. John F. Mulholland, Jr.

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be Lieutenant General

Maj. Gen. William B. Garrett, III

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be Lieutenant General

Lt. Gen. Howard B. Bromberg

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be Lieutenant General

Maj. Gen. James L. Huggins, Jr.

The following Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be Brigadier General

Col. Barry D. Keeling

The following Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be Brigadier General

Col. Joseph E. Rooney

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be Rear Admiral (lower half)

Capt. Janet R. Donovan

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be Rear Admiral (lower half)

Capt. Barbara W. Sweredoski

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be Rear Admiral (lower half)

Capt. Kirby D. Miller

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be Rear Admiral (lower half)

Captain Michael J. Dumont
Captain Robert L. Greene
Captain Lawrence B. Jackson
Captain Scott B.J. Jerabek

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be Rear Admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Clinton F. Faison, III

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be Rear Admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Jonathan A. Yuen

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be Rear Admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Katherine L. Gregory
Rear Adm. (lh) Kevin R. Slates

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be Rear Admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Sandy L. Daniels
Rear Adm. (lh) John E. Jolliffe
Rear Adm. (lh) Christopher J. Paul

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be Rear Admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Bruce A. Doll

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be Rear Admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) David G. Russell

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be Rear Admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Elizabeth L. Train

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be Rear Admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Richard D. Berkey

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be Rear Admiral (lower half)

Capt. Douglas G. Morton

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be Rear Admiral (lower half)

Capt. Terry J. Moulton

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be Rear Admiral (lower half)

Capt. David R. Pimpo
Capt. Donald L. Singleton

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be Rear Admiral (lower half)

Capt. Paul A. Sohl

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be Rear Admiral (lower half)

Capt. Bruce F. Loveless

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be Rear Admiral (lower half)

Capt. Brian K. Antonio
Capt. Luther B. Fuller, III

The following named United States Navy Reserve officer for appointment as the Chief of Navy Reserve and appointment to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., sections 601 and 5143:

To be Vice Admiral

Rear Adm. Robin R. Braun

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be Vice Admiral

Rear Adm. Paul J. Bushong

The following named officer for appointment as Deputy Judge Advocate General of the Navy and for appointment to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 5149:

To be Rear Admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) James W. Crawford, III

The following named officer for appointment to the grade indicated in the United States Navy and for appointment as the Judge Advocate General of the Navy under title 10, U.S.C., section 5148:

To be Vice Admiral

Rear Adm. Nanette M. DeRenzi

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be Vice Admiral

Rear Adm. Michael J. Connor

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Marine Corps to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be Brigadier General

Colonel Edward D. Banta
Colonel Matthew G. Glavy
Colonel william F. Mullen, III
Colonel Gregg P. Olson
Colonel James S. O'Meara
Colonel Eric M. Smith

The following named officer for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general in the United States Marine Corps while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be Lieutenant General

Maj. Gen. (Select) William M. Faulkner

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE

PN1738 AIR FORCE nominations (2) beginning Chance J. Henderson, and ending Jeffrey P. Tan, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1739 AIR FORCE nominations (3) beginning JESSICA L. WEAVER, and ending JONELLE J. KNAPP, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

IN THE ARMY

PN1721 ARMY nomination of Joseph F. Jarrard, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2012.

PN1722 ARMY nomination of Kevin J. Park, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2012.

PN1723 ARMY nomination of Charles R. Perry, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2012.

PN1724 ARMY nominations (12) beginning ANTHONY P. DIGIACOMO, II, and ending RICHARD D. WILSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2012.

PN1740 ARMY nomination of Youngmi Cho, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1741 ARMY nomination of Richard M. Zygadlo, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1742 ARMY nomination of David H. Rittgers, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1743 ARMY nominations (2) beginning Eric S. Slater, and ending Marcus P. Wong, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1744 ARMY nominations (2) beginning Gaston P. Bathalon, and ending Kevin C. Reilly, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1745 ARMY nominations (3) beginning JERRY L. BRATU, JR., and ending AMOS P. PARKER, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1746 ARMY nominations (6) beginning BRETT W. ANDERSEN, and ending MICHAEL D. WHITED, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1747 ARMY nominations (7) beginning CASEY ROGERS, and ending SHARON A. SCHELL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1748 ARMY nominations (17) beginning DWAYNE C. BECHTOL, and ending D005682, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1749 ARMY nominations (17) beginning ARMANDO AGUILERA, JR., and ending DAVE ST JOHN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1750 ARMY nominations (19) beginning BRUCE J. BEECHER, and ending D004871, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1751 ARMY nominations (107) beginning RENEE D. ALFORD, and ending PJ ZAMORA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1752 ARMY nominations (119) beginning JUDE M. ABADIE, and ending D010155, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1753 ARMY nominations (140) beginning BRIAN E. ABELL, and ending D010333, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

FOREIGN SERVICE

PN1346 FOREIGN SERVICE nominations (9) beginning William M. Zarit, and ending Michael J. Richardson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 2, 2012.

PN1526 FOREIGN SERVICE nominations (3) beginning Jeffrey B. Justice, and ending Enrique G. Ortiz, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 18, 2012.

PN1564 FOREIGN SERVICE nominations (162) beginning Michael C. Aho, and ending Michael L. Yoder, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 26, 2012.

PN1678 FOREIGN SERVICE nominations (89) beginning Alboino Lungobardo Deulus, and ending Bradley Alan Freden, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2012.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

PN1300 MARINE CORPS nominations (129) beginning EDUARDO A. ABISELLAN, and ending WILLIAM E. ZAMAGNI, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 31, 2012.

PN1301 MARINE CORPS nominations (677) beginning OMAR A. ADAME, and ending CHRISTINA F. ZIMMERMAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 31, 2012.

IN THE NAVY

PN1601 NAVY nominations (6) beginning JENNIFFER D. GUNDAYAO, and ending DONALD R. WILKINSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2012.

PN1602 NAVY nominations (173) beginning DAVID A. ADAMS, and ending JOHN J. ZERR, II, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2012.

PN1603 NAVY nominations (3) beginning MARK D. LARABEE, and ending RICHARD J. WATKINS, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2012.

PN1604 NAVY nominations (14) beginning GREGORY D. BURTON, and ending JOSEPH M. TUITE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2012.

PN1605 NAVY nominations (11) beginning MICHAEL N. ABREU, and ending SCOTT D. TINGLE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2012.

PN1606 NAVY nominations (3) beginning TRENT R. DEMOSS, and ending CHARLES K. NIXON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2012.

PN1607 NAVY nominations (94) beginning ROGER L. ACEBO, and ending JEFFREY D. WILSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2012.

PN1608 NAVY nominations (14) beginning THOMAS F. BOLICH, JR., and ending DONALD R. XIQUES, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2012.

PN1609 NAVY nominations (8) beginning RAYMOND I. BRUTTOMESSO, and ending MARK R. SANDS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2012.

PN1610 NAVY nominations (3) beginning WILLIAM A. BAAS, and ending JAMES E. PUCKETT, II, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2012.

PN1611 NAVY nominations (3) beginning THOMAS J. AMIS, and ending SUEANN K. SCHORR, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2012.

PN1612 NAVY nominations (2) beginning JEFFERSON W. ADAMS, and ending ROBERT B. SMITH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2012.

PN1613 NAVY nominations (2) beginning ROBERT W. MULAC, and ending WILLIAM K. SALVIN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2012.

PN1614 NAVY nominations (2) beginning COLETTE E. KOKRON, and ending CURTIS L. MICHEL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2012.

PN1615 NAVY nominations (2) beginning TAWNYA J. RACOOSIN, and ending TODD D. WHITE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2012.

PN1616 NAVY nominations (2) beginning ELISABETH S. STEPHENS, and ending SHERYL L. TANNAHILL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2012.

PN1617 NAVY nominations (3) beginning DONALD W. BOSCH, and ending THERESA M. STICE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2012.

PN1618 NAVY nominations (20) beginning DARREN E. ANDING, and ending STEVEN K. RENLY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2012.

PN1619 NAVY nominations (2) beginning JEFF A. DAVIS, and ending BRENDA K. MALONE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2012.

PN1620 NAVY nominations (14) beginning MARK R. ASUNCION, and ending PHILIP W. YU, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2012.

PN1621 NAVY nominations (5) beginning MARC C. ECKARDT, and ending ROBERT W. WITZLEB, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2012.

PN1622 NAVY nominations (5) beginning WILLIAM A. DODGE, JR., and ending ALBERT M. MUSSELWHITE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2012.

PN1623 NAVY nominations (4) beginning ALLEN L. EDMISTON, and ending JACQUELINE V. MCELHANNON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2012.

PN1624 NAVY nominations (10) beginning JASON L. ANSLEY, and ending LOUIS T. UNREIN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2012.

PN1625 NAVY nominations (8) beginning GEORGE A. ALLMON, and ending TIMOTHY G. SPARKS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2012.

PN1629 NAVY nominations (13) beginning JOHN P. AYRES, and ending CLAY L. WILD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2012.

PN1653 NAVY nomination of Glenn E. Gaborko, Jr., which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2012.

PN1654 NAVY nomination of Roger L. Blank, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2012.

PN1655 NAVY nominations (2) beginning MICHAEL C. BARBER, and ending DAVID G. ORAVEC, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2012.

PN1656 NAVY nominations (2) beginning JOSEPH A. DAVIS, and ending SCOTT D. EBERWINE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2012.

PN1657 NAVY nominations (3) beginning DAVID H. DUTTLINGER, and ending DARCY I. WOLFE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2012.

PN1658 NAVY nominations (6) beginning FRANK J. BRAJEVIC, and ending DAVID E. WOOLSTON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2012.

PN1659 NAVY nominations (8) beginning LAUREN D. BALES, and ending DAVID A. SERAFINI, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2012.

PN1660 NAVY nominations (8) beginning CHRISTOPHER J. CORVO, and ending THOMAS J. WELSH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2012.

PN1661 NAVY nominations (10) beginning MARIA L. AGUAYO, and ending ANDREW J. SCHULMAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2012.

PN1662 NAVY nominations (12) beginning DAVID O. BYNUM, and ending MELVIN H. UNDERWOOD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2012.

PN1663 NAVY nominations (13) beginning DOUGLAS J. COHEN, and ending KEVIN P. WHITMORE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2012.

PN1664 NAVY nominations (14) beginning RICHARD S. BARLAMENT, and ending JOHN S. SIBLEY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2012.

PN1665 NAVY nominations (14) beginning BRIAN E. BEHARRY, and ending DARREL G. VAUGHN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2012.

PN1666 NAVY nominations (16) beginning PATRICK J. BLAIR, and ending AARON D. WERBEL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2012.

PN1667 NAVY nominations (29) beginning JAMES T. ALBRITTON, and ending ROBERT L. WILLIAMS, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2012.

PN1668 NAVY nominations (17) beginning VERONICA G. ARMSTRONG, and ending MARIA A. YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2012.

PN1669 NAVY nominations (49) beginning JULIANN M. ALTHOFF, and ending JOHN WYLAND, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2012.

PN1670 NAVY nominations (17) beginning CASEY S. ADAMS, and ending KAREN G. YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2012.

PN1686 NAVY nomination of Robert E. Bradshaw, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 17, 2012.

PN1725 NAVY nomination of Darren W. Murphy, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2012.

PN1754 NAVY nomination of Ling Ye, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1755 NAVY nomination of Gregory E. Ringler, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1756 NAVY nominations (2) beginning CRAIG S. COLEMAN, and ending EDUARDO B. RIZO, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1757 NAVY nominations (2) beginning PAUL D. GINKEL, and ending GABRIEL S. NILES, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1758 NAVY nominations (2) beginning MICHELE M. DAY, and ending DET R. SMITH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1759 NAVY nominations (9) beginning STEVE M. CURRY, and ending WILLIAM R. URBAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1760 NAVY nominations (9) beginning AMY L. BLEIDORN, and ending MICAH A. WELTMER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1761 NAVY nominations (9) beginning MICHAEL J. BARRIERE, and ending MATTHEW T. WILCOX, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1762 NAVY nominations (14) beginning BRIAN M. BALLER, and ending MICHAEL J. SZCZERBINSKI, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1763 NAVY nominations (17) beginning HEATH D. BOHLEN, and ending MATTHEW C. YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1764 NAVY nominations (17) beginning DERECK C. BROWN, and ending SHERRY W. WANGWHITE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1765 NAVY nominations (18) beginning MARC A. ARAGON, and ending ROBERT A. YEE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1766 NAVY nominations (28) beginning KEVIN J. BEHM, and ending EVAN P. WRIGHT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1767 NAVY nominations (33) beginning ERIK E. ANDERSON, and ending CHRISTOPHER G. WILLIAMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1768 NAVY nominations (55) beginning RENE V. ABADESCO, and ending MARK W.

YATES, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1769 NAVY nominations (388) beginning DAVID J. ADAMS, and ending KEVIN P. ZAYAC, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1770 NAVY nominations (5) beginning BRIAN P. BURROW, and ending CHRISTOPHER A. WEECH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

PN1771 NAVY nominations (13) beginning DERRICK E. BLACKSTON, and ending DEREK A. VESTAL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 14, 2012.

CHURCH PLAN INVESTMENT CLARIFICATION ACT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Banking Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 33.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 33) to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to specify when certain securities issued in connection with church plans are treated as exempted securities for purposes of that Act.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I appreciate the efforts of Chairman JOHNSON in making sure that our Nation's religious leaders are able to have expanded opportunities for their retirement plans, while also ensuring that we don't create any unintended consequences. To remove any potential ambiguity, we want to make clear that H.R. 33 is intended to make clear that the offer and sale of a bank collective trust's securities that are exempt from the Securities Act of 1933 if sold to employee benefit plans described in Section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code, such as 401(k) plans, would not lose such exemption solely on the basis that such securities are sold to church plans described in 403(b)(9) of the Internal Revenue Code (church plans described in Section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code already receive such exemptive relief) or to plans that include self-employed ministers. H.R. 33 is not intended to expand the exemption to any interests, participations or securities that are sold to a person other than such church plans and plans that include self-employed ministers.

Mr. JOHNSON. I agree with Senator LEVIN's statement.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and that any statements be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (H.R. 33) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

COMMENDING THE WOMEN OF THE AMERICAN RED CROSS CLUBMOBILES

Mr. REID. I now ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of and the Senate proceed to S. Res. 471.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 471) commending the efforts of the women of the American Red Cross Clubmobiles for exemplary service during the Second World War.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the service of the women of the American Red Cross Clubmobiles. These brave young Americans served our country with distinction overseas during the Second World War.

During the War, the Red Cross was charged by the Armed Forces to provide for the recreational welfare of the troops. Wherever there was a sizable group of American servicemen permanently assigned, the Red Cross established canteens, which provided a bit of respite from training for war and were tremendously popular. But the canteens were fixed sites, and did not reach many of the combat troops garrisoned at small locations across the English countryside.

In order to extend a taste of home to the troops, the Red Cross Commissioner for Great Britain, Harvey Gibson, thought up the idea of the ''Clubmobile,'' a mobile kitchen set up in an old London bus. In late 1942, several of these Clubmobiles began operating between dozens of bases around the country, serving coffee and doughnuts to those preparing for D-day.

Shortly after the beachhead at Normandy was successfully secured, 80 Clubmobiles and 320 volunteers crossed the English Channel to begin operating their mobile kitchens near the front lines. Each Clubmobile group, consisting of eight two-and-a-half ton trucks named for an American city or State, was attached to an Army Corps and moved with the unit's support elements, often going forward to provide the troops with American music, hot coffee, and doughnuts. Like every soldier, the Clubmobile women were in ''for the duration.'' By War's end, the Clubmobiles were operating across Europe, from southern Italy to northern Germany, and in the Far East from the jungles of Burma to the shores of Tokyo Bay.

A visit from a Clubmobile was one of the most significant events for a young G.I. in combat far from home, and the women of the Clubmobiles, young women from every single State, acted as friends and sisters to the troops with whom they interacted.

These women were trailblazers, every bit as much as the Navy's Women Accepted for Volunteer Emergency Service—WAVES—the Women's Army Corps—WACS—and the Women Airforce Service Pilots—WASPS. They were young, independent, and patriotic. They joined for a variety of reasons, some for adventure, some to serve in uniform as close to combat as they were then allowed, and some to honor the sacrifices of their own fathers, brothers, or friends. Every one of them was dedicated to their country, and volunteered for the Clubmobiles rather than an easier or safer job at home.

The dangers of War were real. During the War, 52 Red Cross women lost their lives, some of them from the Clubmobiles. Their stories are those of a nation at war.

Elizabeth Richardson joined the Red Cross in 1944 after graduating from Milwaukee-Downer College and after a brief career in advertising. She helped pilot the Clubmobile named Kansas City throughout England, Holland and France, listening to soldiers' stories while cracking jokes and sharing her own. Two months after V-E Day, Liz's plane crashed en route to Paris. Liz Richardson, dead at 27, now lies interred at the Normandy American Cemetery. Before she died, she said about her service, ''I wouldn't trade this for anything else.''

Those sentiments are shared by Margaret ''Margo'' Hemingway Harrington of Rye, NH, one of the few surviving Clubmobile women. She said, ''I just got itchy feet, and thought I should be doing something more.''

The women of the Clubmobiles touched the lives of hundreds of thousands of U.S. servicemen. The Red Cross alone purchased enough flour to make 1.5 million doughnuts, most of which were served through the windows of a Clubmobile.

To honor their memory, 70 years after they were established, Senator SHAHEEN and I, joined by 11 of our colleagues, introduced Senate Resolution 471, which commends the exemplary and courageous service of the Clubmobiles, honors those that lost their lives, calls upon historians to not let this important piece of American history be lost, and urges the Red Cross to publically commemorate their stories.

Honoring them now is critically important, because only a very few of these women remain. Their stories are every bit as vibrant and important to our victory as those of the men who valiantly fought to defend our freedom. I urge every one of my colleagues to support this Resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to; a Collins amendment to the preamble, which is at the desk, be agreed to; the preamble, as amended, be agreed to; and that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 471) was agreed to.

The amendment (No. 2466) was agreed to, as follows:

In the preamble, strike the third whereas clause through the sixth whereas clause and insert the following:

Whereas thousands of young women, from every State in the United States, volunteered to serve in the Clubmobiles, and were chosen after a rigorous interview process;

Whereas, between July and August 1944, less than 1 month after the invasion of Normandy, France, 80 Clubmobiles and 320 American Red Cross volunteers crossed the English Channel and began providing coffee, doughnuts, and a friendly smile to servicemen fighting on the front lines;

Whereas the Clubmobile volunteers saw service across Europe in France, Belgium, Italy, Luxembourg, and Germany, and later in the Far East, touching the lives of hundreds of thousands of United States servicemen until victory was achieved;

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 471

Whereas, during the Second World War, the American Red Cross was charged by the United States Armed Forces with providing recreational services to the soldiers serving in the war;

Whereas Harvey Gibson, the Red Cross Commissioner to Great Britain during the war, conceived of the Clubmobiles in 1942 as a means of providing hot coffee, fresh doughnuts, and a vital connection to home to thousands of servicemen at dozens of airfields, bases, and camps throughout Great Britain during the buildup to D-Day;

Whereas thousands of young women, from every State in the United States, volunteered to serve in the Clubmobiles, and were chosen after a rigorous interview process;

Whereas, between July and August 1944, less than 1 month after the invasion of Normandy, France, 80 Clubmobiles and 320 American Red Cross volunteers crossed the English Channel and began providing coffee, doughnuts, and a friendly smile to servicemen fighting on the front lines;

Whereas the Clubmobile volunteers saw service across Europe in France, Belgium, Italy, Luxembourg, and Germany, and later in the Far East, touching the lives of hundreds of thousands of United States servicemen until victory was achieved;

Whereas a visit from a Clubmobile, which could serve gallons of coffee and hundreds of doughnuts every minute, was often the most significant morale boost available to servicemen at war;

Whereas 52 women of the American Red Cross, some of whom served on the Clubmobiles, perished during the war as a result of their service; and

Whereas 70 years have passed since the Clubmobiles were founded, and only a few women who served in the Clubmobiles remain to share their stories: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commends the exemplary and courageous service and sacrifice of each of the patriotic women of the United States who served in the American Red Cross Clubmobiles during the Second World War;

(2) honors the Clubmobile women who lost their lives during the Second World War;

(3) calls upon historians of the Second World War to recognize and describe the service of the Clubmobiles, and to not let this important piece of United States history be lost; and

(4) urges the American Red Cross to publicly commemorate the stories of the Clubmobiles and the amazing women who served in them.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JUNE 25, 2012

Mr. REID. Finally, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 2 p.m. on Monday, June 25; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 1940, the flood insurance bill, postcloture; and that at 5:30 p.m., the Senate proceed to a cloture vote on the motion to concur in the House message to accompany S. 3187, the FDA bill, under the previous order.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. At 5:30 p.m. on Monday, there will be a rollcall vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to concur in the House message to accompany S. 3187, the FDA bill.

It has been a long hard week. We have accomplished quite a bit. We have a lot more to do, but it has been one of our better weeks.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, JUNE 25, 2012, AT 2 P.M.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:40 p.m., adjourned until Monday, June 25, 2012, at 2 p.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 21, 2012:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

WILLIAM B. POLLARD, III, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF MILITARY COMMISSION REVIEW.

SCOTT L. SILLIMAN, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF MILITARY COMMISSION REVIEW.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. MICHAEL R. MOELLER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. MARK F. RAMSAY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS THE SURGEON GENERAL OF THE AIR FORCE AND APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 8036 AND 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. THOMAS W. TRAVIS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. DARREN W. MCDEW

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. STANLEY T. KRESGE

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major general

BRIGADIER GENERAL EDWARD M. REEDER, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. JOHN F. MULHOLLAND, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. WILLIAM B. GARRETT III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. HOWARD B. BROMBERG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JAMES L. HUGGINS, JR.

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. BARRY D. KEELING

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. JOSEPH E. ROONEY

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. JANET R. DONOVAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. BARBARA W. SWEREDOSKI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. KIRBY D. MILLER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPTAIN MICHAEL J. DUMONT
CAPTAIN ROBERT L. GREENE
CAPTAIN LAWRENCE B. JACKSON
CAPTAIN SCOTT B. J. JERABEK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) CLINTON F. FAISON III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) JONATHAN A. YUEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) KATHERINE L. GREGORY
REAR ADM. (LH) KEVIN R. SLATES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) SANDY L. DANIELS
REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN E. JOLLIFFE
REAR ADM. (LH) CHRISTOPHER J. PAUL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) BRUCE A. DOLL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) DAVID G. RUSSELL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) ELIZABETH L. TRAIN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) RICHARD D. BERKEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. DOUGLAS G. MORTON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. TERRY J. MOULTON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. DAVID R. PIMPO
CAPT. DONALD L. SINGLETON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. PAUL A. SOHL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. BRUCE F. LOVELESS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. BRIAN K. ANTONIO
CAPT. LUTHER B. FULLER III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS THE CHIEF OF NAVY RESERVE AND APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 5143:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. ROBIN R. BRAUN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. PAUL J. BUSHONG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS DEPUTY JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL OF THE NAVY AND FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 5149:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) JAMES W. CRAWFORD III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY AND FOR APPOINTMENT AS THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL OF THE NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 5148:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. NANETTE M. DERENZI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. MICHAEL J. CONNOR

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COLONEL EDWARD D. BANTA
COLONEL MATTHEW G. GLAVY
COLONEL WILLIAM F. MULLEN III
COLONEL GREGG P. OLSON
COLONEL JAMES S. O'MEARA
COLONEL ERIC M. SMITH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. (SELECT) WILLIAM M. FAULKNER

IN THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHANCE J. HENDERSON AND ENDING WITH JEFFREY P. TAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JESSICA L. WEAVER AND ENDING WITH JONELLE J. KNAPP, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

IN THE ARMY

ARMY NOMINATION OF JOSEPH F. JARRARD, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF KEVIN J. PARK, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF CHARLES R. PERRY, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ANTHONY P. DIGIACOMO II AND ENDING WITH RICHARD D. WILSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 7, 2012.

ARMY NOMINATION OF YOUNGMI CHO, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF RICHARD M. ZYGADLO, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF DAVID H. RITTGERS, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ERIC S. SLATER AND ENDING WITH MARCUS P. WONG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GASTON P. BATHALON AND ENDING WITH KEVIN C. REILLY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JERRY L. BRATU, JR. AND ENDING WITH AMOS P. PARKER, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRETT W. ANDERSEN AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL D. WHITED, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CASEY ROGERS AND ENDING WITH SHARON A. SCHELL, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DWAYNE C. BECHTOL AND ENDING WITH D005682, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ARMANDO AGUILERA, JR. AND ENDING WITH DAVE ST JOHN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRUCE J. BEECHER AND ENDING WITH D004871, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RENEE D. ALFORD AND ENDING WITH PJ ZAMORA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JUDE M. ABADIE AND ENDING WITH D010155, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRIAN E. ABELL AND ENDING WITH D010333, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH EDUARDO A. ABISELLAN AND ENDING WITH WILLIAM E. ZAMAGNI, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 31, 2012 .

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH OMAR A. ADAME AND ENDING WITH CHRISTINA F. ZIMMERMAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 31, 2012.

IN THE NAVY

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JENNIFFER D. GUNDAYAO AND ENDING WITH DONALD R. WILKINSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID A. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH JOHN J. ZERR II, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARK D. LARABEE AND ENDING WITH RICHARD J. WATKINS, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GREGORY D. BURTON AND ENDING WITH JOSEPH M. TUITE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL N. ABREU AND ENDING WITH SCOTT D. TINGLE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH TRENT R. DEMOSS AND ENDING WITH CHARLES K. NIXON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ROGER L. ACEBO AND ENDING WITH JEFFREY D. WILSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH THOMAS F. BOLICH, JR. AND ENDING WITH DONALD R. XIQUES, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RAYMOND I. BRUTTOMESSO AND ENDING WITH MARK R. SANDS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH WILLIAM A. BAAS AND ENDING WITH JAMES E. PUCKETT II, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH THOMAS J. AMIS AND ENDING WITH SUEANN K. SCHORR, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JEFFERSON W. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH ROBERT B. SMITH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ROBERT W. MULAC AND ENDING WITH WILLIAM K. SALVIN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH COLETTE E. KOKRON AND ENDING WITH CURTIS L. MICHEL, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH TAWNYA J. RACOOSIN AND ENDING WITH TODD D. WHITE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ELISABETH S. STEPHENS AND ENDING WITH SHERYL L. TANNAHILL, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DONALD W. BOSCH AND ENDING WITH THERESA M. STICE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DARREN E. ANDING AND ENDING WITH STEVEN K. RENLY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JEFF A. DAVIS AND ENDING WITH BRENDA K. MALONE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARK R. ASUNCION AND ENDING WITH PHILIP W. YU, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARC C. ECKARDT AND ENDING WITH ROBERT W. WITZLEB, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH WILLIAM A. DODGE, JR. AND ENDING WITH ALBERT M. MUSSELWHITE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ALLEN L. EDMISTON AND ENDING WITH JACQUELINE V. MCELHANNON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JASON L. ANSLEY AND ENDING WITH LOUIS T. UNREIN, WHICH

NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GEORGE A. ALLMON AND ENDING WITH TIMOTHY G. SPARKS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOHN P. AYRES AND ENDING WITH CLAY L. WILD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATION OF GLENN E. GABORKO, JR., TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF ROGER L. BLANK, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL C. BARBER AND ENDING WITH DAVID G. ORAVEC, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOSEPH A. DAVIS AND ENDING WITH SCOTT D. EBERWINE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID H. DUTTLINGER AND ENDING WITH DARCY I. WOLFE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH FRANK J. BRAJEVIC AND ENDING WITH DAVID E. WOOLSTON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LAUREN D. BALES AND ENDING WITH DAVID A. SERAFINI, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHRISTOPHER J. CORVO AND ENDING WITH THOMAS J. WELSH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARIA L. AGUAYO AND ENDING WITH ANDREW J. SCHULMAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID O. BYNUM AND ENDING WITH MELVIN H. UNDERWOOD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DOUGLAS J. COHEN AND ENDING WITH KEVIN P. WHITMORE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RICHARD S. BARLAMENT AND ENDING WITH JOHN S. SIBLEY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRIAN E. BEHARRY AND ENDING WITH DARREL G. VAUGHN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH PATRICK J. BLAIR AND ENDING WITH AARON D. WERBEL, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JAMES T. ALBRITTON AND ENDING WITH ROBERT L. WILLIAMS, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH VERONICA G. ARMSTRONG AND ENDING WITH MARIA A. YOUNG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JULIANN M. ALTHOFF AND ENDING WITH JOHN WYLAND, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CASEY S. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH KAREN G. YOUNG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATION OF ROBERT E. BRADSHAW, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF DARREN W. MURPHY, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF LING YE, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF GREGORY E. RINGLER, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CRAIG S. COLEMAN AND ENDING WITH EDUARDO B. RIZO, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH PAUL D. GINKEL AND ENDING WITH GABRIEL S. NILES, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHELE M. DAY AND ENDING WITH DET R. SMITH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH STEVE M. CURRY AND ENDING WITH WILLIAM R. URBAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH AMY L. BLEIDORN AND ENDING WITH MICAH A. WELTMER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL J. BARRIERE AND ENDING WITH MATTHEW T. WILCOX, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRIAN M. BALLER AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL J. SZCZERBINSKI, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH HEATH D. BOHLEN AND ENDING WITH MATTHEW C. YOUNG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DERECK C. BROWN AND ENDING WITH SHERRY W. WANGWHITE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARC A. ARAGON AND ENDING WITH ROBERT A. YEE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KEVIN J. BEHM AND ENDING WITH EVAN P. WRIGHT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ERIK E. ANDERSON AND ENDING WITH CHRISTOPHER G. WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RENE V. ABADESCO AND ENDING WITH MARK W. YATES, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID J. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH KEVIN P. ZAYAC, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRIAN P. BURROW AND ENDING WITH CHRISTOPHER A. WEECH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DERRICK E. BLACKSTON AND ENDING WITH DEREK A. VESTAL, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 14, 2012.

FOREIGN SERVICE

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH WILLIAM M. ZARIT AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL J. RICHARDSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 2, 2012 .

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JEFFREY B. JUSTICE AND ENDING WITH ENRIQUE G. ORTIZ, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 18, 2012.

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL C. AHO AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL L. YODER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 26, 2012.

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ALBOINO LUNGOBARDO DEULUS AND ENDING WITH BRADLEY ALAN FREDEN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 15, 2012.