United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, APRIL 22, 2013 No. 55

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Tuesday, April 23, 2013, at 12 p.m.

Senate

MONDAY, APRIL 22, 2013

The Senate met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Honorable PATRICK J. LEAHY, a Senator from the State of Vermont.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty God, our Father, give our lawmakers today high aspirations as You lift their thoughts above everything that would keep them from fulfilling Your purpose for them. Let Your blessings be upon them, enabling them to know the joy of giving You their whole heart.

Lord, we are grateful that Your power extends beyond humanity's powers and achievements, for Your thoughts are as high above our reflections as the heavens are above the Earth. Give us serenity of mind in spite of life's tensions and tumult, so that we will find the paths of peace.

Again, Lord, we ask You to bless the victims and families of the explosions in Boston and Texas. We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable PATRICK LEAHY 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.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY). The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following leader remarks, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 5:30 this evening. Senators will be permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each. At 5:30 there will be a vote on the motion to proceed to S. 743, the Marketplace Fairness Act.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. I now ask unanimous consent there be a moment of silence at 2:50 p.m. today for the purpose of honoring the victims of the Boston bombings.

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

COMMENDING BOSTON'S LAW ENFORCEMENT COMMUNITY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I commend the law enforcement officials at the city, State, and local level for their incredible response to last week's traumatic and horrifying events at the Boston Marathon, and for hours following that all over the Boston metropolitan area.

A week that began with this unspeakable tragedy, the death of three innocents, ended with the death of one suspect in the Boston bombing marathon and the capture of the other. Capturing those suspects would have been impossible without the hard work and bravery of countless law enforcement personnel as well as the cooperation and fortitude of the people of Boston. They are Boston strong.

Our hearts extend to the family of 26-year-old Sean Collier, the young MIT officer who was simply sitting in his car and was so callously killed by these bombing murderers. Our thoughts this week are with Richard Donohue, the transit police officer who was wounded during the manhunt by these terrorists.

We once again extend hope for recovery of those injured in last week's senseless bombings and our condolences to lost loved ones. The U.S. Government and Americans across the Nation pledge our continued support for the people of Massachusetts as they recuperate from a truly trying week.

SEQUESTRATION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, Americans arriving at the airport—almost any airport in America—to take off on their summer vacations already face long lines at security checkpoints. Soon they will be facing long waits at the terminal as well. Last week the Federal Aviation Administration announced that starting this week thousands of flights every day will be delayed for up to 3 hours.

Because of the devastating, arbitrary cuts of sequestration, the FAA is forced to furlough tens of thousands of workers. These furloughs could lead to

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

Printed on recycled paper.

6,700 flight delays every day this summer. I repeat, every day, 6,700 delayed flights. By comparison, the worst travel day of last year, 2012, was about 3,000 flights being delayed. That was after severe thunderstorms accompanied by 2-inch hail and a 90-mile-an-hour wind that ripped across the Midwest and Northeast and a tornado touched down in New York. That caused 3,000 flight delays. On any day this sequestration kicks in, it will be double that. Travelers were stranded at airports across the country during that very bad day we had last year. Some were stranded for days. It is going to be worse than that. As I said, this summer more than twice that number of flights will be delayed every single day.

While major airports such as LaGuardia in New York and O'Hare in Chicago will see the worst delays, furloughs will impact every airport in the Nation. So whether Americans are traveling to Orlando, Las Vegas, San Diego or Seattle, Maine or Montana, they should expect a long wait for a flight.

This will make air travel frustrating, to say the least. It is bad enough now. It will be worse. It will be time-consuming for millions of Americans, whether taking the family to see the Grand Canyon or heading to New York for business. It will cover everything. At airports across the country, millions of Americans who fly will get their first taste of the pain of sequestration.

Many Americans have been feeling that pain for weeks. For example, in Rockland, ME, Meals on Wheels, a wonderful program, been in existence for a long time, decades—it is for people who are old and homebound. They bring them a meal, one meal a day, a hot meal. In Rockland, ME, Meals on Wheels has a waiting list for the first time in 16 years.

It is going to affect Meals on Wheels Programs all over the country. They have literally cut the size of meals they serve to the elderly in order to save money. Not only are they going to be able to do less meals, but those they serve are going to be smaller. This is the only meal most of these seniors get every day. They may have a bowl of cereal, eat a piece of toast. But as far as a hot meal, this is it.

In Fayetteville, AR, a Head Start Program will close 13 days early this spring, leaving hundreds of needy children without anywhere to go and without nutritious meals to eat. Nationwide, more than 70,000 little boys and girls will be kicked off Head Start, a program for low-income children who could not afford preschool.

As the name Head Start says, the purpose of it is for these tiny little boys and girls to have preschool programs so they can learn to start to understand what it means to read, to understand what education is all about. Economically burdened little kids, because of this program, who want to get a head start will not be able to; these programs will be savaged.

At Duke University, just one program out of hundreds at the School of Medicine program will have 50 people laid off. These are people doing some of the most important research there is in the world to cure diseases such as Parkinson's, Alzheimer's, diabetes. All over the country, thousands of these researchers will be furloughed or they will be laid off.

The U.S. military has cut tuition assistance for soldiers and eliminated a program helping more than 100,000 homeless veterans get off the street and back on their feet. The U.S. Air Force has grounded one-third of its fighter jets and bombers because of the across-the-board cuts. These programs are to train our military so in a time of crisis they can be prepared. They cannot be prepared if they cannot practice. More than 1 million Federal workers, including hundreds of thousands of Defense Department employees, are preparing to take forced furlough days. This is not only a hardship for individual families, it is also a threat to our national economy and our national security.

In national parks across the Nation—Great Basin in Nevada, Bryce Canyon, UT, Mount Desert Island, thousands of miles away from those two places in Maine—employees face reduced hours, and closure will affect thousands of travelers.

Long delays at the airport will not be the only damper on summer vacation travel. For every person who loses work because of this sequestration, that is less they can buy to help people who are selling goods and services. We cannot and we should not only address the FAA cuts. As important as they are, we should look at the whole spectrum. We cannot ignore the sequester's overall effect on Americans and on programs that help small businesses grow, fund crucial medical research, and keep our children and seniors safe.

While airport delays are costly and frustrating, some would say they are not as severe as the pain of a senior citizen missing a meal, the only hot meal they would get that day, or veterans going without a roof over their head at night.

Families and businesses in every State in the Nation, in red States and blue States, are at risk because of these haphazard cuts. That is what they are. But Congress has the power to reverse these self-inflicted wounds without adding 1 penny to the deficit. We are winding down the war in Afghanistan, and Iraq has been wound down significantly. We have provided the money. The money is there. We have not spent it. We do not need to. We can use those savings from wrapping up two wars to avoid the full brunt of the sequester's arbitrary cuts. The Congressional Budget Office said that would score, that money is available, money we could use. Funding for the operations in Iraq and Afghanistan is kept in the so-called Overseas Contingency Operations Account. That is what it is called. Since the worst of the sequester cuts is creating an emergency situation, we should consider using these funds to offset their impact. These really are emergencies. We should do it. I am not proposing to use these funds to offset the entire sequester, but Congress has the power to avert the most painful and senseless of the sequester's cuts using these monies.

Twenty-eight Republicans in the Senate and 174 Republicans in the House voted to oppose these sequester haphazard cuts. If those same Republicans will work with Democrats, we could act now to protect families, businesses, ensure our national defense, and save Americans millions of hours spent waiting at the airport.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 5:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

MARKETPLACE FAIRNESS ACT

Mr. DURBIN. I note Senator ENZI is on the floor. At 5:30 p.m. we are voting on a measure which will affect literally millions of Americans. I will provide some illustration about this bill.

A close friend of mine is the mayor of Normal, IL. His name is Chris Koos, and he is a local businessman. His business sells bicycles, running shoes, running paraphernalia, and equipment. Chris has a good business and has done well.

He told me that in the last 10 or 20 years things have changed. He said, It is not unusual for someone to come into my store, ask to see a pair of running shoes, try them on, look at the different colors, and then leave without buying anything. Sometimes they will come back several weeks later with shoes and they will say: Chris, we bought these over the Internet, and they are not what we thought they would be; what can we do about it?

This is called ''showrooming'' and is happening more and more. Why would somebody try on the shoes, not purchase them, and then go to the Internet? In many instances, it is because many Internet retailers do not collect sales tax. In my State, this means 9 or 10 percent less cost to purchase an item over the Internet.

This is the reality for most companies. Some companies, Internet retailers, collect a sales tax. I recently purchased a book on Amazon, and they

charged the sales tax, which is appropriate in Illinois. Most companies do not collect the sales tax.

I wish to tell another side of this story. When we are dealing with the collection of this sales tax, we are dealing with existing law. Forty-six States in America have sales tax. The States that do not are Montana, Oregon, New Hampshire, and Delaware. Every other State has either a sales tax or what they call a use tax, and the State law requires all of us living in those States to pay a sales tax on Internet purchases even if the seller didn't charge it.

In my State, people are supposed to pay it when they file their annual State income tax return. There is a line: How much do you owe for Illinois sales tax that should have been paid on remote purchases or online purchases? It is really an honor system is what it comes down to. Though there is a legal obligation, there is no direct enforcement. It turns out that only 1 out of 20 people in Illinois even know this exists. So only 5 percent of the population know.

As I mentioned several times, a few years ago my bookkeeper said—when she was doing our taxes—Senator, do you want to pay the sales tax you owe? I said: I think I do. I did, and we have ever since. But most people aren't aware of it.

So here we have businesses all around America, on Main Streets and in shopping malls, collecting sales tax on the things they sell and competing with Internet retailers who do not collect the sales tax. Secondly, we have individuals with an obligation to pay the sales tax, but most of them do not. So the bill we will consider at 5:30 this afternoon is going to try to resolve this problem.

Over 20 years ago the U.S. Supreme Court said: Congress, you have to fix this. We are not going to fix it by court decision. The States can't fix it because it affects retailers from all around the United States. In the Quill decision before the Supreme Court, they said: Congress, you have to fix it.

It was about that time my colleague, Senator ENZI of Wyoming, teamed up with Senator Byron Dorgan of North Dakota to fix it. Many years have passed and here we are today on the floor of the Senate trying to finally resolve this issue. We have reached a good place. I think we have a reasonable approach to it, and this is what it says: States have to decide to opt in to our system. In other words, no mandate from the Federal Government.

If States opt in to what we propose in this legislation, here is what it means. It means States will be willing to provide the Internet retailers with the software program so that when they sell into the State of Illinois and the purchaser gives the home address, the program will automatically calculate how much sales tax should be collected on the sale. This is free to the retailers, and it allows them to collect the sales tax and then remit the sales tax to the State of Illinois or the other States in which they are selling.

We have worked with businesses—Internet businesses, obviously—and have the support of amazon.com, the largest Internet retailer. For years they have been fighting this battle State by State. As I said, they are now in Illinois collecting sales tax on things they sell over the Internet. But they have decided, and many others as well, it is time to put an end to these statewide court battles, statewide legislative battles, and finally have a national program to collect the sales tax.

What it means is a lot of money for the States and localities. My State is struggling with terrible budget problems. We are in the red with deficits, our pension system is in trouble, and money that should be collected for sales tax is not being collected. So what we are doing with this bill is allowing States to have Internet retailers selling in those States to collect the sales tax.

Several of my colleagues will come to the floor to oppose this, and they have one thing in common. Most of them—I think virtually all of them—live in States that don't have a sales tax. So what about those States? If we say Internet retailers can collect a sales tax, what does that mean in the State of Montana, for example? It means nothing changes for the people living in Montana. If there is no State sales tax they have to pay in their stores, this bill is not going to impose any new sales tax on the people of Montana.

So, then, why are the Senators from Montana opposing it? They are arguing their Internet retailers should not have to collect a sales tax for sales made in States that do have a sales tax. My answer to that is, if you wanted to do business in Illinois—if you wanted to move your shoe store to Illinois—you would have to follow Illinois law; you would have to play by Illinois rules—you would have to pay your property tax and collect the sales tax. That is accepted. If you want to do business in our State or any other State, those are the rules. We think the same thing should apply when it comes to Internet sales.

If a Montana Internet retailer, a State with no sales tax—Montana has no sales tax—wants to sell in Illinois, we are saying they need to collect money from the Illinois purchaser—not from the Montana purchaser but from the Illinois purchaser—for the sales tax and remit that back to the State of Illinois. If they do not want to do that or sell in Illinois or any State with a sales tax, that is their right. But if they do, for the privilege of selling in our State, we are saying they will pay this sales tax.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a column from last week, April 21, from the Wall Street Journal, entitled ''Tax Internet Sales, Stimulate Growth.''

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 17, 2013]

TAX INTERNET SALES, STIMULATE GROWTH

(By Arthur B. Laffer)

States can cut their income-tax rates if Web vendors collect the sales taxes that are legally due.

Reinvigorating the economy should be priority No. 1 for federal and state leaders. After enjoying an average growth rate above 3.5% per year between 1960 and 1999, Americans have had to make do with less than one-half that pace since 2000.

The consequences are already dramatic and will become even more so over time. Overall we are 20% poorer today than we would be had the pre-2000 growth rate persisted. All other things being equal, less national income also means federal and state fiscal problems are more intractable.

At the state level, there are reforms that can alleviate the problems associated with declining sales-tax bases and, at the same time, allow the states to move closer to a pro-growth tax system. One such reform would be to have Internet sellers collect the sales taxes that are owed by in-state consumers when they purchase goods over the Web.

So-called e-fairness legislation addresses the inequitable treatment of retailers based on whether they are located in-state (either a traditional brick-and-mortar store or an Internet retailer with a physical presence in the state) or out of state (again as a brick-and-mortar establishment or on the Internet).

In-state retailers collect sales taxes at the time of purchase. When residents purchase from retailers out of state (including over the Internet) they are supposed to report these purchases and pay the sales taxes owed—which are typically referred to as a ''use tax.'' As you can imagine, few people do.

The result is to narrow a state's sales-tax base. It also leads to several inefficiencies that, on net, diminish potential job and economic growth.

Exempting Internet purchases from the sales tax naturally encourages consumers to buy goods over the Web; worse, the exemption incentivizes consumers to use in-state retailers as a showroom before they do so. This increases in-state retailers' overall costs and reduces their overall productivity.

The exemption of Internet and out-of-state retailers from collecting state sales taxes reduced state revenues by $23.3 billion in 2012 alone, according to an estimate by the National Conference of State Legislatures. The absence of these revenues has not served to put a lid on state-government spending. Instead, it has led to higher marginal rates in the 43 states that levy income taxes.

Therefore—as with any pro-growth tax reform—the sales tax base in the states should be broadened by treating Internet retailers similarly to in-state retailers, and the marginal income-tax rate should be reduced such that the total static revenue collected by the state government is held constant.

One difficulty in imposing an Internet sales tax is the existence of dozens, if not hundreds, of sales-tax jurisdictions in many states, often with the tax rates and tax classification of the same goods varying by jurisdiction. It is overly burdensome to task companies with remitting sales taxes to more than 9,500 such tax jurisdictions. Instead, each state should set up a single sales-tax system, making compliance as easy as possible for today's modern sellers.

Addressing e-fairness from a pro-growth perspective creates several benefits for the

economy. A gross inequity is addressed—all retailers would be treated equally under state law. It also provides states with the opportunity to make their tax systems more efficient and better aligned toward economic growth, as well as improve the productivity of local retailers.

The principle of levying the lowest possible tax rate on the broadest possible tax base is the way to improve the incentives to work, save and produce—which are necessary to reinvigorate the American economy and cope with the nation's fiscal problems. Properly addressing the problem of e-fairness on the state level is a small, but important, step toward achieving this goal.

Mr. DURBIN. There are differences of opinion about this, but here are several things we should make clear. This is not a new tax. The bill we have before us will not create any new tax. It creates a method for compliance or collection of an existing tax.

Secondly, it is only fair to the businesses across America—the entrepreneurs who open their stores every morning and do business. If they are required to collect a sales tax on their sales, it is only fair those who are competing with them do the same.

Also, I might add, it is naive to believe the Internet retailers are selling into States and not using the benefits of the State. When I buy a book on Amazon or wherever it happens to be, ultimately it may be delivered by UPS, for example. That UPS truck is going to use the streets of Chicago and the streets of Springfield. It will use all the basic infrastructure of the cities and the State of Illinois to deliver its product. I don't think it is unreasonable they collect taxes to support the State and the city where they are making their sales, and that is what this is about.

I also note, Mr. President, that today the White House announced the President supports this bill to give States the authority to collect sales tax from Internet retailers. The White House spokesman said: The Senate bill will level the playing field for small businesses and brick-and-mortar retailers undercut by online retailers. Governors and mayors are overwhelmingly in support of this bill. They told the White House the bill is needed. The States are losing out on revenues that can go to education, law enforcement, infrastructure investments, and health care.

We have a wide array of businesses supporting this. You can imagine. Retailers large and small are supporting it. Labor unions are supporting it as well. Business and labor have come together. They believe this is only a matter of fairness.

I want to thank my colleague, Senator ENZI of Wyoming—and then I will yield the floor for him—for his leadership, persistence, and patience on this issue. It has been a long time. Senator ENZI was in the retail business before he came to the Senate, and he was one of the earliest supporters of this measure. When Senator Dorgan retired, I asked MIKE if I could join him in this effort, and he has been a terrific ally.

At this point, Mr. President, I yield the floor for my colleague and friend from Wyoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. I thank the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN, for his interest and participation in this issue, his ability to explain it, and for the way he has brought a lot of people along in helping out with this bill. He has been a great replacement, and we have made more progress than we ever have in the other 14 years of working on the bill. So I thank him for that and for his ability to explain things so clearly.

I also want to thank Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER who helped us change this bill in the last year from about an 80-page bill to an 11-page bill and made it States rights. As Senator DURBIN so eloquently explained, this takes action by the States. This is just to clear up the Quill case that made it a little confusing about whether they could charge a tax and then challenged Congress to fix the problem.

The solution Senator ALEXANDER came up with condensed the bill considerably and made it a lot easier. But it made it a States rights issue so that the States have to take some action.

I thank Senator HEITKAMP as well. She is brandnew to the bill but has more years of experience than anybody because she was a part of the Quill case when it came up. She was representing North Dakota in that case, and that is the other side of the case. She can explain the intricacies of that and the challenge we were given, and the number of reasons why it didn't happen earlier.

One of the reasons is that 20 years ago the Internet was in its infancy and nobody knew what its capabilities were going to be. Most people didn't even know it was out there. That has changed over quite a period of time to where it is now one of the handy tools everybody uses. We have come to recognize there are apps that are available that will answer any question and sources of information that will provide us with what we need to know on virtually any subject. I think that has probably put some encyclopedias out of business, but it has made information more readily available, and it has made products available that people didn't have the availability of before. But it is creating a bit of a dilemma that marketplace fairness straightens out.

Today we are scheduled to vote on the motion to proceed to the bill at 5:30, and I do strongly encourage my colleagues to vote yes. Let me explain why.

As Senator DURBIN said, I have been working on this sales tax fairness issue since joining the Senate in 1997, and I may have a unique perspective on the dozens of proposals that have been introduced. For instance, I have worked sales tax from a number of different aspects. I worked the sales tax issue when I was in the Wyoming Legislature. I know when our legislators were considering sales tax they didn't intend to discriminate against the people in the communities, those who hire the people in the communities and pay the property tax to the communities and participate in all of the community events. They definitely didn't anticipate they were going to be the source where people could come in and feel and touch and try on the product and then check the bar code with their cell phone—one of the advances made possible now through Internet use—and then find out if there is a lower price, which is usually based on no sales tax.

I am pleased some businesses across the Nation have said that isn't fair and have decided to voluntarily do the sales tax. And there is no problem with them doing that.

I have also been a retailer, so I know that feeling. My wife and I had a shoe store, so I know the feeling, again, the Senator from Illinois described, of people coming in, trying it on, feeling it, making sure it is the right size and then checking to see where else it is available. It is discouraging when the sales tax is the difference. So as a former small business owner, I believe it is important to level that playing field for all retailers—the in-store, the catalogue, and the online—so an outdated rule for sales tax collection doesn't adversely impact particularly small businesses and Main Street retailers.

I know a lot of year books would never be published if it wasn't for the support of some of the local businesses. Thousands of these local businesses are forced to do business at a competitive disadvantage because they have to collect a sales tax or a use tax and remote sellers don't. In some States that can mean a 5- to 10-percent price disadvantage. We should not be subsidizing some taxpayers at the expense of others. All businesses and their retail sales should be treated equally.

As a former mayor, I know sales taxes go to State and local governments to bring in needed revenue for maintaining schools, fixing our roads, supporting law enforcement, fire protection, those first responders we are always so conscious of, particularly today and through this last week. If Congress fails to authorize States to collect tax on remote sales, and electronic commerce continues to grow, we are implicitly blessing a situation where States will be forced to raise other taxes, such as income and property taxes, to offset the growing loss of sales tax revenue. Do we want that to happen? I don't think so. We need to promote economic growth, not stifle it.

As the Supreme Court identified in the Quill v. North Dakota decision in 1992, the Quill decision challenged Congress to come up with a better system, a way of making it fair. The local brick-and-mortar retailers collect sales taxes, while many online and catalog retailers are exempt from collecting the same tax as a result of that case, and that was based on whether they

had a nexus. The nexus has changed dramatically since that time. That used to be where you would go and actually pick up something, but now it is where you can order something and that can be even moved around the country virtually at will. So we designated some States as not having to do it. Web sites could be set up in that State for people to sell through from anywhere.

So the taxes need to be collected. It needs to be fair, and right now it is not only fundamentally unfair to Main Street retailers, but it is costing States and localities billions in lost revenue. The Supreme Court invited Congress to address this issue, and we stalled. We know that early on the Internet was new, but now everything is done on the Internet. So now is the time for Congress to act.

Many Americans don't realize that when they buy something online or order something from the catalog of a business outside their own State, they still owe the sales tax. I know from being a legislator that was part of what we put in place. There is a form in Wyoming that you can fill out and pay your tax. It is pretty hard to keep track of, particularly on smaller items, but it ought to be easier on big items. And I do know there are about three people who comply with that.

For over a decade Congress has been debating how to best allow States to collect sales tax from the online retailers in a way that puts Main Street businesses on a level playing field with the online retailers. So on February 14, 2013, the bicameral—House and Senate—and bipartisan—Republicans and Democrats—put together the Marketplace Fairness Act that was introduced to close that 20-year loophole that distorts the American marketplace by picking winners and losers, by subsidizing some businesses at the expense of other businesses and subsidizing some taxpayers at the expense of other taxpayers. All businesses in retail sales and all consumers and their purchases should be treated equally.

The bill also empowers States to make the decision themselves. This is not Congress saying what has to be done or whether they collect them. If they choose to collect already existing sales taxes on all online purchases regardless of whether the sale was online or in-store, States will be able to if this bill passes. If they want to keep things the way they are, that is the State's choice. That is why this bill is the States rights bill.

The Marketplace Fairness Act does not tax Internet use, it does not tax Internet services, and it does not raise taxes. It gives States the right to collect what is owed by the purchasing individuals. Some argue that the bill is a disguise to create taxes. It is not. Consumers are already supposed to pay taxes and use taxes in most States for purchases made over the phone, by mail, or by way of the Internet.

Mr. President, in a couple of minutes we are going to have a moment of silence for the tragic events that happened. I yield the floor for the time to be able to do that.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for a moment of silence and that the Senator from Wyoming then be again recognized.

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

MOMENT OF SILENCE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a moment of silence to honor the victims of the bombings in Boston, MA.

(Moment of silence.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I wish to thank the leader for that moment of silence. I hope everybody in America will keep the people of Boston—particularly those who were injured or lost family members and those who saw the pain and the tragedy—in their prayers. I hope we would keep all the people across America who witnessed that on television or saw the replays of it on television in our prayers, and I hope the recovery will bring Americans together, as happened on 9/11.

MARKETPLACE FAIRNESS ACT

Mr. ENZI. To return to the discussion on marketplace fairness, I mentioned that most consumers are aware they are supposed to pay the tax on purchases that the retailer does not choose to collect at the time of the purchase, so I would like to provide some highlights of what the Marketplace Fairness Act actually accomplishes.

The bill gives the States the right to decide to collect or not collect taxes that are already owed. The legislation would simplify and streamline the country's more than 9,000 diverse State tax jurisdictions and provide 2 options by which States could begin collecting sales taxes from online and catalog purchases.

The bill also carves out small businesses so that they won't be adversely affected by the new law by exempting businesses with less than $1 million in online or out-of-State sales from the collection requirements until they have had a year in which they have had more than $1 million worth of sales. This small business exemption will protect small merchants and give new businesses time to get started. As has been mentioned, when they meet that level, then they have to be provided with a program that will do the calculations for them, provide for submitting the revenues, and also hold them harmless for any errors there might be in the program.

So don't let the critics get away with saying this type of simplification can't be done. The different tax rates and jurisdictions are no problem for today's software programs. When you order something online, you have to put in your ZIP Code. The ZIP Code will tell what the tax is from whatever jurisdiction.

As a former mayor and State legislator, I strongly favor allowing States the authority to require sales and use tax collection from retailers on all sales for each State that chooses to do so. We need to implement a plan that will allow States to collect revenue using mechanisms already approved by their local leaders. We need to allow States the ability to collect the sales taxes they already require.

If enacted, it would provide approximately $23 billion in fiscal relief for States for which Congress does not have to find an offset. This will give States less of an excuse to come knocking at the Federal door for handouts and will reduce the problem of federally attached strings.

A lot of people don't realize that the Federal Government is out of money, and that is shown by what was done through the sequester because the Federal Government usually pays property tax to States and localities that have Federal property. That amount has never been equal to what other people would be paying in their property taxes, but it has been a show of good faith that they recognize that with the government there, there is a loss of revenue and that the Federal Government should do something. So there is a tax level they have been paying. It hasn't gone up much and it hasn't gone down much until this year. Then, as part of the sequester, they decided they would hold 5.3 percent from all the States and all the local governments. That is called payment in lieu of taxes, and that is one way the States and the counties have lost money and a way they are going to have to make up for it if that continues. But there is also the possibility that the revenue they take in from this can reduce something like property taxes.

For many years I have worked with all the interested parties to find a mutually agreeable legislative package to introduce and ultimately enact into public law. This year Senators DURBIN, ALEXANDER, HEITKAMP, and I worked together with 25 of our bipartisan Senate colleagues to produce a bill that assists sellers and State and local governments to simplify taxes and use collection and administration. We are working with our House supporters—Representatives STEVE WOMACK, JACKIE SPEIER, PETER WELCH, and JOHN CONYERS—and have found common ground on this important issue to move forward with a bipartisan, bicameral bill in this Congress. I wish to publicly commend all of my Senate and House colleagues in taking a leadership role and working on this important issue.

The Marketplace Fairness Act is about States rights, and it is about fairness on the budget bill. We had a vote on this, and I was very pleased that 75 of the 100 Senators voted in favor of making the marketplace fair. So I strongly encourage my colleagues to vote for the motion to proceed on S. 743, the Marketplace Fairness Act, tonight at 5:30 when we have that vote. I

am hoping we will be able to duplicate what we did before and support the goals of States rights and a level playing field for all businesses.

I yield the floor, and 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. ROCKEFELLER. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, we have an important opportunity this week, or before, to help small and local businesses all across our country. We have an opportunity to help the kinds of local businesses that make our small towns and rural States so warm and inviting. These businesses attract tourists because of the nature of their smallness.

Everything is not big. Everything that is big is not necessarily friendly. Small businesses are almost always friendly. Today these same small and local businesses are competing on a very unfair playing field. This is an issue I have cared about ever since the Internet was created. I felt strongly about it then and I feel strongly about it now—except even more so.

For over 20 years States have been unable to enforce their own sales tax laws on sales by out-of-State catalog and online sellers due to something I am familiar with only because of the specificity of the issue to the 1992 Supreme Court decision Quill Corp. v. North Dakota.

Sales tax is not collected for most Internet transactions, so consumers know they can benefit from a 5- to 10-percent discount online, and they know that before they go into a store. In fact, something that is even more discouraging—because I have made a point of watching it—also takes place, and that is what cell phones can do for shoppers. I have seen shoppers in various small shops, such as craft shops, tool shops, and other various kinds of Main Street shops, come in and look at the merchandise. They pick over the merchandise, compare it, decide what they like, and take a picture of it. While still in that small store, they go online and buy it, thus avoiding having to pay a sales tax. They never have to leave the store—or they can. They can just look at their cell phone when they get home and then buy it if they want to.

This strikes me as profoundly unfair, so profoundly unfair that it is one of the easiest issues I think I have ever dealt with since I came to the Senate some time ago. It is profoundly unfair to traditional shops and small businesses to end up serving as the display case for consumers who see the product in person but buy it online to avoid paying sales tax—or maybe they aren't doing it deliberately to avoid paying sales tax. If they are well versed in the ways of life, they can do that because they know they will get a nice little discount. On the other hand, it is just a habit because States don't have the money—particularly small States such as mine—they don't have the money to possibly collect that or go after that.

I feel very strongly about sales taxes. For the most part sales taxes are used, about 70 percent of them are used in my State for boards of education, public education. I think that is probably true in most States. But, frankly, I just don't know. It is true in my State, so I care about it. My State, because of what I have just described—simply buying online and not having to pay a sales tax or anything—my State lost about $103 million last year alone. That is a pretty big chunk of our budget. That sounds silly to California. On the other hand, California loses about $4 trillion-plus because of this, and this simple bill would correct that situation and allow them to be able to have the software to do all this.

In West Virginia we are fighting to keep our small towns vibrant, and I think the good Presiding Officer understands what I mean by that. His State has a couple of big cities, but it has a lot of small towns. My daughter lives in one. Those small towns are the heart and soul—towns such as Newtown are the heart and soul of America, with good people, honest people, doing honest commerce.

We need local retailers to keep our small towns vibrant. I believe we can have both a vibrant Main Street economy and e-commerce businesses together, but we have to have them both. Let's be honest. Allowing States to collect sales tax for online purchases is not going to stop the growth of e-commerce.

My Commerce Committee held a hearing on this issue a couple of years ago, and we had a bunch of folks who made all kinds of claims, but then a lot more folks who said this isn't fair. It is not a fair way to do business.

Today's technology, with the tremendous advances made in recent years, makes tax collection simple, makes it cheap, makes it reliable. In many ways, the Internet is the perfect environment to collect sales taxes because it can be automated.

If Congress does nothing, we will end up with States forced to raise income or property taxes to offset the growing loss of sales tax revenue. That doesn't seem right or fair to me, and I feel strongly about it.

I know the Congress has worked on this issue for a long time. I recall Senator ENZI's original bill on this issue was referred to the Commerce Committee. Senators ENZI, DURBIN, and ALEXANDER are, from my point of view, to be enormously commended for their commitment on this issue, keeping up the good fight. I have always thought it was the right idea, and I cosponsored the very first bill just as I am cosponsoring this current bill.

When Senator ENZI first introduced this bill, it was not a popular idea. Over time more people have come to understand that this is an issue of basic fairness—really just that word, ''fairness''—to make it possible to allow people to compete on a correct basis, and it is terribly critical to our States' fiscal health. So that is why I stand here excited to see a growing bipartisan consensus in this Chamber to pass the Marketplace Fairness Act. I commend its authors. By a vote of 75 to 24, the Senate recently supported the inclusion of this bill in the budget resolution. I hope we can finish the bill soon and level the playing field once and for all.

I wish to close by saying this bill is ultimately about fairness. It would allow small and local businesses—the kind that dot every town all across the United States—a chance to play on a level playing field and, in fact, in some cases a chance to operate, to be in business. By passing this bill in the next several days, we can restore fairness to small and local businesses.

I thank the Presiding Officer. I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

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

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

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I am here on the floor today just to say a few words to follow the distinguished chairman of the Commerce Committee in support of the Marketplace Fairness Act.

I represent Rhode Island and I have to say my Governor, a former member of this body, Lincoln Chafee; the president of our State senate, Senator Teresa Paiva; our speaker of the house, Gordon Fox, and numerous other Rhode Island organizations have ardently urged us to pass this legislation. The reason for that is twofold. No. 1, they are losing immense amounts of tax revenue that is swirling down this loophole of noncollection. Actually, the number I think is $23 billion for 2012. Rhode Island is not the biggest State, so we don't have a huge chunk of it, but it is about $70 million for Rhode Island, which is pretty significant. So it is important to all of us, while the States are struggling, to make sure tax revenue that is due and just not being collected is put into the revenue equation.

The second thing is that it really just plain is not fair to the local businesses that have shops on Main Street, that have shops in the local shopping malls, to have competition with electronic delivery companies, with companies that exist on the Internet and with Internet shopping, that are subsidized, in effect, by the government.

Very often my colleagues come to the floor to say government should not

pick winners and losers. Government should not pick winners and losers—how many times have we heard that? If I had a nickel for every time somebody on the other side of the house said government should not pick winners and losers, I would probably be a wealthy man. But ''government should not pick winners and losers'' is a principle that really applies in this area because those companies that are operating a brick-and-mortar storefront are paying their taxes—they are paying their taxes—and the noncollection on the Internet sales puts them at an unfair disadvantage.

There are conveniences to Internet sales. Nobody wants to get rid of that. It is an important, growing part of our economy. I am all for that. In fact, I think I have family members who shop that way, including a daughter who is one of the more ardent eBay shoppers in the country, I suspect. But in any event, it is very important that we not add to the natural advantages Internet shopping has by creating this additional, manufactured tax advantage.

It comes down to a point that I think you could appreciate if you can put yourself in the shoes of a small business owner. Imagine that you own an electronic goods store and you sell televisions—imagine that you are a shoestore owner and you sell shoes for kids and adults—and somebody comes into your electronics store and they look at all the TVs, they call over your salesperson and they get the whole briefing on what is best and how you hook it up and all of the technical details about it, and they see exactly what they want. Then, when they have decided what they want, that is the moment when they should reach into their wallet and pull out their credit card and say: I will take that one. I will buy it. Instead, they reach into their pocket and they pull out a notepad and they write down the details of the television they were looking at, and they say thank you very much to the store owner, and they walk out and they buy it off the Internet.

The brick-and-mortar store has put all the expense into having the overhead, into having the television there, and into having the expert salespeople there, and a consumer takes advantage of that but then does not buy it, goes outside. That may still happen, but it will happen less if we can take out the unfair disadvantage that brick-and-mortar store owner has and put that back into balance.

I have had a shoestore owner say the same thing. A parent comes in, sits the kids down, and has the sales clerk bring out boxes of shoes. They try them all on, see which ones the kids like, see which ones fit best. Then, when they are all done and they are ready to make their purchase, again, out with the notepad. They write down the brand of the shoe, the size of the shoe, and then walk out of the store, and there is the sales clerk left to box up the shoes, wrap them back up in the paper, take them back in the back again, and they took all that effort and all that expense and they never made the sale.

Again, there are advantages to shopping on the Internet, and there are probably times when that kind of behavior by consumers will continue. But why add the subsidy of uncollected taxes to the advantages the Internet shopper has? Our local stores, our local small businesses need to have this set right and set into balance.

There has been a concern raised that the Marketplace Fairness Act would create all this immense bureaucracy and it would be so difficult to do this. That is really not true. The computer and billing systems that exist right now make this a virtually seamless transaction, and States are obliged before they can do it to come into compliance with the Streamlined Sales and Use Tax Agreement, which is a compact among States, developed by them, that has coordinated the different State tax laws so that this process can be easy and streamlined.

So I think this is a good moment coming for us after a very lousy week last week. We have the chance to get together on a bill that in the budget process I think gathered 70 votes—maybe more than 70 votes. I do not remember the exact count, but it was a very strong majority in this body. It was a completely bipartisan vote, with proponents and opponents on either side.

But I think that in the interest of fairness, in the interest of economic efficiency, in the interest of not picking winners and losers, and in the interest of helping to move our economy forward and protecting our stores that are on our Main Streets and in our shopping centers and shopping malls, this is a good thing to do. So I hope we will come together and pass this bill and show that we can act productively and in a bipartisan fashion and that we will do so this week.

I thank the Presiding Officer and again thank the chairman of the Commerce Committee for his leadership and enthusiasm.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COONS. I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 20 minutes.

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

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, today is Earth Day, so I wanted to come to the floor and reflect on some of the changes our Earth is experiencing and to talk at some length about how those changes are affecting my home State of Delaware and how the Delaware community is studying, planning, and preparing to deal with these important changes.

The recent National Climate Assessment has said that the last decade in the United States was the hottest on record, and that the last year was the hottest year ever recorded through the U.S. Government. We are waking up to fewer mornings with frost on our windshields, to less snow cover, to warmer oceans and freshwater sources, to more frequent and intense storms, to heat waves, to floods and droughts.

These many changes are affecting human health, agriculture, transportation, our water supply, our ecosystem, wildlife, and many other aspects of our daily lives and our American heritage. On top of all of this, we are seeing higher water levels in our oceans and estuaries, including in and around my home State of Delaware.

Sea level rises essentially for two different reasons. First, as the planet's ice sheets are melting, they are adding to the amount of water in the ocean. But second, saltwater actually expands as it warms. So as the planet's average temperature rises, so does the level of its saltwater seas.

The fact that Earth's oceans are rising each year is not new information. It has been rising for as long as we have been keeping track. What is jarring, though, is that the rate of rise is increasing steadily and significantly.

When the data was tracked between 1870 and 1930, sea level was rising at a rate of just under 4 inches per hundred years. Over the next 60 years, the sea level rose at a doubled rate of 8 inches per hundred years. And then just over the last 20 years, sea level has been rising at a rate of more than 12 inches per hundred years.

The water is rising. For those of us from coastal States, in particular for those in Delaware, it is rising fast. At just 60 feet, Delaware actually has the lowest mean elevation of any State in the United States, already making it more susceptible to sea level rise. But here is the thing. We also have another challenge in that the land itself is also sinking. There is a documented vertical movement of the Earth's crust underneath the MidAtlantic coast referred to as subsidence. It has been happening in Delaware since the last ice age, at a pace of roughly 2 millimeters every year. I know 2 millimeters does not sound like much, but it adds up to another 4 inches per century.

In total, that means you have got, between the water rising and the land sinking, making climate change and sea level rise specifically a very real issue for my State and for many other coastal States. An array of scientists of many different disciplines and backgrounds has studied this in and outside

of the U.S. Government. They have developed three models for future scenarios.

In the most conservative model, by the year 2100, the sea level in Delaware will rise above half a meter or about a foot and a half. In another middle range model, the water in Delaware will rise by a full meter. In the most troubling model, it will rise 1.5 meters or about 5 feet between now and the end of this century. Unfortunately, at present, the scientific consensus, their shared estimate, is this is the most likely model.

Well, let's try to make that real, as we have in Delaware through a whole series of planning exercises to engage our coastal communities. Here is what these different projections look like in Bowers Beach, DE. It only takes half a meter of sea level rise, shown here, before much of this community close to Dover Air Force Base in Kent County, DE, is underwater a half a meter, the most conservative scenario. By the end of the century, the majority of this community is underwater. At a meter and a half—the most likely scenario in current estimates—the town is virtually gone.

Here is another chart which we shared with our communities in Delaware of sea level rise. It is a look at South Wilmington. The city of Wilmington, where I live, is very close to the Delaware River. It has a whole lot of low-lying areas, this part of the largest city in our State.

As water rises in the Atlantic, it also rises up the Delaware Bay and the Delaware River and the Christina River which runs through most of New Castle County and through this part of Wilmington. The water rises through the Peterson Wildlife Refuge as well. The impacts are devastating.

We are talking about water every day more than half a foot higher than Delaware experienced during Superstorm Sandy. You can see from the conservative to the moderate to the most likely scenario, it floods, it impacts, and it eliminates, wipes out, puts underwater most of South Wilmington.

The calculation of whether we are going to be hit with half a meter, a full meter or a meter and a half of sea level rise comes down to a question of the rate of acceleration of climate change globally. It is also implicated in the question of whether we should be trying to slow the rate at which climate change is affecting our planet and maybe even have some hope of turning the tide. This is the part of climate change policy known as mitigation. Priority one in this strategy is reducing, cutting the emissions we are pumping into our atmosphere that are driving this change. To do it, we need to diversify our energy sources, reduce our dependence on fossil fuels. Clean energy technology, energy efficiency programs, public transportation, recycling, and many others could help cut down on these emissions. But it will require a global and coordinated effort to avoid or minimize these projected devastating local impacts.

The second part of climate change policy is adaptation. It is based on accepting the reality our climate is changing and that it will have real effects on our planet and our communities. The truth is, even if we stopped all greenhouse gas emissions today, if we shut down our current powerplants, stopped driving our current automobiles, stopped drilling, using gas-powered equipment on our farms or trains or ships, the amount of greenhouse gases already in the atmosphere would still take decades to dissipate.

Changes in the world's climate are at this point inevitable. It is already happening and affecting our communities. We can expect these impacts to intensify and accelerate as the climate continues to change. In my view, we need to accept these facts and modify our behavior to prevent these effects from becoming cumulatively catastrophic. We can make better choices now to prevent a disaster later.

In Delaware, for example, we have had two laws on the books for decades that helped us to adapt. The first law, championed in 1971 by then-Republican Governor Russ Peterson, was called the Coastal Zone Act and prohibited future industrial development on a vital swath of coastal land, allowing the State and Federal Government to preserve it and to reduce the impacts of flooding and coastal erosion on these vital wetland areas.

The second law empowered our State to protect and replenish the State's beaches, including beaches on the Delaware Bay which are so often overlooked. This has allowed the State to build a series of berm-and-dune systems that protect infrastructure and prevent private property from being washed away. Instead of running away from the science, Delaware's leaders have embraced it. The State agency that manages environmental issues for Delaware is known as DNREC. Under Secretary Collin O'Mara's able leadership, it has taken the lead on a governmentwide project to assess our State's vulnerability to sea level rise and to recommend actions for adaptation.

In fact, Delaware's Sea Level Rise Advisory Committee, whose report I have here, spent 18 months looking at 79 different Statewide resources, vital entities: roads and bridges, fire stations, schools, tourist hotspots, wetlands, and, of course, our people, their homes, their businesses, and layered them on various maps as I have shown, which demonstrated how far the water would reach at different projected sea levels.

If sea level gets to 1.5 meters, we lose more than 10 percent of our State, the water claims 20,000 residential properties, and significant percentages of the State parks and wetlands, farms, highways, industrial sites, rail lines. In Delaware we could lose 21 miles of rail lines to flooding, effectively shutting down Amtrak's Northeast corridor. The vital Port of Wilmington would be rendered useless in its current footprint. Nearly all the State's acreage of protected wetlands would be inundated, destroyed. Nearly three-quarters of the State's dams, dikes, and levies that we use to hold back the bay would be flooded. It would be simply devastating to our State.

So to those who say: Oh, a few feet of water rising over a century is a modest amount, something we can plan for, something we do not need to be alarmed about, I think this detailed and thorough study demonstrates the devastating consequences to my home State, a State that would lose 11 percent of its territory in the worst-case scenario.

Our own Secretary of Natural Resources Collin O'Mara said:

> We are looking at big risks for human health and safety, and not just at the Delaware Bay beaches. We have big concerns about south Wilmington, Delaware City and New Castle. It's more complex than just the bay beaches or a community here or there.

I believe he is right. So once again, if we remember, we have two basic approaches—adaptation and mitigation. Once Delaware compiled its 200-page vulnerability assessment on sea level rise, the committee got to work on an adaptation strategy to protect our State. They came up with more than 60 options and released them publicly, hosting a whole series of townhall meetings to solicit public opinion before the State decides which strategy to implement.

The committee is also now working on a broader vulnerability assessment to examine the full range of impacts from climate change—even beyond sea level rise—changing temperatures, extreme weather, and changes in precipitation. These are impacts which will affect even more of our neighbors.

Climate change will affect the distribution, abundance and behavior of wildlife, as well as the diversity, structure, and function of our complex ecosystems. We are already seeing changes in natural patterns. Many commercial and recreational fish stocks along the east coast have moved northward 25 to 200 miles over the last 40 years as ocean temperatures have steadily but modestly increased, deeply impacting our fishing industries and our fishing-reliant communities.

Scientists expect migratory species to be strongly affected by climate change since animal migration is closely connected to climatic factors, and migratory species use multiple habitats and resources during their migrations. These changes are impacting the multibillion-dollar waterfowl hunting industry vital to my State. It is an important economic driver to Delaware and a vital part of our heritage.

According to the draft National Climate Assessment released in February, our farmers are expected to adapt relatively well to the changing climate over the next 25 years. However, later, as temperatures increase and precipitation extremes become more intense,

crop yields and production of livestock and poultry are expected to decline. More extreme weather events, including droughts and heavy downpours, will further reduce yields, damage soil, stress irrigation water supplies, and increase production costs.

I am proud of my State. I am proud Delaware was the first State to assess its vulnerability and the vulnerability of specific resources in as comprehensive a way as it has. We are determined to confront these changes to our planet head on, protect our own communities, and to protect the way of life we have built. It is an approach which many other States should replicate.

The private sector has a vital role to play, and they are not waiting around for action in this Chamber by the Federal Government. We are already seeing a lot of our companies taking steps on their own to be more sustainable. I see this all the time at home when I visit companies in Delaware, such as Phillips, Kraft, DuPont, Perdue, and Mountaire. This Chamber may still be debating climate change, whether it is real, and what if anything we should do. These companies in communities in our State are reducing their water use, reducing power consumption, slimming their footprint, and finding ways to be energy efficient. They are doing this not only because it is good for the planet, but because it is good for the bottom line. They have learned in measurable ways that reducing their operating costs is good for business and good for the planet.

Frankly, there is only so much the Federal Government can do as far as adapting to climate change. It still plays a very important role, which States and the private sector alone cannot. The Federal Government can ensure States have accurate data on climate trends over the long term on which to base its assessments and calculations; invest in tidal gauges that the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, or NOAA, maintains off all of our coasts, which are critical to monitoring sea level rise; and support the satellites overhead which track changing weather patterns.

The Federal Government facilitates technology transfer and information sharing provides technical assistance and guidance to States and regions such as ours and initiates collaboration and coordination among partners, which is essential. From the U.S. Global Change Research Program, the Interagency Climate Change Adaptation Task Force, to the CDC's grant program to help State and local health departments assess risks the Federal Government is doing a lot. Given the scope and the dire consequences, we need to do more.

This President and this administration understand, but what role can and should Congress play? In my view we need to also lead in the area of mitigation, to support the executive branch as they continue to help States with adaptation. We need to invest wisely in our efforts to combat and prepare for climate change.

I have been a member of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee for more than 2 years. We have seen some ambitious plans to do our part in mitigation, many of which I have supported. One proposal was from Senator Bingaman, former chair of the Energy Committee in the last Congress, to adopt a clean energy standard.

It would have set a national goal for clean energy usage and establish a transparent framework that lets resources compete based on how clean they are, and then move out of the way and let the market and American ingenuity determine the best path forward. Sadly, this plan failed to attract any bipartisan support and did not make it out of committee.

Although I am an idealist, I am also a pragmatist. I can read the politics of this Chamber. They are deeply divided on this issue at a time when we need to be coming together. Fortunately, there is bipartisan support for some steps to improve our Nation's energy efficiency. We could take up and pass the bipartisan bill recently introduced by Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN to increase the use of energy-efficient technologies in residential, commercial, and industrial sectors.

We could level the playing field for financing to help new clean energy technologies get off the ground by giving them access to the same tax advantages currently utilized only by fossil fuel projects. The bipartisan Master Limited Partnerships Parity Act—which I will reintroduce later this week with a bipartisan group of my colleagues, Senators MORAN, STABENOW, and MURKOWSKI—would level the playing field for renewables and give these new technologies a fighting chance in the emerging energy market.

As we take these sorts of steps and others, we must also be mindful of the need to reduce our Nation's dangerous deficits. We also need to ensure we are not taking away the tools we desperately need to prepare for these changes to our planet. This means sustained support for scientific research and protecting the programs which are channeling this vital data to our States.

The bottom line in my view is the climate has already changed. We know this. With this knowledge comes the responsibility to reduce our emissions in order to mitigate the impacts and to prepare for and take action with regard to these coming changes.

Climate change is happening. It is happening right now. While it may have local impacts, it has global causes. We ignore these at our peril. I believe we have a responsibility: a responsibility to God's creation, a responsibility to each other, a responsibility to our home States, and to future generations. We need to do our very best to slow this process, to help this planet, our only home, to survive.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for up to 20 minutes.

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

MARKETPLACE FAIRNESS ACT

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, the Senate is on course to consider profoundly misguided legislation. This proposal is known as the Marketplace Fairness Act, but it is anything but fair. The Marketplace Fairness Act is unprecedented in its reach to discriminate against the Internet, employers, and States with modest or no sales taxes.

As the Internet economy has evolved through innovation, and as it expanded because of the value the innovation enabled, traditional brick-and-mortar businesses are seeking to compete through legislation. Big retailers, effectively seeking a legislative bailout, have allied themselves with State governments that see the Marketplace Fairness Act as an opportunity to obtain new tax revenue without enduring the political consequence of enforcing their own tax laws in their own jurisdictions. It is always easier to put the burden of collecting taxes on the people who can't vote for you; isn't that right, Mr. President?

The Marketplace Fairness Act is going to hobble the Internet economy and constrain online commerce. It is, in my view, a recipe for economic stagnation. It would rein in the Internet economy which has helped lead our economy out of the recession that began in 2008. What this proposal does is give each State the ability to require online businesses outside their States to enforce their tax laws. It enables the State of Indiana or the State of South Dakota to require online businesses located in New Hampshire to collect sales taxes on their behalf. Let me repeat that. The Marketplace Fairness Act could require the businesses of New Hampshire, a State that has determined not to have a sales tax, to collect sales taxes for goods or services provided to consumers in Indiana or South Dakota and then send money to those States.

This proposal, in effect, unleashes all the Nation's tax collectors on small Internet businesses—Internet entrepreneurs who have neither the ability to enforce the terms of the Marketplace Fairness Act nor the political influence in this city to be able to shape

the legislation. The Marketplace Fairness Act takes the Internet down a dangerous path because its passage would endorse the notion that Internet entities should be required to enforce laws outside their home jurisdiction.

Foreign countries have long pressed the notion the Internet should be ceded to their control. Let me repeat that. This has been an objective of a whole number of our global competitors over the years—trying to, in effect, get control over the Internet. There is no difference in New York telling Oregon Internet firms to enforce New York laws than China telling American firms to enforce China's censorship practice. As it is already, many countries are seeking to actually put the United Nations in charge as the Internet's regulator-in-chief, and this bill, to a great extent, endorses that world view.

Today the Senate is being asked to consider schemes to allow States and localities to essentially nationalize their taxes, but tomorrow the Senate may be asked to consider similar schemes to enforce laws and regulations about content, for example, and other issues that are so important to the powerful and the well connected.

The precedent the Marketplace Fairness Act establishes takes the Internet, the American economy, and our society down a dark path. It is a path toward a future where governments can impose their values and their regulatory regimes on Internet businesses anywhere. It is a future in which the sovereignty of the country and the sovereignty of our States is significantly eroded.

Beyond these issues, the proponents of the legislation are spawning myths about the bill that aren't true. One myth is the Marketplace Fairness Act levels the playing field. They are going to argue the Marketplace Fairness Act levels the playing field between brick-and-mortar firms and Internet companies for purposes of collecting and remitting sales taxes. But the facts are the facts, and they indicate otherwise.

Furthermore, even if Best Buy knows the consumer resides in Washington, DC, because Best Buy provides the consumer with a credit card or a rewards card that is associated with a Washington, DC, address, Best Buy is still allowed to assume the television purchased will be consumed in Virginia. The Marketplace Fairness Act, in my view, is a targeted strike against the Internet and a targeted strike against the digital economy.

Another myth being put forward is the myth the MFA isn't about new taxes; that the proposal is about enforcing taxes already owed. The fact is the taxes that would be collected as a result of the Marketplace Fairness Act's passage have generally not been collected. So these are going to be regarded as new taxes. This is money that is going to come out of the pockets of American families that has not come out of their pockets before.

Collecting sales and use taxes for goods or services acquired in another State has long been a low priority for State and local governments. Because these taxes go uncollected and unenforced, the establishment of an unprecedented regime to collect them for the first time is going to require American consumers to pay more sales taxes and pay more use taxes.

Furthermore, the creation of this new trans-State enforcement scheme creates significant new incentives for States to establish new sales taxes and new use taxes and also to increase the tax rates that exist now for these particular items.

Ultimately, the Marketplace Fairness Act is going to require consumers to pay an additional $22 billion in sales taxes they have never had to pay before. In fact, unless the United States pursues the types of international arrangements that govern the Internet economy—the types of arrangements sought by China and a host of other States—foreign Internet retailers will only continue to have the competitive advantage the Marketplace Fairness Act would artificially provide them. That is not what the American economy needs. That is not what is going to promote online innovation and value.

I hope my colleagues will oppose this Marketplace Fairness Act. It is premature. It is, more than anything else, coercive. It is coercive.

We are going to hear about how simple this is. Back when we started writing the first bills about technology and the Internet, we said the key principle is do no harm. This is going to do harm. Just this past weekend, I was in southern Oregon, where we have many small retailers. We have one in Grants Pass, OR—Fire Mountain Gems. It is an exciting new business online, but it is up against very tough international competition. What I fear is that unless there is a thoughtful effort along the lines of what Chairman BAUCUS has tried to do in the Finance Committee to think this through, this bill, in a global economy, will give foreign retailers a significant leg up.

We will have people on the northern border of the United States or the southern border of the United States who will say: I want to do business in the United States. I am a patriotic American, but there are more than 8,000 taxing jurisdictions in America. If we force our businesses, our online retailers, such as the one I represent in southern Oregon, to spend their time and their money trying to comply with scores and scores of tax regimes that are thousands of miles away, it is going to be very tough for them to compete with foreign retailers.

This violates the basic principle we began decades ago with respect to technology; that is, do no harm. Do no harm to the cause of innovation, ensure we have fairness—bricks and clicks together—which is the future of the American economy.

This bill violates that basic principle of technology policy. It will do harm.

I urge my colleagues to oppose it and its premature consideration by the full Senate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise today to urge the Senate not to move forward on the Marketplace Fairness Act.

This bill forces small businesses across the country to spend time and resources they should be using to create jobs, jumping through new bureaucratic hoops. In Montana it forces our small businesses to play tax collector for other States, with absolutely no benefit to them. Instead of slapping more redtape on our small businesses, we need to be supporting their work to create jobs and get our economy going.

Let me be very clear. This bill is bad for business and bad for jobs. This bill is not ready for debate on the Senate floor. It has not been completely thought through and is full of unintended consequences that could seriously harm America's small businesses.

Supporters of the Marketplace Fairness Act claim this bill would level the playing field between Main Street businesses and out-of-State businesses by forcing both to collect sales taxes from customers. The bill's sponsors claim this is fair. The reality, however, is this legislation is anything but fair to America's small businesses. This legislation doesn't help businesses expand and grow and hire more employees. Instead, it forces small businesses to hire expensive lawyers and accountants to deal with the burdensome paperwork and added complexity of tax rules and filings across multiple States.

This is a big-box bill. This is not a downtown bill. Our vanishing downtowns are in crisis. We must find ways to revitalize Main Streets across America by supporting our small retailers. In doing so, we foster economic growth and job creation in our communities.

Let me read just one of the hundreds of letters I have received from small business owners in Montana and across America who are opposed to this legislation:

> Dear Senator Baucus, at a time when the economy is just recovering, the pending Internet sales tax legislation will cost small business jobs, reduce consumer demand, [and] reduce e-commerce innovation.
>
> As you know, TicketPrinting.com is the largest private employer in Wheatland County. . . . We expect this legislation to cost 13–20 jobs in one of the poorest counties in the United States, where a job means everything. Rather than rewarding the thousands of small businesses for their innovation and our hard work, Congress will be taxing the job engine of the economy and reducing jobs across the nation.
>
> Sincerely, Lance Trebesch.

There are mom-and-pop businesses such as Mr. Trebesch's across the country asking for our help. Unfortunately, this bill does not provide that help. It will not solve the challenges facing Main Street. Instead, the Marketplace Fairness Act only creates new challenges that will put many of America's small businesses at a disadvantage.

This bill imposes additional burdens and compliance demands on businesses already weighed down by Federal and State tax systems that are too complex, too time consuming, and too costly to comply with.

I encourage my colleagues to look at this bill very closely. It requires America's businesses to track thousands of different tax codes in 7,500 different jurisdictions if they do online business out of State. It will force small businesses to hire expensive accountants and implement costly systems to deal with the complexity of collecting sales tax on purchases made in other States.

And who is policing all of this? The bill, as written, has no audit or enforcement protection. As a result, it opens small businesses to aggressive out-of-State tax collectors. States will be taxing businesses beyond their borders. This bill helps States target those businesses that are truly operating out of State and subjects them to the same broken, confusing State sales tax systems that are currently in place. Tell me, how does this grow our economy and how does this create jobs? The promise of simplification in the Marketplace Fairness Act is a ruse.

First of all, they provide no simplification to the businesses that already collect sales taxes in multiple jurisdictions. Those businesses are not even considered in this bill. They are left out.

Second, the bill offers no real simplification for the businesses that will now be required to collect sales taxes. It only adds complexity, with no resources for guidance.

This bill does not streamline the 7,500 different tax rates. It does not require the States to agree on definitions of taxable and exempted products. Think about that for a moment. Each State and many cities and municipalities have different definitions of what is taxable and what products are exempt. They are all different.

It does not establish standard requirements for electronic filing. Think of that for a moment, no standard requirements for electronic filing. It does not establish a central location for registration or filing. It does not offer uniform forms or paperwork. The list goes on and on. These are just a few of the problems this bill is going to create.

Even more concerning, this bill does not establish one audit system for all States. Rather, businesses will be exposed to audit by all 50 States. So any State can decide at any time it wants to audit a business beyond its borders.

This bill does not even establish any rules or procedures for dispute resolution. Got a problem with the tax collector in a State across the country? Good luck. You will have to work it out with that State's court system.

The bill's sponsors tell us not to worry. They say that computer software can calculate the sales taxes owed, collect the money due, and file the reports with the States by linking to the seller's Web site. Is offering a business the chance to pay someone else to calculate their taxes for them what passes for simplification? And those software providers cannot protect the business from exposure to audit, collection, and enforcement by 50 different States.

Still worried? Well, the bill's sponsors tell us they will exempt businesses that have $1 million or less in sales to other States where sales taxes are not being currently collected. Why this threshold?

Studies show that the burden of sales taxes on the very smallest is the highest. It costs approximately 13 percent of the tax collected for these small sellers to comply. As a result, they are not profitable tax collectors for the States. And what about the businesses with $1,000,001 in sales? Are they somehow a more efficient tax collector?

These are not just empty fears. Businesses call me, exasperated with current State law collection requirements. Last Friday I received a call from the director of a farmers cooperative. He explained that many States exempt farmers from sales tax on certain goods. But the laws vary greatly by State on what items qualify for exemptions. Businesses selling to farmers already spend a lot of time determining what qualifies for exemption and what does not. They spend even more time tracking exemption certificates.

The director then went on to explain:

> If the Marketplace Fairness Act becomes law, it appears that a regional agribusiness, which might occasionally make Internet sales to farmers in states outside of its territory, would have to invest just as much time and effort into studying and complying with the sales tax laws of far-flung states, as it does in the half dozen states where it has facilities.
>
> The burden of such compliance would clearly outweigh the benefits of occasional sales.

This legislation is ripe with unintended consequences. Let me give another example. A key loophole in this bill is that States get to decide what is and what is not taxable. A State could decide that stock trades are taxable goods or services. Then when that State's resident purchases shares through his broker, that Wall Street firm will be responsible for registering as a business for sales tax purposes, collecting the sales tax, and remitting the tax to the State. True, States have the authority to decide what is and isn't taxable—to date—even without this bill. But right now the only way to collect taxes on transactions with out-of-State businesses is through use taxes.

If States could now require out-of-State businesses to collect on their behalf, there is an incentive to expand the items that are taxable. This bill is going to make it very desirable for States to start taxing and collecting on all sorts of services—not just the financial world but also on services provided by attorneys, architects, engineers, and accountants. One can only imagine. By not asking the States to do anything to simplify their system in return for the benefit of having out-of-State business collect taxes for them, we are giving a carte blanche to States to impose even more taxes on businesses.

The act is also an abdication of the responsibility given to Congress under the Commerce Clause. We have the duty to recognize that the State sales tax systems are still too complicated and would burden interstate commerce if imposed on more businesses.

The Finance Committee is committed to tackling these issues to provide real relief to America's families and small businesses. We have held more than 30 hearings on tax reform—including one specifically dedicated to State tax issues, such as the Marketplace Fairness Act. I have affirmed repeatedly to Senators ENZI and DURBIN that the Finance Committee would work with them to mark up the bill in the next work period, and I stated that commitment a few moments ago personally to them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 10 minutes of his time.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 more minutes.

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

Mr. BAUCUS. Circumventing the committee process allowed this bill to come to the floor full of so many unanswered questions. Avoiding the committee process quashes any chance to improve this bill. Evading the committee process denies the chance to provide a fair playing field among businesses and reduce the heavy burden imposed by State compliance.

I know some may dismiss my concerns as coming from a non-sales-tax State. Granted, I am always proud to protect Montana businesses. But this is not a Montana-only issue, nor is it an issue just for States without sales taxes. Lance Trebesch of TicketPrinting.com and Main Street business owners across America show us that our interests are tied together. We need to stop burdening America's small businesses with more compliance costs and figure out ways to help them grow.

I urge Members to vote against cloture. Do not give small businesses in our States more regulations and more risks with more unintended consequences that have not been addressed. Do not set our Main Street businesses up to be audited by other States' tax collectors. Give the members of the Finance Committee the opportunity to make this bill work and make it fair. I urge a vote against this motion so we can do so.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after I finish speaking, my colleague from Tennessee, Senator ALEXANDER, be permitted to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Reserving the right to object, if the vote is at 5:30, could we allocate time so that each of us could have some time before 5:30? If the Senator would be willing to do that at this point, I would not object.

Ms. AYOTTE. Absolutely. In fact, as I understand it, Senator HATCH is going to be coming to the floor also to speak in opposition to it. I only have some brief comments, and I know Senator ALEXANDER will also. If we want to divide this up, I am fine with that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for her courtesy. I am perfectly agreeable, following her speech, to dividing it, if Senator DURBIN wishes to suggest an allocation of time.

Mr. DURBIN. As I understand what Ms. AYOTTE has said, there are four members who wish to speak. I don't want to be presumptuous, but if we each speak for 5 minutes, then that leaves 10 minutes for those who might arrive whom we are not aware of. So two Senators on the Republican side speak for 5 minutes, I will speak 5 minutes, and then Senator HATCH can speak for 5 minutes. Is that fair?

Ms. AYOTTE. That is fair. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for her courtesy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I rise to support the comments of my colleague from Montana on the so-called Marketplace Fairness Act, which is being brought up today on the floor. I previously said it should be renamed the Internet Tax Collection Act because it is going to make online businesses the tax collectors for the Nation. And as the Wall Street Journal pointed out in an editorial today called ''The Internet Sales Tax Rush,'' it actually puts the Internet businesses in a disadvantage to brick-and-mortar businesses in terms of making requirements on online businesses to collect taxes for transactions that the online businesses would not have to. And for a State such as mine, New Hampshire, where we do not have a sales tax, this is also particularly onerous and tramples on the decision that New Hampshire has made to not have a sales tax.

Most important, where we stand right now with the bill pending on the floor, so many times there is so much around here that happens that does not go through regular order. Yet we have been saying on both sides of the aisle how important it is that when we have a major piece of legislation—which certainly this is—that we must go through regular order.

We just heard the chairman of the Finance Committee saying that this is circumventing the committee process, that there has not been a markup of this legislation, and that there are many concerns being raised by online businesses across this country based on onerous requirements this legislation will put on them to become the tax collectors for States around the Nation.

Many business groups are raising important issues and urging this body to go through the regular process, including the Financial Services Roundtable and the Security Industry and Financial Markets Association.

Technet said:

> Imposing a new Internet sales tax regime is a tremendously complex issue that should be addressed through regular order starting in the Senate Finance Committee and done in a thorough and deliberative manner.

It seems to me that when you have an issue that will impact a growing and robust area of our economy; that is, online businesses that are selling to the Nation, where we have seen tremendous growth, we owe it to the American people to have this go through regular order.

I have heard the Senate leader talk about regular order. I have heard the minority leader, Senator MCCONNELL, talk about regular order. Here we are again not going through regular order. This should go to the Finance Committee. It should be thoroughly marked up in that committee.

I see Senator HATCH. Senator BAUCUS and Senator HATCH both believe this should go through the proper committee of jurisdiction so that we can address the concerns raised by so many about the bill and the way it is drafted.

With that, I urge my colleagues to vote against cloture. This is not the right way to do business. This bill, which has very important and negative implications for many businesses in this country and on a very important area of our economy, should go through regular order to address concerns that have already been raised by many business groups.

Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to vote against cloture today.

I will yield the floor. I know the Senator from Tennessee is coming up now, and I know that he too believes in regular order. I hope that he would, at least for this bill, despite his support for it, ask it go through regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Illinois for allowing me to have 5 minutes.

I do believe in having regular order. I have been looking for it for quite a while on this bill. But let me start with exactly what the point of this bill is. This bill is about two words. It is about States rights. I say that as a former Governor who cares a lot about States rights.

I see another former Governor sitting in the chair up there. What this bill does is it allows the Governor of Tennessee and the Legislature of Tennessee to decide whether to require out-of-State sellers in Tennessee to do the same thing we require of instate sellers in Tennessee. In other words, if the National Boot Company has to collect the State sales tax and send it to the State government when it sells a pair of boots, then an out-of-State catalog seller or an out-of-State online seller who sells boots in Tennessee has to do the same thing. It is that simple.

It is an 11-page bill. That is a rarity around here, an 11-page bill. It doesn't make any of these decisions for the States; it just says the States can make that decision for themselves. With all respect to ourselves, I trust the Governor of Tennessee and the legislators of Tennessee to make tax decisions a lot more than I trust Washington politicians to make them.

This has nothing to do with the Federal Tax Code. It has zero to do with it. It has about as much to do with the Federal Tax Code as the milk production bill. Actually, milk production has more to do with the Federal Tax Code. This is about what a State can decide for itself.

If somebody from Ohio or Illinois wants to sell in Tennessee, they need to play by the same rules everybody in Tennessee has to play by—which is all we are deciding, or at least the Governor and Legislature of Tennessee ought to be able to decide that.

It is going to be done fairly. We have an equal protection clause in the Constitution that says you cannot treat an out-of-State seller in a different way than you do an instate seller, but that is the first point. This is about States rights. It is about the 10th amendment. It is about our saying: Yes, Governor, yes, legislature, you don't have to play ''Mother, may I?'' to the Congress. Make your own decisions about taxes. If you decide you want to treat one set of businesses differently than others and one set of taxpayers differently than others, you have the right to be wrong. That is your business. But if you decide you want to collect taxes that are already owed—that are already owed; this is not a new tax, taxes that are already owed—from everybody who owes the tax so you can lower your tax rate for everybody, you are free to decide that.

That was the argument Art Laffer made in the Wall Street Journal last week. Art Laffer was President Reagan's favorite economist. That is the point he made. States have the right to be right. He said this: States have the right to be wrong. But if Tennessee or Idaho or any State can collect taxes from everybody who owes them, it can lower the tax rate for everybody.

That is why so many conservative leaders support this, Art Laffer, Al Cardenas, the chairman of the American Conservative Union, Gov. Mike Pence, Gov. Mitch Daniels—almost all the Republican Governors support this. But all we are deciding here in this 11-page bill is two words: Do we respect States' rights to decide their own tax policy? Do we respect States rights as the 10th amendment suggests we do?

As far as regular order, I wish the Finance Committee had reported a bill. This legislation was first introduced in some form in 2001. As the chairman of the Finance Committee said, he had a hearing on part of it last year. That was good. The Commerce Committee had a hearing on almost this identical 11-page bill last August. There have been repeated requests of the chairman of the Finance Committee to report the bill. He has not. That is what rule XIV is about.

The majority leader said: If the committee is not going to hold a hearing and report the bill after that amount of time, then let's put it on the floor, let's debate it, let's amendment it.

It has been thoroughly considered. It has been before this body and the American people for a good bit of time. The bill we were to move to today is exactly the bill that was introduced on February 14 of this year, this 11 pages—exactly the bill. It has been out there for everybody to see all that time.

I urge the 75 Senators who voted for this during the budget resolution to reaffirm their vote for States rights—at least vote tonight to move ahead, and let's debate it. Let's put it on the floor. If people have amendments or objections, let's bring them down here and let's debate them and vote on it. If we do not, as Senator HEITKAMP has said, who knows——

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. If I may use 30 more seconds?

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. Senator HEITKAMP has pointed out that if we do not act, it will be one big mess. Instead of having a handful of jurisdictions where a seller can simply—when you buy your ice cream over at Williams-Sonoma and put in your credit card and ZIP Code, automatically the tax is collected by the seller out of State and sent to the State. Instead of that, you will have thousands of jurisdictions to contend with. This simplifies the process.

This is States rights. This is an opportunity to debate a bill that has been around for more than a decade and that the country has been able to see for a couple of months.

I urge our colleagues on both sides to take the conservative point of view and vote yes and move forward.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Tennessee. If this is truly a bipartisan effort on both sides of the issue, Democrats and Republicans see it differently. The distinguishing feature of those who oppose this is that so far the leading opponents are from States with no sales tax—New Hampshire, Oregon, Montana. One other State in America does not have a sales tax—Delaware. They see it differently. They are supporting the bill.

Here is what it boils down to. If this bill passes as written, at the end of the day a resident of Montana still will not pay sales tax on any purchases they make in a store or on the Internet. Residents of Oregon will not pay a sales tax on any purchase they make in an Oregon store or over the Internet. The same holds true for New Hampshire. They are held harmless from the impact of this measure.

However, if an Internet retailer in any of those no-sales-tax States wants to sell in Maine or Illinois, the terms of doing business under here are that they will collect the sales tax that is owed in that State. It is that simple.

People have tried to make this more complicated. It is not. They have also suggested it is just going to be beyond anyone to calculate what the sales tax might be. That is just plain wrong. We are way beyond the quill pen and ledger days. We are now dealing with software easily available for a very small amount of money that can be given to any retailer to know exactly when Durbin of Bates Avenue in Springfield, IL, 62704, buys a product and what sales tax should be collected. And the bill provides that each State has to provide the retailer, free of charge, with the basic software so that they can use it to collect the appropriate sales tax.

They are trying to make this more complicated than it is. Thanks to computers and thanks to software, it is not that complex, and neither is the issue that is underlying this debate. The issue is this: How in the world can you expect the bricks-and-mortar businesses of America to compete with Internet competition when the bricks-and-mortar businesses have to collect sales tax and the Internet competitor does not? In my State, that is an 8-, 9-, or 10-percent advantage, and it is shifting more sales to the Internet and away from the local stores. I don't think that is fair.

We are asking for a level playing field. A level playing field says that if you want to sell to a consumer in Illinois directly over the counter or over the Internet, you collect the same sales tax. It is just that simple. If you don't want to, if your business in Montana or Oregon does not want to collect sales tax for sales in Illinois, it is simple: You don't sell in Illinois. It is their choice, their call. I think that is basic fairness.

Look at the groups that are supporting this. I could sit here for the rest of my time and read all the organizations supporting this—the obvious ones, the retailers across America, the men and women with the stores. The small businesses we venerate in speeches all the time on the floor of the Senate are begging us to do this so they have a fighting chance against Internet retailers. We are also getting a lot of support from Governors, from mayors, from labor unions. It is a diverse group—business and labor. They believe it not only is fair but it will raise revenue that is badly needed in a lot of these local units of government.

I might also say that when you take a look at the impact of the current situation, you can understand why this is long overdue. MIKE ENZI was on the floor earlier. He has been for 12 years trying to change this. People say: Regular order; we ought to take a little more time. You can understand that our patience is wearing thin—MIKE's more than mine. I have only been at this for a few years. But we reached this point. We had a vote on the budget resolution. We asked the Members of the Senate: What do you think about this issue?

Forty-nine from the Democratic side and 26 from the Republican side said: We favor going forward on this issue.

That is the vote we will have in a few minutes. We should go forward on this too. Those who have constructive, relevant, germane amendments, bring them to the floor. Let's have a conversation. Let's get this issue done this week. Let's make sure we meet the challenge we have been given.

I thank the Senator from Tennessee for making this as clear as I think any former Governor can make it. If you want to do business in Tennessee, play by Tennessee rules and obey Tennessee law. If you don't, it is just that simple and fair. In terms of imposing a new tax, this bill does not create one new tax.

First, there are no Federal taxes in here—none. Second, we don't even have the power to impose a new State sales tax, nor would we try. There are no new taxes. It is simply a question of compliance and collecting the taxes already owed in the 46 States that currently have sales-and-use taxes.

I urge my colleagues to come forward tonight at 5:30 and vote for cloture on the motion to proceed. Let us engage in this important debate. Let us not put this off another day, another week, or another month. Let's bring this to a conclusion in the Senate with a good, wholesome debate on a bipartisan basis. Germane, relevant, and constructive amendments that address these issues are welcome. Bring those amendments forward. Let's not burn up the hours of the day and the hours of the week in quorum calls. Let's get down to the business in the Senate we were meant to do.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

BOSTON TRAGEDY

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, before I begin, I want to take a moment to say my thoughts and prayers go out to the good people in Boston and other areas where they have had tremendously horrific events and attacks. I hope and pray that all those whose lives were impacted by these tragic events will have a swift and peaceful recovery.

I want to commend all of the law enforcement agencies involved in the investigation that brought the hunt for the perpetrators to a successful end.

MARKETPLACE FAIRNESS ACT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, over the last few months I have come to the floor several times to discuss the need for the Senate to return to regular order. If the last several years taught us anything, it is that efforts to force legislation through the Senate without full and fair consideration tend to yield unsatisfying results.

Complaints about the lack of bipartisanship have more or less become the norm around here, and we hear all the time about the desire for the so-called grand bargains. Bipartisan agreements don't just happen. I think we would all agree grand bargains cannot be made out of thin air.

Luckily the Senate already has a system in place for fostering these types of agreements. It is called regular order. Yet today the Senate will vote on cloture on the motion to proceed to the so-called Marketplace Fairness Act, and in doing so, the Senate will once again abandon regular order in favor of the whims of the Senate Democratic leadership. This is a bill that falls under the jurisdiction of the Senate Finance Committee, but the committee has not had a markup on the bill. Instead the Marketplace Fairness Act is just the latest in a long line of bills brought before the full Senate without due consideration in the committee of jurisdiction.

This has become far too common. I understand there are those who feel strongly about this legislation, and I admire them and respect the sponsors of the bill who worked hard to address what they see as a major problem with our Nation's tax policy.

However, that simply is not enough to justify yet another abdication of the committee process here in the Senate.

The Senate is organized into various committees of jurisdiction so Members are able to develop and utilize their own expertise on specific issues. When a piece of legislation goes through the committee process, it is thoroughly vetted and examined. This provides an opportunity to resolve technical issues and address various concerns before the bill is brought to the floor for a vote.

Regular order is not a process designed to protect the power of committee chairmen and ranking members. We have regular order and our committee structure so we have an organized way of ensuring our constituents are fully represented and to make sure the legislation we pass is technically sound. The legislation we will be voting on today is a perfect example of the importance of regular order.

The Marketplace Fairness Act is a bill that will have a significant impact on millions of consumers and businesses throughout the country, and clearly, this is no trifling matter.

Most reasonable people would agree that a bill of this magnitude would benefit from full and fair committee consideration, including a markup with an open debate and an opportunity to vote on amendments before it is brought to the floor. However, being reasonable doesn't appear to be part of the equation on the floor today.

I want to stress I am not fundamentally opposed to this legislation. My goal is not to stop it at all costs. Instead, I simply want to ensure it is fully vetted and examined. I know if all sides are able to look at this in a dispassionate way, we might find ways of bringing all sides together, and that is not going to happen the way it is being done now. Therefore, today's vote is, in my view at least, as much a vote on regular order as it is a vote on the underlying bill.

That said, I do have specific concerns about the legislation as it is currently drafted. To begin with, the Marketplace Fairness Act in its current form is a fairly short 11 pages long. This bill essentially provides two avenues for States to compel remote sellers or out-of-State businesses to collect and remit sales and use taxes. Under the bill, the State may either meet specified minimum requirements or be a member State under the Streamlined Sales and Use Tax Agreement, as long as the minimum requirements are met under the agreement.

The Streamlined Sales and Use Tax Agreement is a good deal more complicated than the Marketplace Fairness Act. For starters, at 203 pages, the agreement is about 18 times longer. Since its adoption on November 12, 2002, the Streamlined Sales and Use Tax Agreement has been amended 28 times, most recently last year. It is not a simple little problem here.

The streamlined sales tax governing board has done excellent work in bringing States together to cooperatively and voluntarily address the issues of sales and use tax complexity and administration, just to mention a few issues.

According to the streamlined sales tax governing board, 24 States have adopted the simplification measures in the agreement, representing 31 percent of the population.

The authors of the Marketplace Fairness Act hope to apply its measures to all 50 States and 100 percent of the population.

However, the bill is comparatively short on details. For example, the Streamlined Sales and Use Tax Agreement contains provisions on rules for the sourcing of sales, along with exclusions to those rules. In order to levy the appropriate sales tax, the location and subject matter of the transaction must be determined. This level of detail is not present in the Marketplace Fairness Act.

It is unclear if the floor established on sourcing requirements under this bill is sufficient to protect consumers from unintended consequences. For example, I have received a letter from the American Society of Pension Professionals and Actuaries which is worried that this legislation ''would allow states to impose a financial transaction tax that would apply to American workers' 401(k) contributions and other transactions within workers' accounts.''

Another concern I have with the current version of the Marketplace Fairness Act is that it contains a preemption clause which could make it possible for States to expand the reach of their sales taxes through creative legislating. The Streamlined Sales and Use Tax Agreement at least provides an avenue for the input of multiple States. The States that are not subject to the agreement would, under this bill, be able to legislate knowing that the Federal Government will compel enforcement of their tax law on nonresidents.

I am concerned with the transition costs that will come with this legislation for retailers who have been operating in an environment where they have not been required to collect and remit sales taxes for States where they do not have a physical presence. This legislation would change that almost in an instant.

Before we enact a new sales tax system, we need to take into account the costs that system will impose on businesses of all sizes and the difficulties these companies will face as they adapt to the new regime.

For example, there is the issue of vendor compensation. The Streamlined Sales and Use Tax Agreement currently includes a provision giving States the opportunity to voluntarily compensate remote sellers ''as a measure of good faith'' for registering to voluntarily collect and remit sales taxes into States where the seller has no physical presence. This is included in the agreement because under the current law remote sellers are generally not required to collect and remit the sales tax, and they incur a cost when they do so.

The Marketplace Fairness Act does not include any provision for compensation of remote sellers. I believe this is something we must take into account and examine even more thoroughly. I am also concerned about the small-seller exemption in the bill which would exempt sellers with national remote sales of less than $1 million from the new requirements to collect and withhold sales taxes. This seems like an important concession, but it is not without its problems.

First of all, the cap on the exemption is not indexed to inflation. I think anyone who has observed any part of the roughly 50-year process where the alternative minimum tax has grown from a fairness measure targeting the rich to an ever-increasing burden on the middle class should understand how inflation can radically distort policy outcomes over a period of time. In addition, there are many who argue that the $1 million exemption may be too low. In my view, these are concerns we need to fully consider before bringing the bill to the floor.

Finally, I want to point out that the bill does not include a provision for a

dispute resolution venue. Ideally the bill would give Federal district courts exclusive jurisdiction in matters concerning the implementation of this legislation. Policy changes with such far-reaching effects inevitably lead to unexpected issues and consequences. Giving Federal courts this jurisdiction would ensure greater uniformity and application of this legislation across the country.

These are only a few of the concerns I have regarding the Marketplace Fairness Act. I don't believe these are necessarily fundamental concerns, but they are issues that need to be addressed.

I am quite certain that, if given an opportunity, the Finance Committee could address these issues without inexorably changing the underlying purpose of the bill. However, if we proceed with floor debate on the Marketplace Fairness Act as is, we will not have that opportunity.

The Senate simply cannot continue to operate this way. Once again, we need to restore the deliberative traditions of the Senate, and that means a return to regular order.

I know a number of my colleagues have expressed similar concerns about the need to restore the committee process in the Senate. I hope they will join with me in voting no on cloture on the motion to proceed to the Marketplace Fairness Act. This doesn't necessarily determine how I am going to vote on the final analysis of this, but I sure as heck would like to approach this in a much more intelligent and legislatively profound way than we are doing here tonight.

By the way, we can talk about the fairness of this thing, but there are a lot of stakeholders that are not quite convinced this is as fair as those who are supporting the bill actually claim.

I hope we can have a more deliberative process to examine these matters. The distinguished chairman of the committee has offered to have a hearing on the bill, mark up the bill, and consider it in a regular-order approach in the immediate future as soon as we get back from this next recess. Frankly, I think that is a pretty good offer, and it is one we ought to honor if we honor our committee structure in the Senate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I understand that unanimous consent was given earlier to have printed in the RECORD an op-ed from the Wall Street Journal by Arthur B. Laffer entitled ''Tax Internet Sales Stimulate Growth.''

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Laffer, as most Americans know, is a distinguished economist. People sometimes said he was President Reagan's favorite economist. He makes the argument that many conservatives and many Governors across the country make, which is: Give us the authority to make these decisions for ourselves. We will collect taxes from everybody who already owes the taxes by requiring sellers to collect the taxes whether they are in State or out of State, and then we will lower the tax rate.

Mr. Laffer says fairness legislation that collects taxes from everyone who owes it and then lowers the tax rate is better for economic growth, which is something our country desperately needs.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the comments supporting specifically the legislation from Al Cardenas, chairman of the American Conservative Union, Governor Mike Pence of Indiana, and former Governor Mitch Daniels of Indiana.

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

CONSERVATIVES SUPPORT MARKETPLACE FAIRNESS

AL CARDENAS, CHAIRMAN OF THE AMERICAN CONSERVATIVE UNION

''When it comes to state sales taxes, it is time to address the area where federally mandated prejudice is most egregious—the policy toward Internet sales, the decades old inequity between online and in-person sales as outdated and unfair.''

GOVERNOR MIKE PENCE

''I don't think Congress should be in the business of picking winners and losers. Inaction by Congress today results in a system today, that does pick winners and losers.''

GOVERNOR MITCH DANIELS

''Sales taxes that states impose ought to be paid, and paid by everybody equally and collected by everybody in the retail business . . . We're not talking about an additional or new tax here—we're talking about the collection of a tax that's existed a long time.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are in morning business for 1 more minute and then morning business will be closed and we will proceed to the motion under the agreement.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I will take that 1 minute, please.

This is pretty simple. This legislation is new and only recently introduced. It has never been vetted. Others have but not this legislation. This bill is fraught with all kinds of problems, some of which have already been enumerated on the floor. There are many unintended circumstances.

The only right thing to do is to permit this to go back to the committee so the committee can take it up. As chairman of the committee, I have made that promise many times. We have already had hearings. We will have a markup on this bill in the next work period. A markup means there will be a vote. I stand here ready to abide by the vote. I submit right now that the majority of the Members of the committee maybe will let us work this thing. I don't know. But that is the process. That is what we should be doing, not just ramming this thing through, which is so complex. There are so many unintended consequences. Many of the consequences have been enumerated and not addressed but could be addressed and would be addressed in a proper committee forum.

I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

MARKETPLACE FAIRNESS ACT 0F 2013—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 743 which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 41, S. 743, a bill to restore States' sovereign rights to enforce State and local sales and use tax laws, and for other purposes.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion to invoke cloture.

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 motion to proceed to Calendar No. 41, S. 743, To restore States' sovereign rights to enforce State and local sales and use tax laws, and for other purposes.

Harry Reid, Richard J. Durbin, Sherrod Brown, Sheldon Whitehouse, Amy Klobuchar, Joe Manchin III, Richard Blumenthal, Patrick J. Leahy, Martin Heinrich, Angus S. King, Jr., Al Franken, Tom Harkin, Carl Levin, Mark Begich, Brian Schatz, Robert Menendez, Tammy Baldwin.

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. 743, a bill to restore States sovereign rights to enforce State and local sales and use taxes, 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 assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. SHAHEEN), are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI).

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 74, nays 20, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 107 Leg.]

YEAS—74

Alexander	Feinstein	Mikulski
Baldwin	Fischer	Moran
Barrasso	Flake	Murphy
Begich	Franken	Murray
Bennet	Gillibrand	Nelson
Blumenthal	Graham	Portman
Blunt	Hagan	Pryor
Boozman	Harkin	Reed
Brown	Heinrich	Reid
Burr	Heitkamp	Risch
Cantwell	Hirono	Rockefeller
Cardin	Hoeven	Sanders
Carper	Isakson	Schatz
Casey	Johanns	Schumer
Chambliss	Johnson (SD)	Sessions
Coats	Kaine	Shelby
Cochran	King	Stabenow
Collins	Klobuchar	Thune
Coons	Landrieu	Udall (CO)
Corker	Leahy	Udall (NM)
Cowan	Levin	Warner
Crapo	Manchin	Warren
Donnelly	McCain	Whitehouse
Durbin	McCaskill	Wicker
Enzi	Menendez	

NAYS—20

Ayotte	Heller	Rubio
Baucus	Inhofe	Scott
Coburn	Kirk	Tester
Cornyn	Lee	Toomey
Cruz	McConnell	Vitter
Grassley	Paul	Wyden
Hatch	Roberts	

NOT VOTING—6

Boxer	Lautenberg	Murkowski
Johnson (WI)	Merkley	Shaheen

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 74, the nays are 20. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

VOTE EXPLANATION

● Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I was unable to attend the rollcall vote that occurred on Monday, April 22, 2013. Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to S. 743, the Marketplace Fairness Act.●

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all time during adjournment, recess, and morning business count postcloture on the motion to proceed to S. 743.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I designate the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN, as the floor manager for the consideration of S. 743.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I heard the Senator from Colorado. My remarks are about 25 minutes. Are the remarks of the Senator from Colorado significantly shorter?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I have 3 or 4 minutes of remarks.

Mr. FRANKEN. I yield to my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I am very grateful to my colleague from Minnesota for yielding for those 3 or 4 minutes. I thank him for his forbearance.

I rise in support of our local small businesses and retailers across Colorado and I would like to think across our great country. Senator DURBIN and Senator ENZI have introduced a bipartisan bill, the Marketplace Fairness Act, of which I am a cosponsor. It would level the playing field for businesses located in Colorado by requiring out-of-State online sellers to collect and remit the same local and State sales taxes they have to pay.

It just makes common sense, which is why a similar amendment during the budget debate a few weeks ago, which I also cosponsored, passed by a bipartisan vote of 75 to 24.

The Marketplace Fairness Act is about achieving equitable treatment for all sales so businesses with a physical presence in Colorado, employing Colorado workers living in our communities, are not at a competitive disadvantage with out-of-State businesses that sell products online.

Online marketplaces have created great companies and innovative ways of doing business, but Federal law has failed to keep up with the pace of online sales. Again, we have had a lot of innovation in the online space, but Federal law has failed to keep up with the pace of online sales.

Back when trading posts and local markets were the most prevalent places for consumer goods, they did not have to worry about out-of-State sellers. Today, though, nearly 1 in 10 sales occurs online. Because of these online sales, we now have two inequitable forms of treatment in the marketplace: one where local brick-and-mortar retailers have to pay sales taxes and one where out-of-State online retailers get to take advantage of a loophole and avoid collecting any sales taxes at all. This has, unfortunately, created a disincentive to shop at and support our small local businesses.

It has been said, for at least a decade, that fixing this inequity is too difficult or it will burden certain online retailers and consumers. However, it should be noted this legislation requires States to simplify sales tax laws that apply to these out-of-State sales, in addition to providing software free of charge to sellers in order to make the task of collecting and remitting this revenue as painless as possible.

Many States have already taken this step. My State of Colorado is considering legislation this year to conform to the rules set out in this bill.

The version of the Marketplace Fairness Act we are going to consider has been negotiated by Members of both political parties, and it is a testament to what we can do when we work together to benefit our country and our economy. Not only will this legislation help level the playing field for mom-and-pop shops across our State and our country, it will help restore a lost revenue base for local governments that has slowly been eroded with the expansion of online out-of-State sales.

Most Americans know those commonsense, fair taxes support our schools, police and fire departments, and other critical local services. At the very least I think we can all agree that we do not want to penalize Main Street retailers for creating jobs in Colorado communities, which is why this bipartisan bill is so important.

I look forward to voting for the Marketplace Fairness Act, and I encourage all of my colleagues to do the same. I want to acknowledge my colleague from Minnesota for yielding me the time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELLY.) The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. DURBIN. Would the Senator from Minnesota yield for a moment? I believe the Senator from Oregon would like to make a very brief statement for the RECORD.

Mr. FRANKEN. I will yield.

Mr. MERKLEY. I thank my colleague from Minnesota. The vote was closed as I came in the door. Had I been here, I would have voted against cloture. I want that to be a clear part of the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. FRANKEN. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 25 minutes.

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

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about climate change. But I first do want to say how pleased I am that we just got cloture to move to debate on the Marketplace Fairness Act. I am a strong supporter of the legislation. As I said, I am a cosponsor. I look forward to the upcoming debate. I plan to speak on this legislation further tomorrow.

Now I would like to talk about climate change. More specifically, I rise to suggest that we in this body talk more about climate change so that we can agree on taking action to address it. We need to address the environmental impacts that we are currently facing and the future impacts that will only become exponentially worse if we fail to act. 2012 was the hottest year on record in the continental United States. In fact, it beat the previous record by a full degree.

To give you some idea about how remarkable a full degree of warming in 1 year is, scientists tell us since the last ice age 20,000 years ago the Earth has warmed only 16 degrees at the most. Since we began actually measuring

temperatures in the continental United States and recording them 117 years ago, the variance between the coldest year and the warmest year has only been 4.2 degrees.

So for the temperature to jump a full degree in 1 year is not just remarkable, it is alarming. Often when people consider the harmful consequences of climate change and its cost, they are talking about the future. But make no mistake, climate change is already costing the United States serious money.

2012 was a year when a historic drought caused more than 70 percent of U.S. counties to be declared disaster areas. Agriculture Secretary Tom Vilsack has estimated the drought's impact on the agricultural sector to be around $50 to $60 billion. That cost gets passed on to every American. The drought destroyed or damaged major crops all over this country, making corn and soybeans more expensive, increasing animal feed costs. So Americans are paying more for meats and other animal-based products.

The 2012 drought dramatically lowered water levels on the Mississippi River, seriously interfering with our ability to transport our agricultural goods to market to compete with those from other countries. So that barges did not run aground, shippers sent them down the Mississippi River the last few months half full, say, with soybeans, making our beans less competitive with Brazilian beans.

More and more of my conversation with Minnesota soybean growers who export over one-third of their crop focused on this very issue. Climate change is exacerbating our Nation's wildfires, and that is costing us serious money. When Forest Service Chief Tom Tidwell testified before the Senate Energy Committee, I asked him about the link between forest fires and climate change. He told us that throughout the country we are seeing longer fire seasons on average by more than 30 days. Wildfires are also larger and more intense.

I asked Chief Tidwell whether scientists at the Forest Service thought that climate change was increasing the size and intensity of wildfires and extending their season. Without hesitation he said yes. The Forest Service is spending more and more of its budget fighting wildfires, now about half of its budget. Longer fire seasons and larger more intense fires are just going to eat up more of that budget.

Not only is climate change worsening our forest fires, it is also exacerbating other problems plaguing our forests. That includes a very serious bark beetle crop. The bark beetle is normally kept in check because cold winters at high altitudes kill its larva.

Let's talk about the bark beetle at high altitudes. Their larva used to freeze. But now, because of climate change, that is not happening. The winters have gotten warmer and at higher altitudes, and the bark beetles are surviving. That means they are destroying more forests.

Similarly, in some Colorado forests scientists have shown that because of warmer weather, mountain pine beetles have gone from reproducing once a year to twice a year. In a little over a decade, this mountain pine beetle has killed more than 70,000 square miles' worth of trees. That is an area equivalent to the entire State of Washington.

Of course, we cannot talk about climate change without talking about sea level rise. I serve on the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. Several months ago we had a hearing on sea level rise. We heard testimony about how rising sea level is increasing the size of flood zones and increasing damage that occurs from storm surges.

One of the witnesses told us that just a few extra inches of sea level could result in a storm surge that could flood the New York City subway system. It sounded like something out of science fiction. Yet a little over 6 months later that is exactly what happened. That is exactly what happened when Hurricane Sandy hit New York City and flooded the subways.

My colleagues do not need to be reminded of the cost of Hurricane Sandy. It is costing taxpayers a staggering $60 billion. Unfortunately, only one of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle, the ranking member, Senator MURKOWSKI, attended this hearing. This has been pretty much the case whenever we have a hearing that even tangentially relates to climate change.

A number of my colleagues in Congress do not believe that human activities contribute to climate change. Many others, I suspect, do not talk about climate change because addressing it requires making some difficult choices. But let's be clear about this. Climate change is already costing us. If we do not act now, it will worsen dramatically and be far more costly.

The Defense Department has studied potential threats to national security imposed by climate change. DOD's 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review states that climate change may act as an accelerant of instability or conflict. That, in turn, would place burdens on civilian institutions and militaries around the world. The top commander in the Pacific, ADM Samuel Locklear, has said the biggest long-term security challenge in the Pacific is climate change. As the Pacific commander he understands the impact sea level rise and extreme weather events can have on our military resources and on civilian populations in the Pacific.

My constituents in Minnesota also understand the threat of climate change. That is why recently nearly 400 people gathered at a local Lutheran church in Willmar, MN, to talk about climate change. Willmar is not a big city. So when this many people gather in one place, you know it is a big deal. They are concerned about climate change and the marked increase in severe weather occurrences.

But when they look to Washington they see a disconnect. They see a disconnect between what the country is experiencing and what Washington is doing about it—or, rather, what Washington is not doing. Outside of Washington, and not just in Minnesota, things are different. In fact, many respected Republican leaders outside of Washington understand the importance of addressing climate change.

In the aftermath of Hurricane Sandy, for example, Republican Governor Chris Christie of New Jersey acknowledged that climate change is a problem and that human activities are playing a role.

Former Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger of California, also a Republican, has launched an organization to fight climate change. Former Utah Governor and Republican Presidential candidate John Huntsman has noted that whenever a party takes a position that runs counter to the position of 98 out of every 100 scientists, that party has a problem.

Governor Huntsman is right. Let me illustrate with an analogy. Say you went to a doctor who told you: You know, you better start eating more sensibly and start exercising because you are tremendously overweight. I see in your file that your father died of a heart attack at an early age. So you really have to go on a diet and start working out.

You say: You know what, I would like a second opinion.

So you go to a second doctor and he examines you, or she examines you, and says: OK, look, you have a family history of heart disease. Your father died of a heart attack at 40. You weigh over 300 pounds. Your cholesterol is out of control. Your blood pressure is through the roof. It would just be irresponsible of me not to immediately send you to the Mayo Clinic to this place I know. You have to go there.

Then you say: Thanks, doctor, but I would really like a third opinion.

The third doctor says: Wow. This is a problem. You know, looking at your family history and looking at you and your tests, I am amazed you are still alive. You have to do something about this.

You say: You know, I would really like a fourth opinion—and this keeps going. It takes months. Finally, you get to the 50th doctor. The 50th doctor examines you and says: Boy, it is a good thing you came to me because all this diet and exercise would have been a waste. You are doing just fine. Those other doctors, well, they are in the pockets of the fresh food and vegetable people. Enjoy life as much as you want and watch a lot of TV.

Then you learn this doctor was paid his salary by the makers of Cheetos. Don't get me wrong—Cheetos are a delicious snack. They can and should be eaten in moderation.

If 98 out of 100 doctors tell me I have a problem, I should take their advice. If those two other doctors are paid by

''Big Snack Food'' the way certain climate deniers are paid by ''Big Coal,'' I shouldn't take their advice. However, 98 out of 100 climate scientists are telling us we have a problem.

Governor Huntsman is right. Outside of Washington, many people get this. Even some of the very companies that previously funded anti-climate change efforts have turned the page on this issue. ExxonMobil used to fund the Heartland Institute, which is one of the leading climate change denial organizations. If you go to ExxonMobil's Web site today, it states, ''Rising greenhouse gas emissions pose significant risks to society and ecosystems.'' Shell Oil states on its Web site, ''CO_2 emissions must be reduced to avoid serious climate change.'' Even the major oil and gas companies have begun to acknowledge that climate change is real.

I respectfully suggest that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle here in Congress also need to engage in a serious conversation on climate change. At a time when Americans are dealing with record droughts and devastating hurricanes, the Senate cannot afford to simply ignore climate change. We need to talk about this, as Democratic and Republican leaders outside of Washington are talking about it. Ultimately, we need to come together to address climate change before its damaging costs to society are out of control.

I do not pretend this will be easy. Some people will point out that climate change is a global problem. It is. We can't solve it alone. We can't, and they are right. Emissions in the developing world are now on the rise. China surpasses the United States in total greenhouse gas emissions—not per capita; we are still ahead on that. But China is also making major investment in renewable energy. According to the United Nations Environmental Program, in 2011 China led the world in renewable energy investments, with nearly one-fifth of the global total. This is in spite of the fact that China's GDP in 2011 was half of our GDP. If we are going to lead the clean energy race and create good-paying jobs for Americans, we must invest in our renewable energy infrastructure.

Last year the Senate Energy Committee heard testimony regarding a report from the American Energy Innovation Council's report entitled ''Catalyzing Ingenuity.'' The report, authored by former Lockheed Martin CEO Norman Augustine, Microsoft founder Bill Gates, and other business leaders, states:

> The country has yet to embark on a clean energy innovation program commensurate with the scale of the national priorities that are at stake. In fact, rather than improve the country's energy innovation program and invest in strategic national interests, the current political environment is creating strong pressure to pull back from such efforts.

This is very important. I encourage my colleagues—especially those who oppose Federal funding for clean energy—to read this report because what people often forget is that this is nothing new. Government has always supported strategic energy priorities. As Mr. Augustine noted in his testimony, commercial nuclear power was the result of government investments in naval reactors. Do you know why natural gas is transforming our energy sector today? It is because of years of Federal support to develop hydrofracking technology. The Eastern Gas Shales Project was an initiative the Federal Government began back in 1976, before hydrofracking was a mature industry. The project set up and funded dozens of pilot demonstration projects with universities and private gas companies that tested drilling and fracturing methods. This investment by the Federal Government was instrumental in the development of the commercial extraction of natural gas from shale. In fact, microseismic imaging—a critical tool used in fracking—was originally developed by Sandia National Laboratory, a Federal energy laboratory.

The industry was also supported through tax breaks and subsidies. In fact, Mitchell Energy vice president Dan Stewart said in an interview that Mitchell Energy's first horizontal well was subsidized by the Federal Government. Mr. Mitchell said of the Department of Energy:

> DOE started it, and other people took the ball and ran with it. You cannot diminish DOE's involvement.

So the basis of the natural gas revolution that is helping make America more energy independent can be traced back to Federal support. In the same way, we must support the renewable energy sector now. We need to be the ones—our country, the United States, Americans—we must be the ones who sell this transformative and environmentally friendly technology to other nations. We must do this.

We need to start by having a conversation about climate change. It would be irresponsible to avoid the issue because it is uncomfortable to talk about. The stakes are too high and we would be shirking our responsibility to our constituents, to our children, to our grandchildren, and to posterity. The discussion is not going to be easy because there are going to be painful tradeoffs. I certainly don't have all the answers. I do know we need to have the conversation. We cannot leave this issue to future generations. I have a grandchild on the way—my first. I don't want to look back and tell him that when his grandfather was in a position to do something about climate change, he chose not to because it involved some politically difficult choices. I don't want to tell him that we compromised our moral integrity for political expediency.

We all have constituents who care about this issue. When I go back to Willmar, MN, I want to tell my constituents who met in a church and spoke about climate change that we heard them. I want to tell them we are working together across the aisle to talk about and address one of the most difficult problems we face.

I invite my colleagues to join in this endeavor and make dealing with climate change a bipartisan issue. We owe it to the Nation and to future generations.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, before he leaves the floor, let me commend my colleague from Minnesota for making so many thoughtful points in this effort to deal with climate change. Having returned from Oregon, with a whole host of meetings in connection with Earth Day, the Senator is spot-on in speaking about the enormity of the problem. It is very clear that the planet is getting warmer, drought is becoming more serious, the fires are becoming more catastrophic and the storms increasingly brutal. It is very clear that now Democrats and Republicans must come together around this issue.

The Senator and I serve together on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee. This will be priority business for us, and his thoughtful remarks today are yet another effort in terms of trying to bring people together. The focus of the Senator's remarks has been not to say it is this person's fault or another person's fault, it is about how Democrats and Republicans need to come together.

I commend my Democratic colleague for his good speech and the good fortune to chair the subcommittee on Energy and Natural Resources, where he will be able to focus on these issues.

I ask unanimous consent to speak as if in morning business for up to 30 minutes.

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

Mr. WYDEN. The Senate has now moved to the Marketplace Fairness Act. I say this, frankly, a little dubiously because I think it really ought to be called the Shop Canada or Shop Mexico Act. It will make it attractive for businesses located in the United States to set up shops overseas as the coercion that is applied to the United States will not affect foreign retailers.

What I wish to do tonight is speak for a brief period of time—because we are going to have opportunity throughout the week to discuss this—in the hopes that the points I highlight tonight will help start a bipartisan effort to attempt to fix what I think are the most serious problems with the Marketplace Fairness Act.

The essence of my concern is that coercion and discrimination are not what America is all about. Those are the fundamental principles of the Marketplace Fairness Act. What I wish to do is be very specific with respect to how this coercion and discrimination, particularly against some of the most innovative forces in the American economy, are going to take their toll.

With respect to coercion, this is legislation that enabled one State to impose the enforcement of its laws on 49 other States and the territories without the approval of such States and territories. Let me repeat this. It is coercion. It can be forced on these other States against their will. In effect, under the Marketplace Fairness Act, businesses may be audited by a myriad of out-of-State tax collectors and be forced to defend themselves in out-of-State courts.

A vote for the Marketplace Fairness Act without efforts to try to promote some element of voluntary participation is a vote to subject a Senator's home State Internet companies to the whim and will of tax collectors and State courts around the country. This, in essence, is the coercion aspect of this legislation.

I have suggested to Senators that at a minimum this effort, this legislation should be altered to allow for voluntary compacts. Congress would say States could voluntarily take these steps with respect to interstate tax collection rather than being required to do it. I have heard my colleagues who say perhaps this would make one State a haven with respect to Internet sales. The reality is that States rights are about States rights. One State may look to choose to incent one particular type of business or another, but this is ultimately a State decision.

If you are, in fact, a supporter of States rights, why would you oppose something that allows a State to voluntarily choose what course it wishes to promote with respect to the collection of online taxes? This is not what this bill is all about. It is not voluntary, it is coercive. That is why, in my view, it undermines what I think the principles of our country are all about. Our country is not about coercion, it is not about discrimination. This is what the bill, regrettably, is all about.

Let me outline the second point with respect to how the Marketplace Fairness Act discriminates against Internet companies. The Marketplace Fairness Act relies on Internet sellers to determine the address of where consumers are located in order to generate an approximation of where goods or services sold by an online retailer will be consumed. There is no similar requirement with respect to brick-and-mortar businesses—no similar requirement with respect to brick-and-mortar businesses—even though consumers often travel across State lines in order to purchase goods and services that may be unavailable to them in their home jurisdictions or available at lower sales or use tax rates.

The Marketplace Fairness Act does not require brick-and-mortar firms to obtain and use consumer information to determine where a good or service may be consumed. Why should the Federal Government require Internet companies to collect and remit sales and use taxes on behalf of consumers but not impose any such burden on brick-and-mortar firms providing goods and services to out-of-State consumers?

So the irony of this is that really about 15 years ago—and it has been particularly satisfying to me in terms of our service in the Senate—as we began to look at policies that would allow innovation and technology to grow—and I will talk a little about how some of those policies led to the first investments in social media—we established two principles with respect to technology policy: No. 1, we said let's ensure there is no discrimination. What goes on off-line and what goes on online should be parallel so that we can encourage both parts of the American economy.

That principle has made a lot of sense. In fact, it has led to a great many stores—I am sure at home in Indiana for the Presiding Officer of the Senate—with bricks and clicks looking to try to have a vigorous presence in States because the two are mutually reinforcing. To do that we have to ensure there is a policy of nondiscrimination.

What I have done is outline very specifically about how the Marketplace Fairness Act moves away from that principle of nondiscrimination by giving, in many jurisdictions, the brick-and-mortar retailers a leg up. And what I am in favor of is continuing that policy which has made sense for 15 years.

We also talked about doing no harm and ensuring we especially promoted voluntary approaches—voluntary approaches. I think it was before the Presiding Officer was in the Congress, but one of the things I was especially proud of was our help in generating investment in the social media back when I came to the Senate. There was a great concern about censorship online. Of course, all of us, as parents, were horrified by some of the smut and pornography that was coming available online, all over the Web, and so a big debate was held.

There were essentially two approaches: One was to set up a big censorship effort that would say, for example, if somebody posted some of this horrible pornography on a Web site or a blog, the Web site would be held secondarily liable for this material posted on the site. A lot of us said: No way the Net is going to be able to grow if Web sites and blogs are held liable for something that is posted on their site, which they probably aren't even going to know anything about because there are, of course, thousands and thousands of postings—millions in the case of some of the big sites.

So working with a very conservative Republican in the House, Congressman Cox, we wrote an alternative approach which encouraged voluntary approaches with respect to dealing with a societal problem, and a very serious problem with respect to pornography. Back then the Congress didn't know how to deal with these issues, so both approaches—both the censorship approach and the voluntary approach to help parents filter out the smut—actually got into the law and it went to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court struck down the censorship approach and upheld the voluntary bipartisan approach Congressman Cox and I put together.

Today, when we talk to people in the social media, they will tell us that voluntary approach was, to a great extent, what encouraged the first investments in social media. People in social media will say nobody would have invested in the future Facebooks and Twitters and the like if they thought the social media sites, the Web sites and the like, were going to be held secondarily liable for something that was posted.

That voluntary approach, which did so much to boost our economy, is being rejected in the Marketplace Fairness Act as it is written because this bill goes to a coercive approach, as I said, that would outline the ability for one State to impose the enforcement of its laws on 49 other States and territories without the approval of those States and territories.

So I bring up this tonight because I am very hopeful as this debate goes forward and the bill is considered further that at a minimum the sponsors of the legislation—and all of us here can count and look at vote totals—will see that allowing for voluntary compacts is really what States rights are all about, No. 1. It is that voluntary approach that has made such a difference in encouraging the innovation and growth of the Internet and technology.

One other point I would like to mention tonight is what this bill does with respect to America's ability to compete in a global economy. This is, in effect, an unprecedented approach that would apply local laws to the global medium that is the Internet.

For example, I just came back—flew about 6,000 miles over the last few days—from meeting with constituents at home. I was in southern Oregon until the middle of the day yesterday. They have a big e-commerce effort going in a wonderful company called Fire Mountain Gems in Grants Pass, OR, with hundreds of employees and a very exciting online business. Their big competitor in Grants Pass, OR—which is a town that has been hard hit economically. We are working hard on their forestry issues, particularly trying to get the harvest up. That is something I am working on as chairman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, and I had a good chance to talk about resources policy with the Presiding Officer of the Senate.

One of the things they very much want to do in Grants Pass is find as many good-paying jobs as they can, given the fact the economy is hurting in rural areas.

So as I try to boost the harvest in Grants Pass, OR, and get people back to work in the woods, I am obviously looking for other areas where businesses could grow. This legislation, as

written, will deal a significant body blow to a business's ability to grow, such as the one I know about in Grants Pass, OR. Here is why: The legislation doesn't apply to foreign retailers, and the competition for Fire Mountain Gems is certainly overseas, with a host of companies in this space.

It also has huge implications for the northern border and the southern border of our country because so many of the promising businesses in those communities are going to say to themselves: We are patriotic Americans. We deeply believe in our country and our values, but how are we going to compete? How are we going to figure out a way to wade through more than 9,000 taxing jurisdictions? Wouldn't it be more sensible to just move a half hour across the border and not have to go through any of this?

I just don't think this works as it relates to the global economy. Maybe this bill ought to be called the Shop China or Shop Mexico or Shop Canada bill. Whatever you call it, it seeks to apply local laws to a global medium. That, in my view, defies common sense, and, by the way, that too has been a principle that has been rejected in debates about tech policy over the years.

So I hope Senators are going to be open to working with the bipartisan group—there are a host of Senators on both sides of the aisle who care about these issues—to take some of the principles that have been central to the growth of innovation, online business—particularly as it relates to new apps and new technologies—that have worked for the last few years and build them into this legislation, rather than repudiate the principles of voluntarism and nondiscrimination that have been so key, as I have outlined here tonight, to investment in the social media, to encouraging innovation through nondiscriminatory tax policies, and to new innovations that we began to bring into the policy arena, such as digital signatures.

There we had the same thing—a great concern about whether this was equitable, whether it would work, but after hearings and a thoughtful analysis, a group of us wrote that law as well. So whether it was regulation, whether it was taxes, whether it was innovation such as digital signatures, the four or five laws over the last 15 years that have paid off for technology and innovation and small business—the basic principles behind those laws—are being repudiated in this bill and, I believe, will be injurious to the country.

So my hope is, as we go forward, that we can take some of those principles that have been key to growth in the technology sector and start building them into this discussion with respect to collection of online sales taxes.

By the way, for more than a decade, this has been a topic. I and others have said we are very open to any and all approaches to collect taxes owed, and particularly ones that don't amount to what looks like bureaucratic water torture associated with the collection process. And I think Senators are underestimating how difficult this will be.

I would particularly cite the proposition that if it was so easy, it would have been done some time ago. By the way, it would have been done with voluntary actions through many of these taxing jurisdictions rather than the coercive approach that is advanced in this legislation.

I see my friend from New Hampshire. I was particularly struck, I would say to my colleague, about how the principles I am talking about today—coercion and nondiscrimination—apply in my colleague's State as well because her State, as so many others, would face the prospect where online retailers would have one set of burdensome rules that wouldn't apply to a whole host of other businesses. It brings back the principle of discrimination we rejected years and years ago.

Having heard the Senator from New Hampshire speak eloquently on these issues, I look forward to her remarks. When I came to the floor, I said the key to successful tech legislation for the last 15 years has been two principles: a voluntary approach rather than a coercive approach and nondiscrimination rather than discrimination. The Senator from New Hampshire and I are from States where this bill brings those policies—coercion and discrimination—back in very stark terms that will be injurious to the citizens we represent and harm the cause of innovation across the country.

I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for all her contributions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I couldn't say it any more eloquently than my friend from Oregon whose small businesses are facing the same kind of discrimination our small businesses in New Hampshire are facing.

I came straight from the airport—my flight was delayed; so I wasn't here to vote no on this legislation that I think has not been thought through carefully because, as the Senator from Oregon points out, it is going to affect innovation and the ability to use the Internet in a way that I think most of this should be used. It is going to set up a whole new set of rules that are very difficult for our businesses in New Hampshire and Oregon to comply with. I think it is not the best way for us to go about taxation and doing it in a fair way. Sadly, as a result of this legislation, if it passes, as the Senator pointed out, we are going to see a whole different set of rules for one set of businesses than for another and that just isn't right.

So I plan to come down to the floor and speak at greater length about this tomorrow, but I wanted to come this afternoon, when I heard the Senator was speaking as I came from the airport, to join the Senator in opposition to the legislation and point out that I certainly would have voted no and intend to continue to do everything I can to try to address what I think is a very unfair way to deal with taxation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from New Hampshire for her contribution.

Obviously, the vote this afternoon didn't go our way. My hope is that as Senators from both political parties have a chance over the next few days to lay out the consequences of the two principles we have been talking about—staying away from coercion and staying away from discrimination—by the time the Senate has completed debate and votes, we can come up with a proposal that will not set back the cause of innovation in this country.

We both have talked about the fact that the March numbers on jobs were not where we would like them to be. Particularly distressing is the number of people who seem to be either dropping out of the workforce or working part time because they can't find anything full time. Now we are looking at policies that will make efforts to put those people back to work even harder.

So I am very appreciative of the fact that the Senator was able to come to the floor; because what I tried to do over the last 20 minutes or half an hour is outline what has worked in technology policy for the last 15 years. It has been nondiscrimination and noncoercion. This bill repudiates both of those. My hope is the Senator and I and other Senators on both sides of the aisle can find a way to change this legislation so as to at least not go backward with respect to those values that have been so key to the growth of jobs in the technology sector. To have the Senator here is so helpful, and I am very appreciative.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I look forward to working with my friend from Oregon to try and amend this legislation to address some of the concerns that we, along with a number of other members of this body, share. It should be an interesting week.

Mr. WYDEN. A good note to close on.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and 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. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I address the Senate as if in morning business.

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

VETERANS CLAIMS BACKLOG

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, next month, Americans across the country will gather on Memorial Day to remember the sacrifices made by generations of men and women in service to

our country and to preserve our freedoms.

There is no group of Americans I hold in higher regard than our Nation's veterans. Their service and sacrifice have allowed us to live in the strongest, freest, and greatest country in the world. We should, in the Senate, utilize their service as our role models.

America's veterans have fought tyrants and terrorist to keep our country safe and secure. Yet when they return home from war, they have to continue to fight many battles.

Veterans are struggling to find a job. The unemployment rate for the post-September 11 veteran remains well above the national average of 10 percent.

Some veterans continue to face difficulties accessing quality health care services, especially those as in my State where there are rural areas and long distances to travel for the care they need, and many veterans must wait long periods of time for their benefit claims to be processed by the Federal Government, which is what I would like to highlight today.

Honoring those who served our country certainly means more than paying tribute to them on Memorial Day. It means keeping our promises. We owe our Nation's veterans the absolute best—the best health care, the best educational opportunities, the best support possible to help them continue to have successful lives after their service to our country. But all too often, veterans tell me they had to wait months—and in some cases years—for their benefits to be processed. This is simply unacceptable.

I served on the House Veterans' Affairs Committee for 14 years. I now serve on the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee. Making an improvement in the quality of life for our Nation's veterans is one of my top priorities, and I want to continue to raise the concerns that are raised to me until progress is made.

In January of this year, the VA outlined a strategic plan to reduce their enormous claims backlog. According to this new plan, they estimate they will resolve around 1.9 million claims in 2015, which is an ambitious goal because that would be roughly an 80-percent increase in the productivity over the 2012 level.

I certainly appreciate Secretary Shinseki's commitment to eliminating the backlog of claims and his initiatives to transform the claims process, but there is evidence against the VA's assertion that the claims backlog will be remedied by 2015.

In the 2010, the VA projected that by this year—2013—it would take 160 days per claim to reach a decision. But in the first quarter of this fiscal year, it actually took more than 270 days per claim. It seems the numbers are, once again, continuing to be headed in the wrong direction.

In fact, the number of claims considered backlogged—or have been pending for more than 125 days—grew from fewer than 150,000 in 2009 to 600,000 in March of this year. In total, about 70 percent of the currently pending claims are considered backlogged.

The Presiding Officer has probably heard the saying that past performance is a good indicator of future performance. If this pattern continues, my fear is—and reality suggests—this problem only gets worse.

As we draw down in Afghanistan and the Armed Services reduce their force structure, the number of service members who will rely upon the VA will increase significantly. If the VA is not able to adequately handle claims now, how will the process work when even more veterans claims are being submitted?

As recently as September of last year, the inspector general of the VA found that the VA had not yet fully tested their new system, which is supposed to help them process these claims more efficiently. At that point, the new system could not even process a claim from the beginning of the end of the rating process.

I met recently with Kansas veterans who were here in Washington, DC, as part of national veterans service organization—the American Legion, the Disabled Veterans of America, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars—and their No. 1 concern is the unreasonable amount of time it takes for benefits claims to be processed.

Oftentimes the conversations I have are with folks who have an urgent need related to their home or health care, but they are stuck waiting on the VA to get back to them. I know my colleagues in the Senate experience the same kind of stories. These are real individuals, with real needs, whose lives are impacted when their benefits claims go unresolved day after day.

A step in the right direction was announced this last Friday from the Department of Veterans Affairs: The VA is finally responding to our concerns about claim backlogs and expediting the process for claims that have been held for more than 1 year.

It is absurd a veteran would have been waiting for 1 year or more to have claims processed, and I am pleased to see the VA is taking action and I am glad the message is being heard. I hope it has success.

Nonetheless, we certainly know that challenges remain, and it is important to me that the VA get to the bottom of this issue and come up with a solution to improve the claims process and eliminate this backlog in a timely manner.

The government is not the only industry that has to process an enormous volume of benefit claims. Large insurance companies process claims successfully every day, so the VA should consult with the private sector and learn from their experiences a way to process claims. The VA does not need to waste more time and money recreating the wheel when solutions may be ever present in the private sector and within the agency among those who service claims.

Until then, Congress should continue to hold the VA accountable as to how they will resolve this problem in a real way, with real results for our veterans.

We must never forget that our country has a responsibility to its veterans. The brave men and women who have put their lives on the line to defend our country deserve our respect and that means receiving the benefits they have earned in a timely manner.

Especially at a time when more and more troops are transitioning out of the military, and the needs of aging veterans are increasing, I am committed to keeping our promise to those who have served our country.

REMEMBERING DON CONCANNON

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I also wish to speak this evening about a Kansan who recently died and pay tribute to his life. My tribute this evening is to Don Concannon. Don Concannon of Hugoton, KS, is an example of a life I admire and respect so much. He exemplifies so much the folks from my home State of Kansas. It is a tribute to the folks at home who get so involved in their local communities. They volunteer at school. They serve on their church board. They get involved in public service. Kansans are always looking for ways to improve the lives of those around them, their friends and neighbors and people they do not even know.

One of those Kansans is our former Republican Party State chairman, Don Concannon. We have lost a great man, a strong advocate and a dedicated public servant when Don recently passed away.

Don grew up on a farm in southwest Kansas and graduated from Garden City High School in 1945. Early on in life, Don began serving our country when he joined the U.S. Navy and fought in the South Pacific during WWII.

After the war, Don graduated from Washburn Law School in 1952 and moved to Hugoton to practice law. It didn't take long for him to get involved in his new community because one month after his arrival, Don was elected Stevens County Attorney and went on to serve the county for four years in that role.

That same year, Don married Patricia June Davis and spent the next 49 years by her side before her passing in 2001. Don later re-married his wife of the past ten years, Sharon Collins.

As a young man, Don became interested in politics and at the age of 32, Don was elected Chairman of the Kansas Young Republican Federation. The following year, Don served as Chairman of the Kansas Presidential Electors for the presidential election between John F. Kennedy and Richard Nixon. Then, from 1968–1970, Don served as the Chair of the Kansas Republican Party. His zeal for politics never faded and kept him involved for many

years—chairing committees in support of his favorite candidates. He even put his name on the ballot one year for Governor but fell short by just 530 votes in the primary.

As a long-time Kansas resident, Don was well known and respected by many throughout our state, but especially in Southwest Kansas.

Don was a strong advocate for rural Kansas and the special way of life we enjoy in small communities across our great State. Through his service on several committees focused on the future of rural Kansas, Don helped make certain the next generation can return to the towns and communities they call home.

From his participation in Kansas politics to his public service career, Don was always looking for ways to serve his fellow Kansans and improve their lives. In recognition of that service, Don was awarded a lifetime achievement award by Washburn Law School in 2010.

His family and friends described him as someone whose generosity, enthusiasm, and overall optimism towards life touched the lives of so many. It has been said that Don had the character of ''one in a million,'' and that he did not ''just participate in life, but made life happen.'' Don had the unique ability to connect with just about anyone, but he was especially revered by his family and friends who looked up to him in many ways. Don lived each day to its fullest and his commitment to his fellow man serves as an inspiration to us all.

I extend my heartfelt sympathies to his wife, Sharon, his son, Craig, his daughter, Debra, and his many grandchildren. I know they loved him dearly and will undoubtedly miss him. I ask my colleagues and all Kansans to remember the Concannon family in your thoughts and prayers in the days ahead. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

CONGRATULATING PROFESSOR MUHAMMAD YUNUS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, last week Congress recognized one of the planet's leading visionaries and humanitarians by awarding Prof. Muhammad Yunus the Congressional Gold Medal.

The ceremony occurred just a few hundred yards from here in the august Capitol Rotunda. There to pay tribute to this proud son of Bangladesh, this banker to the poor, this Nobel laureate were Members of Congress, former heads of state, diplomats, heads of major companies and foundations, and grassroots activists—all of whom have been inspired by the work of one great man—Prof. Muhammad Yunus. It was a great privilege for me to be there.

More than 6 years ago I introduced a resolution in the Senate to award Professor Yunus the Congressional Gold Medal. I was joined in this effort by my friends, former Utah Senator Robert Bennett and Representative RUSH HOLT in the House.

We had a lot of help outside of Congress in making this happen. Joanne Carter and her team at RESULTS were instrumental. Thousands of RESULTS grassroots volunteers across the country contacted their Members of Congress and asked them to support the effort to recognize Professor Yunus. Two of those volunteers were Cindy Levin and Richard Smiley from Illinois. I am pleased that both could be here to see their hard work pay off.

I first met Muhammad Yunus more than two decades ago in Bangladesh. His revolutionary concept of microcredit and the Grameen Bank that he founded was helping to lift millions out of poverty. He loaned small amounts of money traditional banks wouldn't bother with to individuals traditional banks wouldn't bother with.

His innovative idea defied old beliefs. He proved banking could be done without collateral and that investing in women worked. Most of Grameen Bank's loans go to poor women who go from beggars to entrepreneurs.

I have seen it myself. Several years ago, in a ramshackle hut in Uganda, I met with three mothers who worked in the local market. I asked them, through an interpreter, how microcredit had changed their lives. One woman said: ''My knees have gone soft.'' I didn't understand what she meant so I asked her to explain. She said that before she received the microcredit loan that gave her a chance to go to market and make a little money, she used to have to crawl on her knees and beg her husband for money to feed her children. But she doesn't have to crawl anymore. Her knees have gone soft.

Over the last nearly 40 years, more than 160 million people on five continents have received microloans. His idea changed the world.

The Congressional Gold Medal is the highest civilian honor Congress can bestow and the practice dates back to the Continental Congress. Unlike other awards, each Congressional Gold Medal is unique to the recipient. It is specifically designed and sculpted according to the wishes of the recipient. I couldn't be more thrilled with how this tribute to Professor Yunus turned out. It is truly beautiful.

The obverse of the medal was designed by Indiana artist Donna Weaver and sculpted by Phebe Hemphill. The portrait of Professor Yunus is meant to ''accurately reflect his optimistic and cheerful personality.'' He is depicted wearing the traditional Bengali jamdani fabric design.

On the reverse, a ''lotus open in full bloom, rising above the water and cradling the world in its open petals'' evokes powerful symbolism. It was designed by Wisconsin artist Richard Masters and sculpted by Jim Licaretz. The Bangla inscription in the center is a quote taken from Professor Yunus' Nobel speech and reads, ''Let us send poverty to the museum.''

Beyond the typical pomp and circumstance of these ceremonies, last week's event truly made history. Professor Yunus becomes the first Muslim to win the Congressional Gold Medal. Additionally, he becomes only the seventh person in history to receive the Presidential Medal of Freedom and the Congressional Gold Medal and the Nobel Peace Prize. In doing so, he joins truly exceptional company. Consider the six others with whom he now shares this honor: Nelson Mandela, Martin Luther King, Jr., Norman Borlaug, Elie Wiesel, Mother Teresa, and Aung San Suu Kyi. To most of us these individuals are giants of history; to Professor Yunus they are peers in the struggle to advance human dignity.

Many probably thought Professor Yunus would be a contender for the Nobel Prize in Economics, but in awarding him the Peace Prize, the Nobel Committee recognized that lasting peace and prosperity can only come when the poor can escape the prison of poverty. As I noted at last week's ceremony, this simple but important lesson from a Bangladeshi professor should not be lost here in Congress.

In addition to those I have already mentioned who contributed to this endeavor, there are many more who deserve a great deal of thanks. I would like to thank a few of them.

First of all, Professor Yunus' assistant and the director of the Yunus Centre, Lamiya Morshed. She has worked tirelessly throughout this process—helping in the medal design and development and successfully taking on the daunting task of planning and coordinating a complex series of ceremonies, receptions, and meetings for Professor Yunus.

The dedicated and professional staff of the U.S. Mint deserve great praise for their work to design and produce the medal. Throughout the process one person has held this project especially close to her heart. Leslie Schwager, program specialist for the Yunus Gold Medal, worked tirelessly with my staff, Lamiya, and within the Mint to keep the process on track.

I would finally like to thank Speaker BOEHNER and his staff, as well as the staff of the Senate Sergeant at Arms, for their cooperation and leadership on the ceremony.

At last, Prof. Muhammad Yunus, my friend, has received from Congress an honor he has deserved for so long. I congratulate him and his family. I thank the country of Bangladesh for sharing this beloved national hero with the world.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR OBJECTION

Mrs. McCASKILL. Mr. President, at this time, I am objecting to the Senate proceeding to the consideration of the nomination of Lt Gen. Susan Helms, USAF, Calendar No. 70 in order to provide additional time for myself and other Senators to gather additional information regarding Lieutenant General Helms' record of service, particularly her actions serving as a convening authority for military courts martial.

TRIBUTE TO ANN LORDEMAN

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I would like to recognize the distinguished career of Ann Lordeman, who is retiring after 22 years of service at the Congressional Research Service, CRS. In her time at CRS, Ann has been lead analyst on employment and training programs, national and community service programs, and programs serving students with disabilities such as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, IDEA. Her work has contributed in important ways to numerous Federal policies in these areas and benefited many American families, workers, and schoolchildren.

Ann was deeply involved in deliberations leading to the passage of the Workforce Investment Act, WIA, of 1998 and in deliberations leading to the reauthorization of the National and Community Service Act, NCSA, of 1990 and the Domestic Volunteer Service Act, DVSA, of 1973. In recent years, she has focused heavily on issues related to the financing, implementation, and administration of IDEA. In all of these policy areas, Ann has provided technical expertise and critical legislative support to congressional committees, Members, and their staffs.

Throughout her career Ann has embraced standards of authoritativeness, objectivity, and confidentiality, which are essential to the success of CRS analysts. She is a trusted resource who has supported the development and refinement of legislative proposals through data analysis, strong understanding of the policy areas she works in, and the anticipation of potential consequences associated with policy options. Ann has also always exhibited a strong service-orientation; while working on national issues, Ann is never too busy to support congressional offices trying to resolve problems for families seeking appropriate educational services and accommodations for their children or to identify resources available for communities to help dislocated workers. She has helped the citizens of West Virginia in this manner with great regularity over her years of service.

Within CRS, Ann is renowned for her generosity and strong inclination to mentor and support the growth of new analysts and to work collaboratively with colleagues for the benefit of her congressional clients. Her many career achievements warrant recognition, and it is my great pleasure to commend her on her 22 years of outstanding public service at CRS.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO DEAN E. GALLES

• Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, today I wish to honor Dean E. Galles, a decorated US Army combat veteran of World War II. Dean, on behalf of all Montanans and all Americans, I stand to say ''thank you'' for your service to this Nation.

It is my honor to share the remarkable story of Dean's service in World War II.

Dean was born November 9, 1919 in Broadview, MT, a small prairie town on a rail spur.

As a boy, Dean's family moved to Billings where his father continued in business. Dean looked up to his father as a role model throughout his life. In 1937, Dean graduated from high school in Billings and enrolled at the University of Montana, where he also participated in the Army Reserve Officer's Training Corps. Dean graduated in the spring of 1941 and became a commissioned officer in the 7th Infantry Division, U.S. Army.

Lieutenant Galles sailed with his division to attack Japanese forces occupying Attu and Kiska Islands in the Aleutian chain, the westernmost group of Alaskan islands. Upon landing, the American forces were left with the daunting task of removing Japanese troops firmly entrenched on high ground.

At dawn on May 29, 1943, the Japanese commander ordered a desperate, all-out assault on the American forces, which is believed to be the largest banzai charge in World War II's Pacific theater of operation. In spite of the extreme cold weather and high casualties, American forces prevailed. Sometime during the battle, Dean was bayoneted twice and left for dead. In spite of his wounds, Lieutenant Galles struggled two miles to alert other Americans.

On April 7, 1945, then-Captain Galles led an American assault on a Japanese force entrenched on the island of Okinawa. With complete disregard for personal hazards, he moved across open, fire-swept terrain and directed the successful attack. During the confrontation, Captain Galles was wounded a third time and received the Silver Star medal for heroism. Dean is still impacted today due to the Japanese bullet in his chest from wounds received on Okinawa.

Following the third injury, Dean returned to Billings where his wife lived, and he began a successful business. After retirement, Dean has been active in veterans' and civic organizations, where he continues to be a source of inspiration, courage, and patriotism. A fellow veteran recently asked Dean what would he say to Americans yet unborn? In a now frail, but resolute, voice, Mr. Galles replied, ''America is worth fighting for; I hope they keep on fighting.''

Seventy years would pass before the Army would award Dean the Bronze Star medal for Valor for his actions on Attu Island.

Mr. President, on behalf of a grateful Nation, I commend Mr. Galles and his service to America.•

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting three treaties which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:03 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 624. An act to provide for the sharing of certain cyber threat intelligence and cyber threat information between the intelligence community and cybersecurity entities, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 3 of the Protect Our Kids Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–275), and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Speaker appoints the following individuals on the part of the House of Representatives to the Commission to Eliminate Child Abuse and Neglect Fatalities: Ms. Susan Dreyfus of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, and Ms. Cassie Statuto Bevan of Derwood, Maryland.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 624. An act to provide for the sharing of certain cyber threat intelligence and cyber threat information between the intelligence community and cybersecurity entities, and for other purposes; to the Select Committee on Intelligence.

MEASURES DISCHARGED

The following bill was discharged from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions, and referred as indicated:

S. 437. A bill to authorize the Department of Housing and Urban Development to transform neighborhoods of extreme poverty into

sustainable, mixed-income neighborhoods with access to economic opportunities, by revitalizing severely distressed housing, and investing and leveraging investments in well-functioning services, education opportunities, public assets, public transportation, and improved access to jobs; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

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–1229. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Decorah, IA'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2011–1433)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1230. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; West Union, IA'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2011–1434)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1231. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Middletown, OH'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0651)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1232. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Superior, WI'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0656)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1233. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace; Round Mountain, TX'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0771)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1234. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace; Tecumseh, NE'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1098)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1235. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace; Beeville, TX'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0821)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1236. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2008–0847)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1237. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0597)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1238. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Turbofan Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1288)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1239. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Hughes Helicopters, Inc., and McDonnell Douglas Helicopter Systems (Type Certificate is Currently Held by MD Helicopters, Inc.) Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0890)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1240. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Robinson Helicopter Company Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1088)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1241. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2005–22523)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1242. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0772)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1243. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2011–1453)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1244. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2011–1417)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1245. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; REIMS AVIATION S.A. Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1346)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1246. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Embraer S.A. Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1077)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1247. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0150)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1248. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of VOR Federal Airway V–233, Springfield, IL'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0179)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1249. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Modification of VOR Federal Airways V–68, V–76, V–194, and V–548 in the Vicinity of Houston, TX'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0231)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1250. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (52); Amdt. No. 3526'' (RIN2120–AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1251. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (87); Amdt. No. 3527'' (RIN2120–AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1252. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron, Inc.'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1016)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1253. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation,

transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; PILATUS Aircraft LTD. Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2008–0070)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1254. A communication from the Regulatory Ombudsman, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Commercial Driver's License Testing and Commercial Learner's Permit Standard'' (RIN2126–AB59) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1255. A communication from the Trial Attorney, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Systems for Telephonic Notification of Unsafe Conditions at Highway-Rail and Pathway Grade Crossings'' (RIN2130–AC38) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1256. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Chief Counsel for Safety, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Vehicle/Track Interaction Safety Standards; High-Speed and High Cant Deficiency Operations'' (RIN2130–AC09) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1257. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment to the Export Administration Regulations: List of Items Classified Under Control Classification OY521 Series—Biosensor Systems'' (RIN0694–AF73) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 1, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1258. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Television Broadcasting Services: Jackson, Wyoming to Wilmington, Delaware'' (MB Docket No. 13–73) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 11, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1259. A communication from the Deputy Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Connect America Fund; A National Broadband Plan for Our Future'' (DA 13–332) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 10, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1260. A communication from the Deputy Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Connect America Fund, High-Cost Universal Service Report'' ((RIN3060–AJ90) (DA 13–252)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 1, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1261. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Lake Champlain, Swanton, VT'' ((RIN1625–AA09) (Docket No. USCG–2012–0918)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1262. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Elizabeth River, Eastern Branch, Norfolk, VA'' ((RIN1625–AA09) (Docket No. USCG–2012–0357)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1263. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Green River, Small-house, KY and Black River, Jonesboro, LA'' ((RIN1625–AA09) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0041)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1264. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Pelican Island Causeway, Galveston, Channel, TX'' ((RIN1625–AA09) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0063)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1265. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Sabine River, near Ruliff, LA'' ((RIN1625–AA09) (Docket No. USCG–2012–1065)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1266. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Operation Regulation; New Haven Harbor, Quinnipiac and Mill Rivers, CT'' ((RIN1625–AA09) (Docket No. USCG–2009–1021)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1267. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulations; 2013 Lauderdale Air Show, Atlantic Ocean; Fort Lauderdale, FL'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2012–1073)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1268. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulations; New River Raft Race, New River; Fort Lauderdale, FL'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0047)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1269. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulations; 2013 International Rolex Regatta; St. Thomas Harbor; St. Thomas, U.S. Virgin Islands'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2012–1079)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1270. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulations; Patriot Challenge Kayak Race, Ashley River; Charleston, SC'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0030)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1271. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulations; Charleston Race Week, Charleston Harbor; Charleston, SC'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0081)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1272. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone within the Lower Portion of Anchorage No. 9, Mantua Creek Anchorage; Paulsboro, NJ'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2012–1092)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 8, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1273. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone, Change to Enforcement Period, Patapsco River, Northwest and Inner Harbors; Baltimore, MD'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2012–1075)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1274. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; MODU KULLUK; Kiliuda Bay, Kodiak Island, AK to Captains Bay, Unalaska Island, AK'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0091)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1275. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Desert Storm Shootout; Lake Havasu, Lake Havasu City, AZ'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0005)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1276. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; BWRC Southwest Showdown 2, Parker, AZ'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0058)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1277. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; 2013 Naval Air Station Key West Air Spectacular, Boca Chica Channel; Boca Chica, FL'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0077) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1278. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Lake Havasu Triathlon; Lake Havasu City, AZ'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0023)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1279. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; M/V XIANG YUN KOU and MODU NOBLE DISCOVERER; Resurrection Bay, Seward, AK'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0128)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1280. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; St. Patrick's Day Fireworks; Manitowoc River, Manitowoc, WI'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0116)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1281. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Lubbers Cup Regatta; Spring Lake, MI'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0210)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1282. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Blue Water Resort and Casino Spring Classic, Parker, AZ'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0074)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1283. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zones; Annual Events Requiring Safety Zones in the Captain of the Port Lake Michigan Zone'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0020)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1284. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Seafair Blue Angels Air Show Performance, Seattle, WA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2012–0903)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1285. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Spanish Navy School Ship San Sebastian El Cano Escort; Bahia de San Juan; San Juan, PR'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0166)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1286. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Anchorages; Lower Mississippi River, Above Head of Passes, Convent, LA and Point Pleasant, LA'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2012–0103)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1287. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Great Lakes Pilotage Rates—2013 Annual Review and Adjustment'' ((RIN1625–AB89) (Docket No. USCG–2012–0409)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1288. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Implementation of MARPOL Annex V Amendments'' ((RIN1625–AB97) (Docket No. USCG–2012–1049)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1289. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Marine Vapor Control Systems'' ((RIN1625–AB37) (Docket No. USCG–1999–5150)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mrs. BOXER, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 601. A bill to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113–13).

By Mr. WYDEN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

S. 23. A bill to designate as wilderness certain land and inland water within the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in the State of Michigan, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113–14).

S. 25. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal features of the electric distribution system to the South Utah Valley Electric Service District, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113–15).

S. 26. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to facilitate the development of hydroelectric power on the Diamond Fork System of the Central Utah Project (Rept. No. 113–16).

S. 112. A bill to expand the Alpine Lakes Wilderness in the State of Washington, to designate the Middle Fork Snoqualmie River and Pratt River as wild and scenic rivers, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113–17).

S. 130. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land to the Powell Recreation District in the State of Wyoming (Rept. No. 113–18).

S. 157. A bill to provide for certain improvements to the Denali National Park and Preserve in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113–19).

S. 222. A bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to clarify that uncertified States and Indian tribes have the authority to use certain payments for certain noncoal reclamation projects and acid mine remediation programs (Rept. No. 113–20).

S. 230. A bill to authorize the Peace Corps Commemorative Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113–21).

S. 244. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to modify the Pilot Project offices of the Federal Permit Streamlining Pilot Project (Rept. No. 113–22).

By Mr. WYDEN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment:

S. 247. A bill to establish the Harriet Tubman National Historical Park in Auburn, New York, and the Harriet Tubman Underground Railroad National Historical Park in Caroline, Dorchester, and Talbot Counties, Maryland, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113–23).

By Mr. WYDEN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

S. 276. A bill to reinstate and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving the American Falls Reservoir (Rept. No. 113–24).

S. 304. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the State of Mississippi 2 parcels of surplus land within the boundary of the Natchez Trace Parkway, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113–25).

By Mr. WYDEN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment:

S. 311. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating sites in the Lower Mississippi River Area in the State of Louisiana as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113–26).

S. 347. A bill to establish the First State National Historical Park in the State of Delaware, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113–27).

By Mr. WYDEN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

S. 352. A bill to provide for the designation of the Devil's Staircase Wilderness Area in the State of Oregon, to designate segments of Wasson and Franklin Creeks in the State of Oregon as wild rivers, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113–28).

S. 354. A bill to modify the boundary of the Oregon Caves National Monument, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113–29).

S. 383. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate a segment of Illabot Creek in Skagit County, Washington, as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System (Rept. No. 113–30).

S. 393. A bill to designate additional segments and tributaries of White Clay Creek, in the States of Delaware and Pennsylvania, as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System (Rept. No. 113–31).

S. 459. A bill to modify the boundary of the Minuteman Missile National Historic Site in the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113–32).

By Ms. LANDRIEU, from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship:

Special Report entitled ''Summary of Legislative and Oversight Activities During the 112th Congress'' (Rept. No. 113–33).

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 (for himself and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 774. A bill to require the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to Congress on the effectiveness of the Federal Communications Commission's universal service reforms; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. JOHANNS):

S. 775. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax incentive for the installation and maintenance of mechanical insulation property; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 776. A bill to establish the Columbine-Hondo Wilderness in the State of New Mexico, to provide for the conveyance of certain parcels of National Forest System land in the State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. LAUTENBERG):

S. Res. 104. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Youth HIV & AIDS Awareness Day; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. Con. Res. 14. A concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; to the Committee on the Budget.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 19

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 19, a bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to establish a procedure for approval of certain settlements.

S. 162

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 162, a bill to reauthorize and improve the Mentally Ill Offender Treatment and Crime Reduction Act of 2004.

S. 170

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 170, a bill to recognize the heritage of recreational fishing, hunting, and recreational shooting on Federal public land and ensure continued opportunities for those activities.

S. 296

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) were added as cosponsors of S. 296, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate discrimination in the immigration laws by permitting permanent partners of United States citizens and lawful permanent residents to obtain lawful permanent resident status in the same manner as spouses of citizens and lawful permanent residents and to penalize immigration fraud in connection with permanent partnerships.

S. 315

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 315, a bill to reauthorize and extend the Paul D. Wellstone Muscular Dystrophy Community Assistance, Research, and Education Amendments of 2008.

S. 316

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 316, a bill to recalculate and restore retirement annuity obligations of the United States Postal Service, to eliminate the requirement that the United States Postal Service prefund the Postal Service Retiree Health Benefits Fund, to place restrictions on the closure of postal facilities, to create incentives for innovation for the United States Postal Service, to maintain levels of postal service, and for other purposes.

S. 337

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 337, a bill to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

S. 425

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 425, a bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to improve the quality, health outcomes, and value of maternity care under the Medicaid and CHIP programs by developing maternity care quality measures and supporting maternity care quality collaboratives.

S. 445

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 445, a bill to improve security at State and local courthouses.

S. 573

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 573, a bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to improve veterans service organizations access to Federal surplus personal property.

S. 619

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 619, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prevent unjust and irrational criminal punishments.

S. 632

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 632, a bill to amend the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 to repeal a duplicative program relating to inspection and grading of catfish.

S. 664

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 664, a bill to require reports by Federal Government entities regarding responses to Inspector General recommendations on potential cost-saving measures or on reimbursement for poor contractor performance, cost overruns, or other reasons, and for other purposes.

S. 674

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 674, a bill to require prompt responses from the heads of covered Federal agencies when the Secretary of Veterans Affairs requests information necessary to adjudicate claims for benefits under laws administered by the Secretary, and for other purposes.

S. 675

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 675, a bill to prohibit contracting with the enemy.

S. 707

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) were added as cosponsors of S. 707, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to extend the reduced interest rate for Federal Direct Stafford Loans.

S. 709

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 709, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to increase diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease and related dementias, leading to better care and outcomes for Americans living with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias.

S. 710

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) were added as cosponsors of S. 710, a bill to provide exemptions from municipal advisor registration requirements.

S. 733

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 733, a bill to amend the Department of Energy High-End Computing Revitalization Act of 2004 to improve the high-end computing research and development program of the Department of Energy, and for other purposes.

S. 734

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S.

734, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation.

S. 742

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 742, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Small Business Act to expand the availability of employee stock ownership plans in S corporations, and for other purposes.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 104—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL YOUTH HIV & AIDS AWARENESS DAY

Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. LAUTENBERG) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 104

Whereas, more than 30 years into the epidemic, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimates that in the United States more than 1,100,000 people are living with HIV, and every year approximately 50,000 people acquire HIV;

Whereas 1 in 4 new HIV infections occurs among young people between the ages of 13 and 24, accounting for approximately 1,000 new cases every month;

Whereas 60 percent of HIV positive youth do not know that they carry the HIV virus;

Whereas there are approximately 76,400 young people living with HIV;

Whereas African-American youth bear a disproportionate burden of the epidemic, representing 60 percent of new infections in young people;

Whereas new HIV infections among 13 to 29 year old African-American men who have sex with men increased 48 percent from 2006 to 2009;

Whereas the Division of Adolescent and School Health is the only Federal program supporting HIV prevention for adolescents in schools;

Whereas the largest Federal program dedicated to providing care and treatment for people living with HIV was named after Ryan White, a teenager from Indiana who helped educate the people of the United States about HIV and AIDS in the 1980s;

Whereas the Ryan White Part D Program is one of the national efforts to link HIV positive youth to medical care and support services;

Whereas the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18001 et seq.) includes many provisions that benefit young people and help achieve the goal of an AIDS-free generation, including funding for sex education to help ensure that every young person in the United States is educated about HIV/AIDS, a prohibition against denying people living with HIV access to health care, HIV testing for women without a copay, and expanded access to Medicaid which will help more HIV-positive youth receive care; and

Whereas April 10 of each year is now recognized as National Youth HIV & AIDS Awareness Day: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of National Youth HIV & AIDS Awareness Day;

(2) encourages State and local governments, including public health agencies, education agencies, schools, and media organizations to recognize and support such a day;

(3) promotes effective and comprehensive HIV prevention education programs both in and out of schools as a tool to ensure that all people in the United States are educated about HIV, as called for in the National HIV/AIDS Strategy;

(4) urges youth-friendly and accessible health care services to better provide for the early identification of HIV through voluntary routine testing, and to connect those in need to clinically and culturally appropriate care and treatment as early as possible;

(5) commends the work of AIDS service organizations, community and faith-based organizations, and school-based health centers that are providing youth-friendly and effective prevention, treatment, care, and support services to young people living with and vulnerable to HIV/AIDS;

(6) recognizes the importance of interventions that address structural barriers faced by young people to living healthy lives, including accessible health care, safe and inclusive schools and communities, family acceptance, secure housing, excellent education, employment and legal protections, and poverty reduction initiatives; and

(7) prioritizes youth leadership and development in order to ensure the involvement of youths in decisions that impact their health and well-being and to provide the next generation of HIV/AIDS doctors, advocates, educators, researchers, and other professionals, as a necessary means to achieving an AIDS-free generation.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 14—SETTING FORTH THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET FOR THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014 AND SETTING FORTH THE APPROPRIATE BUDGETARY LEVELS FOR FISCAL YEARS 2015 THROUGH 2023

Mr. PAUL submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Budget:

S. CON. RES. 14

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2014 and that this resolution sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2014.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.
Sec. 102. Social Security.
Sec. 103. Major functional categories.

TITLE II—RESERVE FUNDS

Sec. 201. Deficit-reduction reserve fund for the sale of unused or vacant Federal properties.
Sec. 202. Deficit-reduction reserve fund for selling excess Federal lands.
Sec. 203. Deficit-reduction reserve fund for the repeal of Davis-Bacon prevailing wage laws.
Sec. 204. Deficit-reduction reserve fund for the reduction of purchasing and maintaining Federal vehicles.
Sec. 205. Deficit-reduction reserve fund for the sale of financial assets purchased through the Troubled Asset Relief Program.

TITLE III—BUDGET PROCESS

Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement

Sec. 301. Discretionary spending limits for fiscal years 2014 through 2023, program integrity initiatives, and other adjustments.
Sec. 302. Point of order against advance appropriations.
Sec. 303. Emergency legislation.
Sec. 304. Point of order against any Budget Resolution that fails to achieve balance.

Subtitle B—Other Provisions

Sec. 311. Oversight of Government performance.
Sec. 312. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.
Sec. 313. Adjustments to reflect changes in concepts and definitions.
Sec. 314. Rescind unspent or unobligated balances after 36 months.

TITLE IV—RECONCILIATION

Sec. 401. Reconciliation in the Senate.

TITLE V—CONGRESSIONAL POLICY CHANGES

Sec. 501. Policy statement on Social Security.
Sec. 502. Policy statement on Medicare.
Sec. 503. Policy statement on tax reform.

TITLE VI—SENSE OF CONGRESS

Sec. 601. Regulatory reform.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2023:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2014: $1,724,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,034,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,318,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,468,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $2,734,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,039,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,323,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,501,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,671,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $3,817,000,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2014: $−547,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $−573,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $−461,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $−436,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $−295,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $−110,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $38,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $44,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $20,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $−15,000,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2014: $2,509,976,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,461,876,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,541,467,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,649,189,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $2,763,981,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: $2,876,015,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $2,980,877,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,062,110,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,220,296,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $3,287,823,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2014: $2,497,689,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,445,543,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,512,417,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,607,682,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $2,705,913,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $2,822,123,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $2,914,907,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,011,989,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,169,595,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $3,232,819,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 2014: $−765,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $−411,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $−193,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $−140,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $23,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $201,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $390,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $467,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $478,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $560,000,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2014: $13,073,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $13,576,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $13,862,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $14,095,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $14,156,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $14,049,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $13,772,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $13,437,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $13,119,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $12,740,000,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2014: $13,073,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $13,576,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $13,862,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $14,095,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $14,156,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $14,049,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $13,772,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $13,437,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $13,119,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $12,740,000,000,000.

SEC. 102. SOCIAL SECURITY.

(a) SOCIAL SECURITY REVENUES.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of revenues of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2014: $732,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $766,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $812,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $862,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $908,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $952,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $995,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $1,039,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $1,084,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $1,129,000,000,000.

(b) SOCIAL SECURITY OUTLAYS.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2014: $634,822,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $711,355,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $756,949,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $805,969,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $856,933,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $907,679,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $962,040,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $1,022,374,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $1,086,431,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $1,227,009,000,000.

(c) SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund for administrative expenses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $5,784,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,803,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $5,968,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,943,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $6,176,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,146,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $6,392,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,360,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $6,619,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,586,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $6,846,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,812,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $7,073,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,039,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $7,304,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,269,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $7,544,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,508,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $7,792,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,754,000,000.

SEC. 103. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2011 through 2021 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $529,191,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $534,962,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $530,037,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $523,364,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $541,611,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $536,268,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $555,333,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $542,638,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $568,160,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $548,903,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $582,025,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $567,622,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $596,924,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $581,825,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $611,794,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $596,323,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $628,145,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $617,785,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $644,858,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $628,204,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $22,801,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,438,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $21,349,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,798,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $21,818,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,563,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $22,288,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,467,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $22,728,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,599,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $23,207,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,997,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $23,691,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,377,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $23,695,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,744,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $24,446,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,420,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $24,930,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,794,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $20,821,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,396,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $21,215,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,168,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $21,616,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,687,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $22,025,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,059,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $22,441,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,439,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $22,866,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,825,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $23,298,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,219,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $23,739,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,620,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $24,188,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,029,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $24,646,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,446,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $672,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,237,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $1,090,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,981,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $1,096,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,491,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $1,108,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,396,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $1,009,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,137,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $1,014,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,137,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $981,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $988,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $934,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $957,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $866,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $985,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $854,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $24,903,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,670,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $24,319,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,318,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $24,717,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,408,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $25,379,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $26,274,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,549,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $26,220,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $224,932,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $26,972,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,419,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $26,706,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,203,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $26,953,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,091,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $27,478,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,483,000,000.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $18,637,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,714,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $18,657,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,107,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $19,241,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,444,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $18,794,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,931,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $18,786,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,867,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $19,074,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,059,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $19,258,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,345,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $19,482,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,589,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $19,611,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,711,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $19,841,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,949,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $12,266,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−3,909,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $10,088,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−4,953,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $11,455,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−3,965,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $12,112,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−5,158,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $11,634,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−5,848,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $11,335,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−11,985,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $11,421,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−10,985,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $11,381,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−5,842,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $11,320,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,038,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $11,240,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−8,454,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $79,068,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $78,768,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $70,126,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $78,229,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $70,962,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $79,661,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, 73,668,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $82,350,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $76,223,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $83,919,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $76,696,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $85,779,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $79,389,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $88,350,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $79,703,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $89,954,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $80,362,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $91,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $80,817,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $92,689,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $31,742,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,419,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $13,051,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,893,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $13,250,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,384,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $13,455,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,402,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $13,172,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,989,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $12,974,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,684,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $13,220,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,921,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $13,472,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,465,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $13,728,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,465,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $13,988,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,729,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $13,565,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,573,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $21,948,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,559,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $31,997,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,873,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $42,511,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,554,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $46,512,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,471,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $47,097,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,017,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $46,859,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,315,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $47,196,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,419,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $47,892,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,802,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $48,645,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,467,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $344,065,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $339,669,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $353,749,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $350,536,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $358,733,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $358,536,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $371,740,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $370,334,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $382,880,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $379,880,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $328,851,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $394,039,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $414,951,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $400,863,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $416,836,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $412,860,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $429,666,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $425,077,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $442,319,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $437,732,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $516,044,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $515,813,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $7,068,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,012,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $338,810,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $341,208,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $336,457,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $333,329,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $340,753,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $337,648,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $345,718,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $338,338,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $354,654,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $343,599,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $364,538,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $358,369,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $375,679,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $369,752,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $387,531,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $381,668,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $397,717,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $396,729,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $408,616,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $402,741,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $27,506,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,586,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $30,322,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,343,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $33,369,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,444,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $36,691,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,729,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $40,005,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,005,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $43,421,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,421,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $46,421,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,954,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $50,474,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,474,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $54,235,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,235,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $58,441,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,441,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $145,079,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $144,951,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $149,792,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $149,237,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $162,051,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $161,425,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $160,947,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $160,110,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $159,423,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $158,564,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $171,032,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $170,143,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $175,674,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $174,791,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $179,585,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $178,655,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $191,294,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $190,344,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $187,945,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $186,882,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $49,101,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,580,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $38,199,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,926,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $40,527,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,512,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $39,329,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,808,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $39,843,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,047,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $40,538,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,333,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $41,242,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,350,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $42,130,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,094,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $46,816,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,690,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $48,121,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,911,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $21,623,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,532,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $22,268,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,550,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $23,010,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,631,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $23,661,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,268,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $24,523,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,065,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $25,408,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,556,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $26,246,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,556,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $27,130,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,478,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $28,043,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $28,953,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,357,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $350,410,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $350,410,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $370,928,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $370,928,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $413,618,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $413,618,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $492,494,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $492,494,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $582,183,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $582,183,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $615,018,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $615,018,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $642,799,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $642,799,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $653,992,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $653,992,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $661,671,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $661,671,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $664,720,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $664,720,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $−1,792,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−269,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $−3,875,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−1,029,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $−3,737,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−1,977,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $−4,392,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−2,831,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $−3,907,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−3,468,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $−3,735,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−3,866,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $−3,777,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−3,890,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $−3,817,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−3,882,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $−89,452,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−89,452,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $−98,914,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−98,914,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $−114,591,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−114,591,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $−131,537,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−131,537,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $−154,180,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−154,180,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $−163,759,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−163,759,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $−168,611,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−168,611,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $−155,297,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−155,297,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $−143,747,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−143,747,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $−151,025,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−151,025,000,000.
(21) Global War on Terrorism (970):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $50,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $25,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,000,000,000
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $−0.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $0.

(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(22) Congressional Health Insurance for Seniors (990):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $3,125,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,125,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $495,308,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $495,406,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $528,308,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $528,416,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $527,644,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $527,777,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $531,755,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $531,921,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $567,710,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $567,989,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $588,233,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $588,479,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $605,718,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $606,297,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $681,132,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $672,935,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $706,491,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $706,150,000,000.

TITLE II—RESERVE FUNDS

SEC. 201. DEFICIT-REDUCTION RESERVE FUND FOR THE SALE OF UNUSED OR VACANT FEDERAL PROPERTIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may reduce the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that achieve savings by selling any unused or vacant Federal properties. The Chairman may also make adjustments to the Senate's pay-as-you-go ledger over 10 years to ensure that the deficit reduction achieved is used for deficit reduction only. The adjustments authorized under this section shall be of the amount of deficit reduction achieved.

SEC. 202. DEFICIT-REDUCTION RESERVE FUND FOR SELLING EXCESS FEDERAL LANDS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may reduce the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that achieve savings by selling any excess Federal lands. The Chairman may also make adjustments to the Senate's pay-as-you-go ledger over 10 years to ensure that the deficit reduction achieved is used for deficit reduction only. The adjustments authorized under this section shall be of the amount of deficit reduction achieved.

SEC. 203. DEFICIT-REDUCTION RESERVE FUND FOR THE REPEAL OF DAVIS-BACON PREVAILING WAGE LAWS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may reduce the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports from savings achieved by repealing the Davis-Bacon prevailing wage laws. The Chairman may also make adjustments to the Senate's pay-as-you-go ledger over 10 years to ensure that the deficit reduction achieved is used for deficit reduction only. The adjustments authorized under this section shall be of the amount of deficit reduction achieved.

SEC. 204. DEFICIT-REDUCTION RESERVE FUND FOR THE REDUCTION OF PURCHASING AND MAINTAINING FEDERAL VEHICLES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may reduce the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that achieve savings by reducing the Federal vehicles fleet. The Chairman may also make adjustments to the Senate's pay-as-you-go ledger over 10 years to ensure that the deficit reduction achieved is used for deficit reduction only. The adjustments authorized under this section shall be of the amount of deficit reduction achieved.

SEC. 205. DEFICIT-REDUCTION RESERVE FUND FOR THE SALE OF FINANCIAL ASSETS PURCHASED THROUGH THE TROUBLED ASSET RELIEF PROGRAM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may reduce the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that achieve savings by selling financial instruments and equity accumulated through the Troubled Asset Relief Program. The Chairman may also make adjustments to the Senate's pay-as-you-go ledger over 10 years to ensure that the deficit reduction achieved is used for deficit reduction only. The adjustments authorized under this section shall be of the amount of deficit reduction achieved.

TITLE III—BUDGET PROCESS

Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement

SEC. 301. DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS FOR FISCAL YEARS 2014 THROUGH 2023, PROGRAM INTEGRITY INITIATIVES, AND OTHER ADJUSTMENTS.

(a) SENATE POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill or joint resolution (or amendment, motion, or conference report on that bill or joint resolution) that would cause the discretionary spending limits in this section to be exceeded.

(2) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEALS.—

(A) WAIVER.—This subsection may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(B) APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this subsection shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this subsection.

(b) SENATE DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.—In the Senate and as used in this section, the term ''discretionary spending limit'' means—

(1) for fiscal year 2014, $942,636,000,000 in new budget authority and $997,677,000,000 in outlays;

(2) for fiscal year 2015, $899,935,000,000 in new budget authority and $942,103,000,000 in outlays;

(3) for fiscal year 2016, $885,842,000,000 in new budget authority and $910,362,000,000 in outlays;

(4) for fiscal year 2017, $906,645,000,000 in new budget authority and $925,457,000,000 in outlays;

(5) for fiscal year 2018, $929,163,000,000 in new budget authority and $939,667,000,000 in outlays;

(6) for fiscal year 2019, $951,179,000,000 in new budget authority and $966,694,000,000 in outlays;

(7) for fiscal year 2020, $976,080,000,000 in new budget authority and $990,498,000,000 in outlays;

(8) for fiscal year 2021, $999,540,000,000 in new budget authority and $1,013,879,000,000 in outlays;

(9) for fiscal year 2022, $1,024,753,000,000 in new budget authority and $1,044,562,000,000 in outlays; and

(10) for fiscal year 2023, $1,050,347,000,000 in new budget authority and $1,064,229,000,000 in outlays;

as adjusted in conformance with the adjustment procedures in subsection (c).

(c) ADJUSTMENTS IN THE SENATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—After the reporting of a bill or joint resolution relating to any matter described in paragraph (2), or the offering of an amendment or motion thereto or the submission of a conference report thereon—

(A) the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may adjust the discretionary spending limits, budgetary aggregates, and allocations pursuant to section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, by the amount of new budget authority in that measure for that purpose and the outlays flowing therefrom; and

(B) following any adjustment under subparagraph (A), the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate may report appropriately revised suballocations pursuant to section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to carry out this subsection.

(2) ADJUSTMENTS TO SUPPORT ONGOING OVERSEAS DEPLOYMENTS AND OTHER ACTIVITIES.—

(A) ADJUSTMENTS.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may adjust the discretionary spending limits, allocations to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and aggregates for one or more—

(i) bills reported by the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate or passed by the House of Representatives;

(ii) joint resolutions or amendments reported by the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(iii) amendments between the Houses received from the House of Representatives or Senate amendments offered by the authority of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; or

(iv) conference reports;

making appropriations for overseas deployments and other activities in the amounts specified in subparagraph (B).

(B) AMOUNTS SPECIFIED.—The amounts specified are—

(i) for fiscal year 2014, $50,000,000,000 in new budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom;

(ii) for fiscal year 2015, $25,000,000,000 in new budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom;

(iii) for fiscal year 2016, $0 in new budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom;

(iv) for fiscal year 2017, $0 in new budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom;

(v) for fiscal year 2018, $0 in new budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom;

(vi) for fiscal year 2019, $0 in new budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom;

(vii) for fiscal year 2020, $0 in new budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom;

(viii) for fiscal year 2021, $0 in new budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom;

(ix) for fiscal year 2022, $0 in new budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom; and

(x) for fiscal year 2023, $0 in new budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom.

SEC. 302. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—Except as provided in subsection (b), it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or conference report that would provide an advance appropriation.

(b) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''advance appropriation'' means any new budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 2013 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2012, or any new budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2013, that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2013.

SEC. 303. EMERGENCY LEGISLATION.

(a) AUTHORITY TO DESIGNATE.—In the Senate, with respect to a provision of direct spending or receipts legislation or appropriations for discretionary accounts that Congress designates as an emergency requirement in such measure, the amounts of new budget authority, outlays, and receipts in all fiscal years resulting from that provision shall be treated as an emergency requirement for the purpose of this section.

(b) EXEMPTION OF EMERGENCY PROVISIONS.—Any new budget authority, outlays, and receipts resulting from any provision designated as an emergency requirement, pursuant to this section, in any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report shall not count for purposes of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress) (relating to pay-as-you-go), section 311 of S. Con. Res. 70 (110th Congress) (relating to long-term deficits), and section 404 of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress) (relating to short-term deficits), and section 301 of this resolution (relating to discretionary spending). Designated emergency provisions shall not count for the purpose of revising allocations, aggregates, or other levels pursuant to procedures established under section 301(b)(7) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for deficit-neutral reserve funds and revising discretionary spending limits set pursuant to section 301 of this resolution.

(c) DESIGNATIONS.—If a provision of legislation is designated as an emergency requirement under this section, the committee report and any statement of managers accompanying that legislation shall include an explanation of the manner in which the provision meets the criteria in subsection (f).

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms ''direct spending'', ''receipts'', and ''appropriations for discretionary accounts'' mean any provision of a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that affects direct spending, receipts, or appropriations as those terms have been defined and interpreted for purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(e) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—When the Senate is considering a bill, resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report, if a point of order is made by a Senator against an emergency designation in that measure, that provision making such a designation shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(2) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEALS.—

(A) WAIVER.—Paragraph (1) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(B) APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this subsection shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution, as the case may be. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this subsection.

(3) DEFINITION OF AN EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.—For purposes of paragraph (1), a provision shall be considered an emergency designation if it designates any item as an emergency requirement pursuant to this subsection.

(4) FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under paragraph (1) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(5) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to this section, and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report shall be deemed stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

(f) CRITERIA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, any provision is an emergency requirement if the situation addressed by such provision is—

(A) necessary, essential, or vital (not merely useful or beneficial);

(B) sudden, quickly coming into being, and not building up over time;

(C) an urgent, pressing, and compelling need requiring immediate action;

(D) subject to subparagraph (B), unforeseen, unpredictable, and unanticipated; and

(E) not permanent, temporary in nature.

(2) UNFORESEEN.—An emergency that is part of an aggregate level of anticipated emergencies, particularly when normally estimated in advance, is not unforeseen.

(g) INAPPLICABILITY.—In the Senate, section 403 of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010, shall no longer apply.

SEC. 304. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ANY BUDGET RESOLUTION THAT FAILS TO ACHIEVE BALANCE.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any budget resolution following the enactment of this resolution that does not achieve balance within 10 fiscal years.

(b) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEALS IN THE SENATE.—

(1) WAIVER.—This section may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEALS.—An affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

Subtitle B—Other Provisions

SEC. 311. OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE.

In the Senate, all committees are directed to review programs and tax expenditures within their jurisdiction to identify waste, fraud, abuse or duplication, and increase the use of performance data to inform committee work. Committees are also directed to review the matters for congressional consideration identified on the Government Accountability Office's High Risk list reports. Based on these oversight efforts and performance reviews of programs within their jurisdiction, committees are directed to include recommendations for improved governmental performance in their annual views and estimates reports required under section 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committees on the Budget.

SEC. 312. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this resolution the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

SEC. 313. ADJUSTMENTS TO REFLECT CHANGES IN CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.

Upon the enactment of a bill or joint resolution providing for a change in concepts or definitions, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may make adjustments to the levels and allocations in this resolution in accordance with section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as in effect prior to September 30, 2002).

SEC. 314. RESCIND UNSPENT OR UNOBLIGATED BALANCES AFTER 36 MONTHS.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall require that any unobligated or unspent allocations be rescinded after 36 months.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments resulting from the required rescissions shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this resolution the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

TITLE IV—RECONCILIATION

SEC. 401. RECONCILIATION IN THE SENATE.

(a) SUBMISSION TO PROVIDE FOR THE REFORM OF MANDATORY SPENDING.—(1) Not

later than September 1, 2013, the Senate committees named in paragraph (2) shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the United States Senate. After receiving those recommendations from the applicable committees of the Senate, the Committee on the Budget shall report to the Senate a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without substantive revision.

(2) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(A) COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS.—The Committee on Foreign Relations shall report changes in law within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending by $2,456,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

(B) COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION.—The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation shall report changes in law within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending outlays by $3,195,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

(C) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND ENERGY.—The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Energy shall report changes in law within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending outlays by $465,600,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

(D) COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS.—The Committee on Environment and Public Works shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending outlays by $1,022,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

(E) COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS.—The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending outlays by $504,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

(F) COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.—The Committee on Finance shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending outlays by $4,676,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

(G) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES.—The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending outlays by $10,818,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

(b) SUBMISSION OF REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—Upon the submission to the Committee on the Budget of the Senate of a recommendation that has complied with its reconciliation instructions solely by virtue of section 310(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the chairman of that committee may file with the Senate revised allocations under section 302(a) of such Act and revised functional levels and aggregates.

TITLE V—CONGRESSIONAL POLICY CHANGES

SEC. 501. POLICY STATEMENT ON SOCIAL SECURITY.

It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that Congress and the relevant committees of jurisdiction enact legislation to ensure the Social Security System achieves solvency over the 75 year window. Legislation should be enacted that adopts the following:

(1) The legislation must modify the Primary Insurance Amount formula to gradually reduce benefits on a progressive basis for workers with career-average earnings above the 40th percentile of newly retired workers.

(2) The normal retirement age (NRA) be increased to reflect longevity growth rate.

(3) The legislation should allow for and provide the option of private Social Security retirement accounts.

(4) Implement and allow for certain individuals to completely forego Social Security benefits and contribution.

SEC. 502. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEDICARE.

It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that Congress and the relevant committees of jurisdiction enact legislation to ensure a reduction in the unfunded liabilities of Medicare. Legislation should be enacted that adopts the following:

(1) Enrolls seniors in the same health care plan as Federal employees and Members of Congress, similar to the Federal Employee Health Benefits Plan (FEHBP).

(2) Beginning on January 1, 2015, the Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall ensure seniors currently enrolled or eligible for Medicare will have access to Congressional Health Care for Seniors Act.

(3) Prevents the Office of Personnel Management from placing onerous new mandates on health insurance plans, but allows the agency to continue to enforce reasonable minimal stands for plans, ensure the plans are fiscally solvent, and enforces rules for consumer protections.

(4) The legislation must create a new ''high-risk pool'' for the highest cost patients, providing a direct reimbursement to health care plans that enroll the costliest 5 percent of patients.

(5) Ensures that every senior can afford the high-quality insurance offered by FEHBP, providing support for 75 percent of the total costs, providing additional premium assistance to those who cannot afford the remaining share.

(6) The legislation must increase the age of eligibility gradually over 20 years, increasing the age from 65 to 70, resulting in a 3 month increase per year.

(7) High-income seniors will be provided less premium support than low-income seniors.

SEC. 503. POLICY STATEMENT ON TAX REFORM.

It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that Congress and the relevant committees of jurisdiction enact legislation to ensure a tax reform that broadens the tax base, reduces tax complexity, includes a consumption-based income tax, and a globally competitive flat tax.

(1) TAXES ON INDIVIDUALS.—This concurrent resolution shall eliminate all tax brackets and have one standard flat tax rate on adjusted gross income. The individual tax code shall remove all credits and deductions, with exception to the mortgage interest deduction, offsetting these with a substantially higher standard deduction and personal exemption. The standard deduction for joint filers should be equal to or greater than $35,000, $21,690 for head of household, and $17,500 for single filers. The personal exemption amount is $6,800. This proposal eliminates the individual alternative minimum tax (AMT). The tax reform would repeal all tax on savings and investments, including capital gains, qualified and ordinary dividends, estate, gift, and interest saving taxes.

(2) TAXES ON BUSINESSES.—This concurrent resolution shall eliminate all tax brackets and have one standard flat tax on adjusted gross income. The business tax code shall remove all credits and deductions, offsetting these with a lower tax rate and immediate expensing of all business inputs. Such inputs shall be determined by total revenue from the sale of goods and services less purchases of inputs from other firms less wages, salaries, and pensions paid to workers less purchases of plant and equipment.

(3) SINGLE SYSTEM.—The individuals and businesses would be subject to taxation on only those incomes that are produced or derived, as a territorial system in the United States. The aggregate taxes paid should provide the ability to fill out a tax return no larger than a postcard.

TITLE VI—SENSE OF CONGRESS

SEC. 601. REGULATORY REFORM.

It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that Congress and the relevant committees of jurisdiction enact legislation to ensure a regulatory reform.

(1) APPLY REGULATORY ANALYSIS REQUIREMENTS TO INDEPENDENT AGENCIES.—It shall be the policy of Congress to pass into law a requirement for independent agencies to abide by the same regulatory analysis requirement as those required by executive branch agencies.

(2) ADOPT THE REGULATIONS FROM THE EXECUTIVE IN NEED OF SCRUTINY ACT (REINS).—It shall be the policy of Congress to vote on the REINS Act, legislation that would require all regulations that impose a burden greater than $100,000,000 in economic aggregate may not be implemented as law unless Congress gives [their/its] consent by voting on the rule.

(3) SUNSET ALL REGULATIONS.—It is the policy of Congress that regulations imposed by the Federal Government shall automatically sunset every two years unless repromulgated by Congress.

(4) PROCESS REFORM.—It shall be the policy of Congress to implement regulatory process reform by instituting statutorily required regulatory impact analysis for all agencies, require the publication of regulatory impact analysis before the regulation is finalized, and ensure that not only are regulatory impact analysis conducted, but applied to the issued regulation or rulemaking.

(5) INCORPORATION OF FORMAL RULEMAKING FOR MAJOR RULES.—It shall be the policy of Congress to apply formal rulemaking procedures to all major regulations or those regulations that exceed $100,000,000 in aggregate economic costs.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will meet in open session on Tuesday, April 23, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room 430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled ''Successful Primary Care Programs: Creating the Workforce We Need.''

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact Sophie Kasimow of the committee staff on (202) 224–2831.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will meet in open session on Wednesday, April 24, 2013, at 2:30 p.m. in room 430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled ''The Economic Importance of Financial Literacy Education For Students.''

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact Josh Teitelbaum of the committee staff on (202) 228–1455.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will meet in open session on Thursday, April 25, 2013, at 2:30 p.m. in room 430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled ''Whistleblowers and Job Safety: Are Protections Adequate to Build a Safer Workplace?''

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact Larry Smar of the committee staff on (202) 224–9243.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will meet in executive session on Thursday, April 25, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room 430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to markup the nomination of Thomas E. Perez, to be Secretary of Labor.

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact the Committee at (202) 224–5375.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on April 22, 2013, at 10 a.m., in room SH–216 of the Hart Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''The Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act, S. 744.''

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

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Anna Henderson, a fellow on my staff, have privileges on the floor during today's session.

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

STANDING WITH THE PEOPLE OF KENYA

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 42, S. Res. 90.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 90) standing with the people of Kenya following their national and local elections on March 4, 2013, and urging a peaceful and credible resolution of electoral disputes in the courts.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with an amendment and an amendment to the preamble and an amendment to the title.

(Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the part printed in italic.)

(Strike the preamble and insert the part printed in italic.)

S. RES. 90

Whereas the Governments of the United States and Kenya have long shared a strong bilateral partnership, and Kenya plays a critically important role as a cornerstone of stability in East Africa and as a valued ally of the United States;

Whereas Kenya's disputed 2007 presidential election threatened the country's stability and its democratic trajectory, triggering an explosion of violence that resulted in the deaths of some 1,140 civilians and displaced nearly 600,000, some of whom have still not returned home;

Whereas a mediation effort by former United Nations Secretary-General Kofi Annan and an African Union Panel of Eminent African Personalities, supported by the United States, led to the signing of the National Accord on February 28, 2008, which led to a series of constitutional, electoral, and institutional reforms to address underlying causes of the crisis;

Whereas, as part of that reform process, the citizens of Kenya participated in a national referendum in August 2010, approving a new constitution that mandated significant institutional and structural changes to the government;

Whereas those constitutional changes have led to important reforms in the judicial sector and the electoral system in Kenya that aim to build greater public confidence in government institutions, and which demonstrate meaningful progress;

Whereas Kenya's Independent Commission of Inquiry into the Post-Election Violence (the ''Waki Commission'') concluded from its investigation in 2008 that there had been ''no serious effort by any government'' to punish perpetrators of previous incidents of ethnic and political violence, leading to a culture of impunity that contributed to the crisis that followed the 2007 elections, and, since then, despite laudable judicial reforms, few perpetrators or organizers of that violence have been held accountable for their crimes in Kenyan courts;

Whereas, based on the findings of the Waki Commission, mediator Kofi Annan submitted a list of key suspects to the Office of the Prosecutor of the International Criminal Court (ICC) in 2009, and several have been subsequently charged at the ICC with crimes against humanity;

Whereas the Department of State's 2011 Human Rights Report on Kenya notes, ''Widespread impunity at all levels of government continued to be a serious problem. The government took only limited action against security forces suspected of unlawful killings, and impunity in cases of corruption was common. Although the government took action in some cases to prosecute officials who committed abuses, impunity . . . was pervasive'';

Whereas President Barack Obama's Strategy on Sub-Saharan Africa, released in June 2012, states that the United States will not stand by while actors ''. . . manipulate the fairness and integrity of democratic processes, and we will stand in steady partnership with those who are committed to the principles of equality, justice and the rule of law'';

Whereas, in a February 2013 message to the people of Kenya, President Obama highlighted the power Kenyan communities have to reject intimidation and violence surrounding the upcoming election, resolve disputes in the courts as opposed to the streets, and ''move forward towards prosperity and opportunity that unleashes the extraordinary talents of your people'';

Whereas, five years after Kenya's post-election crisis, the country held its first general elections under the new constitution on March 4, 2013, which were largely peaceful;

Whereas Kenya's presidential candidates and their political parties committed themselves to a peaceful electoral process, and to resolving any resulting disputes through the judicial process;

Whereas the Kenyan Supreme Court ruled on March 30, 2013, that Uhuru Kenyatta was validly elected, and his opponents pledged to respect and honor the decision of the Court;

Whereas the White House issued a statement on March 30, 2013, stating, ''The electoral process and the peaceful adjudication of disputes in the Kenyan legal system are testaments to the progress Kenya has made in strengthening its democratic institutions, and the desire of the Kenyan people to move their country forward. Now is the time for Kenyans to come together to fully implement the political, institutional, and accountability reforms envisioned in the Kenyan constitution. . ..We welcome and wish to underscore the importance of Kenya's commitment to uphold its international obligations, including those with respect to international justice.''; and

Whereas in his inauguration speech on April 9, 2013, President Kenyatta said, ''I will lead all Kenyans – those who voted for me – and those who voted for our competitors – towards a national prosperity that is firmly rooted in a rich and abiding peace in which unity can ultimately be realized. . .Indeed, national unity will only be possible if we deal decisively with some of the issues that continue to hinder our progress. Achieving peace and strengthening unity will be the goal of my Government. This work begins now. We welcome all Kenyans to hold us to account.'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved,

That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the people of Kenya on their commitment to peaceful elections, as demonstrated on March 4, 2013;

(2) calls on Kenyans to come together to fully implement political, institutional, and accountability reforms envisioned in the Kenyan constitution;

(3) calls on the people of Kenya to continue their efforts to end intimidation, impunity, and violence;

(4) notes that many of the underlying grievances that have underpinned ethnic divisions and fueled the 2007-2008 violence remain largely unaddressed;

(5) affirms that accountability for the 2007-2008 post-election violence is a critical element to ensure Kenya's democracy, peace, and long-term stability;

(6) calls on the Government of Kenya to respect commitments to seek justice for the victims of political violence, including by honoring its obligations under the Rome Statute to cooperate fully with the International Criminal Court with regard to the three cases that remain before the Court slated to go to trial in 2013;

(7) calls on the Government of Kenya to ensure the International Criminal Court witnesses are fully protected and not subject to interference but afforded the protections they deserve to ensure justice is served;

(8) recognizes that, while the Government of Kenya has made important progress since the 2007 election, aspects of the Kenyan reform agenda specified in the National Accord and 2010 constitution remain unfinished, particularly with regard to police reform, devolution, land reform, and security;

(9) encourages the people and Government of Kenya to support ongoing implementation of constitutional reforms, rule of law, the establishment of county level government and efforts to strengthen governance, security, and judicial institutions that respect the dignity and rights of all the people of Kenya and ensure protection for judges;

(10) supports the devolution process in order to enable constitutional reform to be fully implemented;

(11) encourages the Government of Kenya to respect and protect the freedom of civil society organizations and activists which have historically led the process of political reform in Kenya;

(12) expresses hope that newly elected members of government will herald a new generation of responsible leadership in Kenya; and

(13) reaffirms that the people of the United States will continue to stand with the people of Kenya in support of democracy, partnership, and peace.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I further ask that the committee-reported amendment to the resolution be agreed to; the resolution, as amended, be agreed to; the committee-reported amendment to the preamble be agreed to; the preamble, as amended, be agreed to; the committee-reported title amendment be agreed to; and the motions to reconsider be made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The committee-reported amendment to the resolution was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 90), as amended, was agreed to.

The committee-reported amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, with its preamble, as amended, reads as follows:

S. RES. 90

Whereas the Governments of the United States and Kenya have long shared a strong bilateral partnership, and Kenya plays a critically important role as a cornerstone of stability in East Africa and as a valued ally of the United States;

Whereas Kenya's disputed 2007 presidential election threatened the country's stability and its democratic trajectory, triggering an explosion of violence that resulted in the deaths of some 1,140 civilians and displaced nearly 600,000, some of whom have still not returned home;

Whereas a mediation effort by former United Nations Secretary-General Kofi Annan and an African Union Panel of Eminent African Personalities, supported by the United States, led to the signing of the National Accord on February 28, 2008, which led to a series of constitutional, electoral, and institutional reforms to address underlying causes of the crisis;

Whereas as part of that reform process, the citizens of Kenya participated in a national referendum in August 2010, approving a new constitution that mandated significant institutional and structural changes to the government;

Whereas those constitutional changes have led to important reforms in the judicial sector and the electoral system in Kenya that aim to build greater public confidence in government institutions, and which demonstrate meaningful progress;

Whereas Kenya's Independent Commission of Inquiry into the Post-Election Violence (the ''Waki Commission'') concluded from its investigation in 2008 that there had been ''no serious effort by any government'' to punish perpetrators of previous incidents of ethnic and political violence, leading to a culture of impunity that contributed to the crisis that followed the 2007 elections, and, since then, despite laudable judicial reforms, few perpetrators or organizers of that violence have been held accountable for their crimes in Kenyan courts;

Whereas based on the findings of the Waki Commission, mediator Kofi Annan submitted a list of key suspects to the Office of the Prosecutor of the International Criminal Court (ICC) in 2009, and several have been subsequently charged at the ICC with crimes against humanity;

Whereas the Department of State's 2011 Human Rights Report on Kenya notes, ''Widespread impunity at all levels of government continued to be a serious problem. The government took only limited action against security forces suspected of unlawful killings, and impunity in cases of corruption was common. Although the government took action in some cases to prosecute officials who committed abuses, impunity . . . was pervasive'';

Whereas President Barack Obama's Strategy on Sub-Saharan Africa, released in June 2012, states that the United States will not stand by while actors ''. . . manipulate the fairness and integrity of democratic processes, and we will stand in steady partnership with those who are committed to the principles of equality, justice and the rule of law'';

Whereas, in a February 2013 message to the people of Kenya, President Obama highlighted the power Kenyan communities have to reject intimidation and violence surrounding the upcoming election, resolve disputes in the courts as opposed to the streets, and ''move forward towards prosperity and opportunity that unleashes the extraordinary talents of your people'';

Whereas five years after Kenya's post-election crisis, the country held its first general elections under the new constitution on March 4, 2013, which were largely peaceful;

Whereas Kenya's presidential candidates and their political parties committed themselves to a peaceful electoral process, and to resolving any resulting disputes through the judicial process;

Whereas the Kenyan Supreme Court ruled on March 30, 2013, that Uhuru Kenyatta was validly elected, and his opponents pledged to respect and honor the decision of the Court;

Whereas the White House issued a statement on March 30, 2013, stating, ''The electoral process and the peaceful adjudication of disputes in the Kenyan legal system are testaments to the progress Kenya has made in strengthening its democratic institutions, and the desire of the Kenyan people to move their country forward. Now is the time for Kenyans to come together to fully implement the political, institutional, and accountability reforms envisioned in the Kenyan constitution. . ..We welcome and wish to underscore the importance of Kenya's commitment to uphold its international obligations, including those with respect to international justice.''; and

Whereas in his inauguration speech on April 9, 2013, President Kenyatta said, ''I will lead all Kenyans – those who voted for me – and those who voted for our competitors – towards a national prosperity that is firmly rooted in a rich and abiding peace in which unity can ultimately be realized. . .Indeed, national unity will only be possible if we deal decisively with some of the issues that continue to hinder our progress. Achieving peace and strengthening unity will be the goal of my Government. This work begins now. We welcome all Kenyans to hold us to account.'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the people of Kenya on their commitment to peaceful elections, as demonstrated on March 4, 2013;

(2) calls on Kenyans to come together to fully implement political, institutional, and accountability reforms envisioned in the Kenyan constitution;

(3) calls on the people of Kenya to continue their efforts to end intimidation, impunity, and violence;

(4) notes that many of the underlying grievances that have underpinned ethnic divisions and fueled the 2007–2008 violence remain largely unaddressed;

(5) affirms that accountability for the 2007–2008 post-election violence is a critical element to ensure Kenya's democracy, peace, and long-term stability;

(6) calls on the Government of Kenya to respect commitments to seek justice for the victims of political violence, including by honoring its obligations under the Rome Statute to cooperate fully with the International Criminal Court with regard to the three cases that remain before the Court slated to go to trial in 2013;

(7) calls on the Government of Kenya to ensure the International Criminal Court witnesses are fully protected and not subject to interference but afforded the protections they deserve to ensure justice is served;

(8) recognizes that, while the Government of Kenya has made important progress since the 2007 election, aspects of the Kenyan reform agenda specified in the National Accord and 2010 constitution remain unfinished, particularly with regard to police reform, devolution, land reform, and security;

(9) encourages the people and Government of Kenya to support ongoing implementation of constitutional reforms, rule of law, the establishment of county level government and efforts to strengthen governance, security, and judicial institutions that respect the dignity and rights of all the people of Kenya and ensure protection for judges;

(10) supports the devolution process in order to enable constitutional reform to be fully implemented;

(11) encourages the Government of Kenya to respect and protect the freedom of civil society organizations and activists which have historically led the process of political reform in Kenya;

(12) expresses hope that newly elected members of government will herald a new generation of responsible leadership in Kenya; and

(13) reaffirms that the people of the United States will continue to stand with the people of Kenya in support of democracy, partnership, and peace.

Attest:

The committee-reported title amendment was agreed to, as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: ''A resolution congratulating the people of Kenya on their commitment to peaceful elections, as demonstrated on March 4, 2013, and calling on Kenyans to come together to continue to implement political, institutional, and accountability reforms envisioned in the Kenyan constitution.''.

DISCHARGE AND REFERRAL—S. 437

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the HELP Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 437, and the bill be referred to the Committee on Banking.

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

REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY—TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 113–1, TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 113–2, AND TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 113–3

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Injunction of Secrecy be removed from the following treaties transmitted to the Senate on April 22, 2013, by the President of the United States:

Convention on the Conservation and Management of High Seas Fishery Resources in the South Pacific Ocean, Treaty Document No. 113–1; Convention on the Conservation and Management of High Seas Fisheries Resources in the North Pacific Ocean, Treaty Document No. 113–2; and amendment to the Convention of Future Multilateral Cooperation in the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, Treaty Document No. 113–3.

I further ask that the treaties be considered as having been read the first time, they be referred with the accompanying papers to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed, and that the President's messages be printed in the RECORD.

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

The messages of the President are as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

I transmit herewith the Convention on the Conservation and Management of High Seas Fishery Resources in the South Pacific Ocean (the ''Convention''), done at Auckland, New Zealand, November 14, 2009, with a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification. I also transmit, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Secretary of State on the Convention that includes an article-by-article analysis.

The Convention establishes a regional fisheries management organization through which Parties will give effect to their duty to cooperate in the conservation and sustainable use of the high seas fishery resources in the South Pacific Ocean and to safeguard the marine ecosystems in which these resources occur.

The Convention requires Parties to apply specific conservation and management principles and approaches in giving effect to the objective of the Convention. These principles and approaches are enshrined in existing international instruments to which the United States is a party, such as the Agreement for the Implementation of the Provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of December 10, 1982, relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks of December 4, 1995. In addition, the Convention requires that Parties design and adopt specific conservation and management measures, such as limitations on catch or effort, time or area closures, and gear restrictions.

The Department of State, Department of Commerce, U.S. Coast Guard, and relevant U.S. stakeholders strongly support the Convention. The legislation necessary to implement the Convention will be submitted separately to the Congress for its consideration. I therefore recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to this Convention and give its advice and consent to ratification.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 22, 2013.*

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Convention on the Conservation and Management of High Seas Fisheries Resources in the North Pacific Ocean, done at Tokyo on February 24, 2012, and signed by the United States on May 2, 2012 (the ''Convention''). I also transmit, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Secretary of State on the Convention that includes an article-by-article analysis.

The Convention establishes a regional fisheries management organization through which Parties will cooperate to ensure the long-term conservation and sustainable use of the fisheries resources in the high seas of the North Pacific Ocean while protecting the marine ecosystems in which these resources occur.

The Convention will require implementing legislation, which is being drafted and will be submitted separately to the Congress for its consideration.

Cooperation under the Convention will address fisheries resources not covered under preexisting international fisheries management instruments and will help to prevent destructive fishing practices on the high seas that may have impacts on fisheries resources in areas subject to U.S. jurisdiction. Ratification by the United States would also ensure that future U.S. fisheries interests in the region subject to the Convention will be factored into allocation decisions. I therefore recommend that the Senate give favorable consideration to the Convention and give its advice and consent to ratification at the earliest possible date.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 22, 2013.*

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Amendment to the Convention on Future Multilateral Cooperation in the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries (the ''Convention''), adopted on September 28, 2007, at the twenty-ninth Annual Meeting of the North Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO). I also transmit, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Secretary of State on the Amendment, which includes an article-by-article analysis.

The Amendment serves to bring the Convention in line with modern international fisheries governance, including revisions to its decisionmaking and objection rules and a new comprehensive dispute settlement procedure. The Amendment also reflects changes to the budget contribution scheme that are expected to significantly reduce U.S. annual payments to NAFO. Involved Federal agencies and stakeholders strongly support the proposed changes to the Convention. The strengthened Convention will improve the way NAFO manages the fish stocks under its purview and enforces compliance with the measures it adopts, which in turn will improve the chances that key stocks in the Northwest Atlantic will recover enough to support resumed fishing.

The recommended changes to the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Convention Act of 1995 necessary to implement the Amendment will be submitted separately to the Congress. I therefore recommend that the Senate give favorable consideration to the Amendment to the Convention and give its advice and consent to ratification at the earliest possible date.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 22, 2013.*

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, APRIL 23, 2013

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. on Tuesday, April 23, 2013; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the majority controlling the first half and the Republicans controlling the final half; further, that following morning business, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 41, S. 743, the Marketplace Fairness Act postcloture; finally, that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly caucus meetings.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent the Senate stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:09 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, April 23, 2013, at 10 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, April 23, 2013 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's record.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

APRIL 24

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2014 for the Environmental Protection Agency.
SD–124

10 a.m.
Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2014 for the Department of Health and Human Services.
SD–138

Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Personnel
To resume hearings to examine the Active, Guard, Reserve, and civilian personnel programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2014 and the Future Years Defense Program.
SR–222

Committee on Finance
To hold hearings to examine the Trans-Pacific partnership, focusing on opportunities and challenges.
SD–215

Committee on Foreign Relations
To hold hearings to examine international development priorities in the fiscal year 2014 budget.
SD–419

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
Subcommittee on Financial and Contracting Oversight
To hold an oversight hearing to examine business practices of durable medical equipment companies.
SD–342

Committee on Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to examine Veterans' Affairs outreach and community partnerships.
SR–418

10:30 a.m.
Joint Economic Committee
To hold hearings to examine long-term unemployment, focusing on consequences and solutions.
SD–106

11 a.m.
Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Department of Defense
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2014 for the Department of the Navy.
SD–192

2 p.m.
Special Committee on Aging
To hold hearings to examine the national plan to address Alzheimer's disease, focusing on if we are on track to 2025.
SD–106

2:30 p.m.
Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2014 for the National Nuclear Security Administration.
SD–192

Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support
To hold hearings to examine military construction, environmental, and base closure programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2014 and the Future Years Defense Program.
SR–232A

Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Strategic Forces
To hold hearings to examine military space programs and views on Department of Defense usage of the electromagnetic spectrum in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2014 and the Future Years Defense Program.
SR–222

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings to examine a status update on the development of voluntary do-not-track standards.
SR–253

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
Subcommittee on Children and Families
To hold hearings to examine the economic importance of financial literacy education for students.
SD–430

Committee on Indian Affairs
To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2014 for Tribal Programs.
SD–628

Committee on the Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Raymond T. Chen, of Maryland, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Federal Circuit, and Jennifer A. Dorsey, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nevada.
SD–226

3 p.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Airland
To hold hearings to examine tactical aircraft programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2014 and the Future Years Defense Program.
SD–G50

APRIL 25

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
To hold hearings to examine the Department of the Navy in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2014 and the Future Years Defense Program; with the possibility of a closed session in SVC–217 following the open session.
SD–106

Committee on the Judiciary
Business meeting to consider S. 607, to improve the provisions relating to the privacy of electronic communications, and S. 744, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform.
SD–226

10 a.m.
Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2014 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
SD–192

Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies
To hold hearings to examine an overview of the Federal Housing Administration.
SD–138

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine drought and the effect on energy and water management decisions.
SD–366

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
Business meeting to consider the nomination of Thomas Edward Perez, of Maryland, to be Secretary of Labor, and any pending nominations.
SD–430

10:30 a.m.
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Subcommittee on Communications, Technology, and the Internet
To hold hearings to examine the state of wireless communications.
SR–253

2 p.m.
Committee on Foreign Relations
Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs
To hold hearings to examine rebalance to Asia II, focusing on security, defense, cooperation, and challenges.
SD–419

2:30 p.m.
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
Subcommittee on Public Lands, Forests, and Mining
To hold hearings to examine S. 27, to clarify authority granted under the Act entitled ''An Act to define the exterior boundary of the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation in the State of Utah'', S. 28, to provide for the conveyance of a small parcel of National Forest System land in the Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest in Utah to Brigham Young University, S. 159, to designate the Wovoka Wilderness and provide for certain land conveyances in Lyon County, Nevada, S. 241, to establish the Rio Grande del Norte National Conservation Area in the State of New Mexico, S. 255, to withdraw certain Federal land and interests in that land from location, entry, and patent under the mining laws and disposition under the mineral and geothermal leasing laws, S. 256, to amend Public Law 93–435 with respect to the Northern Mariana Islands, providing parity with Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, S. 258, to amend the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 to improve the management of grazing leases and permits, S. 312, to adjust the boundary of the Carson National Forest, New Mexico, S. 327, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to enter into cooperative agreements with State foresters authorizing State foresters to provide certain forest, rangeland, and watershed restoration and protection services, S. 340, to provide for the settlement of certain claims under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, S. 341, to designate certain lands in San Miguel, Ouray, and San Juan Counties, Colorado, as wilderness, S. 342, to designate the Pine Forest Range Wilderness area in Humboldt County, Nevada, S. 353, to designate certain land in the State of Oregon as wilderness, to make additional wild and scenic river designations in the State of Oregon, S. 360, to amend the Public Lands Corps Act of 1993 to expand the authorization of the Secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce, and the Interior to provide service opportunities for young Americans; help restore the nation's natural, cultural, historic, archaeological, recreational and scenic resources; train a new generation of public land managers and enthusiasts; and promote the value of public service, S. 366, to amend the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 to require the Bureau of Land Management to provide a claimant of a small miner waiver from claim maintenance fees with a period of 60 days after written receipt of 1 or more defects is provided to the claimant by registered mail to cure the 1 or more defects or pay the claim maintenance fee, S. 368, to reauthorize the Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act, S. 447, to provide for the conveyance of certain cemeteries that are located on National Forest System land in Black Hills National Forest, South Dakota, S. 609, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land in San Juan County, New Mexico, S. 736, to establish a maximum amount for special use permit fees applicable to certain cabins on National Forest System land in the State of Alaska, and S. 757, to provide for the implementation of the multispecies habitat conservation plan for the Virgin River, Nevada, and Lincoln County, Nevada, to extend the authority to purchase certain parcels of public land.
SD–366

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
Subcommittee on Employment and Workplace Safety
To hold hearings to examine whistleblowers and job safety, focusing on adequate protections to build a safer workplace.
SD–430

Select Committee on Intelligence
To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.
SH–219

MAY 7

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
To hold hearings to examine the Department of the Air Force in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2014 and the Future Years Defense Program.
SH–216

10 a.m.
Committee on Foreign Relations
To hold hearings to examine the nominations of James Knight, of Alabama, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Chad, and Deborah Kay Jones, of New Mexico, to be Ambassador to Libya, both of the Department of State.
SD–419

MAY 8

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Airland
To hold hearings to examine Army modernization in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2014 and the Future Years Defense Program.
SR–222

Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on SeaPower
To hold hearings to examine Navy shipbuilding programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2014 and the Future Years Defense Program.
SR–232A

10 a.m.
Joint Economic Committee
To hold hearings to examine immigration and its contribution to our economic strength.
TBA

MAY 16

10 a.m.
Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
To hold hearings to examine certain nominations.
SD–430

JUNE 11

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Airland
Business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2014.
SD–G50

11 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support
Business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2014.
SD–G50

2 p.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Personnel
Business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2014.
SD–G50

3:30 p.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Strategic Forces
Closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2014.
SR–232A

6 p.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities
Closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2014.
SR–232A

JUNE 12

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on SeaPower
Closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2014.
SR–222

2:30 p.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Closed business meeting to markup the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2014.
SR–222

JUNE 13

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Closed business meeting to continue to markup the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2014.
SR–222

JUNE 14

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Closed business meeting to continue to markup the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2014.
SR–222

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S2819–S2855

Measures Introduced: Three bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 774–776, S. Res. 104, and S. Con. Res. 14. **Pages S2844–45**

Measures Reported:

Special Report entitled "Summary of Legislative and Oversight Activities During the 112th Congress". (S. Rept. No. 113–33)

S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 113–13)

S. 23, to designate as wilderness certain land and inland water within the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in the State of Michigan. (S. Rept. No. 113–14)

S. 25, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal features of the electric distribution system to the South Utah Valley Electric Service District. (S. Rept. No. 113–15)

S. 26, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to facilitate the development of hydroelectric power on the Diamond Fork System of the Central Utah Project. (S. Rept. No. 113–16)

S. 112, to expand the Alpine Lakes Wilderness in the State of Washington, to designate the Middle Fork Snoqualmie River and Pratt River as wild and scenic rivers. (S. Rept. No. 113–17)

S. 130, to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land to the Powell Recreation District in the State of Wyoming. (S. Rept. No. 113–18)

S. 157, to provide for certain improvements to the Denali National Park and Preserve in the State of Alaska. (S. Rept. No. 113–19)

S. 222, to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to clarify that uncertified States and Indian tribes have the authority to use certain payments for certain noncoal reclamation projects and acid mine remediation programs. (S. Rept. No. 113–20)

S. 230, to authorize the Peace Corps Commemorative Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs. (S. Rept. No. 113–21)

S. 244, to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to modify the Pilot Project offices of the Federal Permit Streamlining Pilot Project. (S. Rept. No. 113–22)

S. 247, to establish the Harriet Tubman National Historical Park in Auburn, New York, and the Harriet Tubman Underground Railroad National Historical Park in Caroline, Dorchester, and Talbot Counties, Maryland, with an amendment. (S. Rept. No. 113–23)

S. 276, to reinstate and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving the American Falls Reservoir. (S. Rept. No. 113–24)

S. 304, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the State of Mississippi 2 parcels of surplus land within the boundary of the Natchez Trace Parkway. (S. Rept. No. 113–25)

S. 311, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating sites in the Lower Mississippi River Area in the State of Louisiana as a unit of the National Park System, with an amendment. (S. Rept. No. 113–26)

S. 347, to establish the First State National Historical Park in the State of Delaware, with an amendment. (S. Rept. No. 113–27)

S. 352, to provide for the designation of the Devil's Staircase Wilderness Area in the State of Oregon, to designate segments of Wasson and Franklin Creeks in the State of Oregon as wild rivers. (S. Rept. No. 113–28)

S. 354, to modify the boundary of the Oregon Caves National Monument. (S. Rept. No. 113–29)

S. 383, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate a segment of Illabot Creek in Skagit County, Washington, as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. (S. Rept. No. 113–30)

S. 393, to designate additional segments and tributaries of White Clay Creek, in the States of Delaware and Pennsylvania, as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. (S. Rept. No. 113–31)

S. 459, to modify the boundary of the Minuteman Missile National Historic Site in the State of South Dakota. (S. Rept. No. 113–32) **Page S2844**

Measures Passed:

Kenyan Elections: Senate agreed to S. Res. 90, congratulating the people of Kenya on their commitment to peaceful elections, as demonstrated on March 4, 2013, and calling on Kenyans to come together to continue to implement political, institutional, and accountability reforms envisioned in the Kenyan constitution, after agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, and an amendment to the title. **Pages S2853–54**

Measures Considered:

Marketplace Fairness Act—Agreement: Senate resumed consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 743, to restore States' sovereign rights to enforce State and local sales and use tax laws. **Pages S2833–40**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 74 yeas to 20 nays (Vote No. 107), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, having voted in the affirmative, Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill. **Pages S2833–34**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that all time during adjournment, recess, and morning business count post-cloture on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill. **Page S2834**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that Senator Durbin be designated as the floor manager for the consideration of the bill. **Page S2834**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill, post-cloture, at approximately 11 a.m. on Tuesday, April 23, 2013. **Page S2855**

Bill Referral—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions was discharged from further consideration of S. 437, to authorize the Department of Housing and Urban Development to transform neighborhoods of extreme poverty into sustainable, mixed-income neighborhoods with access to economic opportunities, by revitalizing severely distressed housing, and investing and leveraging investments in well-functioning services, education opportunities, public assets, public transportation, and improved access to jobs, and the bill be referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. **Page S2854**

Removal of Injunction of Secrecy: The injunction of secrecy was removed from the following treaties:

Convention on the Conservation and Management of High Seas Fishery Resources in the South Pacific Ocean (Treaty Doc. No. 113–1);

Convention on the Conservation and Management of High Seas Fisheries Resources in the North Pacific Ocean (Treaty Doc. No. 113–2); and

Amendment to the Convention on Future Multilateral Cooperation in the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries (Treaty Doc. No. 113–3).

The treaties were transmitted to the Senate today, considered as having been read for the first time, and referred, with accompanying papers, to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed. **Page S2855**

Messages from the House: **Page S2841**

Measures Referred: **Page S2841**

Executive Communications: **Pages S2842–44**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S2845–46**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S2846–52**

Additional Statements: **Page S2841**

Notices of Hearings/Meetings: **Pages S2852–53**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S2853**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S2853**

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—107) **Page S2834**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 2 p.m. and adjourned at 7:09 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Tuesday, April 23, 2013. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S2855.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine S. 744, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform, after receiving testimony from former Representative Jim Kolbe; Megan Smith, Vermont Department of Tourism and Marketing Commissioner, Montpelier; Kris W. Kobach, Kansas Secretary of State, Topeka; Mark L. Shurtleff, former Utah Attorney General, Troutman Sanders LLP, Arturo S. Rodriguez, Untied Farm Workers of

America, Keene, California; Charles Conner, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, Tamar Jacoby, ImmigrationWorks USA, Rick Judson, National Association of Home Builders, Janet Murguia, National Council of La Raza, Mark Krikorian, and Steven A. Camarota, both of the Center for Immigration Studies, Janice L. Kephart, 9/11 Security Solutions, Chris Crane, American Federation of Government Employees, and Grover Norquist, Americans for Tax Reform, all of Washington, D.C.; Alyson Eastman, Lake Home Business Services, Inc., Orwell, Vermont; Brad Smith, Microsoft Corporation, Seattle, Washington; Ronil Hira, Rochester Institute of Technology, Rochester, New York; Neeraj Gupta, Systems In Motion, Newark, California; Fred Benjamin, Medicalodges, Inc., Coffeyville, Kansas; Maria Gabriela Pacheco, Bridge Project, Miami, Florida; David Fleming, Champion Forest Baptist Church, Houston, Texas; and former Mayor Guillermo Vidal, on behalf of the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of Metro Denver, and Laura Lichter, American Immigration Lawyers Association, both of Denver, Colorado.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

The House was not in session today. The House is scheduled to meet at 12 noon on Tuesday, April 23, 2013.

Committee Meetings

No hearings were held.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR TUESDAY, APRIL 23, 2013

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of Homeland Security, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2014 for the Department of Homeland Security, 2:30 p.m., SD–124.

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine the Department of the Army in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2014 and the Future Years Defense Program, 9:30 a.m., SD–106.

Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities, to hold hearings to examine proliferation prevention programs at the Department of Energy and at the Department of Defense in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2014 and the Future Years Defense Program; to be immediately followed by a closed session in SVC–217, 2:30 p.m., SR–222.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: to hold hearings to examine the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's semi-annual report to Congress, 10 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on the Budget: to hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget and revenue request for fiscal year 2014 for Veterans' program proposals, 10:30 a.m., SD–608.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries, and Coast Guard, to hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2014 for the Coast Guard and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), 10 a.m., SR–253.

Subcommittee on Science and Space, to hold hearings to examine challenges and opportunities for human space exploration, 2:30 p.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: to hold hearings to examine S. 306, to authorize all Bureau of Reclamation conduit facilities for hydropower development under Federal Reclamation law, S. 545, to improve hydropower, and an original bill to promote energy savings in residential and commercial buildings and industry, 10 a.m., SD–366.

Subcommittee on National Parks, to hold hearings to examine S. 59, to designate a Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial at the March Field Air Museum in Riverside, California, S. 155, to designate a mountain in the State of Alaska as Denali, S. 156, to allow for the harvest of gull eggs by the Huna Tlingit people within Glacier Bay National Park in the State of Alaska, S. 219, to establish the Susquehanna Gateway National Heritage Area in the State of Pennsylvania, S. 225, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of alternatives for commemorating and interpreting the role of the Buffalo Soldiers in the early years of the National Parks, S. 228, to establish the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area, S. 285, to designate the Valles Caldera National Preserve as a unit of the National Park System, S. 305, to authorize the acquisition of core battlefield land at Champion Hill, Port Gibson, and Raymond for addition to Vicksburg National Military Park, S. 349, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate a segment of the Beaver, Chipuxet, Queen, Wood, and Pawcatuck Rivers in the States of Connecticut and

Rhode Island for study for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, S. 371, to establish the Blackstone River Valley National Historical Park, to dedicate the Park to John H. Chafee, S. 476, to amend the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Development Act to extend to the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park Commission, S. 486, to authorize pedestrian and motorized vehicular access in Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area, S. 507, to establish the Manhattan Project National Historical Park in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, Los Alamos, New Mexico, and Hanford, Washington, and S. 615, to establish Coltsville National Historical Park in the State of Connecticut, 2:30 p.m., SD–366.

Committee on Finance: to hold hearings to examine the Antwone Fisher story as a case study for child welfare, 10 a.m., SD–215.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Subcommittee on Primary Health and Aging, to hold hearings to examine successful primary care programs, 10 a.m., SD–430.

Committee on the Judiciary: to resume hearings to examine S. 744, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform, 9:30 a.m., SH–216.

Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights and Human Rights, to hold hearings to examine drone wars, focusing on the constitutional and counterterrorism implications of targeted killing, 4 p.m., SD–226.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, hearing entitled ''Meeting the Challenge of Drug-Resistant Diseases in Developing Countries'', 3 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Rules: Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 1549, the ''Helping Sick Americans Now Act'', 5 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Ongoing Intelligence Activities'', 5 p.m., HVC–304. This is a closed hearing.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM AHEAD

Week of April 23 through April 26, 2013

Senate Chamber

On *Tuesday*, at approximately 11 a.m., Senate will continue consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 743, Marketplace Fairness Act.

During the balance of the week, Senate may consider any cleared legislative and executive business.

Senate Committees

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Committee on Appropriations: April 23, Subcommittee on Department of Homeland Security, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2014 for the Department of Homeland Security, 2:30 p.m., SD–124.

April 24, Subcommittee on Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2014 for the Environmental Protection Agency, 9:30 a.m., SD–124.

April 24, Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2014 for the Department of Health and Human Services, 10 a.m., SD–138.

April 24, Subcommittee on Department of Defense, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2014 for the Department of the Navy, 11 a.m., SD–192.

April 24, Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2014 for the National Nuclear Security Administration, 2:30 p.m., SD–192.

April 25, Subcommittee on Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine an overview of the Federal Housing Administration, 10 a.m., SD–138.

April 25, Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2014 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, 10 a.m., SD–192.

Committee on Armed Services: April 23, to hold hearings to examine the Department of the Army in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2014 and the Future Years Defense Program, 9:30 a.m., SD–106.

April 23, Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities, to hold hearings to examine proliferation prevention programs at the Department of Energy and at the Department of Defense in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2014 and the Future Years Defense Program; to be immediately followed by a closed session in SVC–217, 2:30 p.m., SR–222.

April 24, Subcommittee on Personnel, to resume hearings to examine the Active, Guard, Reserve, and civilian personnel programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2014 and the Future Years Defense Program, 10 a.m., SR–222.

April 24, Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, to hold hearings to examine military space programs and views on Department of Defense usage of the electromagnetic spectrum in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2014 and the Future Years Defense Program, 2:30 p.m., SR–222.

April 24, Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support, to hold hearings to examine military construction, environmental, and base closure programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2014 and the Future Years Defense Program, 2:30 p.m., SR–232A.

April 24, Subcommittee on Airland, to hold hearings to examine tactical aircraft programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2014 and the Future Years Defense Program, 3 p.m., SD–G50.

April 25, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the Department of the Navy in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2014 and the Future Years Defense Program; with the possibility of a closed session in SVC–217 following the open session, 9:30 a.m., SD–106.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: April 23, to hold hearings to examine the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's semi-annual report to Congress, 10 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on the Budget: April 23, to hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget and revenue request for fiscal year 2014 for Veterans' program proposals, 10:30 a.m., SD–608.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: April 23, Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries, and Coast Guard, to hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2014 for the Coast Guard and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), 10 a.m., SR–253.

April 23, Subcommittee on Science and Space, to hold hearings to examine challenges and opportunities for human space exploration, 2:30 p.m., SR–253.

April 24, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine a status update on the development of voluntary do-not-track standards, 2:30 p.m., SR–253.

April 25, Subcommittee on Communications, Technology, and the Internet, to hold hearings to examine the state of wireless communications, 10:30 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: April 23, to hold hearings to examine S. 306, to authorize all Bureau of Reclamation conduit facilities for hydropower development under Federal Reclamation law, S. 545, to improve hydropower, and an original bill to promote energy savings in residential and commercial buildings and industry, 10 a.m., SD–366.

April 23, Subcommittee on National Parks, to hold hearings to examine S. 59, to designate a Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial at the March Field Air Museum in Riverside, California, S. 155, to designate a mountain in the State of Alaska as Denali, S. 156, to allow for the harvest of gull eggs by the Huna Tlingit people within Glacier Bay National Park in the State of Alaska, S. 219, to establish the Susquehanna Gateway National Heritage Area in the State of Pennsylvania, S. 225, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of alternatives for commemorating and interpreting the role of the Buffalo Soldiers in the early years of the National Parks, S. 228, to establish the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area, S. 285, to designate the Valles Caldera National Preserve as a unit of the National Park System, S. 305, to authorize the acquisition of core battlefield land at Champion Hill, Port Gibson, and Raymond for addition to Vicksburg National Military Park, S. 349, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate a segment of the Beaver, Chipuxet, Queen, Wood, and Pawcatuck Rivers in the States of Connecticut and Rhode Island for study for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, S. 371, to establish the Blackstone River Valley National Historical Park, to dedicate the Park to John H. Chafee, S. 476, to amend the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Development Act to extend to the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park Commission, S. 486, to authorize pedestrian and motorized vehicular access in Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area, S. 507, to establish the Manhattan Project National Historical Park in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, Los Alamos, New Mexico, and Hanford, Washington, and S. 615, to establish Coltsville National Historical Park in the State of Connecticut, 2:30 p.m., SD–366.

April 25, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine drought and the effect on energy and water management decisions, 10 a.m., SD–366.

April 25, Subcommittee on Public Lands, Forests, and Mining, to hold hearings to examine S. 27, to clarify authority granted under the Act entitled ''An Act to define the exterior boundary of the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation in the State of Utah'', S. 28, to provide for the conveyance of a small parcel of National Forest System land in the Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest in Utah to Brigham Young University, S. 159, to designate the Wovoka Wilderness and provide for certain land conveyances in Lyon County, Nevada, S. 241, to establish the Rio Grande del Norte National Conservation Area in the State of New Mexico, S. 255, to withdraw certain Federal land and interests in that land from location, entry, and patent under the mining laws and disposition under the mineral and geothermal leasing laws, S. 256, to amend Public Law 93–435 with respect to the Northern Mariana Islands, providing parity with Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, S. 258, to amend the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 to improve the management of grazing leases and permits, S. 312, to adjust the boundary of the Carson National Forest, New Mexico, S. 327, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to enter into cooperative agreements with State foresters authorizing State foresters to provide certain forest, rangeland, and watershed restoration and protection services, S. 340, to provide for the settlement of certain claims under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, S. 341, to designate certain lands in San Miguel, Ouray, and San Juan Counties, Colorado, as wilderness, S. 342, to designate the Pine Forest Range Wilderness area in Humboldt County, Nevada, S. 353, to designate certain land in the State of Oregon as wilderness, to make additional wild and scenic river designations in the State of Oregon, S. 360, to amend the Public Lands Corps Act of 1993 to expand the authorization of the Secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce, and the Interior to provide service opportunities for young Americans; help restore the nation's natural, cultural, historic, archaeological, recreational and scenic resources; train a new generation of public land managers and enthusiasts; and promote the value of public service, S. 366, to amend the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 to require the Bureau of Land Management to provide a claimant of a small miner waiver from claim maintenance fees with a period of 60 days after written receipt of 1 or more defects is provided to the claimant by registered mail to cure the 1 or more defects or pay the claim maintenance fee, S. 368, to reauthorize the Federal Land Transaction

Facilitation Act, S. 447, to provide for the conveyance of certain cemeteries that are located on National Forest System land in Black Hills National Forest, South Dakota, S. 609, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land in San Juan County, New Mexico, S. 736, to establish a maximum amount for special use permit fees applicable to certain cabins on National Forest System land in the State of Alaska, and S. 757, to provide for the implementation of the multispecies habitat conservation plan for the Virgin River, Nevada, and Lincoln County, Nevada, to extend the authority to purchase certain parcels of public land, 2:30 p.m., SD–366.

Committee on Finance: April 23, to hold hearings to examine the Antwone Fisher story as a case study for child welfare, 10 a.m., SD–215.

April 24, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the Trans-Pacific partnership, focusing on opportunities and challenges, 10 a.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: April 24, to hold hearings to examine international development priorities in the fiscal year 2014 budget, 10 a.m., SD–419.

April 25, Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs, to hold hearings to examine rebalance to Asia II, focusing on security, defense, cooperation, and challenges, 2 p.m., SD–419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: April 23, Subcommittee on Primary Health and Aging, to hold hearings to examine successful primary care programs, 10 a.m., SD–430.

April 24, Subcommittee on Children and Families, to hold hearings to examine the economic importance of financial literacy education for students, 2:30 p.m., SD–430.

April 25, Full Committee, business meeting to consider the nomination of Thomas Edward Perez, of Maryland, to be Secretary of Labor, and any pending nominations, 10 a.m., SD–430.

April 25, Subcommittee on Employment and Workplace Safety, to hold hearings to examine whistleblowers and job safety, focusing on adequate protections to build a safer workplace, 2:30 p.m., SD–430.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: April 24, Subcommittee on Financial and Contracting Oversight, to hold an oversight hearing to examine business practices of durable medical equipment companies, 10 a.m., SD–342.

Committee on Indian Affairs: April 24, to hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2014 for Tribal Programs, 2:30 p.m., SD–628.

Committee on the Judiciary: April 23, to resume hearings to examine S. 744, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform, 9:30 a.m., SH–216.

April 23, Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights and Human Rights, to hold hearings to examine drone wars, focusing on the constitutional and counterterrorism implications of targeted killing, 4 p.m., SD–226.

April 24, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Raymond T. Chen, of Maryland, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Federal Circuit, and Jennifer A. Dorsey, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nevada, 2:30 p.m., SD–226.

April 25, Full Committee, business meeting to consider S. 607, to improve the provisions relating to the privacy of electronic communications, and S. 744, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform, 9:30 a.m., SD–226.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: April 24, to hold hearings to examine Veterans' Affairs outreach and community partnerships, 10 a.m., SR–418.

Select Committee on Intelligence: April 23, to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

April 25, Full Committee, to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

Special Committee on Aging: April 24, to hold hearings to examine the national plan to address Alzheimer's disease, focusing on if we are on track to 2025, 2 p.m., SD–106.

House Committees

Committee on Agriculture, April 24, Subcommittee on Horticulture, Research, Biotechnology, and Foreign Agriculture, public hearing to Review Horticulture Priorities for the 2013 Farm Bill, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Appropriations, April 24, Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, American Indian and Alaska Native Public Witness Hearing, 9:30 a.m., B–308 Rayburn.

April 24, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA, and Related Agencies, hearing on USDA Rural Development Budget Hearing, 10 a.m., 2362–A Rayburn.

April 24, Subcommittee on Defense, hearing on Defense Health Program Budget, 10 a.m., 2358–C Rayburn.

April 24, Subcommittee on State Foreign Operations, and Related Agencies, hearing on Department of Treasury, International Programs Budget, 9:30 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

April 24, Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, hearing on Federal Aviation Administration Budget, 10 a.m., 2358–A Rayburn.

April 24, Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, American Indian and Alaska Native Public Witness hearing, 1 p.m., B–308 Rayburn.

April 24, Subcommittee on State and Foreign Operations, and Related Programs, hearing on United States Agency for International Development, 1:30 p.m., 2359 Rayburn.

April 24, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA, and Related Agencies, hearing on USDA Natural Resources and Environment, 2 p.m., 2362–A Rayburn.

April 25, Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, American Indian and Alaska Native Public Witness Hearing, 9:30 a.m., B–308 Rayburn.

April 25, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA, and Related Agencies, hearing on USDA Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services, 10 a.m., 2362–A Rayburn.

April 25, Subcommittee on Defense, hearing on oversight AFRICOM, 10 a.m., H–140 Capitol. This is a closed hearing.

April 25, Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government, hearing on the Department of Treasury Budget, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

April 25, Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, hearing on the Department of Health and Human Service Budget, 10 a.m., 2358–C Rayburn.

April 25, Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, hearing on the Federal Railroad Administration Budget, 10:30 a.m., 2358–A Rayburn.

April 25, Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, American Indian and Alaska Native Public Witness Hearing, 1 p.m., B–308 Rayburn.

April 26, Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, hearing on the United States Forest Service Budget, 9:30 a.m., B–308 Rayburn.

April 26, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA and Related Agencies, hearing on the Food and Drug Administration Budget, 10:30 a.m., 2362–A Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, April 24, Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces, hearing on Oversight of U.S. Naval and U.S. Air Force Acquisition Programs in the Fiscal Year 2014 National Defense Authorization Budget Request, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

April 24, Subcommittee on Readiness, hearing entitled ''The Readiness Posture of the U.S. Air Force'', 11:30 a.m., 2122 Rayburn.

April 24, Subcommittee on Military Personnel, hearing on the status of implementation of the requirements of the VOW Act and the recommendations of the Presidential Veteran Employment Initiative Task Force for the DOD Transition Assistance Program—Goals, Plans, and Success, 2 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

April 25, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Fiscal Year 2014 National Defense Authorization Budget Request from the Department of the Army'', 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

April 25, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled ''Transitioning to Afghan Security Lead: Protecting Afghan Women?'', 2 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

April 25, Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, hearing entitled ''Fiscal Year 2014 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for National Security Space Activities'', 3:30 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

April 26, Subcommittee on Readiness, hearing entitled ''The Readiness Posture of the U.S. Navy and the U.S. Marine Corps'', 8 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

April 26, Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces, hearing entitled ''Fiscal Year 2014 Army Modernization Programs'', 10:30 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on the Budget, April 24, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''State of the Highway Trust Fund: Long-Term Solutions for Solvency'', 10 a.m., 210 Cannon.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, April 24, Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Training, hearing entitled ''Keeping College Within Reach: Enhancing Transparency for Students, Families and Taxpayers'', 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, April 24, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled ''The Center for Consumer Information and Insurance Oversight and the Implementation of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act'', 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

April 25, Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled ''Securing Our Nation's Prescription Drug Supply Chain'', 10 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

April 25, Subcommittee on Communications and Technology, hearing entitled ''The Lifeline Fund: Money Well Spent?'', 10:30 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

April 26, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled ''Does HIPAA Help or Hinder Patient Care and Public Safety?'', 9 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, April 24, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Building a Sustainable Housing Finance System: Examining Regulatory Impediments to Private Investment Capital'', 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

April 24, Subcommittee on Monetary Policy and Trade, hearing entitled ''Evaluating U.S. Contributions to the International Monetary Fund'', 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, April 23, Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, hearing entitled ''Meeting the Challenge of Drug-Resistant Diseases in Developing Countries'', 3 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

April 24, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Export Control Reform: the Agenda Ahead'', 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

April 24, Subcommittee on Europe, Eurasia, and Emerging Threats, hearing entitled ''Kosovo and Serbia: A Pathway to Peace'', 3 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

April 25, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''The FY 2014 Budget Request: U.S. Foreign Assistance Priorities and Strategy'', 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

April 25, Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, markup on H.R. 419, the ''Taiwan Policy Act of 2013'', 2 p.m., 2255 Rayburn.

April 25, Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade, hearing entitled ''Natural Gas Exports: Economic and Geopolitical Opportunities'', 2 p.m., 2200 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, April 24, Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security, markup on H.R. 1417, the ''Border Security Results Act of 2013'', 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

April 25, Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence, hearing entitled ''Counterterrorism Efforts to Combat a Chemical, Biological, Radiological, and Nuclear (CBRN) Attack on the Homeland'', 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

April 25, Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies, hearing entitled ''Striking the Right Balance: Protecting Our Nation's Critical Infrastructure from Cyber Attack and Ensuring Privacy and Civil Liberties'', 2 p.m., 311 Cannon.

April 26, Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency, hearing entitled ''Cutting DHS Duplication and Wasteful Spending: Implementing Private Sector

Best Practices and Watchdog Recommendations'', 9 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, April 25, Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security and Investigations, hearing entitled ''The Electronic Communications Privacy Act (ECPA), Part 2: Geolocation Privacy and Surveillance'', 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

April 25, Subcommittee on Constitution and Civil Justice, hearing on the ''Victims' Rights Amendment'', 11:30 a.m., 2237 Rayburn.

April 25, Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property and the Internet, hearing entitled ''An Examination of the Judicial Conduct and Disability System'', 1:30 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, April 24, Full Committee, markup on the following measures: H.R. 3, the ''Northern Route Approval Act''; H.R. 85, to create the Office of Chief Financial Officer of the Government of the Virgin Islands, and for other purposes; H.R. 126, the ''Corolla Wild Horses Protection Act''; H.R. 251, the ''South Utah Valley Electric Conveyance Act''; H.R. 253, the ''Y Mountain Access Enhancement Act''; H.R. 330, the ''Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial Act''; H.R. 356, the ''Hill Creek Cultural Preservation and Energy Development Act''; H.R. 426, the ''Utah National Guard Readiness Act''; H.R. 520, the ''Buffalo Soldiers in the National Parks Study Act''; H.R. 573, to amend Public Law 93–435 with respect to the Northern Mariana Islands, providing parity with Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa; H.R. 674, the ''Rota Cultural and Natural Resources Study Act''; H.R. 723, the ''Wood-Pawcatuck Watershed Protection Act''; H.R. 739, the ''Chesapeake Bay Accountability and Recovery Act of 2013''; H.R. 767, to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to modify the Pilot Project offices of the Federal Permit Streamlining Pilot Project; H.R. 829, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate a segment of Illabot Creek in Skagit County, Washington, as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System; H.R. 862, to authorize the conveyance of two small parcels of land within the boundaries of the Coconino National Forest containing private improvements that were developed based upon the reliance of the landowners in an erroneous survey conducted in May 1960; H.R. 876, the ''Idaho Wilderness Water Resources Protection Act''; H.R. 885, the ''San Antonio Missions National Historical Park Boundary Expansion Act of 2013''; H.R. 934, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act related to a segment of the Lower Merced River in California, and for other purposes; H.R. 993, the ''Fruit Heights Land Conveyance Act''; H.R. 1156, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to adjust the boundary of the Stephen Mather Wilderness and the North Cascades National Park in order to allow the rebuilding of a road outside of the floodplain while ensuring that there is no net loss of acreage to the Park or the Wilderness, and for other purposes; H.R. 1157, the ''Rattlesnake Mountain Public Access Act''; H.R. 1158, the ''North Cascades National Park Service Complex Fish Stocking Act''; H.R. 1206, the ''Permanent Electronic Duck Stamp Act of 2013''; H.R. 1208, the ''Manhattan Project National Historical Park Act''; H.R. 1241, to facilitate a land exchange involving certain National Forest System lands in the Inyo National Forest, and for other purposes; and H.R. 1377 the ''Mescalero Apache Tribe Leasing Authorization Act''; 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

April 25, Subcommittee on Water and Power, hearing entitled ''Federal Impediments to Water Rights, Job Creation and Recreation: A Local Perspective'', 10 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

April 25, Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife, Oceans, and Insular Affairs, hearing on H.R. 638, the ''National Wildlife Refuge Review Act of 2013''; H.R. 1300, to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 to reauthorize the volunteer programs and community partnerships for the benefit of national wildlife refuges, and for other purposes; and H.R. 1384, the ''Wildlife Refuge System Conservation Semipostal Stamp Act of 2013'', 1 p.m., 1334 Longworth.

April 26, Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, hearing on H.R. 1613, the ''Outer Continental Shelf Transboundary Hydrocarbon Agreements Authorization Act''; and ''U.S.-Mexico Transboundary Hydrocarbon Agreement and Steps Needed for Implementation'', 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

April 26, Subcommittee on Public Lands and Environmental Regulation, hearing on H.R. 1169, ''Naval Air Station Fallon Housing and Safety Development Act''; H.R. 1299, the ''White Sands Missile Range Security Enhancement Act''; H.R. 1574, to amend the Dayton Aviation Heritage Preservation Act of 1992 to rename the site a park; legislation regarding the ''Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake Security Enhancement Act''; legislation regarding the ''Johnson Valley National Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Area Establishment Act''; legislation regarding the ''Limestone Hills Training Area Withdrawal Act''; and legislation regarding the ''Chocolate Mountain Aerial Gunnery Range Security Enhancement Act'', 10 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

April 26, Subcommittee on Indian and Alaska Native Affairs, hearing on H.R. 1548, the ''Native American Energy Act'', 11 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, April 24, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Broken Promises: the Small Business Lending Fund's Backdoor Bank Bailout'', 9:30 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

April 24, Subcommittee on Economic Growth, hearing entitled ''Green Energy Oversight: Examining the Department of Energy's Bad Bet on Fisker Automotive'', 2 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

April 25, Subcommittee on Economic Growth, Job Creation and Regulatory Affairs, hearing entitled ''Oversight of the Federal Government's Procurement of Ammunition'', 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

April 25, Subcommittee on Energy Policy, Health Care and Entitlements, hearing entitled ''Examining the Lack of Transparency and Consumer Driven Market Forces in U.S. Health Care'', 10:30 a.m., 2247 Rayburn.

Committee on Rules, April 23, Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 1549, the ''Helping Sick Americans Now Act'', 5 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

April 24, Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 527, the ''Responsible Helium Administration and Stewardship Act'', 3 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, April 24, Subcommittee on Technology and Subcommittee on Research, hearing entitled ''Next Generation Computing and Big Data Analytics'', 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

April 24, Subcommittee on Space, hearing entitled ''An Overview of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Budget for Fiscal Year 2014'', 2 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

April 25, Subcommittee on Environment, hearing entitled ''Policy Relevant Climate Issues in Context'', 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

April 26, Subcommittee on Energy, hearing entitled ''A Review of Federal Hydraulic Fracturing Research Activities'', 9:30 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, April 24, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''The Budget Outlook for the Small Business Administration'', 1 p.m., 2360 Rayburn.

April 25, Subcommittee on Contracting and Workforce, hearing entitled ''Help Wanted: The Small Business STEM Workforce Shortage and Immigration Reform'', 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, April 24, Full Committee, meeting on ''Overview of the United States' Freight Transportation System'', 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

April 24, Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, hearing entitled ''The President's Fiscal Year 2014 Budget: Administration Priorities for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers'', 2 p.m., 2167 Rayburn.

April 25, Subcommittee on Highways and Transit, hearing entitled ''Implementing MAP–21: The State and Local Perspective'', 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, April 24, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Examining the Implications of the Affordable Care Act on VA Healthcare'', 10:15 a.m., 334 Cannon.

April 25, Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity, markup of pending legislation, 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

April 25, Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs, markup of pending legislation, 3 p.m., 334 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, April 25, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Tax Reform and Residential Real Estate'', 9:30 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

April 25, Subcommittee on Oversight, hearing entitled ''Internal Revenue Service Operations and the 2013 Tax Return Filing Season'', 2:30 p.m., 1100 Longworth.

April 26, Subcommittee on Social Security, hearing entitled ''Challenges Facing the Next Commissioner of Social Security'', 9:30 a.m., B–318 Rayburn.

House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, April 23, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Ongoing Intelligence Activities'', 5 p.m., HVC–304. This is a closed hearing.

April 25, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Ongoing Intelligence Activities'', 10 a.m., HVC–304. This is a closed hearing.

Joint Meetings

Joint Economic Committee: April 24, to hold hearings to examine long-term unemployment, focusing on consequences and solutions, 10:30 a.m., SD–106.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Tuesday, April 23

Senate Chamber

Program for Tuesday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond one hour), Senate will continue consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 743, Marketplace Fairness Act, post-cloture.

(Senate will recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. for their respective party conferences.)

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12 noon, Tuesday, April 23

House Chamber

Program for Tuesday: To be announced.

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Printing Office, at *www.fdsys.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Printing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.