



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MAY 20, 2013

No. 71

Senate

The Senate met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Honorable TIM KAINE, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Virginia.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal Lord God, because You are our shepherd, we face the future with confidence. Keep our Senators humble as they seek to serve You and country. May they never forget Your kindness to them and this land we love. Remind them that You alone are the source of their strength and the shelter where they can find safety. Listen to their prayers and answer them, supplying all their needs according to the richness of Your grace and mercy. Lord, strengthen them for each challenge as You bless them in their going out and coming in. May they overcome cynicism with civility in all their relationships.

We pray in Your gracious Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable TIM KAINE led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, May 20, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable TIM KAINE, a Senator

from the Commonwealth of Virginia, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. KAINE thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following leader remarks the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 3 p.m. today. At 3 p.m. the Senate will begin consideration of S. 954, which is the farm bill. At 5 p.m. the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider two U.S. district court nominations: the Chappell nomination, from Florida, and the McShane nomination, from Oregon. At about 5:30 there will be up to two rollcall votes on confirmation of these nominations.

THE FARM BILL

Mr. REID. Mr. President, Democrats and the tea party-driven Republicans differ on many things, so it is remarkable and encouraging to see how well Senator STABENOW and Senator COCHRAN, the chairman and ranking member of the Senate Agriculture Committee, worked as a team to bring the ag jobs bill to the floor. Their work has been exemplary, some would say old-fashioned—the way things used to be.

The committee members included many of the amendments that were adopted last year when the Senate considered and passed a farm bill. As we will remember, it went to the House, and of course they did nothing. The committee did this in an effort to expedite the floor process which begins today. I hope their cooperative spirit

guides our work on this important legislation.

American farmers are counting on us, but so is the economy. Despite uncertain economic times, America's farms and ranches are the most productive in the world, exporting about \$150 billion worth of products last year and supporting 16 million private sector jobs. But to keep American farms strong, Congress must pass a strong farm bill. The legislation before this body will create jobs, cut taxpayer subsidies, and reduce the deficit. The bill includes important reforms to farm and food stamp programs and saves more than \$23 billion, which we will use to reduce the deficit. It will give farmers the certainty they need to maintain the largest trade surplus in any sector of our economy.

Helping American farmers thrive is an important part of our work getting the economy on firm footing again. Again, I commend Senators STABENOW and COCHRAN for their leadership on this important issue.

While the Senate has taken a lot of bipartisan action on the agriculture jobs bill, it has seen no progress on the important budget. Senate Republicans still refuse to allow us to negotiate with our House counterparts on a compromise that respects both parties' principles. It has now been 58 days since the Senate passed its budget, 58 days waiting for the Republicans to say: OK, let's try to work out our differences.

They have been talking for a couple of years now: What is wrong with the Senate? We don't follow regular order.

What does that mean? We don't follow the principles we have always followed.

They say they want to pass a budget so we can get to regular order. I guess they thought we could not pass a budget, because we passed one and now they refuse to go to conference. I think the main reason they are afraid to do that is that under the rules in the House, if

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S3589

we go to conference, the House Democrats—who are kept out of everything—have the right by rule of the House of Representatives to offer what they call motions to instruct, to say don't cut Medicare, don't continue to whack little kids who are trying to get an education with the Head Start Program, don't cut NIH programs. They can force the Republicans to vote on that matter. I think that is what it is all about.

It has been 58 days since the Senate passed its commonsense, progrowth budget, but my Republican colleagues have objected time and time again to a conference with the House. The only explanation Republicans have given for endless obstruction is this: They refuse to negotiate unless we agree in advance to let them win. I am not making that up. That is true. Republicans refuse to go to conference unless Democrats adopt policies that were soundly rejected by the American people last November. It is a very bizarre way to negotiate. Meanwhile, the country inches closer and closer to yet another crisis—defaulting on the Nation's legitimate bills. They put off compromise until the last moment so they can use the debt limit as a bargaining chip. They hope to exploit concessions such as more tax breaks for the wealthy, hurting middle-class families; more concessions in Draconian cuts to Medicare, which, of course, hurts the elderly; stark concessions with cuts to Head Start, hurting little kids or they hope to extort concessions on more cuts to the National Institutes of Health, which hurts us all.

In fact, House Republicans met last week to decide what ransom they would demand to avoid a catastrophic default on this Nation's debts. One House Republican called it a laundry list of conditions. On the list—repealing the landmark health care reform. On the list—restricting women's health choices. On the list—more Draconian cuts to programs that are keeping American families strong.

Despite the political pain they caused themselves last time they held hostage the full faith and credit of the United States, they are again headed down that same path. This time they are suggesting that government should skip payments to the troops, to veterans, to Medicare recipients, and more. Why? So we can pay China first. I am not making this up. That is what they want to do. Their plan would hurt our national security, our economic security, and it would not prevent default. The Republican approach—default on the bills—is irresponsible, extreme, and really senseless. By now they should know that it is compromise, not political hostage-taking, that will set our Nation on the road to fiscal responsibility.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

Mr. REID. Will the Chair announce the business of the day.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 3 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

McSHANE NOMINATION

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate will be voting on the confirmation of Judge Michael McShane today to serve as U.S. district court judge for the District of Oregon.

Judge McShane is a product of the judicial selection committee that I have organized at home in Oregon. Senator MERKLEY has been in full support of this effort. Judge McShane is coming forward for consideration by the Senate as a result of the work of that special judicial selection committee made up of individuals with a variety of different philosophical views, and I am very pleased that the President has seen fit to send Judge McShane's name to the Senate.

In a sentence, Judge McShane has a heart for people, a head for the law, and a high-minded sense of justice. I start by way of saying he certainly has outstanding academic credentials. He was a magna cum laude graduate from Gonzaga University. He attended the Northwestern School of Law at Lewis and Clark College where he graduated in the top 10 percent of his class, and his accomplishments in the courtroom have earned him very high ratings by the American Bar Association.

From an academic standpoint, Judge McShane is clearly qualified for this position. What I feel particularly strongly about—and what was evidently very important to our judicial selection committee—is that he has been an extraordinary member of our community.

He always steps up when asked to help his community. For instance, he stepped up when he was called and asked to be an advocate for inner-city and HIV-positive youngsters. While in these various leadership and volunteer roles, he has always come forward, not just to help but also to come up with innovative approaches in terms of his work with kids. We especially see this in his advocacy for at-risk youngsters in the Job Corps Program.

Judge McShane brings these young people into his courtroom as interns to help with the day-to-day operations where they are given the opportunity to see the inner workings of our judicial system. In many instances Judge McShane literally guides them through the process and sets about to make it possible for them to be involved in ways we normally would not think of when we are looking at the role of a judge.

For example, in many cases Judge McShane buys sport coats and khakis for these youngsters who might otherwise feel uncomfortable in a courtroom setting. Judge McShane, in his own words, has been known to say: I want to make sure those young people have a chance to "blossom." Those are the words he uses. He makes it possible for them to get the sport coats and khakis with his own money so they can participate in this unique training.

This past year he was awarded the 2012 Oregon State Bar President's Public Service Award for his service to the community. He is involved in the Northwestern School of Law mentoring program, and in 2009 he was named the law school's Mentor of the Year.

Also, through the classroom law project Judge McShane presides over Summer Law Camp for inner-city kids. On top of that, Judge McShane plays an important role as a foster—and now adoptive—parent through the Oregon Department of Human Services.

We looked at that kind of community caring, and we said this is truly an exceptional individual. We juxtaposed that wonderful record of community service alongside of his legal track record.

Judge McShane began his legal career as an attorney with the Metropolitan Public Defender's Office in Portland. We all understand the importance of public defenders. In 1997, as a result of his good work, he was appointed by the Oregon Supreme Court as a full-time pro tem judge. For the last decade he has been an adjunct professor at his alma mater, the Northwestern School of Law at Lewis and Clark College, where he teaches trial advocacy and the criminal practice seminar.

Among the many reasons I believe he is academically and professionally very qualified to be a judge is because his litigation experience includes both complex criminal and civil cases. He is the senior member of the Multnomah County Circuit Court's Death Penalty Panel and presided over more capital cases than any other sitting judge in our State. He has been a proven advocate for evidence-based sentencing, and he has a proof-based sentencing model for driving under the influence of intoxicants offenders that has now become the standard in Multnomah County.

It is for all of those reasons—especially his track record in terms of community service as well as those outstanding professional experiences starting as a public defender and teaching in the classroom—that I am very

hopeful the Senate will agree with me on a bipartisan basis that Judge McShane is qualified to serve as the U.S. district court judge for the District of Oregon.

As I indicated, Judge McShane has a heart for people, a head for the law, and a high-minded sense of justice. We have a long history in our State, as I think the President pro tempore of the Senate is aware, of some of those who have been part of our network of distinguished judges, and I have every confidence Judge McShane will join that list.

I thank Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman LEAHY and Ranking Member GRASSLEY for advancing Judge McShane's confirmation through the committee. I also wish to thank Leader REID and Minority Leader MCCONNELL for bringing this nomination to the floor, and I look forward to the vote we will have later today.

I hope my colleagues, on a bipartisan basis, will vote to confirm Judge Michael McShane as U.S. district court judge for the District of Oregon.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is now closed.

AGRICULTURE REFORM, FOOD, AND JOBS ACT OF 2013

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of S. 954, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 954) to reauthorize agriculture programs through 2018.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I wish to thank our majority leader, Republican leader, and all the Members for allowing us in the Senate to move forward today on this very important bill. I want to thank my ranking member Senator THAD COCHRAN for his friendship and his leadership. I want to thank all of the members of the committee for working together to write this important legislation. Also, I want to thank our staffs on both sides of the aisle. We have excellent staffs who have worked together, and I know we will continue to work together as we move this legislation through.

Our bill, the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013, is critical

to the 16 million Americans whose jobs rely on a strong agricultural economy. Agriculture has been one of the bright spots as our economy is getting back on track. In fact, it is one of the few areas where we actually have a trade surplus, where we are exporting more than we are importing. This means jobs for us in America.

The farm bill is a jobs bill. It is a jobs bill, a trade bill, a reform bill, a conservation bill, and it is a kitchen table bill. Thanks to the farm bill, families all across America will sit down around a table tonight and enjoy the bounty of the world's safest, most abundant, and most affordable food supply. Those who need temporary help to feed their families during an economic crisis will get help as well. This is a bill that reflects our best values as Americans.

It is easy to take agriculture for granted. It is easy for many of us to forget the food we eat doesn't come from the supermarket, as some folks may think. The food we eat comes from the skill and the efforts of the men and women who work hard from sunrise to sunset, day in and day out, to put food on our tables. Too often I believe we take them for granted as well. Most of us don't have to worry about how many days it has been since the last rainfall or whether it is going to freeze in May after the fruit trees are blooming. Most of us don't have to worry about decisions and weather conditions around the world and how they affect our livelihood here at home.

That is why we have what we call the farm bill. We have a farm bill because farmers are in the riskiest business in the world. We saw that last year as our country was in the grip of the worst drought in generations. We saw this as ranchers had to cull their herds because they couldn't get enough food or water for their cattle. We saw all across the country that farmers lost their crops in late spring freezes that wiped out cherry and apple crops in Michigan and other parts of the country. That is why the top goal of the agriculture reform bill is risk management. We are reforming farm programs, ending direct payments and other subsidies that have no relationship to risk and instead giving farmers market-based risk management tools. That is the hallmark of this farm bill.

We want to make sure a farm that has been passed on for generations doesn't face bankruptcy because of a drought or other events outside the farmer's control. We also want to make sure that when there is a drought we are conserving our precious soil and water resources. When it comes to conservation, the farm bill is risk management for the whole country. Conservation programs in the farm bill make sure our soil doesn't blow away and our waters aren't polluted by runoff.

In many parts of the country last year we had a drought that was worse than the Dust Bowl, but we didn't have a dust bowl. We didn't have out-of-control erosion, and that is because the

farm bill did what it was supposed to do in conservation. Soil stayed on the ground. It is easy to take that for granted as well.

The farm bill is our country's largest investment in land and water conservation on private lands, and the farm bill gives farmers tools to strengthen wildlife habitat. I had the opportunity this weekend, with my gracious host, the Senator from Mississippi, to visit a wildlife preserve program and wetlands preserve program, and Senator COCHRAN is responsible for those parts of the farm bill. We had an opportunity to go out on a beautiful piece of flat land in the Mississippi delta and see where ducks were coming back, quail were coming back, and habitat was beginning to flourish because of efforts to support these important resources for the future. The farmer involved in the property said he felt he was in partnership with the USDA and making a commitment for his children and future generations through conservation. This is a real source of pride for us as we look at this 5-year farm bill.

I am pleased the bill before us includes a new historic agreement between conservation groups and commodity groups around conservation and crop insurance. These folks from very different perspectives sat down together, listened to one another, and worked out an agreement that will preserve land and water resources for generations to come.

The farm bill helps farmers improve 1.9 million acres of land for wildlife habitat. Healthy wildlife habitat and clean fishable waters are not only good for our environment but they also support hunting, fishing, and all the other great outdoor recreation which benefits our economy and creates jobs. We just plain have fun doing it in Michigan. In fact, outdoor recreation supports over 6 million jobs alone. That is a big deal.

We also continue our support for specialty crops, fruits, vegetables, and those crops that make up about half of the cash receipts of our country. Organic agriculture is a growing part of agriculture. We expand farmers markets in local food hubs to encourage schools and businesses to support their local farmers by purchasing locally grown food and creating more local jobs. We expand the availability of fresh fruits and vegetables that are so essential in schools and community food programs.

We also strengthen rural development financing for small businesses. Once you get outside of the cities in Michigan and all across our country, every single community in Michigan, outside of our big cities, gets support for jobs through something we call rural development, financing for small businesses, for water and sewer projects, road projects, housing efforts for families, a whole wide variety of things we do through this economic arm in the USDA called rural development.

We also expand the energy title to encourage support for new jobs in biobased manufacturing, which is an exciting new effort. In addition to biofuels, we now can use agricultural products and byproducts to replace petroleum and other chemicals in manufacturing. There is a huge new opportunity for jobs, as well as supporting our environment by doing these things. There is no doubt that the farm bill is a jobs bill.

This bill also continues to focus on the issue that has taken so much of our time this year, last year, and the year before, and that is cutting the deficit and getting our Nation's fiscal house back in order. We get rid of unnecessary subsidies such as the Direct Payment Program that sends a check to folks regardless of whether they are even farming a particular crop anymore, streamlining programs to cut redtape, and cracking down on fraud and abuse. In fact, we eliminate over 100 different programs or authorizations that either were duplicating something else or didn't make sense to do anymore. I think that is the way we ought to be cutting spending and creating savings.

Altogether, including the cuts that took effect already this year, we are able to cut spending by about \$24 billion. That is more than double the cuts proposed by the Simpson-Bowles Commission and last year's Gang of Six that worked on deficit reduction. And I want to underscore that this is four times—four times—more than is required by the arbitrary across-the-board sequestration cuts. So we in agriculture take a back seat to no one in our commitment to doing our part in making tough decisions and setting priorities to reduce the deficit.

This bill represents the most significant reform of American agriculture in decades, in my judgment. We are putting caps on payments to farmers and closing loopholes that allowed people who were not actually farming to receive payments. We are strengthening crop insurance, which we heard from farmers was the No. 1 risk management tool for them. It is important we strengthen it and protect it as we move through this process.

The agriculture reform bill includes disaster assistance for our ranchers and farmers as well who cannot receive crop insurance—livestock owners and others in areas that cannot receive crop insurance.

We made sure our food assistance programs are accountable, that there is integrity in our programs, so we continue to build on the integrity that is already there by cracking down on abuses and misuse. We made sure our changes would not remove one single needy family. It is not about hurting folks, it is about making sure there is not abuse, and that is what we address.

Let me say when we look at crop insurance, it is there for disasters for our farmers, and it goes up when there are a lot of disasters. That is when there is

cost. Then it goes down when things are going better, and it is the same for food assistance for families. Costs go up during bad times, as we have seen over the last number of years, but now CBO tells us those costs are going down. Why? Because the economy is getting better and people are able to go back to work. That is how it is supposed to work, and that is how it is working.

Last year we in the Senate passed a farm bill with strong bipartisan support. We didn't take the 16 million Americans who work in agriculture for granted, we didn't take our land and water resources for granted, and we stood for families all across the country who had fallen on hard times.

Unfortunately, at that time the House of Representatives did not follow our lead. They allowed the farm bill to expire at the end of last year, which is why we are here again working through this process.

I appreciate the way we have gotten to this point in a bipartisan way. We have worked very hard to make sure every part of agriculture is addressed in terms of their needs and the risk management tools in this bill.

I thank my colleague from Mississippi Senator COCHRAN, who is the ranking member of our committee. He and his staff have worked diligently and in a bipartisan way, and that has allowed us to get to this point. So I thank him for that.

I am looking forward to working with colleagues to pass this bill as soon as possible, and we look forward to working with colleagues on amendments throughout this week.

I see my distinguished colleague, our ranking member, is here, and I will turn to him in just a moment. I do want to place one amendment in order at this point, and then we can proceed with our discussions. This is an amendment we have cleared on both sides on behalf of Senator CANTWELL.

AMENDMENT NO. 919

Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 919.

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

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Michigan [Ms. STABENOW], for Ms. CANTWELL, proposes an amendment No. 919.

Ms. STABENOW. I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To allow Indian tribes to participate in certain soil and water conservation programs)

At the end of subtitle F of title II, add the following:

SEC. 25 ____ . SOIL AND WATER RESOURCE CONSERVATION.

(a) CONGRESSIONAL POLICY AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE.—Section 4 of the Soil and Water Resources Conservation Act of 1977 (16 U.S.C. 2003) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by inserting “and tribal” after “State” each place it appears; and

(2) in subsection (c)(2), by inserting “, tribal,” after “State”.

(b) CONTINUING APPRAISAL OF SOIL, WATER, AND RELATED RESOURCES.—Section 5 of the Soil and Water Resources Conservation Act of 1977 (16 U.S.C. 2004) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(4), by striking “and State” and inserting “, State, and tribal”;

(2) in subsection (b), by inserting “, tribal” after “State” each place it appears; and

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking “State soil” and inserting “State and tribal soil”; and

(B) by striking “local” and inserting “local, tribal.”

(c) SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION PROGRAM.—Section 6(a) of the Soil and Water Resources Conservation Act of 1977 (16 U.S.C. 2005(a)) is amended—

(1) by inserting “, tribal” after “State” each place it appears; and

(2) by inserting “, tribal,” after “private”.

(d) UTILIZATION OF AVAILABLE INFORMATION AND DATA.—Section 9 of the Soil and Water Resources Conservation Act of 1977 (16 U.S.C. 2008) is amended by inserting “, tribal” after “State”.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I now take the opportunity to turn to my friend, a great agricultural leader in the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I am flattered by the kind remarks of the distinguished Senator from Michigan and am pleased and honored to serve with her on the Senate Agriculture Committee. She chairs that committee with a sense of responsibility for the subject matter, which is very important to our Nation's farmers and all consumers in America as well, but also to the fellow members of our committee—Republicans and Democrats—who serve on the committee and who have worked together to put a bill before the Senate that continues to authorize programs of the Federal Government that benefit landowners and those who work to conserve the resources of soil and water that help nurture our great agricultural sector that produces a bountiful amount of fruits and vegetables and marketable commodities that are sold in international trade at competitive prices.

It is a great success story. I am tempted to say a great American success story because it truly is. It is the backbone of our Nation's economy. So it is serious business at the same time it provides jobs, food to eat, grain to harvest, to export, and cotton and the fibers that come from it that clothe and dress millions of people in our Nation and around the world. So bringing this bill to the floor is a point of achievement, and with gratitude we point out the leadership of the distinguished chairman.

We have enjoyed her strong leadership and her keen sense of awareness of how to manage legislation such as this and present it to the Senate, as she has just done, and that is quite impressive. We are very fortunate to have her serving in this capacity.

We have recommended a bill that contains some major reforms of the farm programs that come within the jurisdiction of our committee. For example, the bill reduces authorized spending by \$24 billion. It includes \$6 billion in sequestration cuts. These represent real savings. We know we have been confronting a deficit crisis, a fiscal policy management crisis, and this bill does its part.

With the authority it has over the law governing the subject matter, we have moved to eliminate direct payments to farmers, which has amounted in the past to \$40 billion. There are reforms in this legislation of the crop insurance title. The bill recommends adoption of reforms that limit payments to producers. Conservation programs have been streamlined in this legislation and consolidated.

The committee has crafted reforms in the nutrition title to eliminate waste, fraud, and abuse in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. These are big challenges, and these challenges have been met with a recognition that there are people who need the support of programs such as this—schoolchildren who are attending school and getting the benefit of a reduced price and, in some cases, free meals at school. This has made major contributions to the quality of work and the degree and level of education that children are able to absorb and benefit from, and it is tied to these programs.

The committee has dealt with conservation, as I have mentioned, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, and throughout the bill we see reflected a broad bipartisan level of support and an approach that accommodates interests represented by all the members of our committee. So I think we have produced, with the leadership of the chairman, a responsible but fair bill, and I am pleased to recommend to the Senate that it should approve the bill. It deserves our support.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss one of the most important and significant reforms of our Nation's agriculture in decades. The Agriculture Reform, Food, and JOBS Act of 2013, known around here as the farm bill, is the product of months and months of policy discussions and late-night deliberations, with special thanks to the chairman of the committee, Senator STABENOW from Michigan, and the ranking member, Senator COCHRAN of Mississippi. I thank them both for their good work, and also a special thanks to Katharine Ferguson in my office for her good work on this legislation.

There is a reason people across the country—farmers and business owners, faith leaders, and county commissioners—are paying attention to this legislation. It is a farm bill, it is a food bill, it is a nutrition bill, it is an eco-

nomics development bill, it is a rural development bill, and it is a conservation bill all in one. In my State one out of seven jobs is related to food and agriculture. To keep our economy moving forward, the farm bill must remain a priority in Congress.

We did our job last year on this legislation. Unfortunately, the House of Representatives didn't, but I think this year it will when we pass overwhelmingly a similar bill to the one which passed by a vote of 64 to 35 last year.

The bill saves more than \$20 billion while maintaining important investments in conservation and nutrition, renewable energy and agricultural research, which is so important to my State, to rural development, to broadband, and all that farm legislation can in fact do for rural development.

In the last 2 years the Senate has considered reform bills that have done more than any farm bill literally in 20 years. We have eliminated direct payments and recoupled eligibility for crop insurance with the expectation that farmers do right by the land.

The work of Chairwoman STABENOW and Ranking Member COCHRAN in committee to keep that coalition together, linking crop insurance with conservation, was especially important. We set tight limits on the amount of support any individual producer can receive.

There is obviously more that can be done, but this bill takes important strides in reforming our farm program. It will increase efforts to improve water quality in Lake Erie—one of the five Great Lakes with the greatest body of fresh water anywhere in the world. It is even perhaps more important to the State of Michigan, the chairwoman's State, than even mine. It will help small towns such as Bryan, Bucyrus, and Bellaire make strategic economic development investments to jumpstart their local economies.

The bill continues efforts to make sure all Americans have enough to eat and access to affordable, healthy, and fresh food.

This is a forward-looking bill, and I was pleased to support it in committee and hope to work with Senate colleagues of both parties in the coming days to make slight improvements as it moves forward.

The centerpiece of the bill's deficit reduction efforts is rooted in reform of the farm safety net. The era of direct payments made annually regardless of need is over.

Across Ohio and the Nation we have heard crop insurance is the most important tool farmers have for managing risk, so this bill improves and preserves crop insurance. We know what that meant last year, particularly as drought hit States such as Ohio and, more severely, States west of my State.

Farmers have said they want a leaner, more efficient market-oriented farm safety net. Taxpayers deserve that too. Last year, Senator THUNE, a

Republican from South Dakota, and Senators DURBIN and Lugar and I proposed the Aggregate Risk and Revenue Management Program, ARRM, streamlining the farm safety net to make it more market oriented.

Instead, the new Agriculture Risk Coverage Program will work with crop insurance to provide farmers the tools they need to manage risk—making payments only when farmers need them most. This program is market oriented, relying on current data. It is more responsive to farmers' needs and is more responsive to taxpayers.

The bill reforms a number of longstanding unjustifiable practices. For the first time this farm bill ends payments to landowners who have nothing to do with farm management. It ends payments to millionaires and puts a firm cap on how much support any farmer can receive from the direct farm support programs each year. This so-called conservation compliance provision reflects a landmark agreement put forward by a number of key commodity and conservation interests and stakeholders.

People who are going to receive federally subsidized crop insurance need to show they are meeting basic conservation requirements. Again, the days of subsidies without conditions and subsidies without responsibility are over. It is an example of what can happen when groups with different perspectives—the commodities farmers and the conservationists—come together to listen to each other. By re-linking crop insurance subsidies with good environmental practices, this bill makes our farm safety net more defensible and protects our natural resources.

As I said, this farm bill takes great strides toward better, leaner, smart farm policy, but it is also a work in process. A key difference between this year's bill versus the one we passed last year is the inclusion of the Adverse Market Payments Program—the AMP Program—that, to be candid, is something important to southern growers but not in line with what I believe Ohioans want to see and what I hear from Ohio farmers.

I worked closely with colleagues from the middle of the country to make sure this AMP Program is as market-oriented as possible, but it was a battle not wholly won and something I want to see modified. We cannot have farm programs in one part of the country become more market-oriented while others do not.

The Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act supports farmers but also provide a lifesaving safety net to American families who have fallen on hard times. The SNAP program now serves 47 million Americans, more than half of whom are children and seniors. Along with unemployment insurance, SNAP is the primary form of assistance we provide Americans who have fallen on tough times. Just understand and be certain that many of these families are people with full-time and part-

time jobs who simply do not make enough money to get along.

Some of my colleagues will point out the rapid increase in SNAP enrollment over the past few years. This is to be expected since it mirrors the downturn in the economy, the unemployment levels, and the fact that for 10 years most people in this country have not had a raise. As costs go up, it hits the lowest income people the hardest. That is the biggest reason people have relied on food stamps. This is evidence that SNAP is working. As our economy is recovering, SNAP enrollment will decrease.

More telling is that today some 50 million Americans still live under the Federal poverty level. The number of Americans who rely on SNAP tells me we should not be gutting, we should not be undercutting, as a number of my colleagues in the House of Representatives want to do. We should not be cutting Federal nutrition programs. What we should be doing is enacting better economic policies that create jobs and reduce inequality and enable Americans to put food on the table without assistance.

This bill cuts \$4 billion from SNAP. That is already \$4 billion too much. I appreciate the chairwoman's efforts to make that \$4 billion cut as painless as possible in terms of benefits SNAP beneficiaries receive. Again, most of these—a huge number of these SNAP beneficiaries are in working families. A huge number of them are children. A huge number of them are senior citizens. It goes without saying that a bill with the level of the cuts to SNAP—some \$20 billion included in the House bill—will not get my support and will not pass muster in the Senate.

While we also work to preserve SNAP, we can make sure our nutrition programs are smarter. The farm bill makes important strides toward aligning our food and our farm and our economic policy. Agriculture has always been an important engine of economic growth. I said at the outset that one out of seven jobs in my State is related to agriculture and food. Shortening the supply chain benefits farmers and families, meaning that the more people eat what is grown locally, the better it is for the economy, the better it is for their health, and the better it is for the environment. It helps keep money in the local economy and helps build the economy, especially of rural communities in my State and across the country.

This farm bill affects every American every day. It is a deficit reduction bill, it is a jobs bill, and it is a bipartisan economic relief bill. I again commend Chairwoman STABENOW and Ranking Member COCHRAN for their work in drafting this legislation. I especially appreciate the staff of individual members of the committee, their staffs, for their work.

I urge my colleagues to work together and break the impasse that keeps us from making progress on this legislation.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Before the Senator from Ohio leaves, I want to thank him. He has been an invaluable member of our committee. We would not have the agricultural risk coverage portion and the yield loss coverage portion in this bill were it not for his work, he and Senator THUNE working together. We used their bill as the basis for this.

He has also been the champion of rural development. We have investments in rural development we would not have had without his involvement, as well as other efforts in the energy title and throughout the bill. I thank him. We are very lucky to have him as a member of the committee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to call up the Feinstein-McCain amendment No. 923 and make it pending.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I just indicated to the Senator from Arizona that while I have no objection to having a vote on his amendment, I ask that he not proceed with his request at this time. We have an amendment that is pending, and we also have a number of crop insurance amendments we want to do together. I will not object to voting on his amendment, there is no attempt not to do that, but at this point I do object to having his amendment as the pending amendment.

I ask my colleague through the Chair if he would be willing to work with us. I will commit to having a vote on his amendment. This is not an attempt to not vote on his amendment. The ranking member and I have talked, and we are certainly committed to voting on the Senator's amendment; however, we would like to have an opportunity to set up how we will be voting on a series of amendments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, if I heard the Senator correctly, she committed to a vote on this amendment, correct?

Ms. STABENOW. That is correct.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to engage in a colloquy.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Does that mean we would vote on this early on?

Ms. STABENOW. I don't know the exact timing of the vote. There is no attempt to delay. We are just getting started at this point. I will be happy to work with the Senator from Arizona. We are certainly not trying to postpone it to be the last vote. We can certainly do it earlier rather than later, but we would like to have some flexibility to look at a group of amendments we might vote on which relate to the same subject area.

I believe I can speak on behalf of the ranking member in saying we are committed to a vote on the amendment and want to work with Senator MCCAIN as to a time.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank the distinguished manager.

Since I have the floor, I would like to make a brief statement about the amendment. I understand the objection, and I would rely on the good offices of the manager of the bill, as well as the ranking member, that we would have a vote early on in regard to this amendment and not at the last minute when we are trying to complete the votes on the amendments to the bill.

The amendment by Senator FEINSTEIN and me would eliminate taxpayer-subsidized crop insurance for tobacco. The Congressional Budget Office estimates this amendment would save taxpayers \$333 million. Again, that is the estimate of the Congressional Budget Office.

It might surprise Americans to know that despite efforts to end traditional farm subsidies for tobacco producers, government handouts for tobacco lives on in the form of highly subsidized crop insurance. Since 2004 we have spent more than \$276 million on insurance subsidies for tobacco. This is in addition to the \$10 billion financed under the tobacco buyout law the Congress passed a decade ago. That law was paid for by assessments on cigarette manufacturers, and it was meant to wean tobacco growers from farm subsidies by buying out their growing quotas. Well, it turns out that Joe Camel's nose has been under the tent all this time in the form of these hidden crop insurance subsidies.

As my colleagues know, crop insurance in general has a dubious reputation as a "safety net" for farmers because it largely insures against revenue loss instead of crop loss due to weather or pests. According to the Congressional Research Service, taxpayers spend about \$14 billion a year to subsidize about 60 percent of the cost of crop insurance premiums. The Federal Government also reimburses private crop insurance companies for about 25 percent of their "administrative and operating" costs.

We have identified eight types of tobacco that are eligible for crop insurance: tobacco Maryland, tobacco flue cured, tobacco fire cured, tobacco dark air, tobacco cigar wrapper, tobacco cigar filler, tobacco cigar binder, and

tobacco burley. All of these crops remain extremely profitable even without their old farm subsidies.

According to reports by the Wall Street Journal and CNBC, tobacco is 10 times more profitable than corn and most American tobacco is exported. In fact, the value of American tobacco is at a 10-year high since Congress ended traditional tobacco subsidies. It makes no sense to subsidize tobacco insurance considering how well the free market system is working for tobacco producers.

I will have a longer statement on this, Mr. President.

Last year the eight separate tobacco insurance products cost \$34.7 million in taxpayer subsidies. The USDA—Department of Agriculture—data shows that more than \$276 million in taxpayer subsidies has been spent on this tobacco subsidy program since 2004.

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, cigarette smoking adds \$96 billion to domestic health care expenses and costs the American economy \$97 billion in lost productivity annually. Secondhand smoke adds another \$10 billion in health care costs and lost productivity.

Clearly, we should be doing nothing to subsidize production of tobacco. I am not saying we should ban the growth of tobacco in America; that is a decision farmers and the market make. But for us to continue to subsidize when these enormous costs are borne by the American people in terms of our health and our economy—it is time we ended it.

I thank the distinguished manager and ranking member for their commitment to having an up-or-down vote on this amendment.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment this afternoon to talk about the importance of crop insurance as a risk management tool. I think we will probably have a lot of discussion on the floor about crop insurance, but, as I said, as a matter of policy, we are moving away from direct subsidies. We certainly have not subsidized tobacco growers for a long time, and I would not support doing that.

In general, we are moving away from that into an insurance model where the cost is shared between the Federal Government and growers. We want as many growers as possible to purchase crop insurance rather than have a disaster and then want us to pass a disaster assistance bill. I might add that we didn't have to do that this last time

around despite the worst drought in 50, 60, 70 years because the crop insurance worked this last year. Crop insurance covered the losses. It is a very important public-private sector process and partnership.

One of my concerns about carving it up, having limits or removing one crop over another is that we have been moving away from a general policy of insurance. Going down the road, I think that would have a lot of implications and farmers in general would have great concern about that.

I have a tremendous amount of sympathy and, in fact, agreement with the distinguished Senator from Arizona. I sympathize with what my colleague was saying about tobacco as far as the harm to health and so on. When we look overall at crop insurance, the good news is that less than 1 percent of that whole program—I think substantially less than 1 percent—covers tobacco, so that is a good thing.

The larger question for farmers and all of us across the country is, Are we going to make a commitment broadly to the No. 1 risk management tool for them? Are we going to make sure that as we say we are not going to do subsidies anymore, we listen to what they are saying about having a crop insurance system?

There are parallels between that and flood insurance. So as people are proposing various limits on crop insurance, I think it is important to ask would we put that on other types of insurance, such as flood insurance risks or other things. Insurance deals with risks, and it is more about encouraging farmers to have a stake in the game and to be able to cover part of that risk with their own dollars rather than other types of policies we have debated about subsidies.

As we go forward, there will be a lot of different discussions about crop insurance, and I would ask colleagues to join with us in resisting efforts to eliminate or limit what is a public-private insurance system that is, frankly, working very well.

We are so proud that all of the farm organizations and commodity groups—just about all of them—come together to work with the conservation groups and environmentalists. They say that together they are going to both support an insurance model—a risk management model broadly as a matter of policy for agriculture—and they are also going to support linking that to conservation packages. So as a farmer receives that partnership—the piece we kick in—with that brings a commitment for conservation practices for our land, our soil, our water, and so on.

This is very important. This was not the case in the last farm bill or the farm bill before. We have not seen that kind of link, and now they have come together and said they support crop insurance broadly as an insurance model without limits that have been proposed by various people. In return for that, whether it is a very large farm or a

small farm, the broad public benefit of having conservation compliance outweighs much of what we are hearing about in terms of the limits being proposed. In terms of the public good, we should have crop insurance that gives this alliance of crop insurance and conservation compliance.

This is a historic agreement, and I stand by that agreement with all of the Members. I believe that whether we are talking about large farmers or small farmers, this is a very important policy, and we need to have conservation compliance involved across the board in our efforts as we expand crop insurance.

We will have a lot of discussion and a lot of debate on this issue. I think it is very tempting to look at one particular crop—certainly a crop that has a lot of health risks related to it and that we have a lot of concerns about in other venues—and say let's just eliminate one crop.

The challenge with that, of course, is as a policy for insurance, there will be deep opposition and concern coming from agriculture—from farmers, large and small, across the country—about starting down that road no matter how noble the cause in terms of the concern about the risks of that particular crop. So we look forward to more discussion, but I think it is very important to put a broad lens on this. We have moved away from subsidies that come regardless of good times or bad, whether they are needed or not, and have moved to a system where we are asking farmers to put some skin in the game. We are saying: You have to get crop insurance; you have to be a part of paying for it, and you don't get any help unless there is a disaster; there is no payout unless there is a disaster. As we move to that broad cornerstone, I hope we can keep that in place and not see efforts that will weaken it around the edges.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. GILLIBRAND). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I further ask unanimous consent to speak for perhaps as long as but probably shorter than 20 minutes as in morning business.

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

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, every week that we are here, I try to remind the body of the damage carbon pollution is doing to our atmosphere and oceans, try to awaken us to our duty. I have done it more than 30 times now. I have tried to kick out the underpinnings of any argument that the deniers could stand on.

I have kicked out the scientific so-called denial argument, which actually properly belongs in the category of falsehood, not argument. I have kicked out the economic denial argument, pointing out that in a proper market, the costs of carbon must be in the price of carbon. I even tried to kick out the religious denial argument, showing that the belief that God will just tidy up after us, however stupidly we behave, runs counter to history and counter to Biblical text.

So today let's take a crack at the political argument. How wise is it for the Republican Party to wed itself to the deniers and proclaim that climate change is a hoax?

Make no mistake, that is the Republican position. The consensus Republican position and the default Republican position is that climate change is a hoax. It has been said right on this floor and in committees and, as far as I know, not one Republican Senator has stood afterwards in this Chamber to say: Wait a minute. Not so fast. That is actually not the case. Any Republican Senator who disagrees, please, come to the floor and articulate a Republican position other than that climate change is a hoax.

This Chamber looks relatively empty, but on C-SPAN lots of people are watching, and lots of Republicans are watching. Yet not one Republican, over all 30 speeches, has ever gotten back to me, even quietly on the side, to say: You know what. This is really getting serious. Let's see if we can work on this together.

An iron curtain of denial has fallen around the Republican Party. So let me respectfully ask my Republican colleagues: What are you thinking? How do you imagine this ends?

More than 95 percent of climate scientists are convinced that human carbon pollution is causing massive and unprecedented changes to our atmosphere and oceans. You want to go with the 5 percent, and you think that is going to be a winning strategy?

Moreover, it turns out that a lot of those 5 percenters are on the payroll of the polluters. You know that. It is public knowledge. Some of those payroll scientists are the same people who denied acid rain, who denied the dangers of tobacco.

You still like those odds? Those are the folks to whom you really want to hitch your Republican wagons? You have to know they are not telling the truth. So where does this go? What is the endgame?

Our planet has had a run of at least 800,000 years, with levels of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere between 170 and 300 parts per million. That is measurement not theory—800,000 years. Homo sapiens have only been around for about 200,000 years, so that 800,000 years—8,000 centuries—takes us back a ways. Madam President, 800,000 years, between 170 and 300 parts per million, and in just the last 50 years, we have blown out of that range and have now

hit 400 parts per million and climbing. You really want to be on the side of “nothing is going on here”? Really?

Have you noticed the floods and wildfires and droughts and superstorms and tornadoes and blizzards and temperature records? Have you noticed those warming, rising seas? Have you noticed species invading new territories and miles of dead pine forests in the Rockies and Arctic sea ice disappearing?

Do you understand that carbon in the atmosphere gets absorbed by the sea and that is a law of science and is not debatable? Do you understand that because they are absorbing the carbon, the oceans are getting more acidic—30 percent more acidic already and climbing?

Do you understand that is a measurement, not a theory? It is one thing to be the party that stands against science. Are you really also going to be the party that stands against measurement? Do you know the measurement is showing the oceans are not just becoming more acidic, they are becoming more acidic at the fastest rate recorded in a geologic record of 50 million years?

Have you not heard about the coral reefs, those incubators of our oceans, bleaching out and dying off, with almost 20 percent gone already worldwide? If you are a denier, look around. Do you think the news is getting better for you?

Let me ask my Republican friends, what is your best bet on whether this climate and oceans problem gets better or worse in the next 20 or 40 years? Seriously. Your party's reputation is on the line here. All the chips. Tell me how you are going to bet. Do you want to bet the reputation of the Republican Party that suddenly this is all going to magically start getting better? Because that is what you are doing right now.

Let me ask you this: What are the young people of today going to think when they are 37 or 57 and it is worse, maybe a lot worse? What are they going to think about the Republican Party then, that you took the 5-percent bet with their futures; that you went with the polluters over the scientists? Young people are already out there asking their universities to divest from coal, as they divested from the evils of apartheid and the dangers of tobacco. Good luck with the youth vote when you lock in with the coal merchants. By the way, the youth vote grows. It grows up and it sticks around.

How is it going to look for the Republican Party when the historical records show, because facts have a funny way of coming out, that the campaign to fool the public on climate change was as phony and dishonest as the campaign to fool the public on acid rain and the campaign to fool the public on tobacco, when the historical record discloses that 5 percent wasn't even real, and was actually a scam paid for by the polluters? You, your great party, with young American's futures

in the balance, took sides with the scam.

If that is the state of play for young voters as they come of age, why would those young people ever trust the Republican Party on anything else ever again?

Speaking of taking sides, have you noticed who is left on your side? The Koch brothers, billionaire polluters; the big oil companies, the biggest polluters in the world; the coal barons with their legacy of pollution, strip mining, mountaintop removal, and safety violations that kill their miners. That is a fine cast to be surrounded by.

But wait, you say, there is more. There is the Heartland Institute, and the Institute for Energy Research, and the American Enterprise Institute, the American Legislative Exchange Council, and the Heritage Foundation. There are many organizations. Right. Like the heads of Hydra, they may look like many, but, as you know, in reality, it is all the same beast. It is all the same scheme. It is all the same money behind the scheme. You can name those front organizations and many more, but none of it is real. They are all part of the same cheesy vaudeville show put on by the big polluters.

Do you, I ask my Republican friends, want to lash yourself to that operation, to go down with that ship? The great Republican Party, the party of Abraham Lincoln and Theodore Roosevelt, branding itself as the one that gave it all to protect a gang of scheming polluters? That is where you are headed.

Look who is on the other side on record against you seeing through that nonsense. How about the Joint Chiefs of Staff, our military leaders? How about the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops? How about NASA? NASA is driving a vehicle as big as an SUV around on the surface of Mars right now. They sent it there. To Mars. They landed it there safely. Now they are driving it around on Mars. Do you think those scientists might know what they are talking about? How about every legitimate American scientific professional society, about 30 strong? How about major American corporations such as Walmart, Ford, Apple, Coca-Cola? How about global insurance and reinsurance businesses such as Lloyds of London and Munich Re, whose businesses depend on accurate risk models?

Indeed, today, Frank Nutter, the president of the Reinsurance Association of America, is reported as saying:

Insurance is heavily dependent on scientific thought. It is not as amenable to politicized scientific thought.

So I ask my Republican friends, whose side do you like in this? In this corner, the Joint Chiefs, the bishops, Walmart, Ford, Apple, Coke, NASA, 30 top scientific organizations, the top insurers and reinsurers, and, by the way, several thousand legitimate others. In that corner, the polluting industry and a screen of sketchy organizations they

fund. Let's be serious. Do you want to bet the reputation of the Republican Party that the polluters are the ones we should count on here? Because that is what you are doing. For what? To protect market share for the polluters. That is your upside. The reputation of the party hangs in the balance and your upside is market share for polluters.

Look, I am willing to do a carbon pollution fee that sets the market in balance and returns every single dollar to the American people. No new agencies; no new taxes; no bigger government; every dollar back; a balanced market with the costs included in the price the way they are supposed to be, which will make better energy choices, increase jobs, and prevent pollution.

Yes, that does mean less market share for the polluters as new technologies emerge—that is actually the point—but every single dollar back in Americans' pockets. By the way, three-quarters of the American people believe climate change is real and that we need to do something about it.

You may have a question for me: Why do you care? Why do you, SHELDON WHITEHOUSE, Democrat of Rhode Island, care if we Republicans run off the climate cliff like a bunch of proverbial lemmings and disgrace ourselves?

I will tell you why. We are stuck in this together. We are stuck in this together.

When cyclones tear up Oklahoma, hurricanes swamp Alabama, and wildfires scorch Texas, you come to us, the rest of the country, for billions of dollars to recover. The damage your polluters and deniers are doing doesn't just hit Oklahoma, Alabama, and Texas; it hits Rhode Island with floods and storms, it hits Oregon with acidified seas, and it hits Montana with dying forests. Like it or not, we are in this together. You drag America with you to your fate.

I want this future: I want a Republican Party that has returned to its senses, is strong, and is a worthy adversary in a strong America that has done right by its people and the world. That is what I want. I don't want this future. I don't want a Republican Party disgraced, that lets its extremists run it off the cliff. I don't want America suffering from grave, economic, environmental, and diplomatic damage because we failed, because we didn't wake up and do our duty for our people, and because we didn't lead the world.

I do not want that future, but that is where we are headed. I will keep reaching out and calling out, ever hopeful you will wake up before it is too late, both for you and for the rest of us.

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.

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

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

Ms. STABENOW. Before we move on to other business this evening in the Senate, I would like to encourage all of our Senators to submit whatever amendments they have so we can begin to work through them. We want to work diligently through the amendments and be able to move, obviously, as quickly as possible within reason to be able to put together votes. We would ask all of our colleagues, if they do have amendments, to let us know what they are and to file them as soon as possible so we can begin working on those amendments.

I believe Senator COCHRAN and I are both in agreement. We are anxious to get going and are looking forward to working with colleagues to vote on and dispose of amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. I am pleased to join the distinguished chairman.

I urge Senators who do have amendments to come to the floor and offer those amendments so we can proceed to complete action on this bill in a reasonable amount of time. We don't want to cut everybody off. Everybody has a right to be heard on whatever subject they wish to bring before the Senate.

We do have some Senators whom we know have amendments that are relevant to the issue before us. We are hopeful we can consider all of them and give them the kind of attention they deserve.

Ms. STABENOW. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF SHERI POLSTER CHAPPELL TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

NOMINATION OF MICHAEL J. MCSHANE TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nominations of Sheri Polster Chappell, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida, and Michael J. McShane, of Oregon, to be United States District Judge for the District of Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 30 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Connecticut.

GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, it has now been almost 6 months since the horrible shooting in my State of Connecticut at Sandy Hook Elementary where 20 6- and 7-year-old children lost their lives, and another 6 adults, who were protecting them, perished as well.

We all believed we were going to do something about it here on the floor of the Senate. We thought we were going to come to our senses and finally realize it is in part the laws of this Nation that allow for this kind of senseless killing, whether it be in mass numbers in places such as Sandy Hook or Aurora or Tucson or at the Sikh temple in the State of the Presiding Officer or in just the everyday, average gun violence that has become background noise to this Nation.

It is not just about bad people doing bad things; it is also about the laws of this Nation that have allowed for this to happen because we don't have background checks on every gun purchase so that criminals do not get guns. We still allow for dangerous military-style weapons, such as the AR-15 and 100-round drums of ammunition to be carried on the streets of this country. We don't even have a Federal law saying it is illegal to traffic in guns, taking them out of gun shows and gun stores and then going out and selling them on the streets as straw purchasers to people who shouldn't have bought them in the first place. We had 55 votes in the Senate to do something about that, but we didn't have 60 votes, which is the law of the land here these days.

I have promised to come down here every week and do something rather simple, which is to tell the stories of the dozens of people who are killed every single day by guns, because it is their stories that will eventually move this place to action. I know this place has enough empathy, enough compassion to not be so callous as to allow month after month to go by and do nothing about the 4,243 people, as of today, since Newtown who have died in this country at the hands of gun violence.

Let me cite that number again. Since the massacre at Sandy Hook, where 28 people died, including the gunman and his mother, 4,243 people have died due to gun violence.

I want to spend the next couple of minutes before we get back to the debate on these nominations telling the stories of a few of these people.

On May 15, 2013, about a week ago, five different people were shot in Detroit. Halfway through May and there have been 73 shootings in Detroit, MI. Ten people have been killed, with 8 of the shooting victims being 17 years old or younger.

On that day, May 15, five people were shot. A 24-year-old man opened fire

after a pretty simple verbal altercation on the street. What happened, apparently, was that one parent of one child told the other kids to go home for some reason. Something had happened at their house. That youth returned to the house with some of his family members, including the 24-year-old man who got so upset over this simple altercation about a mom asking some kids to leave her house that he opened fire, killing Allmeter Walls and wounding the others.

It was a pretty bloody 24-hour period in Detroit, where 12 people were shot on that day from 6 a.m. on Wednesday until 6 a.m. on Thursday. There were 73 shootings halfway through May in 1 city alone.

On May 15 as well, Newark police said that an 18-year-old high school student, a senior, at Weequahic High School in Newark, NJ, was killed. He had signed himself out of school because he wasn't feeling well, and he was shot.

Councilman Ras Baraka, who is also the principal of another high school, said: "We are outgunned and outmanned here on the street." There are so many guns on the streets of Newark that principals and law enforcement feel outgunned and outmanned.

Of the young student who was killed, one of his friends said: "He was a good kid. When he was little, we used to play pool and video games around here."

In Bridgeport, CT, just before sunrise on Mother's Day, police found 22-year-old Robert Rivera dead in his car from perhaps a dozen bullet wounds. "He was one in a million," a friend said. "No one will ever be like him." Chino was his nickname. He was a good kid. His friend said, "The good die young here." He was 22 years old and was killed in a spray of bullets in his car in Bridgeport, CT.

These are the ones we don't hear that much about because they are in the local papers. But we know there are also these mass killings as well, and before I yield the floor, I want to talk about a handful of victims from the State of the Presiding Officer who were killed at a Sikh temple when someone walked in, in August 2012, and opened fire, because people should know who these victims are as well. There are victims of everyday gun violence, but we have had a string of mass shootings in this country which will not end until we do something about it.

Paramjit Kaur lived for her children. She spent 11 hours a day, 6 days a week in production at a medical devices firm in order to provide for her children. She was praying inside the temple when she learned of the active shooter outside the temple. Instead of being afraid, she showed great courage, bowed down and prayed one last time before she was shot.

Satwant Singh Kaleka was the founder and president of that Sikh temple. He worked 18 hours a day at his fam-

ily's gas station to provide for his family. His hard work as a small businessman paid off and he acquired eight stations by the end of his career. His attempts to thwart the gunman with a small dull knife gave the group of women, including his mother, a chance to escape.

Suveg Singh Khattra, a former dairy farmer in northern India, came to the United States for a better life. He was a humble and loving man who was a constant presence at the temple. He was a man of habit, waking every morning at 4:30 a.m. to watch a live broadcast from India and engage in readings from the holy book. He died at 84.

Prakash Singh was a pious man with a great sense of humor. He stayed in the priest quarters in the temple, and was excited about the fact he was about to get an apartment outside the temple. They were due to move into their new home at the end of August, a few weeks after he was killed.

Then the two brothers, Ranjit and Sita Singh. They were brothers and Sikh priests who left their families behind to move to Oak Creek for a better life. Ranjit was the more outgoing of the two. His responsibility was to take care of every visitor who came through those doors. But his younger brother Sita was just as fun loving and would wake up every morning at 5 a.m. to read the Sikh holy book. His specialty was to make sure everyone who walked into that temple had enough to eat.

All perished at that Sikh temple. These things are going to happen again. There is going to be another mass atrocity. And there will continue to be these shootings in Detroit and Bridgeport and Newark if we don't do something about it on this floor. I know we have important business, whether it be the farm bill this week or our hopeful attempt at passing immigration reform, but as soon as that is done, hopefully, we will get to come back to this issue of gun violence, because if we don't these everyday urban stories will mount and there will be another mass shooting somewhere across this country.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, I would say to my colleague from Connecticut: Amen.

And I would say to my colleague from Oregon: Thank you for your courtesy in letting me go ahead, in light of the fact we have a Federal judge coming up for a vote at 5:30.

I am very grateful to the Judiciary Committee—to both the Democrats and the Republicans—in allowing us to vote, and I urgently implore we confirm Judge Sheri Polster Chappell to the United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida.

While I rise to speak in favor of Judge Chappell, I want to express my concern for the growing partisanship that is dragging down our efforts to fill

these judicial vacancies across the Nation. In the past we have had qualified consensus judicial nominees who would be confirmed in weeks, if not in days. Unfortunately, even the judicial nominees who have the support of both Senators from the State—and sometimes, as is the case of Florida where we have the Republican Senator, Senator RUBIO, and myself, the Democratic Senator—we are still finding the judges are being held up. We are experiencing waiting months for an up-or-down vote only to then have them confirmed overwhelmingly.

Mr. LEAHY. Will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. NELSON. Of course, I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. LEAHY. I would say to my dear friend, the senior Senator from Florida, I share his frustration. We put these judges through the Senate Judiciary Committee often with a unanimous vote and then they wait here months and months to get a vote on the floor. As the distinguished Senator from Florida noted, that vote is then virtually unanimous.

This effort where if somebody is nominated by President Obama they must be blocked, even if it is somebody everyone supports, is totally unfair to the President, it is completely unfair to the judiciary because good men and women are not going to be willing to take nominations or appointments to be a Federal judge if they think they are going to wait month after month after month or even a year before they go on the bench.

I appreciate the statement of the distinguished senior Senator from Florida and I share his frustration.

Mr. NELSON. I thank the chairman of the Judiciary Committee. A good example—this isn't even a Federal district judge, this is court of appeals—we confirmed the judge 94 to 5, when we finally got a vote. That was Judge Adalberto Jordan, the first Cuban-American-born judge, from Miami, to serve on the U.S. court of appeals. The Eleventh Circuit is one of the busiest circuits in the country. It encompasses the Southeastern United States. He was unanimously reported out of the Judiciary Committee, but he was blocked by a filibuster of judicial nominees after 4 months of waiting on the Executive Calendar.

Obviously, with a vote of 94 to 5, he was eminently qualified. He was not controversial. He had the support of Senator RUBIO and myself, a unanimous vote in the Judiciary Committee. Yet his nomination was filibustered.

In addition, highly qualified district court judge nominees are facing the same partisan delays. Obviously, these nominees ought to get confirmed without the needless obstacles, facing potential cloture motions, just to receive an up-or-down vote. I am told the majority leader has had to file cloture on as many as 20 of the Federal district

court nominees since 2009. It is an indication that we are clearly going in the wrong direction in this Senate.

I will give one other example. Here the judge we are about to confirm—and before the chairman came in I thanked him profusely, and the Republicans on the Judiciary Committee, for bringing Judge Chappell up for a vote today. There is no controversy over Judge Chappell. She has the support of Senator RUBIO and myself. She was voted out of the Judiciary Committee twice unanimously. It is a judicial vacancy emergency declared in the Middle District of Florida.

She is waiting. Today is the 329th day.

She was originally nominated during the 112th Congress, but it has taken 329 days to get us to this point today.

Judge Chappell earned her Bachelor of Arts degree at the University of Wisconsin and her juris doctor at Nova Southeastern University. Judge Chappell is serving as a United States Magistrate Judge for the Middle District of Florida, where she has been since 2003.

Prior to which she served as a county court judge in the Twentieth Judicial Circuit of Florida and she began her legal career as prosecutor in Fort Myers. Judge Chappell has also been an active member of the community. She has served on the Florida Prosecuting Attorneys Association, the Domestic Violence Task Force, and the truancy board. Judge Chappell is a true public servant and she will make a fine district court judge.

As of May 20, 2013, according to the United States Administrative Office of the Courts, there are 34 judicial emergency vacancies across this Nation. Florida is home to four empty benches—two in the middle district of Florida and two in the southern district of Florida. In total there are 84 judicial vacancies waiting to be filled and 28 nominees stuck in the pipeline waiting for confirmation. These delays in filling vacancies mean that courts are overburdened. It also means that our citizens are seeing their day in court delayed.

The public is concerned as these delays are further exacerbating the problem facing the courts. In fact, these delays are a scathing indictment of the lack of cooperation and growing partisan nature of process for confirming judicial nominations. These delays undermine the public trust and are illustrative of the stranglehold that partisanship has on Washington and on the rest of the country.

We cannot have that. It is time to confirm Judge Polster Chappell and move with purpose on the rest of these nominations so we can get our courts fully staffed and the judicial system working how it is supposed to.

I again thank the Judiciary Committee for bringing up Judge Chappell, but it cannot keep going on like this. I hope we are going to see some reform and movement quickly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Today the Senate will finally be allowed to vote on the nominations of Judge Sheri Chappell and Judge Michael McShane. For Judge Chappell in particular, this day is long overdue. She was nominated almost a year ago, and was one of the 11 nominees who Senate Republicans refused to vote on before the end of the last Congress. They delayed her confirmation even though she had the support of every single Republican on the Judiciary Committee, and the bipartisan support of her home state Senators, Senator NELSON and Senator RUBIO. They delayed her confirmation even though she is nominated to fill a judicial emergency vacancy that has been vacant for over 400 days. When I say that President Obama's qualified, consensus nominees have faced unprecedented levels of delay and obstruction, this is precisely what I have been talking about.

Even the Wall Street Journal has taken notice. In an article last week, Gerald Seib wrote that the obstruction even of consensus district court nominees is an example of "the Senate's inability to pull out of partisan ruts and get beyond an epidemic of filibusters." While only a few years ago Senate Republicans insisted that filibusters of judicial nominees were unconstitutional, or that they should be reserved for "extraordinary circumstances," this article notes that they "decided in recent years that it is acceptable to mount filibusters not only in exceptional cases but to stop even the most routine business." I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my statement.

Senate Republicans claim that they have blocked only two of President Obama's nominees, but they are not being fair in that characterization. They blocked nominees like Robert Chatigny and Louis Butler by refusing to allow the Senate to vote on them. They blocked nominees like Victoria Nourse, Arvo Mikkanen, and Elissa Cadish by refusing to return blue slips. They even blocked Steve Six by rescinding the blue slips after the nominee had already had a hearing. This reminds me of the way they pocket filibustered dozens of President Clinton's nominees. While as Chairman I have protected the rights of home State Senators, that right does not extend to allowing them to shirk responsibility for it. In all, President Obama has had a significantly lower percentage of his circuit and district nominees confirmed at this point in his time in office than President Bush did at the same point in his presidency.

Senate Republicans who take such pride in the number of nominees being confirmed this year ignore how many, like Judge Chappell, were needlessly delayed from confirmation last year and what they have done during the last 4 years. That is why even after the 17 confirmations this year, we remain nearly 20 confirmations behind the

pace we set for President Bush's circuit and district nominees, and vacancies remain nearly twice as high as they were at this point during President Bush's second term. For all their self-congratulatory statements they cannot refute the following: We are not even keeping up with attrition. Vacancies have increased, not decreased, since the start of this year. President Obama's judicial nominees have faced unprecedented delays and obstruction by Senate Republicans. We have yet to finish the work that could and should have been completed last year. There are still a dozen judicial nominees being denied confirmation.

A recent report by the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service compares the whole of President Obama's first term to the whole of President Bush's first term, and the contrast could not be more clear. The median Senate floor wait time for President Obama's district nominees was 5 times longer than for President Bush's. President Obama's circuit nominees faced even longer delays, and their median wait time was 7.3 times longer than for President Bush's circuit nominees. The comparison is even worse if we look just at nominees who were reported and confirmed unanimously. President Bush's unanimously confirmed circuit nominees had a median wait time of just 14 days. Compare that to the 130.5 days for President Obama's unanimous nominees. That is more than 9 times longer. Even the nonpartisan CRS calls this a "notable change." There is no good reason for such unprecedented delays, but those are the facts.

The confirmations in the last few months do not change the reality of what has happened over the last four years. If a baseball player goes 0-for-9, and then gets a hit, we do not say he is an all-star because he is batting 1.000 in his last at bat. We recognize that he is just 1-for-10, and not a very good hitter.

So while I welcome the confirmations this year, I note both that 13 of the 17 could and should have been confirmed last year and that there are another dozen nominees pending before the Senate, including two who also could have been confirmed last year. We can and must do more for Americans who look to our courts for justice. They deserve better than long delays and empty courtrooms. With 10 percent of our Federal bench vacant, and a backlog of nominees on the Senate Executive Calendar, it is clear that the Senate is not doing what it should on nominations.

It is also ridiculous to complain that the Senate does not have nominees when Mark Barnett, Claire Kelly, Sheri Chappell, Michael McShane, Nitza Quinones Alejandro, Luis Restrepo, Jeffrey Schmehl, Kenneth Gonzales, Gregory Phillips, Sri Srinivasan, Ray Chen, and Jennifer Dorsey are awaiting confirmation.

In addition, Senate Republicans need to take responsibility for not working

with the President to fill vacancies. It is disingenuous of Republican Senators not to work with President Obama to pick nominees and then blame the President for the lack of nominees. I was interested to hear one Senate Republican argue that if Senators do not get recommendations in "expeditiously enough," the President "has the prerogative to nominate someone and then we have the responsibility to act on it." Before President Obama had made a single judicial nomination, all Senate Republicans sent him a letter threatening to filibuster his nominees if he did not consult Republican home state Senators. So the recent statement was either a complete reversal in position, or baiting a trap to then block any nominees the President sends to us.

Some Republican Senators have been willing to work with the President to find nominees in their States. We recently received nominations for district court vacancies in Alabama and Tennessee, and I hope to schedule those nominees for hearings soon. In Pennsylvania, the Republican Senator is now working with Senator CASEY to find nominees that they both support. In fact, three such nominees are pending before the Senate now, and they would fill three of the six current vacancies in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. The nominees have been pending before the Senate for over 2 months after being reported unanimously, and I hope Senate Republicans will allow us to complete action on them before the Memorial Day recess.

I remain deeply concerned about the impact of sequestration on our Federal courts and our legal system. After 4 years in which Senate Republicans have forced our courts to operate short-handed, with 10 percent or more of judgeships vacant, these harsh spending cuts are the last thing we should be doing. I continue to hear from judges and other members of the legal community about the damage of sequestration.

The Judicial Conference, whose presiding officer is Chief Justice Roberts, wrote last week to request emergency funding for fiscal 2013 in order to "address critical needs resulting from sequestration cuts." These indiscriminate cuts have left our Federal judiciary "confronting an unprecedented fiscal crisis that could seriously compromise the Constitutional mission of the United States courts." Members of the bar have written in support of this request, stating that "budget cuts have forced diminished court staffing, court closures, compromised security, and lengthy trial delays." They rightly note that "it is people's lives that are adversely changed" by these unnecessary cuts. I ask unanimous consent that both letters be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my statement. I hope Senators read these letters and take these concerns seriously, and that we can come together to meet our responsibilities to our coequal

branch and to the 310 million Americans we all serve.

Judge Sheri Polster Chappell is nominated to a judicial emergency vacancy on the U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Florida, where she has been serving since 2003 as a Federal Magistrate Judge. Prior to her appointment to the Federal bench, she worked as a Lee County Court Judge, as an Assistant State Attorney in the Twentieth Judicial Circuit of Florida, where she was the first female county office head, and as an instructor at the Southwest Florida Criminal Justice Academy. Judge Chappell was reported unanimously last year and again 2 months ago. The Middle District of Florida has a second judicial emergency vacancy, and it is unfortunate that the Senate is not being allowed to consider the nominee to that seat, as well. Judge Brian Davis received unanimously the ABA Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary's highest rating of "well qualified," and was reported favorably almost 1 year ago.

Judge Michael McShane is nominated to a judicial emergency vacancy on the U.S. District Court for the District of Oregon. Currently a Circuit Court Judge on the Multnomah County Circuit Court, Judge McShane has served as a State court judge for over 15 years. He previously served as a Circuit Judge Pro Tem on the Multnomah County Circuit Court. Prior to becoming a judge, Judge McShane spent his entire 9-year legal career as a trial attorney in the Metropolitan Public Defender's Office in Portland, OR. Judge McShane has the support of his home State Senators, Senator WYDEN and Senator MERKLEY, and was reported unanimously by the Judiciary Committee over 2 months ago.

Senate Republicans have a long way to go to match the record of cooperation on consensus nominees that Senate Democrats established during the Bush administration. After today's votes, 10 more judicial nominees remain pending, and all but one were reported unanimously. All Senate Democrats are ready to vote on each of them to allow them to get to work for the American people. We can make real progress for our Federal courts and the American people if Senate Republicans are willing to join us.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 14, 2013]

OPEN JUDGESHIPS SHOW D.C. DYSFUNCTION

(By Gerald F. Seib)

Jill Pryor of Georgia and Rosemary Marquez of Arizona aren't exactly household names, but they share a distinction with national importance: Both have been waiting exactly 689 days for the Senate to act on their nominations to become federal judges.

Yet they aren't even the most extreme examples of Washington's inability to perform one of its most basic functions, filling the federal judiciary across the land. All told, 85 federal judgeships sit vacant, meaning some 10% of the federal judiciary is empty—and this at a time when those who run the court

system think there actually should be new judicial posts created because of an escalating workload.

Openings on two of the nation's most important federal appeals courts—the Ninth Circuit in the West and the D.C. Circuit in Washington—have been unfilled since 2005.

There is no current nominee for either seat, not since President Barack Obama's choice for the D.C. slot gave up in frustration after Republican filibusters put her nomination in limbo for 2½ years.

The Obama administration must shoulder some blame for this predicament. It has been slower than its predecessors to vet and nominate judicial candidates.

But the lion's share of the blame lies with the Senate, a body that's becoming an embarrassment to itself and that increasingly infects the rest of government with its paralysis.

Traditionally, the first step in the process of picking federal judicial nominees is for senators to recommend to the White House candidates to fill vacancies in their home states; the process slows when home-state senators of different parties can't agree.

Senators then can quietly decline to endorse a nominee, or put an unpublicized "hold" on nominees they disapprove of, or can stop a nomination by simply threatening a filibuster.

In today's partisan environment, all those tactics are at work.

"There always was a bit of back and forth between the parties on nominations generally, and judicial nominations specifically," says Caroline Fredrickson, a former Senate aide and now president of the American Constitution Society, a left-leaning organization that tracks judicial nominations. "But it's become so extreme that I think we are in a completely different situation now."

This problem persists even though the Senate has confirmed more than a dozen judges in the past couple of months. That progress has served mostly to keep the number of vacancies below 100; judges still aren't being confirmed fast enough to keep up with the rate of attrition as older judges retire.

In recent days, more attention has been devoted to the Senate's unwillingness to confirm Obama administration nominations for senior executive-branch positions, including Thomas Perez as labor secretary and Gina McCarthy as Environmental Protection Agency administrator. Republican senators have buried the nominees with written questions and refused to show up for committee votes on them.

Yet the backlog of judicial vacancies is a more long-standing problem and a better illustration of the Senate's inability to pull out of partisan ruts and get beyond an epidemic of filibusters.

Both parties know that, while cabinet secretaries come and go, federal judges stay on the scene for years, even decades. So the party out of power is reluctant to let a president fill the judiciary with nominees of his political persuasion, if leaving the positions unfilled creates at least the chance that the opposition party will be able to put a judge of its liking into place a few years hence.

This political temptation wouldn't matter so much if senators hadn't also decided in recent years that it is acceptable to mount filibusters not only in exceptional cases but to stop even the most routine business.

Thus, the country now is in the bizarre position of having a chief justice, John Roberts, on the Supreme Court for almost eight years—while his previous position on the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals has sat empty for the entire time.

This problem has been building for years. A recent study by the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service shows that even

noncontroversial judicial appointments—those that ultimately got bipartisan support and easily passed the Senate—are having to wait longer for confirmation across the past four presidencies of both parties.

As Republicans note, Democrats set the stage for today's problems by filibustering George W. Bush's judicial nominees. Now the problem has grown worse in the Obama years, as Republicans turn the tables and bottle up Democratic nominations.

The study found that 35.7% of George W. Bush's noncontroversial circuit-court nominees had to wait more than 200 days for confirmation—up from 22.2% for Bill Clinton. During the Obama presidency, that percentage has soared to 63.6%. No Obama circuit-court nominee has been confirmed in less than 100 days.

What's more, previously only more-sensitive appeals-court nominations were filibustered; now it's also less-sensitive district-court nominations.

It has been clear for a while that Washington has trouble getting big things done. Judicial vacancies show it doesn't do the smaller ones so well either.

DRI,

Chicago, IL, May 16, 2013.

Senator PATRICK LEAHY,

Chairman Senate Judiciary Committee, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN LEAHY: The operations of the federal judiciary are essential to maintaining the rule of law in this country, the foundation for much of our economic life. This lies in peril now as budget cuts have forced diminished court staffing, court closures, compromised security, and lengthy trial delays. This, of course, means that justice is delayed. Since criminal trials must take priority, already lengthy delays in civil trials become even longer. Perhaps thousands of businesses will not survive the abeyance of lengthy uncertainty over the outcome of litigation. We talk of the effect on justice, we talk of the effect on businesses but, at bottom, it is people's lives that are adversely changed.

The U.S. Judicial Conference and the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts have petitioned for emergency funding of \$73 million that would replace only a small portion of the \$350 million in cuts forced upon them by sequestration. The 22,000 members of DRI—The Voice of the Defense Bar with one voice wholeheartedly support their petition and urge that you take whatever action is necessary to realize its fulfillment.

DRI will remain at the disposal of Congressional and White House leaders to provide any expertise or support needed to move funding forward.

Sincerely,

MARY MASSARON ROSS,
DRI President.

JUDICIAL CONFERENCE
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, May 14, 2013.

Hon. SYLVIA MATHEWS BURWELL,
Director, Office of Management and Budget,
17th Street NW, Washington, DC.

DEAR DIRECTOR BURWELL: We write on behalf of the Judicial Conference of the United States to inform the Administration of the Judiciary's decision to seek \$72.9 million in fiscal year 2013 emergency supplemental appropriations to address critical needs resulting from sequestration cuts. The supplemental request includes \$31.5 million for the Courts Salaries and Expenses account, and \$41.4 million for the Defender Services account. In accordance with 31 U.S.C. 1107, we respectfully request that the President transmit the Judiciary's supplemental requirements to Congress promptly and with-

out change. A detailed summary of this supplemental request is included in Enclosure 1. A funding table and the proposed legislative language are included in Enclosure 2.

Final enacted appropriations for fiscal year 2013, after sequestration cuts are applied, reduce Judiciary funding overall by nearly \$350 million below fiscal year 2012 discretionary appropriations. Emergency measures have been implemented throughout the federal court system to address the drastically reduced funding levels under sequestration, but the federal courts do not have the flexibility to absorb such a large cut. The impacts of sequestration are compounded by the fact that 100 percent of the cuts must be absorbed with only six months remaining in the fiscal year. Unlike some Executive Branch entities, the Judiciary has little flexibility to move funds between appropriation accounts to lessen the effects of sequestration. There are no lower-priority programs to reduce in order to transfer funds to other Judiciary accounts.

Section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 allows for statutory spending caps to be exceeded under certain conditions, including if Congress and the President designate funding as an emergency requirement. The Judiciary is confronting an unprecedented fiscal crisis that could seriously compromise the Constitutional mission of the United States courts. We believe our supplemental request meets the threshold for receiving an emergency designation.

The Judiciary's emergency actions to date do not constitute a solution to the budget crisis facing the federal courts as a result of sequestration. Instead, these actions represent a conscientious effort to mitigate the adverse impact of sequestration on court operations in an attempt to ensure continued access to justice for the citizens of this country. However, sequestration cuts have created an unprecedented financial crisis that is impacting all facets of federal court operations.

Finally, we note that Executive Branch agencies with criminal justice responsibilities have had the flexibility and resources to address their fiscal year 2013 sequestration cuts. As a result, these agencies—which directly impact the workload of the Judiciary—have been able to avoid furloughs. While the Judiciary has the authority to transfer funds between appropriation accounts, it does not have the available funding flexibility needed to do so. Instead, we must ask Congress to approve a supplemental appropriation.

Please feel free to contact us if you have any questions regarding this supplemental appropriations request.

Sincerely,

JULIA S. GIBBONS,
Chair, Judicial Conference, Committee on the Budget.

THOMAS F. HOGAN,
Secretary, Judicial Conference of the U.S.

SUMMARY OF JUDICIARY FISCAL YEAR 2013
EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST
COURTS SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The Courts Salaries and Expenses account funds the bulk of federal court operations including the operations of the appellate, district, and bankruptcy courts, and probation and pretrial services offices. This account was cut \$239 million below fiscal year 2012 levels under sequestration. Given the decentralized nature of the federal court system, individual courts will decide how to absorb the majority of cuts required by sequestra-

tion. To mitigate the impact of sequestration on employees, the courts have slashed non-salary budgets but even with these reductions, on a national level, up to 1,000 court employees could be laid off over the remainder of the fiscal year and thousands of employees face furloughs. These staffing losses will come on top of the nearly 2,200 probation and pretrial services officers and clerks' office staff the courts have already lost since the end of July 2011, a 10 percent loss of staff. Cuts to clerks' office staffing will result in the slower processing of civil and bankruptcy cases which will impact individuals, small businesses, and corporations seeking to resolve disputes in the federal courts.

Sequestration cuts will also impact public safety. Our probation and pretrial services officers are federal law enforcement officers that supervise defendants awaiting trial and offenders on post-conviction release. Cuts to officer staffing levels mean less deterrence, detection, and response to possible resumed criminal activity by federal defendants and offenders in the community. In addition, funding to support GPS and other electronic monitoring of potentially dangerous defendants and offenders has been cut 20 percent. Equivalent cuts to funding for drug testing, substance abuse and mental health treatment of federal defendants and offenders have also been made, increasing further the risk to public safety.

Of the \$31.5 million in fiscal year 2013 supplemental funding requested for Courts Salaries and Expenses, \$18.5 million will be used to avoid further staffing cuts and furloughs in clerks of court and probation and pretrial services offices during the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2013. This funding will save the jobs of approximately 500 court employees and avoid 14,400 planned furlough days for 3,300 court employees. The remaining \$13.0 million will restore half of the sequestration cuts to drug testing, substance abuse, and mental health treatment services for defendants awaiting trial and offenders released from prison. Timely diagnosis and treatment of drug and mental health conditions is critical to defendants/offenders successfully completing their terms of release and ensuring community safety.

DEFENDER SERVICES

The Judiciary's Defender Services program provides financially eligible federal defendants with defense counsel and related services that, under the Sixth Amendment and the Criminal Justice Act, the government must fund in order to prosecute cases. Program costs are essentially comprised of compensation to federal defender organization (FDO) staff, payments to private "panel" attorneys, case related expenses (expert witnesses, interpreters, investigations, etc.), space rent, and other fixed costs. Consequently, the primary options for absorbing the \$52 million sequestration cut are reducing FDO staffing levels and/or deferring payments to private panel attorneys. Reducing FDO staff results in appointments being shifted to panel attorneys thus increasing those costs, and deferring panel attorney payments into fiscal year 2014 only adds to fiscal year 2014 appropriations requirements. Absent supplemental funding, the Judiciary will need to suspend payments to private panel attorneys for the last 15 business days (3 weeks) of the fiscal year, and FDOs will need to further reduce costs through staffing cuts and by furloughing employees for a national average of approximately 15 days for the remainder of the fiscal year.

We are aware that the U.S. Department of Justice is not furloughing staff so we anticipate the pace at which criminal cases requiring appointment of defense counsel will continue unabated, while resources in the Defender Services program are diminishing. Between October 2012 and April 2013, FDOs downsized by 113 employees and other employees were furloughed. Further FDO cuts and the anticipated suspension of panel attorney payments will create the real possibility that panel attorneys may decline to accept Criminal Justice Act appointments in

cases that otherwise would have been represented by FDOs. Delays in the cases moving forward may result in violations of constitutional and statutory speedy trial mandates resulting in criminal cases being dismissed.

Of the \$41.4 million in supplemental funding requested for Defender Services, \$27.7 million is required to avoid deferring payments to private attorneys for the last 15 business days (3 weeks) of the fiscal year. To address staffing losses, \$8.7 million is needed to avoid further staffing cuts and furloughs

in FDOs during the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2013. This funding will save the jobs of approximately 50 employees and avoid 9,600 planned furlough days for 1,700 FDO employees. The remaining \$5.0 million is for projected defense representation and related expert costs for high-threat trials, including high-threat cases in New York and Boston that, absent sequestration, the Defender Services program would have been able to absorb without the need for supplemental funding.

FEDERAL JUDICIARY—FY 2013 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS REQUEST
(\$000)

Appropriation Account	FY 2012		FY 2013			
	FY 2012 Enacted Approp.	FY 2013 Full Year CR (P.L. 113-6) ¹	FY 2013 Sequestration Cut ²	FY 2013 Available Appropriation	FY 2013 Supplemental Request	FY 2013 Revised Appropriation
U.S. Supreme Court:						
Salaries & Expenses	74,819	74,684	(3,653)	71,030	—	71,030
Care of Building and Grounds	8,159	8,143	(410)	7,732	—	7,732
U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit	32,511	32,462	(1,509)	30,953	—	30,953
U.S. Court of International Trade	21,447	21,405	(992)	20,412	—	20,412
Courts of Appeals, District Courts & Other Judicial Services (CADCOJS):						
Salaries & Expenses:						
Direct	5,015,000	5,015,955	(239,114)	4,776,841	31,500	4,808,341
Vaccine Injury Fund	5,000	4,990	4,990	—	4,990
Total	5,020,000	5,020,945	(239,114)	4,781,831	31,500	4,813,331
Defender Services	1,031,000	1,037,920	(51,865)	986,055	41,400	1,027,455
Fees of Jurors & Commissioners	51,908	51,804	(2,611)	49,193	—	49,193
Court Security	500,000	499,000	(25,153)	473,847	—	473,847
Subtotal, CADCOJS	6,602,908	6,609,670	(318,744)	6,290,926	72,900	6,363,826
Administrative Office	82,909	82,743	(4,171)	78,572	—	78,572
Federal Judicial Center	27,000	26,946	(1,358)	25,588	—	25,588
Judicial Retirement Funds (mandatory)	103,768	125,464	—	125,464	—	125,464
U.S. Sentencing Commission	16,500	16,467	(830)	15,637	—	15,637
Total, The Judiciary	6,970,021	6,997,983	(331,668)	6,666,314	72,900	6,739,214
Sequestration to Judiciary Fees	(13,974)
Total Judiciary Sequestration	(345,642)

¹ Reflects Judiciary appropriations included in the FY 2013 full year CR (P.L. 113-6) as well as the reduction associated with the 0.2 percent across-the-board rescission.
² Reflects sequestration cuts calculated by the Office of Management and Budget on March 1, 2013.

FEDERAL JUDICIARY FY 2013 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS REQUEST
COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Bill Language

For an additional amount for ‘Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services, Salaries and Expenses,’ \$31,500,000, for emergency expenses of the courts for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, including amounts necessary to minimize staffing reductions and furloughs, and for drug testing, drug treatment, and mental health treatment services of offenders and defendants in the probation and pretrial services program. Provided, That the amount provided herein is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

Justification

\$18.5 million will be used to avoid further staffing cuts and furloughs in clerks of court and probation and pretrial services offices during the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2013. This funding will save the jobs of approximately 500 court employees and avoid 14,400 planned furlough days for 3,300 court employees.

\$13.0 million will restore half of the sequestration cuts to drug testing, substance abuse, and mental health treatment services for defendants awaiting trial and offenders released from prison. Timely diagnosis and treatment of drug and mental health conditions is critical to defendants/offenders successfully completing their terms of release and ensuring community safety.

DEFENDER SERVICES

Bill Language

For an additional amount for ‘Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services, Defender Services,’ \$41,400,000, for emergency expenses related to the representation of defendants under the Criminal Justice Act for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, including amounts necessary to minimize staffing reductions and furloughs in federal defender organizations, for the compensation and reimbursement of panel attorneys and experts, and for representation costs associated with high-threat trials. Provided, That the amount provided herein is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

Justification

\$27.7 million is required to avoid deferring payments to private attorneys representing indigent defendants under the Criminal Justice Act for the last 15 business days (3 weeks) of the fiscal year. Without additional funding, sequestration cuts will necessitate that these expenses shift to fiscal year 2014. These costs were not included in the Judiciary’s fiscal year 2014 budget request to Congress.

\$8.7 million will avoid further staffing cuts through layoffs, buyouts and early outs, and furloughs in federal defender organizations during the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2013. This funding will save the jobs of approximately 50 employees and avoid 9,600 planned furlough days for 1,700 federal defender organization employees.

The remaining \$5.0 million is for projected defense representation and related expert costs for high-threat trials, including high-threat cases in New York and Boston that, absent sequestration, the Defender Services program would have been able to absorb without the need for supplemental funding.

Mr. LEAHY. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I rise to speak to the nomination of Michael McShane to serve on the U.S. district court of Eugene. Judge McShane is an exceptionally qualified nominee and will make a terrific addition to the Federal bench in Oregon. Over his entire career, Judge McShane has demonstrated a tremendous commitment to the law, to public service, and to our State.

He came to Oregon 30 years ago to serve communities through the Jesuit Volunteer Corps. The Jesuit Volunteer Corps, known as JVC, is folks, often graduating from college, who dedicate 1 year of direct service to the poor, simple living, and spiritual community. They work in locations such as food banks and local church programs, to work with at-risk youth and work of this nature. They work directly to help make the world a better place and do so in an exceptional manner. Anyone who comes out of college and dedicates 1 year to such an effort certainly starts in a very sound place.

Since that time, Judge McShane has remained deeply dedicated both to Oregon and to serving those in our society most in need. After graduating from Lewis & Clark Law School, Judge McShane went to work as a public defender in Portland. For more than 10

years, he represented those who otherwise would have no voice in our legal system. After his time as a public defender, he went to work on the circuit court, first as a judge pro tem and then simply as a judge.

In the approximately 15 years he served on the circuit court, Judge McShane has developed an excellent reputation for fairness, thoroughness, and accuracy.

He also continued to serve in the community as a foster parent and adjunct law professor at Lewis & Clark College. In one letter of support I received, a member of the Portland law community summed up his nomination by saying:

What stands out to me is that Judge McShane lives and conducts his personal life with the same integrity, honor, compassion and diligence as he displays as a judge.

Judge McShane will make an excellent addition to the U.S. district court. I urge my colleagues present tonight to join in support for his nomination.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, before we vote on the nominees today, I want to update my colleagues on where we stand with judicial confirmations. After tonight, the Senate will have confirmed 190 district and circuit nominees; we have defeated two. That's 190-2; which is a .990 batting average. That is an outstanding record. Who can complain about achieving 99 percent?

So far this year, the Senate has confirmed 17 nominees. Today, if Judge Chappell and Judge McShane are confirmed, we confirm the eighteenth and nineteenth nominees. At this stage in President Bush's second term, only 4 were confirmed. That is a record of 19 to 4.

This President is being treated exceptionally fairly.

The President has recently submitted a few new nominations. I know I have been reminding him that we can't do anything about vacancies without him first sending up nominees.

But again, even with the recent nominations, 58 of 82 nominations still have no nominee. And for judicial emergencies, only 6 of 32 vacancies have a nominee.

So I just wanted to set the record straight before we vote on these nominees. I expect they will both be confirmed tonight and I congratulate them on their confirmations.

Judge Chappell received her B.A. from the University of Wisconsin—Madison in 1984 and her J.D. from Nova Southeastern University Law School in 1987. Upon graduation, Judge Chappell became an assistant State Attorney in the Fort Myers Misdemeanor Division. In 1988, she began prosecuting felony cases including crimes against children, drugs, property crimes, and crimes against persons. In 1991, she was promoted to office head of the Hendry and Glades County office where she prosecuted cases and supervised the attorneys, secretaries, and investigators. From 1993 until 1998, she acted as the

supervisor of the Fort Myers Circuit Court Trial Division where she served as chair of the hiring committee and created a training course for new assistant state attorneys. From 1998 to 2000, Judge Chappell served as the office head of the Charlotte County office.

In 2000, Judge Chappell was appointed by then-Governor Jeb Bush as a Lee County Court judge for the Twentieth Judicial Circuit. In 2002, she was elected to serve a 6-year term for this position. There, she had jurisdiction over misdemeanor cases and civil disputes involving \$15,000 or less. She resigned in 2003 due to her selection as a United States magistrate judge for the Middle District of Florida. There she handles criminal and civil dockets.

According to her questionnaire, Judge Chappell has presided over approximately 519 cases that have gone to verdict or judgment.

The American Bar Association's Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary gave her a Unanimous "Qualified" rating.

Judge McShane received his B.A. from Gonzaga University in 1983 and his J.D. from Northwestern School of Law at Lewis and Clark College in 1988. For the first 9 years of his law career, Judge McShane worked as a public defender in Portland, OR, representing indigent clients facing criminal prosecution, the majority accused of felonies. During this time, he held the positions of Senior Felony Attorney and Misdemeanor Supervisor. According to his questionnaire, as a practicing attorney, Judge McShane tried over 500 trials to verdict.

In 1997, Judge McShane was appointed as a Multnomah County Circuit Court judge pro tem by then-Chief Justice of the Oregon Supreme Court, Wallace Carson. He presided over misdemeanor trials, criminal arraignments, traffic matters, stalking protective orders, probation hearings, small claims, and forcible entry and detainer matters.

In 2001, Judge McShane was appointed to the Multnomah County Circuit Court by then-Governor John A. Kitzhaber. In 2002, he was elected to the position and re-elected in 2008. He served as a trial judge with general jurisdiction and presided over criminal and civil matters. In 2012, he was assigned to the family law bench. According to his questionnaire, Judge McShane has presided over thousands of cases, of which approximately 1,600 cases went to verdict.

The American Bar Association's Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary gave him a Majority "Qualified" and Minority "Well Qualified" rating.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COWAN). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. 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. JOHANNIS. Mr. President, we yield all time on our side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Sheri Polster Chappell, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) would each vote "yea."

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER), and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted "yea" and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) would have voted "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 90, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 128 Ex.]

YEAS—90

Ayotte	Feinstein	Merkley
Baldwin	Fischer	Mikulski
Barrasso	Flake	Moran
Baucus	Franken	Murkowski
Begich	Gillibrand	Murphy
Bennet	Graham	Murray
Blumenthal	Grassley	Nelson
Blunt	Hagan	Portman
Boozman	Harkin	Reed
Boxer	Hatch	Reid
Brown	Heinrich	Risch
Burr	Heller	Roberts
Cantwell	Hirono	Rockefeller
Cardin	Inhofe	Rubio
Carper	Isakson	Sanders
Casey	Johannis	Schatz
Chambliss	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Coats	Johnson (WI)	Sessions
Coburn	Kaine	Shaheen
Cochran	King	Shelby
Collins	Kirk	Stabenow
Coons	Klobuchar	Tester
Corker	Leahy	Thune
Cornyn	Lee	Toomey
Cowan	Levin	Udall (CO)
Crapo	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Cruz	McCain	Warner
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warren
Durbin	McConnell	Whitehouse
Enzi	Menendez	Wyden

NOT VOTING—10

Alexander	Lautenberg	Vitter
Heitkamp	Paul	Wicker
Hoehven	Pryor	
Landrieu	Scott	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Michael J. McShane, of Oregon, to be United States District Judge for the District of Oregon?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

The Senator from New Jersey.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period of morning business until 7 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that upon the conclusion of my remarks Senator BOXER be recognized for her remarks.

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, let me thank the distinguished Senator from California for her courtesy in allowing me to move forward first.

THOUGHTS AND PRAYERS FOR THE PEOPLE OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, before I begin, let me offer my thoughts and prayers for the people of Oklahoma, who are in the middle of a devastating disaster. We in New Jersey know what that kind of devastation can mean, and our hearts go out to the victims and their families who have lost everything.

PEREZ NOMINATION

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise today to reiterate my strong support for Tom Perez, a man eminently qualified to serve our country as the next Secretary of Labor.

I am pleased that the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee voted last Thursday to favorably report Mr. Perez's nomination to the full Senate. But we must remember this step forward came only after weeks of delay.

This is the week we should have been on this floor debating and voting on the confirmation of Tom Perez, but we are not. Instead, delaying tactics on this and other nominees have now needlessly, pointlessly pushed this debate into next month.

Let me state for the record that the obstruction we have seen thus far in the confirmation process is completely unacceptable and, for the sake of the American people, for the sake of good governance, it must end.

It does not stop at the Department of Labor. Republicans have refused to take up nominees at the National Labor Relations Board, threatening the operation of this critical agency. It appears any agency that stands up for workers' rights is under attack. Let's just do the job the American people sent us here to do.

Tom Perez is a quintessential public servant, but apparently that is not enough for my colleagues on the other side. He is a consensus builder, but that is not enough. As secretary of labor in Maryland, he brought together the chamber of commerce and Maryland labor unions to make sure that workers received the level of wages and benefits they deserved and that businesses had the skilled workforce they needed, but that experience of bringing both sides together is not enough. It is not enough that he is the Assistant Attorney General for the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice, where he increased prosecutions of human trafficking by 40 percent, won \$50 million for armed services members whose homes were improperly foreclosed on while they served, and settled the three largest fair lending cases in the history of the Fair Housing Act, recovering more money for victims in 2012 than in the previous 23 years combined. But none of those accomplishments on human trafficking, on servicemembers, on people who were abused in fair housing—that is not enough. It is not enough that he spent his entire career in public service. It is not enough to be a Brown University graduate or have a master's in public policy from the Kennedy School or a juris doctorate from Harvard Law.

The truth is that my friends on the other side are looking to block his nomination because Tom Perez is not enough of a Republican to pass muster. He is too much of an advocate for people with disabilities, achieving the largest ever disability-based housing discrimination settlement. He is too much of a civil rights champion. He obtained the first convictions under the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd Hate Crimes Prevention Act. He has been a strong supporter of ending discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. They seem to hate the Civil Rights Division, but who could deny the importance of their work?

Tom Perez is just too much for my friends on the other side who want to block this nominee and insist on obstructing, obfuscating, and politicizing

everything that comes before the Congress. The fact is that this is not even about Tom Perez. It is about rendering government helpless and standing in the way of any effort to govern.

Tom Perez is a good man. He is qualified and competent. He is a professional public servant nominated by the President and already confirmed by the Senate to the post he holds today. I endorsed Tom Perez after meeting him. I continue to stand firmly by him as a nominee. But what I will not stand for is Republicans blocking his nomination for no valid reason, without any real objection, only an ideological objection to allowing this President or this Congress to govern or to at least select a Cabinet that will help us do so, and in this case particularly the Department of Labor that stands for working men and women of this country.

I said, when the President nominated him, he was an outstanding nominee to be the Secretary of Labor. He has "dedicated his career to championing the rights of workers and all Americans, and I am confident he will continue to do the same if confirmed."

I also marvel that I listen to all the election postmortem about how the Republican Party has to reach out to Hispanic Americans in this country, how they have to do a better job of engaging them and selling their vision of America. This is the President's first nominee for this second term of a Hispanic American who is eminently qualified.

To try to stop this nominee is reverting back to the same old failed political strategies during the last election. It is unfortunate that the President's first Hispanic choice for his second-term Cabinet comes under such attack, no valid attack. It does not have to be that way. Mr. Perez deserves an up-or-down vote, and he deserves to be swiftly confirmed as the next Secretary of Labor.

To my friends on the other side, I would say to you it is time to stop the obstructionism. I would say to you the empty rhetoric and baseless objections to Tom Perez's nomination are not going to serve you well in the Hispanic community. You should allow, as I have heard so many times—give us an up-or-down vote—an up-or-down vote. Working families in this country, those who depend upon the Labor Department to have a sense of fairness and justice, deserve an up-or-down vote. Hispanic Americans who want to see someone from that community represented in the President's Cabinet want to see an up-or-down vote. That is what justice would be all about.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Before my friend from New Jersey leaves the floor, I wish to thank him for leading a letter regarding this important nomination. We need a Secretary of Labor. We had a wonderful Secretary of Labor, Hilda Solis. The reason it is so essential is we

now see that the middle class is essentially collapsing, even though we are coming out of the worst recession since the Great Depression because of the leadership of our President and those of us who tried to help him. We need a head of the Department of Labor to make sure everybody gets a fair chance. I wish to thank my friend. He makes a very important point about Republican obstructionism.

After the election, they sat around, all of them, and said: Oh, my goodness. We have to do better with Hispanics. We have to do better with women.

Who are the two people they are holding up with all their might at this point—and I hope they end it—Mr. Perez and Gina McCarthy, a woman who deserves a promotion just as Mr. Perez deserves a promotion. They can say all they want that they are reaching out to minorities and women, but then they are blocking promotions of people who are outstanding Americans. I wished to say that before my friend left the floor.

FACING THE ISSUES

Mrs. BOXER. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are focused on several issues, which they call scandals. I would like to address those and then talk about issues that seem to be falling through the cracks while they focus on “gotcha” politics; they are going to get the President.

I think we will start with the IRS. It is wrong to target any group for scrutiny whether they are on the right or on the left, if it is a tea party group or a liberal church. We have seen this with the IRS over the years. As a matter of fact, I looked back to see how many of my Republican friends stood up and talked about going after the IRS and straightening them out when they went after the NAACP or when they went after a liberal church in Pasadena in Congressman SCHIFF’s district. The fact is they got exercised when they went after the tea party. OK. I hear you. I am with you. What is important is so is the President.

If this President says: I agree with you, they say: We didn’t hear you.

They just want to fight. I have friends where sometimes we are having a debate, and all of a sudden a bright light goes on and I will say, you know what, I think you are right. Sometimes they keep on arguing.

The President said this is an outrage, and he has already made sure people are being fired. We are going to make sure we straighten things out at the IRS.

Let’s focus on how to fix it, not how to make it into a “gotcha” political issue. We also have Republican outrage over the Justice Department seeking the phone records of the Associated Press.

I, myself, believe freedom of the press is one of the most important freedoms we have. I don’t like to see phone records of reporters subpoenaed in secret.

I was once a reporter and had a lot of confidential sources. I wrote for a very good weekly magazine called the PacificSun. I did in-depth stories on all kinds of issues. People would talk to me, and they knew I would never say who they were and who was giving background.

The thought of having the government take a look at these records without telling the press is bad. Guess what. The President agrees it is bad. The President said we need a law, a media shield law. Guess what else. We had a vote on this in 2008. It was 51 to 43 with all Democrats supporting the media shield law and all Republicans, save 5, voting to filibuster, so the bill was killed.

How do they then say this is horrible when they themselves, Republicans, blocked us from protecting the media?

I believe this is an important issue we should work on together, but it shouldn’t be made into a political “gotcha.” We should fix it and move on. Let’s take up a media shield law again. This time the Republicans shouldn’t filibuster since they are all over this question, and let’s get going.

Then we look at Benghazi. I am on the Foreign Relations Committee. I sit next to the chairman. I sat next to John Kerry. I sat through all the hearings where Hillary Clinton, the Secretary of State, said: This was a tragedy. These were my friends who were killed. I take full responsibility.

She ordered an independent investigation. It came back and guess what it said. We need to spend more defending our outposts.

Guess who started cutting embassy security, who initiated it. The Republicans in the House.

I think if they are looking to blame someone, why don’t they look in the mirror for starters.

Again, let’s fix the problem. I am supporting a bill that will authorize funding for key items identified by the independent review board Secretary Clinton put together. It will deal with a number of pieces they recommend. It requires, among others, detailed reports from the State Department on how they are progressing toward implementing the recommendations, and it requires the identification of the most high-security threats.

I understand why we would look at losing four brave Americans as a tragedy. It is a tragedy. Don’t politicize it.

Where were the Republicans when we lost 4,000 Americans in Iraq, injured 10 times as many. Where were they? Where was their indignation at that? Based on false premises, that war was a war of choice, not a war of necessity.

We have all of this swirling around Washington and we look at the American people and we say what is it they want us to do. Sure, we should conduct oversight. I am all for it. Let’s solve those problems, but let’s move to the issues that matter.

I will tell you what matters most in California: jobs, jobs, jobs, the econ-

omy, the economy, the economy. We just moved off a double-digit unemployment rate. For the first time in a long time we are below 10 percent. It means we have to keep our eye on this economy. We have to make the investments that matter. Restore some of the mindless cuts that were made with the sequester while we see this deficit going down.

That is another point. All the howling from the Republicans about how this President doesn’t care about deficit reduction, we are witnessing deficit reduction. We are witnessing the housing market come back. We are witnessing a lot of good. Just think of what we could witness if we came together, sat down with this President and inked a whole new plan for this economy, for deficit reduction.

We have to do the farm bill. We just did the water resources bill. Let the House get it done. We did the Marketplace Fairness Act. Let the House get it done.

Republicans, I say to them—they are not here—rhetorically, help us pass a budget. They are blocking the budget. They went around the country campaigning against Democrats saying we didn’t pass a budget. Then we passed a budget and now they will not finish the job, which means making sure we get conferees appointed. Bring the two bills together, the House and the Senate, compromise on that, and get the budget done. There is no budget. They will not let us do it.

Endlessly, they bash the President. Immigration reform, my colleagues are doing an incredible job in the Judiciary Committee, very difficult—sensible gun laws, background checks, things that matter to people.

Working on the farm bill, I hope we get it done this week. Last time it died in the House. I have a message for my House friends. Please, do your oversight but do something for the people that they are asking us to do. Get a budget, get a farm bill, get a Marketplace Fairness Act. Work on restoring the mindless cuts so we can have more jobs. These are the things that have to be done. Background checks. We didn’t get it here. It was very close. It would be great if they did something in the House.

This week I believe we are voting on Richard Cordray to head the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. We have to protect the middle class.

Today I read the paper about some new instrument that has been thought of by Wall Street that would go to people and say give us the proceeds of your pension plan, and we will give you a lump sum. Maybe that is great, but it sounds risky to me. We need someone who is out there protecting the consumers, particularly in banking and housing. I hope we get Richard Cordray done.

I thought Senator MENENDEZ was brilliant the way he explained why Thomas Perez deserves to be head of Department of Labor.

I wish to spend a couple of minutes on Gina McCarthy. She has a history of bipartisanship. She worked for not one, not two, not three but four Republican Governors: Republican Governor of Connecticut Jodi Rell, Republican Governor of Massachusetts Paul Cellucci, Republican Governor of Massachusetts Jane Swift, Republican Governor of Massachusetts Mitt Romney. She worked for four Republican Governors. She is not enough qualified for my friends on the other side. She was confirmed here without a dissenting vote for her current position. What more do they want? She worked for four Republicans and one Democrat, Barack Obama. What more do they want?

This is what Christie Todd Whitman said about the Republican boycott: They walked out. They have since returned to the table. I was happy, but when they walked out of that meeting, they didn't come to the meeting, and we couldn't mark her up the first time we tried. She said: They looked like sore losers when they walked out. If they don't object to the person and what they have done in the past, and they don't with Gina, then they have even less grounds to hold up this nominee.

Jane Swift, who was a former Republican Governor of Massachusetts, said it was disgraceful.

I don't get it. Ms. McCarthy answered 1,000 of their questions. Then when I approach my friends on the other side and say, you asked her a thousand questions, their answer was: Well, we only cared about five. Then why did you ask her a thousand questions? She had to sit there, exhausted, answering every single question.

Now Senator VITTER says I don't know what I will do. I might let it go and not filibuster, but then I might filibuster or I might wind up voting for her. Well, you know, the time for all this contemplation has passed. The woman is qualified. The President deserves his Cabinet, he deserves an EPA Administrator. He made a bipartisan choice in Gina. Gina was brilliant when we had our hearing. Enough already. Please, it is time to have a vote up or down on Gina McCarthy.

We have a lot of work to do. I mentioned a few. How about the latest threat from the Republicans? They decided they are not sure they are going to raise the debt ceiling so they now have a bill where they lay out who would get paid first when we default on our debt. And guess what, America: It is not you. It is China. Before we pay America's business or American bondholders, we are going to pay China.

So when you look at where we are going with this debt ceiling, the last time they held it up it cost us \$19 billion—\$19 billion over 10 years—because they played games, even though when Ronald Reagan was President he said: Don't even go there. Of course, I am paraphrasing. But he said even the thought of not raising the debt ceiling and not paying our debts is dangerous for our Nation.

Yet now the Republicans have a bill that we call "Pay China First." That is what it is about. They would pay China and other foreign bondholders before we pay our troops, our disabled and retired veterans, doctors and hospitals that treat Medicare patients, and before we pay American businesses that are contractors.

I understand they had a meeting to discuss this further, and they were so excited about it—what hostages they could hold—they talked about proposals that threaten a woman's right to choose, tax breaks for the wealthy, and repealing ObamaCare. They have already tried it 37 times. And cutting Medicare.

What are they thinking over there? Pay our bills. Don't let this country's credit be downgraded again.

I tell you something, if that is what they do, they do not deserve to get their salary. I have a bill that would say if we default on our obligations by not raising the debt ceiling we should give up our pay. I don't know what they are doing over there other than playing politics, and it is dangerous.

We know they do not care for our President, but he is the President. Show a little respect for the office. Show a little respect for what he has on his shoulders. Show a little respect for what he has already accomplished, and accept the fact that when there is trouble he doesn't hide in the corner. He says: You are right, I want to fix it. Let's fix it together.

CLIMATE CHANGE

I have gone over just some of the issues we have to look at, but I am going to close with one very big issue that no one, except a handful of Senators, seems to care about, and that is climate change.

I have to say it is shocking to me that as this planet enters a planetary emergency, where we are as close as we can be to carbon concentrations of almost 400 parts per million, which is the danger zone, I still don't see anyone here saying to me, as chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, let's get a bill to the floor. Oh, no. Oh, no. So we are burning up.

I am going to read a little bit from what I thought was a very well-done piece in Politico, and I am going to read parts of it, but I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the entire Politico article I am about to read from.

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

[From Politico Pro, May 10, 2013]
SCIENTISTS ALARMED AS CO2 PASSES
THRESHOLD

(By Andrew Restuccia)

The amount of heat-trapping carbon dioxide in the atmosphere passed a symbolic milestone this week, scientists announced Friday, reaching levels that haven't prevailed on the Earth since long before human civilization began.

The long-expected announcement by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Adminis-

tration—that CO2 concentrations had finally hit 400 parts per million at a key measuring station in Hawaii—means little by itself. But it's a sign that time is slipping away to head off or lessen the rising sea levels, worsening storms, species die-offs and other fallout from global warming, scientists and climate activists warned.

Still, there are few signs that Washington will emerge from its deep snooze on the issue.

Congress remains unable to pass serious legislation to tackle climate change. Efforts to reach a major binding international climate change treaty have sputtered. And while the Obama administration has made some strides in lowering greenhouse gas emissions, including increasing fuel-efficiency standards for cars, climate experts say much more needs to be done—and fast.

"We've never been here before, certainly not while human beings were on the planet," said Melanie Fitzpatrick, climate scientist at the Union of Concerned Scientists, estimating that it's been 3 million–5 million years since the planet has had such high carbon dioxide levels.

"The carbon dioxide concentration in the atmosphere is like the thermostat in your house. Every time you turn it up, we are essentially turning up the heat in the planet," said Jon Hoekstra, chief scientist at the World Wildlife Fund. "We're essentially baking ourselves in, perhaps quite literally."

NOAA said the daily mean CO2 concentration was 400.03 ppm on Thursday at Mauna Loa, Hawaii, the world's oldest continuous carbon dioxide measurement station. That was the first time the figure had crossed 400 ppm there since measurements began at the site in 1958, the agency said.

NOAA said last year that sites in the Arctic had already reached 400 ppm, but measurements from the facility in Hawaii are closely watched as an indicator of broader trends on the planet.

"It's unprecedented," said James Butler, director of the Global Monitoring Division of NOAA's Earth System Research Laboratory. "Hitting 400 is just saying, 'Folks, we haven't addressed this yet.'"

Butler said the planet hasn't seen atmospheric levels of carbon dioxide this high since the Pliocene era, between 2.5 million and 5 million years ago. He said the global average temperature will probably reach 400 ppm in one or two years.

Scientists warn that continued increases could result in catastrophe. A federal report released earlier this year, for example, said 5 million Americans living in low-lying areas could be affected by sea-level rise in the coming decades.

And global emissions appear poised to continue soaring. Not only has the CO2 concentration risen over the decades, NOAA said, but the rate of increase has been accelerating—"from about 0.7 ppm per year in the late 1950s to 2.1 ppm per year during the last 10 years."

"Before the Industrial Revolution in the 19th century, global average CO2 was about 280 ppm," NOAA said in a statement Friday. "During the last 800,000 years, CO2 fluctuated between about 180 ppm during ice ages and 280 ppm during interglacial warm periods. Today's rate of increase is more than 100 times faster than the increase that occurred when the last ice age ended."

The surge in atmospheric carbon dioxide emissions shows that federal and global policies to curb global warming aren't even close to adequate, said Dan Lashof, director of the climate and clean air program at the National Resources Defense Council.

"It's a very black and white record of what we're doing to the atmosphere. The bottom line for climate policy can be measured by

the CO2 concentration we're observing in the atmosphere," Lashof said.

Bill McKibben, founder of 350.org—an activist group that has led the call for lowering carbon dioxide in the atmosphere to 350 ppm—called the measurement “one more grim milestone.”

“Somewhere between 350 and 400 ppm the Arctic melted, and the ocean turned 30 percent more acidic,” he said. “And the country's political leaders took no action even remotely commensurate with the scale of the crisis. Let's hope we can build this movement strong enough that that changes before we add another 50 ppm.”

Environmental groups used the 400 ppm milestone to revive their long-standing demands for action.

“What we're looking at is really an opportunity for a wake-up call for people,” Fitzpatrick said. “We really need to come up with solutions. And they're out there. We just need to implement them.”

But bitter partisanship in Washington has proven that policymakers face massive hurdles in their push to tackle the problem. Brad Johnson, campaign manager of the climate activist group Forecast the Facts, painted a bleak picture of the political landscape.

“We must respond with urgent resolve to end this uncontrolled experiment on our only home,” he said in a statement. “Yet the Republican Party maintains climate change denial as a central tenet of their party platform, and President Obama refuses to admit the threat projects like the Keystone XL tar-sands pipeline pose to our future survival.”

Still, some expressed hope that recent events like the droughts that hammered much of the country and Hurricane Sandy will build support for action.

“At what point do we as a society say this is more than we can put up with?” Hoekstra asked.

Mrs. BOXER. This is from an article dated May 10 from Politico:

The amount of heat-trapping carbon dioxide in the atmosphere passed a symbolic milestone this week, scientists announced Friday, reaching levels that haven't prevailed on the Earth since long before human civilization began.

Let me say that again. Is anybody listening to this? Scientists said:

The amount of heat-trapping carbon in the atmosphere passed a symbolic milestone this week, reaching levels that haven't prevailed on the Earth since long before human civilization began.

Do you know who said that? NOAA, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

... CO2 concentrations had finally hit 400 parts per million at a key measuring station in Hawaii. ... Still, there are few signs that Washington will emerge from its deep snooze on the issue.

How right on. They are all sleeping, except for a handful of us. Wake up to this.

Congress remains unable to pass serious legislation to tackle climate change.

Melanie Fitzpatrick, climate scientist at the Union of Concerned Scientists, was quoted in the article saying:

... it's been 3 million to 5 million years since the planet has had such high carbon dioxide levels. We've never been here before, certainly not while human beings were on the planet.

She goes on. Oh, no, this is Jon Hoekstra of the Wildlife Fund.

The carbon dioxide concentration in the atmosphere is like the thermostat in your house. Every time you turn it up, we are essentially turning up the heat in the planet.

James Butler, Director of Global Monitoring of NOAA's Earth System Research Lab, was quoted as saying:

It is unprecedented. Hitting 400 is just like saying, “Folks, we haven't addressed this yet.” The planet hasn't seen atmospheric levels of carbon dioxide this high since the Pliocene era, between 2.5 million and 5 million years ago. The global average temperature will reach 400 parts per million in 1 or 2 years.

The article continues:

Scientists warn that continued increase could result in catastrophe. ... 5 million Americans living in low-lying areas who could be affected by sea level rise.

It goes on and on. Hoekstra ends his quote with:

At what point as a society do we say this is more than we can put up with?

I will tell you why we are not doing anything. Special interest: Big oil, big coal, big polluters. They do not want to address this. For their short-term profit they do not want to address this. It is sad, the control they have here. Special interests have a lot of control, whether it is the NRA stopping us from doing something 90 percent of the people want, such as background checks, or it is big polluters—big polluters who don't want us to do anything about this issue for their short-term benefit.

When they are all gone and people are suffering in our country, our grandkids and great-grandkids are going to say: What was my great-grandma thinking? What was my great-grandpa doing? We see what is happening in the weather. Just look out the window. We see it.

Mr. President, I have discussed the latest scientific information that is available to us, including a front-page story in USA Today, on March 1, that spotlighted the impacts of climate change unfolding around us. The story was part of a year-long series called “Why You Should Sweat Climate Change,” and it described how climate disruption is happening all around us.

I have also talked about a report entitled the “2013 High Risk List” that was released by the Government Accountability Office—GAO—a government watchdog agency. That report told us how climate disruption and the increased frequency and intensity of extreme weather events, such as Superstorm Sandy, threaten our Nation's financial security.

Another aspect of climate change that I have discussed is its impact on public health in the U.S. and China, which has experienced the harmful health effects from air pollution due to its rapid industrialization over the past few decades.

Today I will discuss how climate disruption poses a risk to our national security in several ways. It has serious implications on national security planning, it places additional burdens on the U.S. military, and it affects our military readiness.

We have been told by a number of military leaders and defense experts, such as former Secretary of State George Schultz under President Reagan, that climate change is a fact and we must address it as a national security priority.

It is a priority that we simply cannot ignore. An open letter was signed by 38 former high-ranking Republicans, Democrats, and Independents—including 17 former Senators and Congress members, 9 retired generals and admirals, and Cabinet officials from the Nixon, Ford, Carter, Reagan, Bush (41), Clinton, and Bush (43) administrations. The letter was turned into an ad highlighting that.

Look at this chart.

“The cost of inaction will be staggering.” This is a February 25, 2013, Partnership for a Secure America ad.

Some of our most senior military leaders have already told us that climate disruption will have significant impacts on national security.

According to the Chief of U.S. Pacific forces:

The significant upheaval from climate change ‘is probably the most likely thing . . . that will cripple the security environment . . . Navy Admiral Samuel J. Locklear, III, “Chief of US Pacific forces calls climate biggest worry.”

That is from the Boston Globe, March 9, 2013.

There are a broad range of risks associated with the impacts of climate change, such as drought and lack of drinking water supplies, which can contribute to military crises around the world. These threats must be factored into our national security planning and operations.

According to President Obama's National Security Advisor, the environmental impacts of climate change are clear:

[T]he danger from climate change is real, urgent, and severe. The change wrought by a warming planet will lead to new conflicts over refugees and resources; new suffering from drought and famine; catastrophic natural disasters; and the degradation of land across the globe.

That is from Tom Donilon, National Security Advisor, April 24, 2013.

In March, the Director of National Intelligence, James Clapper, reported to the Senate that climate change and extreme weather will create water scarcity, disrupt food supplies, and harm energy infrastructure in ways that will raise global risks of instability and aggravated regional tensions.

This is from the March 12, 2013, Worldwide Threat Assessment of the U.S. Intelligence Community, report to the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence.

While climate change alone does not cause conflict, it can accelerate instability, increase the threat of international military crises, and hinder our ability to combat terrorism. According to the Department of Defense's Defense Science Board:

Climate change effects, particularly those related to water and food and security, can erode the legitimacy of fragile states and create conditions terrorists and extremists seek to exploit. Therefore, they are significant factors in combating terrorism.

This is from "Trends and Implications of Climate Change for National and International Security," Department of Defense's Defense Science Board, October 2011.

Climate disruption is also placing an additional burden on our military, because it impacts the type of missions that must be planned for and undertaken. Climate change is increasing the frequency and intensity of extreme weather events, and when a weather disaster occurs, our Armed Forces mobilize to provide humanitarian assistance to local communities and families in need.

We saw this happen with Superstorm Sandy, which wiped out entire communities in just a few hours. In response, our soldiers came to the rescue of people on the east coast who were impacted by Sandy's storm surge. These types of humanitarian missions—whether it is in the U.S. or overseas—place additional burdens on our brave men and women in uniform.

Disasters such as Sandy that harm our civilian infrastructure, such as airports, ports, and electric grids, also create national security issues, because they can affect military readiness.

In addition to civilian infrastructure, Superstorm Sandy caused tremendous damage to our military facilities. A portion of the \$60 billion Sandy emergency relief package that Congress passed earlier this year went toward repairing and replacing damaged Federal military assets, including: Fort Dix in New Jersey; Norfolk Naval Station in Virginia; Dover Air Force Base in Delaware; and the Coast Guard Academy campus in Connecticut.

The U.S. military has almost 300,000 buildings valued at \$590 billion—much of which is at risk because of climate change. In January, DoD stated:

In many ways, coastal military installations have been on the front lines of climate change."

In fact, 10 percent of DoD coastal installations and facilities are located at or near sea level. According to the National Intelligence Council, more than 30 U.S. military installations were already facing elevated risks from storm surges and rising sea levels. These installations include

Eglin Air Force base, located on the Gulf of Mexico in the Florida panhandle—this facility faces storm surges and sea level rise; and

Norfolk Naval Station and the neighboring Newport News shipyard—the location where we build aircraft carriers. These facilities are also threatened by storm surges and sea level rise.

The U.S. military is not alone in viewing climate change as a threat. A recent study found that over 70 percent of nations surveyed around the world

view climate change as a national security threat.

This is from the American Security Project: Global Security Defense Index on Climate Change, March 21, 2013.

Countries around the world recognize that climate change is a national security threat, but it is the U.S. military that must take a leading role. As one of America's retired military leaders, former U. S. Navy Vice Admiral Lee Gunn, stated:

Climate Change poses a clear and present danger to the United States of America . . . The imperative, then, is for leadership and action on a global scale. The United States must act. The United States must lead.

This is from the November 1, 2012, "Climate Change and the Homeland," American Security Project.

I could not agree more. We must follow the analysis and advice of our Nation's military leaders and national security experts to protect the American people by addressing the dangerous threat posed by climate disruption.

I want to show a few charts about what people are saying, and then I will stop.

"The cost of inaction will be staggering." This ran in March.

The effects of climate change in the world's most vulnerable regions present a serious threat to American national security. Countries least able to adapt to or mitigate the impacts of climate change will suffer the most, but the resulting crisis will quickly become a burden on U.S. priorities. Both the Department of Defense and State Department have identified climate change as a serious risk to American security and an agent of instability.

This is a very bipartisan group. It is actually mostly Republicans on this, of people saying do something about this. Our national security is at stake.

When there are refugees who are run out of their country, what is going to happen to the world? There already are climate refugees. There is a movie called "Climate Refugees."

"Danger from climate change is real, urgent and severe."

The change wrought by a warming planet will lead to new conflicts over refugees and resources; new suffering from drought and famine; catastrophic natural disasters; and the degradation of land across the globe.

That is a quote from Tom Donilon, National Security Adviser. So this is a national security issue.

How could the polluters have so much power to overwhelm our national security people? But that is where it is. That is where it is.

"Climate change can hinder ability to combat terrorism."

Climate change effects, particularly those related to water and food and security . . . can create conditions terrorists and extremists seek to exploit. Therefore, they are significant factors in combating terrorism.

That was the Department of Defense, October 2011. Department of Defense. National security advisers. The CIA has been telling us this for a long time. We have to act. We have to act.

I have to say there are a number of my colleagues here—a small number—

who feel the way I do. We are all pushing hard. Senator SANDERS and I have a bill, the Sanders-Boxer bill, that would put a price on carbon. Carbon could cost us the planet. The least we can do is put a little charge on it so people move to clean energy—clean energy.

Take the issue of the Keystone Pipeline. It is a big controversy. People say, let's just do it. Well, you ought to see what will come out of that in terms of carbon pollution. It will undo all the good we did from fuel economy. And the oil won't stay here. They have a waste disposal problem with it. But it is a little bit inconvenient.

Remember when Vice President Gore wrote the book "Inconvenient Truth." It is a little inconvenient for us. We don't want to know about it because it is hard to deal with. But we can do it.

In California, we are beginning to see more and more solar rooftops, more and more clean power, and the jobs that are coming with it are extraordinary. We can do this. This is the greatest Nation in the world, but we are kind of held hostage to the big polluters. We have to say that we have to act for the safety of the people.

We are hearing it. We are hearing it from our national defense department, we are hearing it from George Shultz, who was the former Secretary of State under President Reagan. He says it is a national priority that shouldn't be ignored. Cabinet officials from the Nixon, Ford, Carter, Reagan, and Bush—41 from Clinton and 43 from Bush—wrote a letter to us. And Navy ADM Samuel Locklear, III, Chief of U.S. Pacific Forces, calls climate "our biggest worry."

That is what he said.

The significant upheaval climate change "is probably the most likely thing . . . that will cripple the security environment. . . ."

This is a Navy man.

There are a broad range of risks associated with the impacts of climate change, such as drought and lack of drinking water supplies, which can contribute to military crises around the world.

This is what the Director of National Intelligence, James Clapper, said:

. . . extreme weather will create water scarcity, disrupt food supplies, and harm energy infrastructure in ways that will raise the global risks of instability and aggravated regional tensions.

It goes on. The entire national defense establishment is speaking with one voice. We also wanted them to tell us what would happen to our military facilities. Many of them—300,000 buildings valued at \$590 billion are at risk because of climate change. Those are coastal military installations.

We are dealing with a lot of infrastructure. Norfolk Naval Station, neighboring Newport News shipyard where they build the aircraft carriers, they are threatened by storm surges and sea level rise.

I have come to the floor now three or four times to keep raising these different issues. Tonight I am talking about national security, but we also

saw terrible tornadoes in Oklahoma—horrible. I send my condolences to the people who lost loved ones. This is climate change. This is climate change. We were warned about extreme weather—not just hot weather but extreme weather.

When I had the gavel years ago—it has been a while—the scientists started to agree that we would start to see extreme weather. People said: What do you mean? Do you mean it is going to get hot? Yes, it is going to get hot, but we are also going to have snow in the summer in some places. We are going to have terrible storms and tornadoes and all the rest.

We need to protect our people. That is our No. 1 obligation. We have to deal with this threat that is upon us. It is going to get worse and worse through the years.

I certainly hope—and I pray over it—that people will wake up to this and we will start to have support for moving together and at the end of the day it is a win-win-win. We will help save our planet. We will create good-paying jobs right here in America as we move toward clean energy. We will see fewer people with asthma, and we will have a more healthy population.

At the end of the day we will help those in the transition who have to pay a little bit more for their energy. We have it all figured out, how to do that, and no one will be hurt. But right now—I am a very straight from the shoulder person—I can tell you it is not happening, but I feel an obligation to my grandkids to be here every Monday I can be here to put in the RECORD the problems we are facing.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, over the past several weeks the Senate Judiciary Committee has considered the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act. In addition to the three hearings the Committee held this year on the need for comprehensive immigration reform, the Committee held an additional three hearings specifically on this legislative proposal after it was introduced. In those legislative hearings we received testimony from 26 witnesses, including the Secretary of Homeland Security, Secretary Napolitano, who spoke at length about the bill would make our country safer and help address the current problems in our immigration system.

The Judiciary Committee has benefited from more process and transparency than any previous Committee consideration of immigration reform. In 1985, the Judiciary Committee Subcommittee on Immigration held three hearings on the Immigration Control and Reform Act and heard testimony from 14 witnesses. In 2006 and 2007, the last two times the Senate tried to enact comprehensive immigration reform, the Republican chairman of the Judiciary Committee held no hearings

on his legislative proposal or the McCain-Kennedy proposal or the Kyl-Kennedy formulation.

In 2006, the Republican chairman circulated his legislative proposal just one week before the Committee met to make opening statements. He then revised his legislation and circulated it barely 2 days before the Committee met to begin debate and consider amendments. This year, the Judiciary Committee received the bill text on April 17, and after a period of more than 3 weeks to consider it and draft amendments we began our consideration of amendments to the bill on May 9.

During the Committees consideration of the Immigration Reform and Control Act in 1986 the Committee met four times. We are holding our fourth day of markup today. It is my hope that the Committee will complete our consideration of the bill on Wednesday after 6, extended days of consideration. In 1985, the Committee debated only 11 amendments, adopting 7. The Committee sent the bill to the Senate on a 12-5 vote.

In 2006, the Committee met five times to consider amendments to the Chairman's Securing America's Borders bill, conducted 60 votes and adopted 54 amendments. The bill was then reported to the Senate on a vote of 12 to 6. In 2007, the bill was not considered by the Judiciary Committee at all before floor consideration.

Already this year the Committee has met for 4 days to consider amendments to the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act. During just the first three executive sessions, the Committee has considered 99 amendments. Of those 50—more than half—were offered by the Republican minority. During those first 3 days, the Committee debated and voted to accept 67 amendments to the bill. That is already more amendments than were debated in 2006 and 6 times as many amendments as were debated in 1986. Of those accepted, 20 were offered by Republican members. That includes several amendments sponsored by Senator GRASSLEY, Senator CORNYN and a few sponsored by Senator SESSIONS. The Committee has acted in a bipartisan way to accept amendments authored by Senators from both sides of the aisle and by Senators who are proponents of the bill and some by Senators who can fairly be considered opponents of the bill.

The Committee will continue its consideration of the legislation after tonight's votes. As of 4:30 today, we have considered an additional 45 amendments, including 22 offered by Republicans, and 23 offered by Democrats.

One example of the Committee's bipartisan efforts to improve this legislation was offered by Senators HATCH, COONS and KLOBUCHAR, which will increase certain immigration fees and provide 70 percent of the funds collected to the states to improve and enhance the economic competitiveness of the United States by improving

science, technology, engineering, and mathematics education and training in the United States. Senator SCHUMER offered a second degree amendment which would direct some of this funding to promote STEM education in groups that are underrepresented in the sciences, such as women and racial minorities. Both amendments were accepted by the Committee by unanimous consent.

The Committee also unanimously approved my amendment to permanently authorize and further strengthen the EB-5 Regional Center Program which will benefit the economy. The United States Citizenship and Immigration Services—USCIS—estimates that the EB-5 Regional Center Program has created tens of thousands of American jobs and has attracted more than \$1 billion in investment in communities all across the United States since 2006.

These amendments are just a few of the many offered to promote jobs and innovation in the non-immigration visa provisions in Title IV of the bill. Other bipartisan proposals to provide assistance for American workers to apply for jobs in the technology sector and establish employee reporting requirements to address potential abuse of the visa system have also been adopted.

The Committee has voted to accept amendments offered by nearly every member of the minority on the Judiciary Committee. Senators GRASSLEY, HATCH, SESSIONS, GRAHAM, CORNYN, LEE, and FLAKE have all offered amendments adopted by the Committee to improve the bill. Senators FEINSTEIN, WHITEHOUSE, KLOBUCHAR, FRANKEN, COONS, BLUMENTHAL and HIRONO have also contributed important amendments to improve the legislation. With the adoption of these amendments, the Committee demonstrated its ability to act in a bipartisan manner to improve this historic legislation.

In an unprecedented effort to achieve transparency during the Judiciary Committee's public proceedings, and to ensure the American people could follow the Committee's consideration of the bill, I made public all 301 amendments filed on Tuesday, May 7, by posting them on the Judiciary Committee's website. In real time, as the Committee accepts or rejects amendments, the Committee's website is updated to reflect which amendments are modified, accepted or fail.

The Judiciary Committee's mark up of the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act is not yet finished but we have completed work on two of the four titles of the bill as well as the important "trigger" provisions. We have been able to focus our extensive consideration of this complex bill for three weeks and still achieve a fair and transparent process for Committee consideration. With the help of the Senators who serve so diligently on the Judiciary Committee from both sides of aisle, I hope by the end of this week

that the Committee will have completed its consideration of the legislation and that we will report a comprehensive immigration reform bill to the Senate with the recommendation that it be considered and passed. I look forward to bringing this legislation before the full Senate at the beginning of our next work period.

I note, I hope we will finish that this week. We will go very late tonight, very late tomorrow night, very late Wednesday night, all day Thursday, and all day Friday, if necessary, until we get it finished.

THE FARM BILL

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, last week, the Senate Agriculture Committee once again reported to the full Senate a bipartisan farm bill, and I am pleased the Senate has turned to its consideration this week. I compliment the distinguished chair, Senator STABENOW, who has done Herculean duties. The bill before us represents nearly 2 years of hard work to satisfy the widely varied agricultural interests of this country, while supporting food assistance programs for those in need. The Agriculture Reform, Food and Jobs Act will save \$23 billion over 10 years, which is remarkable given the fiscal restraints we face, and was overwhelmingly supported by the members of the agriculture committee by a vote of 15-5.

Unfortunately, due to the House's inaction on the Senate-passed bill last year, many farm bill programs expired, while others were temporarily extended at the end of the year, making it all the more imperative that we work together now to ensure we move ahead with a bill in the next few months. I was glad that in December we were able to delay and prevent the "dairy cliff" from roiling markets worldwide and inflating dairy prices, which would have wreaked havoc in the marketplace and on our farms. But the short-term extension of the Farm Bill is no rational way to legislate, and the last-minute extension left dozens of critical agriculture programs stranded without funding. We must not repeat that process.

The bill before us contains many of the same improvements included in the 2012 Senate-passed bill, while making important updates to reflect new fiscal realities and maintaining the integrity of the policies we worked so hard to pass last year. The Agriculture Reform, Food and Jobs Act makes an investment in American agriculture that will benefit our producers, our dairy farmers, our rural communities, our Main Street businesses, taxpayers, and consumers, all while reducing the deficit by \$23 billion.

Every Farm Bill is important to the Green Mountain State and to all the states of our nation as a matter of national security. Very few countries can boast that they can feed themselves. We have the ability to nourish 320-plus

million Americans. This represents an important part of our national security.

Agriculture is a pillar of Vermont's economy and of our Nation's economy. So it is with this farm bill that we have produced in the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry. One of many key components of this bill, in terms of Vermont and Vermont's economy, is a significant dairy reform proposal that offers the best hope in decades of helping producers and consumers step off the dangerous rollercoaster of wild price swings in the markets in which dairy farmers must sell their time-sensitive products. I believe this is key to our consideration of a farm bill, and I know it is what farmers in Vermont are watching closely; I have been hearing from them regularly in strong support of stabilization and margin insurance working in tandem. We simply must protect our dairy farmers from the volatility of turbulent price swings with a financially sound risk management program to help farmers manage risk and margin volatility, and do so without driving up the cost to the government.

As the author of the Organic Foods Production Act, I am extremely pleased this bill continues to make strong improvements for organic agriculture. I am also pleased that the bill once again includes a policy to give the National Organic Program much-needed authority to effectively protect and enforce organic integrity. In addition to enforcing the integrity of the organic brand, I am committed to seeing that this bill treats all farmers fairly. We made great strides last year in making improvements to crop insurance so that it will adequately compensate organic producers for their losses. Similar changes are needed in the Environmental Quality Incentive Program to eliminate the unfair lower payment limit applied solely to organic farmers seeking to enroll in the program's Organic Initiative.

Another important compromise in this bill is found in the trade title, where the proposal expands the success of the Local and Regional Food Aid Procurement pilot program from the 2008 farm bill, and also increases the funds available to support strategic prepositioning, which brings food aid commodities to at-risk regions before food emergencies strike. I look forward to working with Senators to find further improvements in how we can best provide emergency food aid and international development programs that have the flexibility to react quickly in times of emergency, avoid disrupting local markets, and increase efficiency so we can save money and feed more people.

This legislation also includes support for vital anti-hunger programs such as the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, SNAP, and the Emergency Food Assistance Program. Unfortunately, with so many Americans still

struggling to put food on the table, nutrition assistance and emergency feeding programs have become even more crucial. The bill also contains initiatives to encourage better health, increased access to local foods, nutrition for children and seniors, and to support self-sufficiency and food security in our Nation's low-income communities while tackling the difficult problem of "food deserts." I am also pleased that Chairwoman STABENOW included language I offered as an amendment in committee last year to make it easier for SNAP participants to buy local foods through a Community Supported Agriculture Share, CSA, membership.

But at a time when more Americans than ever before are at risk of going hungry and food pantry shelves across the country are bare, these programs could be made even stronger by dedicating more resources to help the neediest among us. I hope during our consideration of this bill we can work to increase support for the Emergency Food Assistance Program, SNAP employment and training programs, and community food projects to the level included in last year's farm bill. These programs are essential in our communities, and I hope we can invest as much in these programs this year as we did last year.

I am disappointed, however, that the bill before the Senate today once again includes \$4 billion in cuts to the SNAP program, which will predominately come from northeastern States. I understand this cut is part of a larger compromise on behalf of Chairwoman STABENOW, who has been a strong supporter of these nutrition assistance programs. Ensuring these programs can continue to serve Vermonters and all Americans in need is a key part to enacting a strong farm bill for this country.

This is why I am particularly concerned about the bill the House will consider which includes five times the cuts to nutrition assistance as the Senate bill, and \$4 billion more than the House included in their committee bill last year. These cuts will needlessly eliminate millions of low-income Americans from this program. The House bill would mean that several thousand children would lose eligibility for free school lunches. In Vermont, one in five children lives in food insecure homes and I know that number is even higher in some other States. It is shameful for any child in this country to go hungry and I hope the Senate will continue to oppose these draconian cuts to nutrition assistance.

The Senate agriculture committee's chairwoman and ranking member, and both of their staffs, should be applauded for the great work they have done to swiftly move this bipartisan bill through committee and now onto the Senate floor in record speed. I hope the Senate can once again move forward in a bipartisan way to pass the farm bill this week, and I hope the

House moves forward as well so we might reconcile our differences before the expiration in September of the current short-term extension.

KENTUCKY MILITARY ORDER OF THE PURPLE HEART

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the men and women of the Commonwealth of Kentucky's Military Order of the Purple Heart, MOPH. Membership in the MOPH is reserved for combat-wounded veterans who have been awarded the Purple Heart for their service in the U.S. Armed Forces. The members of the Kentucky MOPH have made extraordinary contributions and sacrifices in defense of the United States. Their brave and valiant actions during combat have been vital to preserving the freedom and way of life that Americans continue to enjoy today. I applaud the members of the Kentucky MOPH not only for their service to the United States but also for their steadfast commitment to their fellow combat-wounded veterans and to all of our Nation's veterans and their families.

On June 1, 2013, the Kentucky MOPH will gather in Paducah, KY, for its annual convention. In anticipation of this gathering, I would like to draw attention to two noteworthy milestones the Kentucky MOPH celebrates this year. January 2, 2013, marked the 70th anniversary of the Louisville, KY, Bluegrass Chapter 146 of the MOPH, and the Department of Kentucky MOPH will celebrate its 25th anniversary on October 22, 2013. At this time, I ask my colleagues in the Senate to join me in extending gratitude and commendations to members of the Commonwealth of Kentucky's Military Order of the Purple Heart for their dedication and service to America's military and America's veterans. America has the greatest military in the world, and the MOPH serves as a vital support system to veterans that make this a reality.

TRIBUTE TO STEVE NEWBERRY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a longtime friend and a fixture of the broadcasting industry in Kentucky and nationally, Mr. Steve Newberry. For more than 25 years, Steve, a resident of Hiseville, KY, has been a leader in Kentucky radio. He has earned the respect and admiration of his peers in the Commonwealth and throughout the country many times over. I am sad to note that next month, Steve will complete his service on the board of directors of the National Association of Broadcasters.

Over the course of his career, Steve has helped lead radio and television broadcasters on a national level, and he has had a significant impact on the broadcasting industry. This was recognized when in 2011 Steve received from his peers the prestigious National Radio Award, which is given annually to an outstanding leader in the radio industry.

Steve loved radio from an early age. He began his broadcasting career at the age of 14, when he got a job working at the local radio station in his hometown of Glasgow, KY. His parents were supportive of Steve's dream and drove him to work at that first job.

By the age of 21, Steve owned his first radio station. When he bought it, it was a 250-watt AM station that only broadcast in the daytime. Steve soon upgraded it to 500 watts and 24 hours of broadcasting a day.

Steve attended the University of Kentucky, where he received a bachelor's degree in telecommunications. While completing his senior year, he bought WKVE, an AM station in Cave City. Today he is the president and CEO of Commonwealth Broadcasting, based in Glasgow, and owns and operates 22 radio stations throughout the Bluegrass State.

As his business grew, Steve became more and more engaged in broadcasting industry matters. He was first elected to the board of directors of the National Association of Broadcasters, NAB, in 1999. He would go on to serve as part of the board's leadership, chairman of the board, and ultimately as the NAB joint board chairman, the association's top industry leadership post. Steve also served on the board of directors and executive committees for the Radio Advertising Bureau.

Steve's community service in Kentucky is equally impressive. He has served as the chairman of the Authority for Kentucky Educational Television and has worked with the Glasgow-Barren County Industrial Development Economic Authority, the Glasgow Rotary Club, and the Glasgow-Barren County Boys & Girls Club.

Steve is a past president of the Kentucky Broadcasters Association and in 2009 received their highest honor, the Distinguished Kentuckian Award. And as I already stated, Mr. President, in 2011 he received the very high honor from his peers of the prestigious National Radio Award.

It is the Commonwealth's loss that in June, Steve will end his service on the NAB board of directors. Whatever endeavors may lay ahead for him, I know he will dispatch them with the same success that has marked his career to date. I am sure his family, including his wife Vickie and his son Walker, are very proud of him.

Steve Newberry is one of Kentucky's finest broadcasters and a man of integrity. I know my colleagues in the Senate join me in congratulating him for his dedication to the radio profession, to his community, and to the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

THE FAMILY ACT

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, building a family is an exciting milestone in the lives of millions of American families. Unfortunately, the road towards conceiving a child is often difficult and painful for the nearly 7 mil-

lion Americans diagnosed with the disease of infertility.

Earlier this month, men and women across the country shared their stories during National Infertility Awareness Week. This movement, organized by RESOLVE: The National Infertility Association, brings attention to the disease of infertility and encourages the public to take charge of their reproductive health. Let me take this opportunity to commend RESOLVE for its work providing community and giving voice to women and men experiencing infertility.

Over the last few decades, significant medical advancements, such as in vitro fertilization, have provided a solution for some would be parents. However, the high cost to undergo infertility care often poses an additional barrier for couples to overcome. It costs more than \$12,000 for a couple to undergo one cycle of infertility treatment and insurance coverage is often dismal. For some patients, multiple cycles are required to achieve a successful pregnancy outcome. Federal Government insurance plans do not specifically cover infertility treatments and only 15 States offer any level of coverage.

I have introduced a bill that would alleviate some of the costs associated with infertility care. The Family Act (S. 881) creates a Federal tax credit for individuals who are diagnosed with infertility by a licensed physician. A tax credit will help make this vital patient care more accessible and affordable to those who lack insurance coverage for these services.

I hope you will join me by becoming a cosponsor of The Family Act. This is a necessary step towards ensuring that all of our citizens have the ability to raise a family, without compromising their financial future.

TRIBUTE TO JANE HOLL LUTE

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I rise today to express my deep gratitude and best wishes to Ms. Jane Holl Lute for her service as Deputy Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, DHS, over the past 4 years.

Ms. Lute arrived at DHS in April 2009 with an already impressive public service record that included over 30 years of distinguished service, including time in the U.S. Army during Operation Desert Storm. She served on the National Security Council staff under both President George H.W. Bush and President Bill Clinton. Ms. Lute held senior-level positions within the United Nations, UN, where she oversaw logistical and administrative support to UN peacekeeping operations worldwide and coordinated efforts to build sustainable peace in countries emerging from violent conflict. Her record of achievement extends to her academic accomplishments. She holds a Ph.D. in political science from Stanford University and a J.D. from Georgetown University. I would be remiss if I did not mention that she achieved many of

these extraordinary accomplishments as a single mother. Impressive indeed.

As Deputy Secretary of DHS, Ms. Lute has served as the Department's second-highest official and chief operating officer, responsible for the day-to-day business and management of the third largest department in the Federal Government of the United States. Comprised of more than 240,000 employees and operating with an annual budget of over \$56 billion, DHS works to secure our Nation, while enhancing Federal, State, and local capabilities to prepare for, respond to, and recover from threats and disasters of all kinds.

Throughout the past 4 years, Ms. Lute has committed herself wholeheartedly to the mission set forth in DHS's Quadrennial Homeland Security Review, QHSR, which is to ensure that our Nation is a safe, secure, and resilient place where the American way of life can thrive. Against a backdrop of continued and evolving threats and hazards of all kinds, Ms. Lute has worked determinedly to fulfill the challenging and wide-ranging mission of the Department.

To that end, Ms. Lute has worked closely with the many partners in both the public and the private sector who play an essential role in keeping our Nation safe. This includes all levels of government, law enforcement, private industry, and most importantly, individuals and communities, who have proven time and time again that they are our greatest allies and the key to our success. This bottom-up approach to homeland security reflects the manner in which Ms. Lute has helped lead DHS during her time at the Department. As I see it, her focus has always closely mirrored two of my core values—to figure out the right thing to do and do it, as well as to focus on excellence in everything we do.

Under Ms. Lute's leadership, DHS also made significant progress in aligning operations with smart and efficient strategy through publication of the QHSR, the Nation's first ever comprehensive review of America's strategy for homeland security, followed by the Bottom-Up Review, which is DHS's effort to align programmatic activities and organizational structure with the mission sets and goals identified in the QHSR.

In her role as Deputy Secretary at DHS, Ms. Lute made it a priority to institute the sound management practices that have helped place DHS on solid financial, programmatic, strategic, and organizational footing. Perhaps most notably, Ms. Lute's efforts helped DHS earn a qualified audit opinion on all Fiscal Year 2012 financial statements, a first for the Department and in record time for such a large and new department. Ms. Lute also helped to implement the framework for Integrated Investment Life Cycle Management to ensure that the DHS budget of nearly \$60 billion is spent wisely and efficiently.

Like a true leader, Ms. Lute has the vision to plan ahead and address future

challenges. One of Ms. Lute's hallmark achievements at DHS has been her early focus in the area of cybersecurity. As Ms. Lute has said herself, it is impossible to imagine a safe, secure, and resilient Nation without a safe, secure, and resilient cyberspace. In particular, Ms. Lute oversaw all Departmental efforts to strengthen the nation's cybersecurity, including policy, planning, operations, and budget. Through the numerous transitions in the Department's cyber governance structure, Ms. Lute was a steady, reliable, informed, and persistent voice on cyber matters, and she helped ensure that cyberspace would remain civilian space.

In order to ensure our Nation's success in cybersecurity, Ms. Lute personally led the implementation effort to improve the Department's ability to build a world-class cybersecurity workforce and to ensure a strong pipeline of talent for the future. Ms. Lute also helped promote a Continuous Diagnostics and Monitoring capability, which will enable Federal agencies and other organizations to see and respond to day-to-day cyber threats. These efforts and others have contributed directly to a stronger national cyber ecosystem.

Ms. Lute's accomplishments are not limited to domestic operations. Her familiarity with international negotiation was of great value to DHS and her efforts abroad have helped enhance security practices here at home. As the lead negotiator for the U.S. Passenger Name Record Agreement with the European Union, she secured a landmark new data-sharing agreement with the European Union that increased the security of air travel while protecting civil liberties and privacy. In these negotiations, she bridged fundamental differences between how Europeans and Americans view privacy through tenacity and perseverance. These same traits are seen in her approach to the Department's bilateral relations as well. She expanded cooperation with our British and German allies through the Joint Contact Group and Security Cooperation Group, forged stronger ties with India through the Homeland Security Dialogue, and she opened the door to frank discussions with China over cyber and port security.

The commitment to secure our Nation and create a more resilient America is a goal that is shared not only among Members of Congress and the men and women of the Department of Homeland Security, but also among everyday citizens. That security is ensured by the men and women who step forward each day and say "Send Me." Ms. Lute once told me this is the very credo the men and women of DHS embrace in every crisis. So today, I sincerely thank Deputy Secretary Lute for her public service and for her extraordinary service over 3 decades to keep our Nation safe. She leaves behind a strong legacy of "just get it done" leadership, paving the path for future

leaders and employees at DHS. I, for one, will remember her fondly for her commitment to ensuring American homeland security and for living DHS's "Send Me" attitude. Jane Holl Lute is a role model for us all.

HANES MAGNET MIDDLE SCHOOL

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, today I wish to congratulate Hanes Magnet Middle School in Winston-Salem, NC, for being recognized as the top magnet school in the country. On May 7, 2013, Hanes was awarded the prestigious Dr. Ronald P. Simpson School of Merit Excellence Award, which recognizes one school for innovative programming, academic achievement, and promoting diversity. Hanes Magnet School, which focuses on science, technology, engineering and mathematics, or STEM, has worked within the Winston-Salem community to provide real world application of STEM, taking students out of the classroom for innovative, hands-on application of STEM. This approach has increased student engagement, and I believe achievement within the school overall.

Hanes has only been a magnet school for 6 years but in that time has seen large increases in enrollment, matched by equally impressive gains in its achievement data. Magnet schools like Hanes provide parents with expanded options for their child's education—options that will ensure students aren't confined to schools that might not be serving their individual needs. For that reason, I am proud of the success Hanes has achieved as recognized by this award. Congratulations to principal Melita Wise, the parents, students, and everyone else at Hanes for this award. It is well deserved.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

HAVERHILL, NEW HAMPSHIRE

● Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, today I wish to honor Haverhill, NH—a town in Grafton County that is celebrating the 250th anniversary of its founding. I am proud to join citizens across the Granite State in recognizing this special milestone.

Haverhill is comprised of the villages of Woodsville, Pike, North Haverhill, and the historic town center at Haverhill Corner. The village of North Haverhill is the county seat of Grafton County. The Bedell Bridge State Park, Black Mountain State Forest, Kinder Memorial Forest, and the Oliverian Valley Wildlife Preserve are all located in Haverhill.

Haverhill was granted a charter by Governor Benning Wentworth on May 18, 1763. A veteran of the French and Indian War, CPT John Hazen originally oversaw and settled Haverhill, naming it after his birthplace in Massachusetts.

The population has grown to over 4,600 residents. The patriotism and

commitment of the people of Haverhill is reflected in part by their record of service in defense of our Nation.

Some of Haverhill's most notable residents have included U.S. Senator and New Hampshire Governor, Henry W. Keyes; U.S. Congressmen Noah Davis and Jonathan H. Rowell; and professional baseball players Chad Paranto and Bob Smith.

As sturdy and resilient as the people who built it, Haverhill is home to the Haverhill-Bath Covered Bridge. Completed in 1829, it is the oldest Town Lattice Truss Saltbox covered bridge in the United States.

Haverhill is also home to the Museum of American Weather. This unique institution chronicles the history of four unique New England weather events.

Haverhill is a place that has contributed much to the life and spirit of the State of New Hampshire. I am pleased to extend my warm regards to the people of Haverhill as they celebrate the town's 250th anniversary. ●

TRIBUTE TO BETSY BROUN

● Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, today I wish to honor Betsy Broun, the Director of the Smithsonian Art Museum. Betsy will be honored Thursday evening at the Frederic E. Church Award Gala in New York for "transforming the perception of American Art."

Betsy and I became friends years ago over—you guessed it—American Art. She has always been more than gracious with her time, her great stories, and her expertise. I am an American History teacher by trade, but Betsy has taught me a great deal about the intersection of American Art and American History.

Under Betsy Broun's leadership, the Smithsonian American Art Museum has undergone a \$250 million renovation. She has taken the Smithsonian's work far afield through new media, distance learning, and her lectures. And there is nothing better than a walk through a Betsy-curated exhibit.

Despite all of her professional and academic success, Betsy has never lost touch with her native Kansas, and she and I have had a lot of fun over the years talking about Thomas Hart Benton, a native Missouri artist and the great nephew of the first Senator from Missouri, and discussing other "middle America" artists.

My wife Abby and I are so grateful for Betsy's friendship, and we congratulate her on the Frederic E. Church Award—an honor she will no doubt receive Thursday with her typical Midwestern humility, but one we know she deserves. ●

TRIBUTE TO SERGEANT CHARLES HARRIS

● Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, today I wish to honor an American hero—SGT Charles Harris of the U.S. Army

2nd Infantry 3rd Brigade. This May 30, just 3 days after our Nation's Memorial Day salute to America's fallen heroes, Sergeant Harris will observe the 1-year anniversary of his "Alive Day." That is the inspiring way our wounded warriors describe the day they were injured—wounded but alive, they celebrate their second chance at life.

It was on May 30, 2012, that Sergeant Harris lost his legs and almost his life in an IED explosion in Afghanistan. And over the past year, he has come so far and so fast in his recovery at Walter Reed Army Hospital, where I first met him. With the help of his family and his devoted mother Lisa, who has been at his side throughout his recovery, he has come back from the dead. Family and loved ones are the unsung heroes in all of America's wars—and the best medicine for a faster recovery.

Charles has a dream, and it is coming true: He is building a home in West Virginia, and he will live the rest of his life there, in what he calls almost Heaven. We are honored that such a great American has chosen to make his home in our beautiful State. He will be welcomed warmly to one of the most patriotic States in our Nation.

To celebrate Sergeant Harris's "coming home" to a place he has never been before and to honor his heroism, sacrifice, and determination, I ask that a poem written by Albert Caswell of West Virginia be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I urge all my Senate colleagues to take time to read this warm tribute to such an inspiring hero and to congratulate him on the anniversary of his "Alive Day."

And may God grant him, his mother, and all of his friends many more anniversaries in the years ahead.

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

2nd TO NONE

2nd . . .
2nd to none . . .
The 2nd Infantry are how our wars are won . . .
2nd ID, Men of iron and might,
who all out in times of war their fine souls do so ignite!

But for The Greater Good,
all in what they so could!
Who so lock and load,
and so live by such a code!
Of Strength In Honor,
as do all of those!

The 2nd Infantry,
as they so make history!
Wherever they so go!
The ones who love our Nation so!
With Boots on the ground!
As they kick all of those doors down!
As their most valiant hearts so explode!
One fine fighting machine!
Who so heroically come upon the battle scene!

With Boots on the ground!
As where they will be found!
As one and all,
as their brave hearts so sound!
As we hear their great hearts pound!
The grunts on the ground!
Who shall not let our Nation down!
Where would this our Nation so be,

if but not for all of these?
And one such fine son of liberty,
his name is Sargent Charles Harris . . . he!
Is part of that magnificent 2nd Infantry!
From that golden state,
when he could not so wait to serve his Country Tis of Thee!

As it was out on patrol,
as when we almost lost this brave soul . . .
While, in an IED blast . . .
it looked like he would not so last . . .
Losing his two legs,
as he so cheated death on that day!
But with his light,
as he so came out of all of that darkness
some way!

To recovery . . .
For when he so awoke,
and so saw that all that he so had left was
but hope!

His fine to heart to him so spoke!
Of being, The Being The Best!
All in what he must now so invoke,
all on this his future quest!
With what he now has so left!
And with your devoted Mother Lisa by your side,

helping you so pass that test!
For already Charles in your short life,
you have scaled to the highest of all heights!
To places where few of us will sight!
As with your courage our Nation you have so blessed!

To So Teach Us!
To So Beseech Us!
To So Reach Us,
all in your most magnificent quest!
For you are 2nd to none!
And you are one of America's most brightest
of all sons!

As you so make the Angels tears so run!
As your heart would so crest!
Moments are that we so have!
To change the world,
to hearts so grab!
To make a difference with it all!
For men of honor like Charles,
who so hear that most noble call!
And so go off to war!
All of our freedoms so insure!
Who are 2nd to none,
now that is so for sure!

As up ahead but lies so much more!
Because, your going almost to Heaven soon!
to West Virginia to live the rest of your life
as you like to so croon!
To live a long and happy live,
as there you are shooting for the moon!
And without such inspirational men as you,
heroes like Charles from of 2nd ID where
would we all so be?

For one thing is so true,
there 2nd to none! ●

2013 PRIDE FOUNDATION SCHOLARS

● Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the 2013 Pride Foundation Scholars—a remarkable group of 89 students who share incredible perseverance, a strong desire to give back, and a focus on how education can improve their lives and their communities.

Pride Foundation plays a crucial role in encouraging and supporting the next generation of leaders in the LGBT community. Students who have been stigmatized because of their sexual orientation or gender identity sometimes do not receive the support they need from their families and communities, and too often, individuals of great

promise give up on their dreams because they do not believe success is possible.

Over the past 20 years, Pride Foundation has worked to lift up future leaders by giving over \$3 million in educational scholarships to LGBT and allied students in Washington, Alaska, Idaho, Montana, and Oregon. They have provided these students with financial support, mentorship opportunities, and a community that focuses on generosity, encouragement, and acceptance. As Pride Foundation marks the 20th anniversary of their scholarship program and honors these students at the 2013 Scholarship Celebration Reception, I wish to congratulate this year's scholars on all their achievements.

Pride Foundation's longstanding determination to help students succeed mirrors the LGBT community's tireless efforts in the fight for equality. And as we commemorate this year's Pride Month, we should look back and celebrate the tremendous strides that we have made toward equality in Washington State and across the Northwest.

I join with many in Washington State in congratulating this year's Pride Foundation Scholars on all they have achieved so far. I look forward to seeing all they will accomplish as leaders in their communities. Although we have a long way to go to move our country in the right direction, working together we have accomplished so much. I am proud to stand up and fight for the LGBT community, and I will continue to make sure that your stories are heard in the Senate. Again, congratulations to the 2013 Pride Foundation Scholars. I look forward to seeing all you will accomplish in the years to come.●

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 sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

REPORT ON THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY THAT WAS ORIGINALLY DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13303 OF MAY 22, 2003, WITH RESPECT TO THE STABILIZATION OF IRAQ, RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE ON MAY 17, 2013—PM 10

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message

from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the stabilization of Iraq that was declared in Executive Order 13303 of May 22, 2003, is to continue in effect beyond May 22, 2013.

Obstacles to the continued reconstruction of Iraq, the restoration and maintenance of peace and security in the country, and the development of political, administrative, and economic institutions in Iraq continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. Accordingly, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency with respect to the stabilization of Iraq.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 17, 2013.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:03 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2761, and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Speaker appoints the following Member of the House of Representatives to the British-American Interparliamentary Group: Mr. Cicilline of Rhode Island.

The message also announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 6913 and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Speaker appoints the following Members on the part of the House of Representatives to the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China: Mr. Wolf of Virginia, Mr. Pittenger of North Carolina, and Mr. Meadows of North Carolina.

At 6:43 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 bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 45. An act to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and health care-related provisions in the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010.

H.R. 1062. An act to improve the consideration by the Securities and Exchange Commission of the costs and benefits of its regulations and orders.

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 1062. An act to improve the consideration by the Securities and Exchange Commission of the costs and benefits of its regulations and orders; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

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. LEE (for himself, Mr. VITTER, Mr. PAUL, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. COBURN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. ENZI, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. WICKER, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. 988. A bill to provide for an accounting of total United States contributions to the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. SCHATZ:

S. 989. A bill to eliminate the prerequisite of direct appropriations relating to collection of health data and to modify standards for measuring sexual orientation and gender identity; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN:

S. 990. A bill to extend the Iraqi and Afghan Special Immigrant Visa Programs by 1 year; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

S. 991. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prevent the avoidance of tax by insurance companies through reinsurance with non-taxed affiliates; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. VITTER, Mr. BAUCUS, and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. Res. 149. A resolution designating the week of May 19 through May 25, 2013, as "National Public Works Week"; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 116

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 116, a bill to revise and extend provisions under the Garrett Lee Smith Memorial Act.

S. 119

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 119, a bill to prohibit the application of certain restrictive eligibility requirements to foreign non-governmental organizations with respect to the provision of assistance

under part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

S. 170

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) were added as cosponsors 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. 294

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 294, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the disability compensation evaluation procedure of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for veterans with mental health conditions related to military sexual trauma, and for other purposes.

S. 316

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) 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. 368

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 368, a bill to reauthorize the Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act, and for other purposes.

S. 381

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 381, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the "Doolittle Tokyo Raiders," for outstanding heroism, valor, skill, and service to the United States in conducting the bombings of Tokyo.

S. 403

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 403, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to address and take action to prevent bullying and harassment of students.

S. 420

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 420, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the logical flow of return information between partnerships, corporations, trusts, es-

tates, and individuals to better enable each party to submit timely, accurate returns and reduce the need for extended and amended returns, to provide for modified due dates by regulation, and to conform the automatic corporate extension period to long-standing regulatory rule.

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 420, *supra*.

S. 452

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 452, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to reduce the incidence of diabetes among Medicare beneficiaries.

S. 460

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 460, a bill to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage.

S. 462

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 462, a bill to enhance the strategic partnership between the United States and Israel.

S. 466

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 466, a bill to assist low-income individuals in obtaining recommended dental care.

S. 520

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 520, a bill to strengthen Federal consumer protection and product traceability with respect to commercially marketed seafood, and for other purposes.

S. 534

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 534, a bill to reform the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers, and for other purposes.

S. 541

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 541, a bill to prevent human health threats posed by the consumption of equines raised in the United States.

S. 562

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 562, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of marriage and family therapist services and mental health counselor services under part B of the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 576

At the request of Mr. JOHANNIS, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 576, a bill to reform laws relating to small public housing agencies, and for other purposes.

S. 619

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) 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. 623

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 623, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure the continued access of Medicare beneficiaries to diagnostic imaging services.

S. 679

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 679, a bill to promote local and regional farm and food systems, and for other purposes.

S. 742

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) were added as cosponsors 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.

S. 750

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 750, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to make grants to support fire safety education programs on college campuses.

S. 751

At the request of Mr. COATS, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 751, a bill to amend the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 to authorize producers on a farm to produce fruits and vegetables for processing on the base acres of the farm.

S. 774

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, his name was added as a cosponsor of 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.

S. 783

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 783, a bill to amend the Helium Act to improve helium stewardship, and for other purposes.

S. 789

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), the Senator from

Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 789, a bill to grant the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the First Special Service Force, in recognition of its superior service during World War II.

S. 871

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) and the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) were added as cosponsors of S. 871, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to enhance assistance for victims of sexual assault committed by members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 892

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 892, a bill to amend the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 to impose sanctions with respect to certain transactions in foreign currencies, and for other purposes.

S. 897

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 897, a bill to prevent the doubling of the interest rate for Federal subsidized student loans for the 2013–2014 academic year by providing funds for such loans through the Federal Reserve System, to ensure that such loans are available at interest rates that are equivalent to the interest rates at which the Federal Government provides loans to banks through the discount window operated by the Federal Reserve System, and for other purposes.

S. 917

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 917, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a reduced rate of excise tax on beer produced domestically by certain qualifying producers.

S. 921

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 921, a bill to amend chapter 301 of title 49, United States Code, to prohibit the rental of motor vehicles that contain a defect related to motor vehicle safety, and for other purposes.

S. 937

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 937, a bill to prohibit the Internal Revenue Service from applying disproportionate scrutiny to applicants for tax-exempt status based on ideology, and for other purposes.

S. 941

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 941, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prevent discriminatory misconduct against taxpayers by Federal officers and employees, and for other purposes.

S. 945

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 945, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to diabetes self-management training by authorizing certified diabetes educators to provide diabetes self-management training services, including as part of telehealth services, under part B of the Medicare program.

S. 953

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) and the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) were added as cosponsors of S. 953, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to extend the reduced interest rate for undergraduate Federal Direct Stafford Loans, to modify required distribution rules for pension plans, to limit earnings stripping by expatriated entities, to provide for modifications related to the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

S. 960

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 960, a bill to foster stability in Syria, and for other purposes.

S. 962

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) were added as cosponsors of S. 962, a bill to prohibit amounts made available by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 from being transferred to the Internal Revenue Service for implementation of such Acts.

S. 964

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 964, a bill to require a comprehensive review of the adequacy of the training, qualifications, and experience of the Department of Defense personnel responsible for sexual assault prevention and response for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 968

At the request of Mr. UDALL of Colorado, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 968, a bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act, to advance the ability of credit unions to promote small business growth and economic development opportunities, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 15

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 15, a joint resolution removing the deadline for the ratification of the equal rights amendment.

S. RES. 26

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 26, a resolution recognizing that access to hospitals and other health care providers for patients in rural areas of the United States is essential to the survival and success of communities in the United States.

S. RES. 75

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the names of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 75, a resolution condemning the Government of Iran for its state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 149—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF MAY 19 THROUGH MAY 25, 2013, AS “NATIONAL PUBLIC WORKS WEEK”

Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. VITTER, Mr. BAUCUS, and Mr. BARRASSO) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 149

Whereas public works infrastructure, facilities, and services are of vital importance to the health, safety, and well-being of the people of the United States;

Whereas the public works infrastructure, facilities, and services could not be provided without the dedicated efforts of public works professionals, including engineers and administrators, who represent State and local governments throughout the United States;

Whereas public works professionals design, build, operate, and maintain the transportation systems, water infrastructure, sewage and refuse disposal systems, public buildings, and other structures and facilities that are vital to the people and communities of the United States; and

Whereas understanding the role that public infrastructure plays in protecting the environment, improving public health and safety, contributing to economic vitality, and enhancing the quality of life of every community of the United States is in the interest of the people of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of May 19 through May 25, 2013, as “National Public Works Week”;

(2) recognizes and celebrates the important contributions that public works professionals make every day to improve—

(A) the public infrastructure of the United States; and

(B) the communities that public works professionals serve; and

(3) urges individuals and communities throughout the United States to join with

representatives of the Federal Government and the American Public Works Association in activities and ceremonies that are designed—

(A) to pay tribute to the public works professionals of the United States; and

(B) to recognize the substantial contributions that public works professionals make to the United States.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 919. Ms. CANTWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

SA 920. Ms. CANTWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 921. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 922. Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. HELLER, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 923. Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. MCCAIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 924. Mr. VITTER (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. COATS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 925. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. CORKER, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. COATS, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. COONS, Mr. COBURN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. HELLER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 926. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. TOOMEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 927. Mr. HELLER (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. VITTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 928. Mr. LEAHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 929. Mrs. GILLIBRAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 930. Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. COWAN, Mr. LAUTENBERG, and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 931. Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. COWAN, Mr. REED, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. KING, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 932. Mr. BEGICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 933. Mr. BEGICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 934. Mr. BEGICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 935. Mr. BEGICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 936. Mr. BEGICH (for himself and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 937. Mr. BEGICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 938. Mr. BEGICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 939. Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. COWAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 940. Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 941. Mrs. GILLIBRAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 942. Mrs. GILLIBRAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 943. Mr. BEGICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 944. Mrs. GILLIBRAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 945. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 946. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 947. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 948. Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. JOHANNIS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 949. Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. JOHANNIS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 950. Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. JOHANNIS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 951. Mrs. BOXER (for Mr. HARKIN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 309, to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the Civil Air Patrol.

SA 952. Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 953. Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. COBURN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 919. Ms. CANTWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title II, add the following:

SEC. 25 . SOIL AND WATER RESOURCE CONSERVATION.

(a) CONGRESSIONAL POLICY AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE.—Section 4 of the Soil and Water Resources Conservation Act of 1977 (16 U.S.C. 2003) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by inserting “and tribal” after “State” each place it appears; and

(2) in subsection (c)(2), by inserting “, tribal,” after “State”.

(b) CONTINUING APPRAISAL OF SOIL, WATER, AND RELATED RESOURCES.—Section 5 of the Soil and Water Resources Conservation Act of 1977 (16 U.S.C. 2004) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(4), by striking “and State” and inserting “, State, and tribal”;

(2) in subsection (b), by inserting “, tribal” after “State” each place it appears; and

(3) in subsection (c)—
(A) by striking “State soil” and inserting “State and tribal soil”; and

(B) by striking “local” and inserting “local, tribal.”

(c) SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION PROGRAM.—Section 6(a) of the Soil and Water Resources Conservation Act of 1977 (16 U.S.C. 2005(a)) is amended—

(1) by inserting “, tribal” after “State” each place it appears; and

(2) by inserting “, tribal,” after “private”.

(d) UTILIZATION OF AVAILABLE INFORMATION AND DATA.—Section 9 of the Soil and Water Resources Conservation Act of 1977 (16 U.S.C. 2008) is amended by inserting “, tribal” after “State”.

SA 920. Ms. CANTWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 845, strike line 21 and all that follows through page 846, line 4, and insert the following:

(iv) by striking clause (iii) and inserting the following:

“(iii)(I) agree to complete buildout of the broadband service described in the application by not later than 3 years after the initial date on which proceeds from the loan made or guaranteed under this section is made available; or

“(II) for tribal utilities that serve tribal trust land, trust allotted land, and non-Indian fee land within reservation boundaries, agree to complete buildout of the broadband service described in the application by not later than 5 years after the initial date on which proceeds from the loan made or guaranteed under this section is made available.”;

SA 921. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1096, between lines 15 and 16, insert the following:

SEC. 110 . MARKET LOSS PILOT ENDORSEMENT PROGRAM.

Section 523 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1523) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(1) MARKET LOSS PILOT ENDORSEMENT PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—To the extent practicable starting with the 2014 reinsurance year, notwithstanding section 508(a)(1), the Corporation shall establish and carry out a market loss pilot endorsement program for producers of specialty crops (as defined in section 3 of the Specialty Crops Competitiveness Act of 2004 (7 U.S.C. 1621 note; Public Law 108-465)) that covers losses due to—

“(A) a quarantine imposed under Federal law, pursuant to the terms of which the commodity is destroyed or otherwise unable to be marketed or otherwise used for its intended purpose (as determined by the Secretary); or

“(B) a naturally occurring, unintentional outbreak of a pathogen of public health concern (as determined by the Secretary) that results in inadequate market price.

“(2) DETERMINATION BY BOARD.—The Board shall approve a policy or plan of insurance proposed under paragraph (1) if, as determined by the Board, the policy or plan of insurance—

“(A) protects the interest of producers;

“(B) is actuarially sound; and

“(C) requires the payment of premiums and administrative fees by a producer obtaining the insurance.”.

SA 922. Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. HELLER, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 83 . GOOD NEIGHBOR AGREEMENTS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ELIGIBLE STATE.—The term “eligible State” means a State that contains National Forest System land or Bureau of Land Management land.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means—

(A) the Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to National Forest System land; or

(B) the Secretary of the Interior, with respect to Bureau of Land Management land.

(3) STATE FORESTER.—The term “State forester” means the head of a State agency with jurisdiction over State forestry programs in an eligible State.

(b) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS AND CONTRACTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may enter into a cooperative agreement or contract (including a sole source contract) with a State forester to authorize the State forester to provide the forest, rangeland, and watershed restoration and protection services described in paragraph (2) on National Forest System land or Bureau of Land Management land, as applicable, in the eligible State.

(2) AUTHORIZED SERVICES.—The forest, rangeland, and watershed restoration and protection services referred to in paragraph (1) include the conduct of—

(A) activities to treat insect infected trees; and

(B) activities to reduce hazardous fuels; and

(C) any other activities to restore or improve forest, rangeland, and watershed health, including fish and wildlife habitat.

(3) STATE AS AGENT.—Except as provided in paragraph (6), a cooperative agreement or

contract entered into under paragraph (1) may authorize the State forester to serve as the agent for the Secretary in providing the restoration and protection services authorized under paragraph (1).

(4) SUBCONTRACTS.—In accordance with applicable contract procedures for the eligible State, a State forester may enter into subcontracts to provide the restoration and protection services authorized under a cooperative agreement or contract entered into under paragraph (1).

(5) TIMBER SALES.—Subsections (d) and (g) of section 14 of the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 472a) shall not apply to services performed under a cooperative agreement or contract entered into under paragraph (1).

(6) RETENTION OF NEPA RESPONSIBILITIES.—Any decision required to be made under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) with respect to any restoration and protection services to be provided under this section by a State forester on National Forest System land or Bureau of Land Management land, as applicable, shall not be delegated to a State forester or any other officer or employee of the eligible State.

(7) APPLICABLE LAW.—Any employee, contractor, or subcontractor performing activities under a cooperative agreement or contract entered into under paragraph (1) shall be subject to the labor standards required under applicable State or local law.

SA 923. Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. MCCAIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1101, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following:

SEC. 11 . PROHIBITION ON PAYMENT OF PORTION OF PREMIUM BY CORPORATION FOR TOBACCO.

Section 508(e) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(e)) (as amended by section 11030(b)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(9) PROHIBITION ON PAYMENT OF PORTION OF PREMIUM BY CORPORATION FOR TOBACCO.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Effective beginning with the 2015 reinsurance year, notwithstanding any other provision of this subtitle, the Corporation shall not pay any portion of the premium for a policy or plan of insurance for tobacco under this subtitle.

“(B) DEFICIT REDUCTION.—Any savings realized as a result of subparagraph (A) shall be deposited in the Treasury and used for Federal budget deficit reduction.”.

SA 924. Mr. VITTER (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. COATS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . PROHIBITION ON LIFELINE SUPPORT FOR COMMERCIAL MOBILE SERVICE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—A provider of commercial mobile service may not receive universal service support under sections 214(e) and 254 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 214(e); 254) for the provision of such service through the Lifeline program of the Federal Communications Commission.

(b) COMMERCIAL MOBILE SERVICE DEFINED.—In this section, the term “commercial mobile service” has the meaning given

such term in section 332(d)(1) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 332(d)(1)).

SA 925. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. CORKER, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. COATS, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. COONS, Mr. COBURN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. HELLER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In title I, strike subtitle C and insert the following:

Subtitle C—Sugar Reform**SEC. 1301. SUGAR PROGRAM.**

(a) SUGARCANE.—Section 156(a) of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7272(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4), by striking “and” after the semicolon at the end;

(2) in paragraph (5), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(6) 18 cents per pound for raw cane sugar for each of the 2014 through 2018 crop years.”.

(b) SUGAR BEETS.—Section 156(b)(2) of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7272(b)(2)) is amended by striking “2012” and inserting “2018”.

(c) EFFECTIVE PERIOD.—Section 156(i) of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7272(i)) is amended by striking “2012” and inserting “2018”.

SEC. 1302. FLEXIBLE MARKETING ALLOTMENTS FOR SUGAR.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 359b of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1359bb) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)—

(A) in the matter before subparagraph (A), by striking “2012” and inserting “2018”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “at reasonable prices” after “stocks”; and

(2) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “but” after the semicolon at the end and inserting “and”; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) appropriate to maintain adequate domestic supplies at reasonable prices, taking into account all sources of domestic supply, including imports.”.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF FLEXIBLE MARKETING ALLOTMENTS.—Section 359c of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1359cc) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “but” after the semicolon at the end and inserting “and”; and

(ii) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) appropriate to maintain adequate supplies at reasonable prices, taking into account all sources of domestic supply, including imports.”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(B), by inserting “at reasonable prices” after “market”; and

(2) in subsection (g)(1)—

(A) by striking “ADJUSTMENTS.—” and all that follows through “Subject to subparagraph (B), the” and inserting “ADJUSTMENTS.—The”; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (B).

(c) SUSPENSION OR MODIFICATION OF PROVISIONS.—Section 359j of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1359jj) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) SUSPENSION OR MODIFICATION OF PROVISIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this part, the Secretary may suspend or modify, in whole or in part, the application of any provision of this part if the Secretary determines that the action is appropriate, taking into account—

“(1) the interests of consumers, workers in the food industry, businesses (including small businesses), and agricultural producers; and

“(2) the relative competitiveness of domestically produced and imported foods containing sugar.”

(d) ADMINISTRATION OF TARIFF RATE QUOTAS.—Section 359k of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1359kk) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 359k. ADMINISTRATION OF TARIFF RATE QUOTAS.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, at the beginning of the quota year, the Secretary shall establish the tariff-rate quotas for raw cane sugar and refined sugar at no less than the minimum level necessary to comply with obligations under international trade agreements that have been approved by Congress.

“(b) ADJUSTMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (a), the Secretary shall adjust the tariff-rate quotas for raw cane sugar and refined sugar to provide adequate supplies of sugar at reasonable prices in the domestic market.

“(2) ENDING STOCKS.—Subject to paragraphs (1) and (3), the Secretary shall establish and adjust tariff-rate quotas in such a manner that the ratio of sugar stocks to total sugar use at the end of the quota year will be approximately 15.5 percent.

“(3) MAINTENANCE OF REASONABLE PRICES AND AVOIDANCE OF FORFEITURES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may establish a different target for the ratio of ending stocks to total use if, in the judgment of the Secretary, the different target is necessary to prevent—

“(i) unreasonably high prices; or

“(ii) forfeitures of sugar pledged as collateral for a loan under section 156 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7272).

“(B) ANNOUNCEMENT.—The Secretary shall publicly announce any establishment of a target under this paragraph.

“(4) CONSIDERATIONS.—In establishing tariff-rate quotas under subsection (a) and making adjustments under this subsection, the Secretary shall consider the impact of the quotas on consumers, workers, businesses (including small businesses), and agricultural producers.

“(c) TEMPORARY TRANSFER OF QUOTAS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—To promote full use of the tariff-rate quotas for raw cane sugar and refined sugar, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall promulgate regulations that provide that any country that has been allocated a share of the quotas may temporarily transfer all or part of the share to any other country that has also been allocated a share of the quotas.

“(2) TRANSFERS VOLUNTARY.—Any transfer under this subsection shall be valid only on voluntary agreement between the transferor and the transferee, consistent with procedures established by the Secretary.

“(3) TRANSFERS TEMPORARY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Any transfer under this subsection shall be valid only for the duration of the quota year during which the transfer is made.

“(B) FOLLOWING QUOTA YEAR.—No transfer under this subsection shall affect the share of the quota allocated to the transferor or transferee for the following quota year.”

(e) EFFECTIVE PERIOD.—Section 359l(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7

U.S.C. 1359ll(a)) is amended by striking “2012” and inserting “2018”.

Strike section 9008 and insert the following:

SEC. 9008. REPEAL OF FEEDSTOCK FLEXIBILITY PROGRAM FOR BIOENERGY PRODUCERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 9010 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8110) is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 359a(3)(B) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1359aa(3)(B)) is amended—

(A) in clause (i), by inserting “and” after the semicolon at the end;

(B) in clause (ii), by striking “; and” at the end and inserting a period; and

(C) by striking clause (iii).

(2) Section 359b(c)(2)(C) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1359bb(c)(2)(C)) is amended by striking “, except for” and all that follows through “ of 2002”.

SA 926. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. TOOMEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 1603, strike “(d) APPLICATION.—The amendments made by this” and insert the following:

(d) LIMITATION ON PAYMENT OF PORTION OF PREMIUM BY CORPORATION.—Section 508(e) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(e)) (as amended by section 11030(b)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(9) LIMITATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the total amount of premium paid by the Corporation on behalf of a person or legal entity, directly or indirectly, with respect to all policies issued to the person or legal entity under this title for a crop year shall be limited to a maximum of \$50,000.

“(B) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAW.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Corporation shall carry out this paragraph in accordance with sections 1001 through 1001F of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308 et seq.).”

(e) APPLICATION.—The amendments made by this

SA 927. Mr. HELLER (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. VITTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title XII, insert the following:

SEC. 12213. PROHIBITION ON TRANSFER OF FUNDS FOR HEALTH CARE REFORM IMPLEMENTATION BY IRS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of division F of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-6) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 1315. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, none of the amounts made available in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148) or the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-152) shall be appropriated to the Internal Revenue Service for the purpose of carrying out any provisions of, or amendments made by, such Acts. No amount shall be appropriated to the Internal Revenue Service under this Act for such purpose.”

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) none of the amounts made available in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148) or the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-152) should be appropriated to the Internal Revenue Service for the purpose of carrying out any provisions of, or amendments made by, such Acts in fiscal year 2014 or thereafter; and

(2) no amounts appropriated to the Internal Revenue Service, from whatever source, for fiscal year 2014 or thereafter should be used to implement, enforce, or carry out the provisions of, or amendments made by, such Acts.

SA 928. Mr. LEAHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 840, strike line 22 and all that follows through page 849, line 18, and insert the following:

“(3) RURAL AREA.—The term ‘rural area’ means any area described in section 3002 of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act.

“(4) ULTRA-HIGH SPEED SERVICE.—The term ‘ultra-high speed service’ means broadband service operating at a 1 gigabit per second downstream transmission capacity.”

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking “LOANS AND” and inserting “GRANTS, LOANS, AND”;

(B) in paragraph (1), by inserting “make grants and” after “Secretary shall”;

(C) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) PRIORITY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In making grants, loans, or loan guarantees under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

“(i) establish not less than 2, and not more than 4, evaluation periods for each fiscal year to compare grant, loan, and loan guarantee applications and to prioritize grants, loans, and loan guarantees to all or part of rural communities that do not have residential broadband service that meets the minimum acceptable level of broadband service established under subsection (e);

“(ii) give the highest priority to applicants that offer to provide broadband service to the greatest proportion of unserved rural households or rural households that do not have residential broadband service that meets the minimum acceptable level of broadband service established under subsection (e), as—

“(I) certified by the affected community, city, county, or designee; or

“(II) demonstrated on—

“(aa) the broadband map of the affected State if the map contains address-level data; or

“(bb) the National Broadband Map if address-level data is unavailable; and

“(iii) provide equal consideration to all qualified applicants, including those that have not previously received grants, loans, or loan guarantees under paragraph (1).

“(B) OTHER.—After giving priority to the applicants described in subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall then give priority to projects that serve rural communities—

“(i) with a population of less than 20,000 permanent residents;

“(ii) experiencing outmigration;

“(iii) with a high percentage of low-income residents; and

“(iv) that are isolated from other significant population centers.”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) GRANT AMOUNTS.—

“(A) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible for a grant under this section, the project that is the subject of the grant shall be carried out in a rural area.

“(B) MAXIMUM.—Except as provided in subparagraph (D), the amount of any grant made under this section shall not exceed 50 percent of the development costs of the project for which the grant is provided.

“(C) GRANT RATE.—The Secretary shall establish the grant rate for each project in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary that shall provide for a graduated scale of grant rates that establish higher rates for projects in communities that have—

“(i) remote locations;

“(ii) low community populations;

“(iii) low income levels;

“(iv) developed the applications of the communities with the participation of combinations of stakeholders, including—

“(I) State, local, and tribal governments;

“(II) nonprofit institutions;

“(III) institutions of higher education;

“(IV) private entities; and

“(V) philanthropic organizations; and

“(v) targeted funding to provide the minimum acceptable level of broadband service established under subsection (e) in all or part of an unserved community that is below that minimum acceptable level of broadband service.

“(D) SECRETARIAL AUTHORITY TO ADJUST.—The Secretary may make grants of up to 75 percent of the development costs of the project for which the grant is provided to an eligible entity if the Secretary determines that the project serves a remote or low income area that does not have access to broadband service from any provider of broadband service (including the applicant).”;

(4) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “loan or” and inserting “grant, loan, or”;

(ii) by striking clause (i) and inserting the following:

“(i) demonstrate the ability—

“(I) to furnish, improve in order to meet the minimum acceptable level of broadband service established under subsection (e), or extend broadband service to all or part of an unserved rural area or an area below the minimum acceptable level of broadband service established under subsection (e); or

“(II) to carry out a project under paragraph (4)(B)(ii).”;

(iii) in clause (ii), by striking “a loan application” and inserting “an application”; and

(iv) in clause (iii)—

(I) by striking “the loan application” and inserting “the application”; and

(II) by striking “proceeds from the loan made or guaranteed under this section are” and inserting “assistance under this section is”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) in the matter preceding clause (i)—

(aa) by striking “the proceeds of a loan made or guaranteed” and inserting “assistance”; and

(bb) by striking “for the loan or loan guarantee” and inserting “of the eligible entity”;

(II) in clause (i), by striking “is offered broadband service by not more than 1 incumbent service provider” and inserting “are unserved or have service levels below the minimum acceptable level of broadband service established under subsection (e).”;

(III) in clause (ii), by striking “3” and inserting “2”;

(ii) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) ADJUSTMENTS.—

“(i) INCREASE.—The Secretary may increase the household percentage requirement under subparagraph (A)(i) if—

“(I) more than 25 percent of the costs of the project are funded by grants made under this section; or

“(II) the proposed service territory includes 1 or more communities with a population in excess of 20,000.

“(ii) REDUCTION.—The Secretary may reduce the household percentage requirement under subparagraph (A)(i)—

“(I) to not less than 15 percent, if the proposed service territory does not have a population in excess of 5,000 people; or

“(II) to not less than 18 percent, if the proposed service territory does not have a population in excess of 7,500 people.”;

(iii) in subparagraph (C)—

(I) in the subparagraph heading, by striking “3” and inserting “2”;

(II) in clause (i), by inserting “the minimum acceptable level of broadband service established under subsection (e) in” after “service to”; and

(III) by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following:

“(i) EXCEPTIONS.—Clause (i) shall not apply if—

“(I) the applicant is eligible for funding under another title of this Act; or

“(II) the project is being carried out under paragraph (4)(B)(ii), unless an incumbent service provider is providing ultra-high speed service as of the date of an application for assistance submitted to the Secretary under this section.”;

(C) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “loan or” and inserting “grant, loan, or”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) INFORMATION.—Information submitted under this subparagraph shall be—

“(I) certified by the affected community, city, county, or designee; and

“(II) demonstrated on—

“(aa) the broadband map of the affected State if the map contains address-level data; or

“(bb) the National Broadband Map if address-level data is unavailable.”;

(D) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by striking “Subject to paragraph (1),” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (1) and subparagraph (B).”;

(ii) by striking “loan or” and inserting “grant, loan, or”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) PILOT PROGRAMS.—The Secretary shall carry out pilot programs under which the Secretary shall provide grants, loans, or loan guarantees under this section to eligible entities, including interested entities described in subparagraph (A)—

“(i) to address areas that are unserved or have service levels below the minimum acceptable level of broadband service established under subsection (e); or

“(ii) for the purposes of providing a proposed service territory with ultra-high speed service, subject to the conditions that—

“(I) not more than 5 projects, and not more than 1 project in any State, shall be carried out under this clause during the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and ending on September 30, 2018;

“(II) for each fiscal year, not more than 10 percent of the funds made available under subsection (I) shall be used to carry out this clause;

“(III) for each fiscal year, not more than 20 percent of the funds made available under

subclause (II) shall be used for any 1 project; and

“(IV) paragraph (2)(A)(i) shall apply to the project, unless—

“(aa) the Secretary determines that no other project in the State is funded under this section; and

“(bb) no application for any other project that could be funded under this section, other than under this clause, is pending in the State.”;

SA 929. Mrs. GILLIBRAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 172, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

SEC. 16 . OVERSIGHT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall—

(1) recoup overpayments associated with fraud or abuse under any program carried out by the Secretary; and

(2) use any funds recouped under paragraph (1) to fund a program for stricter oversight of all programs of the Department of Agriculture.

(b) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary shall—

(1) initially carry out subsection (a) using existing funds of the Department; and

(2) continue carrying out subsection (a) using any funds recouped under that subsection, which shall be available for that purpose and the purpose described in subsection (a)(2) without further appropriation.

SA 930. Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. COWAN, Mr. LAUTENBERG, and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1034, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 100 . FARMED SHELLFISH AS SPECIALTY CROPS.

Section 3(1) of the Specialty Crops Competitiveness Act of 2004 (7 U.S.C. 1621 note; Public Law 108-465) is amended by inserting “farmed shellfish,” after “fruits.”

SA 931. Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. COWAN, Mr. REED, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. KING, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 355, strike line 8 and all that follows through page 357, line 15.

On page 1065, after line 25, add the following:

SEC. 11011. ANNUAL LIMITATION ON DELIVERY EXPENSES AND REDUCED RATE OF RETURN.

(a) ANNUAL LIMITATION ON DELIVERY EXPENSES.—Section 508(k)(4) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(k)(4)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(G) ANNUAL LIMITATION ON DELIVERY EXPENSES.—Beginning with the 2014 reinsurance year, the amount paid by the Corporation to reimburse approved insurance providers and agents for the administrative and

operating costs of the approved insurance providers and agents shall not exceed \$924,000,000 per year.”.

(b) **REDUCED RATE OF RETURN.**—Section 508(k)(8) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(k)(8)) (as amended by section 1101) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(G) **REDUCED RATE OF RETURN.**—Beginning with the 2014 reinsurance year, the Standard Reinsurance Agreement shall be adjusted to ensure a projected rate of return for the approved insurance producers not to exceed 12 percent, as determined by the Corporation.”.

SA 932. Mr. BEGICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title XII, add the following:

SEC. ____ SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS OF WILD GAME MEAT.

It is the sense of the Senate that Congress should enact legislation that—

(1) allows fees incurred for the processing of wild game meat to be taken into account in determining the amount allowable as a tax deduction for any charitable contribution of such wild game meat; and

(2) exempts from income fees received by meat processors from charitable organizations for the processing of wild game meat donated to such charitable organizations.

SA 933. Mr. BEGICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ SEAFOOD MARKETING AND DEVELOPMENT.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “National Seafood Marketing and Development Act of 2013”.

(b) **FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.**—

(1) **FINDINGS.**—Congress makes the following findings:

(A) The fishery resources of the United States are valuable and renewable natural resources that provide a major source of employment and contribute significantly to the food supply, economy, and health of the United States.

(B) Increased consumption of seafood would provide significant nutritional and health benefits for many people in the United States and help to reduce childhood obesity.

(C) The fishery resources of the United States are not fully developed and utilized because of underdeveloped markets.

(D) United States seafood companies have the potential to expand their contribution to interstate and foreign commerce, favorably affecting the balance of trade.

(E) A national program for marketing seafood is needed to realize the full potential of the fishery resources of the United States and to assure that the people of the United States benefit from the employment, food supply, and revenue that could be generated by such realization.

(2) **PURPOSES.**—The purposes of this section are—

(A) to improve and expand markets for seafood and strengthen the competitive position of the United States in domestic and international markets;

(B) to encourage the sustainable development and utilization of the seafood resources

of the United States through enhancement of markets, promotion, and public education;

(C) to assist growers, harvesters, and processors in improving the safety, traceability, quality, marketability, and sustainability of United States seafood products;

(D) to assist growers, harvesters, and processors of United States seafood products in the development and promotion of markets for seafood and improve coordination of their marketing activities; and

(E) to educate and inform consumers about the nutritional and health benefits of seafood.

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **BOARD.**—The term “Board” means a Regional Seafood Marketing Board established under subsection (d).

(2) **CONSUMER EDUCATION.**—The term “consumer education” means actions undertaken to inform consumers on matters related to the consumption of seafood products.

(3) **FUND.**—The term “Fund” means the National Seafood Marketing and Development Fund established by subsection (e).

(4) **GROWER.**—The term “grower” means any person in the business of growing or farming seafood.

(5) **HARVESTER.**—The term “harvester” means any person in the business of harvesting seafood from the wild.

(6) **MARKETER.**—The term “marketer” means any person in the business of selling seafood in the wholesale, retail, or restaurant trade, but whose primary business function is not the processing or packaging of seafood in preparation for sale.

(7) **MARKETING AND PROMOTION.**—The term “marketing and promotion” means an activity aimed at encouraging the consumption of seafood or expanding or maintaining commercial markets for seafood.

(8) **PERSON.**—The term “person” means any individual, group of individuals, partnership, corporation, association, cooperative, or any private entity organized or existing under the laws of the United States or any State, commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States.

(9) **PROCESSOR.**—The term “processor” means any person in the business of preparing or packaging seafood (including seafood of the processor’s own harvesting) for sale.

(10) **RESEARCH.**—The term “research” means any study or project designed to advance the image, desirability, usage, marketability, production, or quality of seafood.

(11) **SEAFOOD.**—The term “seafood” means farm-raised and wild-caught fish or shellfish harvested in the United States or by a United States flagged vessel for human consumption.

(12) **SEAFOOD INDUSTRY.**—The term “seafood industry” means harvesters, marketers, growers, processors, and persons providing them with goods and services.

(13) **SECRETARY.**—Except as otherwise specifically provided, the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Commerce.

(14) **UNITED STATES.**—The term “United States”, when used in the geographic sense, means the several States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Northern Mariana Islands, and any other territory, possession, or commonwealth of the United States.

(d) **REGIONAL SEAFOOD MARKETING BOARDS.**—

(1) **ESTABLISHMENT OF REGIONAL SEAFOOD MARKETING BOARDS.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish Regional Seafood Marketing Boards as follows:

(A) **NORTHEAST ATLANTIC BOARD.**—The Northeast Atlantic Board shall consist of the following members:

(i) Twelve members from Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, or Connecticut.

(ii) One member from Vermont, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Illinois, Michigan, Indiana, or Ohio.

(B) **MID AND SOUTH ATLANTIC BOARD.**—The Mid and South Atlantic Board shall consist of the following members:

(i) Twelve members from New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, or Georgia.

(ii) One member from West Virginia, Kentucky, or Tennessee.

(C) **GULF AND CARIBBEAN BOARD.**—The Gulf and Caribbean Board shall consist of the following members:

(i) Twelve members from Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Puerto Rico, or the territory of the Virgin Islands.

(ii) One member from Oklahoma, Arkansas, Missouri, Iowa, Nebraska, or Kansas.

(D) **PACIFIC BOARD.**—The Pacific Board shall consist of the following members:

(i) Twelve members from Idaho, Washington, Oregon, or California.

(ii) One member from Arizona, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, North Dakota, or South Dakota.

(E) **WEST AND NORTH PACIFIC BOARD.**—The West and North Pacific Board shall consist of thirteen members from Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, or American Samoa.

(2) **APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS.**—

(A) **NOMINATION.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall solicit nominations for members of each Board from the public.

(B) **CONSULTATION.**—Prior to appointing an individual to the Board, the Secretary shall consult with and seek the recommendations of the Governors of the States in the geographical area of the Board.

(C) **APPOINTMENT.**—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall appoint the members of each Board from among the nominees received under paragraph (1) and the recommendations received under paragraph (2).

(D) **MEMBER EXPERTISE.**—The Secretary shall ensure that the members of each Board fairly reflect the expertise and interest of the seafood industry located in the geographical area of the Board, and that the members of each Board include the following:

(i) Three individuals with experience in harvesting.

(ii) Two individuals with experience in processing, including one having experience with large processors and one having experience with small processors.

(iii) One individual with experience in transportation and logistics.

(iv) One individual with experience in mass market food distribution.

(v) One individual with experience in mass market food retail or food service.

(vi) One individual with experience in the marketing of seafood.

(vii) One individual recommended by a regional or State seafood marketing organization.

(viii) One individual with experience in growing seafood.

(ix) Two individuals that represent the general public and are familiar with the seafood industry as a whole.

(E) **MEMBER TERMS.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The term for a member of a Board shall be 3 years unless the Secretary designates a shorter term to provide for staggered expirations of terms of office.

(ii) **TERM LIMITS.**—No member of a Board may serve more than 3 consecutive terms, except that a member may continue to serve

on a Board beyond that member's term until a successor is appointed.

(3) VACANCIES.—

(A) REMOVAL.—A Board may remove a member from the Board for failure to attend 3 consecutive Board meetings without reasonable excuse, or for other cause by not less than a vote of $\frac{2}{3}$ of the members of the Board.

(B) EFFECT OF VACANCY.—A vacancy shall not affect the ability of a Board to function.

(C) SUBSEQUENT APPOINTMENT.—A vacancy on a Board shall be filled by the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(4) PER DIEM AND EXPENSES.—A member of a Board shall serve without compensation, but shall be reimbursed in accordance with section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for reasonable travel costs and expenses incurred in performing duties as a member of a Board.

(5) CHAIRMAN.—Each Board shall elect a chairman by a majority of those voting if a quorum is present.

(6) QUORUM.—A simple majority of members of a Board shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number may hold hearings.

(7) EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, STAFF, ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANCE.—

(A) EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—A Board may employ and determine the salary of an executive director, but such salary shall not exceed level II of the Executive Schedule under section 5313 of title 5, United States Code.

(ii) SELECTION CRITERIA.—The individual selected as the executive director shall have demonstrated expertise in the marketing and promotion of food products.

(B) STAFF.—With the approval of the Board, the executive director may select and employ additional staff as necessary without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code.

(C) ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall provide each Board such administrative assistance as requested by the Board for purposes of its initial organization and operation.

(8) NATIONAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE.—

(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—The chairman and 2 members of each Board shall establish a National Coordinating Committee—

(i) to exchange information and, if appropriate, coordinate the activities of the Boards; and

(ii) to conduct other business consistent with the policies and purposes of this Act.

(B) MEETING.—The National Coordinating Committee shall meet at least once each year.

(9) VOLUNTARY PAYMENTS.—Any person may make a voluntary payment to the Secretary to assist a Board in carrying out their marketing plans. Such payments shall be disbursed to the appropriate Board from the Fund.

(10) ANNUAL MARKETING PLAN.—

(A) REQUIREMENT FOR PLAN.—Each Board may prepare an annual marketing plan that describes the consumer education, research, and other marketing activities of the Board for the following year, including the selection procedures and criteria the Board plans to use for the solicitation and awarding of grants and its plans to coordinate its activities with those of the other Boards established under this Act. Plans may include marketing activities that reference a particular brand or trade name, and may include projects designed to promote the consumption or purchase of a specific seafood species or group of similar seafood.

(B) PURPOSE.—The purpose of each annual marketing plan shall be to—

(i) increase consumer demand for seafood;

(ii) encourage, expand, or improve the marketing and utilization of seafood; and

(iii) improve consumer education, research, and other marketing activities regarding seafood.

(11) ACCOUNTING.—

(A) RECORDS.—Each Board shall maintain accounting records of the receipt and disbursement of all funds of the Board, which shall be subject to the review of the Secretary.

(B) REPORTS.—Each Board shall submit to the Secretary an annual report that describes each expenditure of the Board.

(C) MAINTENANCE OF FUNDS.—Each Board shall keep the amounts distributed to it from the Fund on deposit in appropriate interest-bearing accounts that shall be established by the Board or invested in obligations of, or guaranteed by, the United States. Any revenue accruing from such deposits and investments shall be available to the Board for carrying out its marketing plans.

(12) LIMITATIONS ON DECEPTIVE OR NEGATIVE MARKETING.—Consumer education and other marketing and promotion activities of a Board shall avoid use of deceptive or negative acts or practices on behalf of seafood or with respect to the quality, value, or use of any competing seafood product or group of products.

(13) GRANTS.—

(A) REQUIREMENT TO MAKE.—Each Board shall make grants to persons to carry out projects subject to such terms and conditions as the Board may require, consistent with the purposes of this Act and any marketing plan the Board has adopted.

(B) COST-SHARING.—A grant made by a Board under paragraph (1) may not exceed 50 percent of the total estimated cost of the project. The remaining 50 percent shall be provided by the grantee, which may include the value of in-kind contributions from the grantee.

(C) AWARD.—Each Board shall award at least 10 percent of the grant funds awarded by the Board under this paragraph each year to minority-owned, veteran-owned, or small businesses.

(14) CONFLICT OF INTEREST.—The conflict of interest and recusal provisions set forth in section 302(j) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1852(j)) shall apply to any decision by the Board and to all members of the Board as if each member of the Board is an affected individual within the meaning of such section 302(j), except that in addition to the disclosure requirements of section 302(j)(2)(C) of such Act, (16 U.S.C. 1852(j)(2)(C)), each Board member shall disclose any financial interest or relationship in an organization or with an individual that is applying for funding from the Board held by the Board member, including an interest as an officer, director, trustee, partner, employee, contractor, agent, or other representative.

(e) NATIONAL SEAFOOD MARKETING AND DEVELOPMENT FUND.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund to be known as the National Seafood Marketing and Development Fund.

(2) EXCLUSIVE USE OF FUND.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, all amounts in the Fund shall be used exclusively by the Secretary for making grants to the Boards under this Act and no such amount shall be transferred from the Fund for any other purpose.

(3) DISTRIBUTION OF AMOUNTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The amount available in the Fund for each fiscal year shall be disbursed by the Secretary for such fiscal year to the Boards as follows:

(i) Eighty percent of such amount in the Fund shall be distributed equally among the Boards.

(ii) Twenty percent shall be distributed to the Boards based on a ratio of the total pounds of seafood harvested in the geographical area of each Board to the total pounds of seafood harvested in the United States.

(B) RATIO CALCULATION.—The ratio referred to in clause (ii) shall be calculated by the Secretary every 3 years using data collected by the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture.

(4) FUNDING UNDER THE SALTONSTALL-KENNEDY ACT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 2(b)(1) of the Act of August 11, 1939 (15 U.S.C. 713c-3(b)(1)) is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (A)(iv), by striking “and” at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon and “and”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) the provision of moneys to the National Seafood Marketing and Development Fund established under subsection (e) of the National Seafood Marketing and Development Act of 2013.”.

(B) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS UNDER THE SALTONSTALL-KENNEDY ACT.—Section 2(e)(1) of the Act of August 11, 1939 (15 U.S.C. 713c-3(e)(1)) is amended by striking subparagraphs (A) and (B) and inserting the following:

“(A) For each fiscal year prior to fiscal year 2014:

“(i) The Secretary shall use no less than 60 percent of such moneys to make direct industry assistance grants to develop the United States fisheries and to expand domestic and foreign markets for United States fishery products pursuant to subsection (c).

“(ii) The Secretary shall use the balance of the moneys in the fund to finance those activities of the National Marine Fisheries Service which are directly related to development of the United States fisheries pursuant to subsection (d).

“(B) For fiscal year 2014 and each subsequent fiscal year:

“(i) The Secretary shall use no less than 60 percent of such moneys that are available after the amount described in clause (ii) is provided to make direct industry assistance grants to develop the United States fisheries and to expand domestic and foreign markets for United States fishery products pursuant to subsection (c).

“(ii) For the National Seafood Marketing and Development Fund established under subsection (e) of the National Seafood Marketing and Development Act of 2013, \$20,000,000 for each fiscal year

“(iii) The Secretary shall use the balance of the moneys in the fund after the amounts described in clauses (i) and (ii) are made available to finance those activities of the National Marine Fisheries Service which are directly related to development of the United States fisheries pursuant to subsection (d).”.

SA 934. Mr. BEGICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title XII, add the following:

Subtitle D—Prohibition on Sale of Genetically Altered Salmon

SEC. 12301. PROHIBITION ON SALE OF GENETICALLY ALTERED SALMON.

(a) PROHIBITION.—It shall be unlawful for a person—

(1) to ship, transport, offer for sale, sell, or purchase a covered fish, or a product containing covered fish, in interstate or foreign commerce;

(2) to have custody, control, or possession of, with the intent to ship, transport, offer for sale, sell, or purchase a covered fish, or a product containing covered fish, in interstate or foreign commerce;

(3) to release a covered fish into a natural environment; or

(4) to have custody, control, or possession of a covered fish with the intent to release it into a natural environment.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to a fish, fish part, or product—

(1) under confined use, or intended for confined use, for scientific research;

(2) collected for the purpose of enforcing this subtitle; or

(3) if the Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere, in consultation with the Director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and any other Federal, State, or tribal entity the Under Secretary considers appropriate, reviews any application requesting an action by a department or agency of the Federal government to permit an act prohibited under subsection (a), including any environmental assessment prepared as part of that application, and—

(A) prepares a finding of no significant impact in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); or

(B) finds the application to be consistent with an environmental impact statement prepared by the Under Secretary in accordance with section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332) that includes—

(i) an environmental risk analysis that assesses the potential direct and indirect impacts from escapement of covered fish on wild and cultured fish stocks and environments that may be exposed to such covered fish;

(ii) a failure mode and effects analysis that quantitatively assesses the best- and worst-case probabilities of failure of each applicable confinement technique;

(iii) an assessment of the costs of control or eradication of escaped covered fish; and

(iv) an assessment of the potential economic damage in terms of loss of production or sales to relevant wild and cultured fish stocks and environments from the escapement of covered fish.

(c) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT CONSIDERATIONS.—

(1) NOTICE.—Each agency, department, or other unit of the Federal government shall promptly notify the Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere when an action involving covered fish, or a product containing covered fish is first identified.

(2) ENSURING COMPLIANCE.—The Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere, in cooperation with each Federal, State, or tribal entity that the Under Secretary considers appropriate, may monitor any mitigation measures proposed under subsection (b)(3) to ensure implementation and compliance therewith.

(3) PROVISIONS AS COMPLEMENTARY.—The provisions of this subtitle are in addition to, and shall not affect the operation of, other Federal, State, or local laws regulating a covered fish, or a product containing covered fish.

(d) RULES AND REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall prescribe such rules and regulations as the Secretary considers necessary to carry out the provisions of this subtitle.

SEC. 12302. ENFORCEMENT AND PENALTIES.

(a) ENFORCEMENT.—The Secretary of Commerce may enforce section 12301 in the same manner, by the same means, and with the same jurisdiction, powers, and duties provided under sections 308, 309, 310, and 311 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation

and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1858, 1859, 1860, and 1861).

(b) PENALTIES.—A person who violates section 12301 shall be subject to the penalties, and entitled to the privileges and immunities, under sections 308, 309, 310, and 311 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1858, 1859, 1860, and 1861).

SEC. 12303. REPORT ON RISKS TO WILD FISH STOCKS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere shall transmit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives the report under section 1007 of the Food and Drug Administration Amendments Act of 2007 (21 U.S.C. 2106).

SEC. 12304. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) CONFINED USE.—The term “confined use” means any operation, undertaken within a secured, land-based facility, that involves a covered fish controlled by specific measures that effectively prevent the covered fish from having contact with and impact on the external environment, including biological and physical confinement measures.

(2) COVERED FISH.—The term “covered fish” means a salmon or other anadromous or marine fish, live or dead, including the gametes, fertilized eggs, offspring, and descendants thereof, that is modified or produced through the application of recombinant deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA) technologies, using DNA from an organism’s own genome or that of another species, which overcome natural physiological reproductive barriers and which are not techniques used in traditional breeding and selection.

(3) FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT.—The term “finding of no significant impact” has the meaning given the term in section 1508.13 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations.

(4) PRODUCT.—The term “product” means an item manufactured or produced for sale or use as food.

SA 935. Mr. BEGICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 11, strike lines 1 through 3, and insert the following:

SEC. 2. DEFINITION.

In this Act:

(1) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term “Indian tribe” has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b).

(2) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Agriculture.

SA 936. Mr. BEGICH (for himself and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1101, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following:

SECTION 110 . DISCLOSURE IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST.

Section 502(c)(2) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1502(c)(2)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as subparagraphs (C) and (D) respectively; and

(2) by inserting before subparagraph (C) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(A) DISCLOSURE IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1) or any other provision of law, except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall on an annual basis make available to the public—

“(i)(I) the name of each individual or entity who obtained a federally subsidized crop insurance, livestock, or forage policy or plan of insurance during the previous fiscal year;

“(II) the amount of premium subsidy received by the individual or entity from the Corporation; and

“(III) the amount of any Federal portion of indemnities paid in the event of a loss during that fiscal year for each policy associated with that individual or entity; and

“(ii) for each private insurance provider, by name—

“(I) the underwriting gains earned through participation in the federally subsidized crop insurance program; and

“(II) the amount paid under this subtitle for—

“(aa) administrative and operating expenses;

“(bb) any Federal portion of indemnities and reinsurance; and

“(cc) any other purpose.

“(B) LIMITATION.—The Secretary shall not disclose information pertaining to individuals and entities covered by a catastrophic risk protection plan offered under section 508(b).”.

SA 937. Mr. BEGICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 634, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

“SEC. 3504. HOUSING FOR EDUCATORS, PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS, AND MEDICAL PROVIDERS.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) EDUCATOR.—The term ‘educator’ means an individual who—

“(A) is employed full-time as a teacher, principal, or administrator by—

“(i) a public elementary school or secondary school that provides direct services to students in grades prekindergarten through grade 12, or a Head Start program; and

“(ii) meets the appropriate teaching certification or licensure requirements of the State for the position in which the individual is employed; or

“(B) is employed full-time as a librarian, a career guidance or counseling provider, an education aide, or in another instructional or administrative position for a public elementary school or secondary school.

“(2) MEDICAL PROVIDER.—The term ‘medical provider’ means—

“(A) a licensed doctor of medicine or osteopathy;

“(B) an American Indian, Alaska Native, or Native Hawaiian recognized as a traditional healing practitioner;

“(C) a health care provider that—

“(i) is licensed or certified under Federal or State law, as applicable; and

“(ii) is providing services that are eligible for coverage under a plan under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code;

“(D) a provider authorized under section 119 of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act (25 U.S.C. 1616f); or

“(E) any other individual that the Secretary determines is capable of providing health care services.

“(3) PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER.—The term ‘public safety officer’ means an individual who is employed full-time—

“(A) as a law enforcement officer by a law enforcement agency of the Federal Government, a State, a unit of general local government, or an Indian tribe; or

“(B) as a firefighter by a fire department of the Federal Government, a State, a unit of general local government, or an Indian tribe.

“(4) QUALIFIED COMMUNITY.—The term ‘qualified community’ means any open country, or any place, town, village, or city—

“(A) that is not part of or associated with an urban area; and

“(B) that—

“(i) has a population of not more than 2,500; or

“(ii)(I) has a population of not more than 10,000; and

“(II) is not accessible by a motor vehicle, as defined in section 30102 of title 49, United States Code.

“(5) QUALIFIED HOUSING.—The term ‘qualified housing’ means housing for educators, public safety officers, or medical providers that is located in a qualified community.

“(6) QUALIFIED PROJECT.—The term ‘qualified project’ means—

“(A) the construction, modernization, renovation, or repair of qualified housing;

“(B) the payment of interest on bonds or other financing instruments (excluding instruments used for refinancing) that are issued for the construction, modernization, renovation, or repair of qualified housing;

“(C) the repayment of a loan used—

“(i) for the construction, modernization, renovation, or repair of qualified housing; or

“(ii) to purchase real property on which qualified housing will be constructed;

“(D) purchasing or leasing real property on which qualified housing will be constructed, renovated, modernized, or repaired; or

“(E) any other activity normally associated with the construction, modernization, renovation, or repair of qualified housing, as determined by the Secretary.

“(7) EDUCATIONAL SERVICE AGENCY, ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY, SECONDARY SCHOOL, STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCY.—The terms ‘educational service agency’, ‘elementary school’, ‘local educational agency’, ‘secondary school’, and ‘State educational agency’ have the meanings given those terms in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

“(b) GRANTS.—The Secretary may make a grant to an applicant to carry out a qualified project.

“(c) LOAN GUARANTEES.—The Secretary may guarantee a loan made to an applicant for the construction, modernization, renovation, or repair of qualified housing.

“(d) FINANCING MECHANISMS.—The Secretary may make payments of interest on bonds, loans, or other financial instruments (other than financial instruments used for refinancing) that are issued to an applicant for a qualified project.

“(e) APPLICATION.—An applicant that desires a grant, loan guarantee, or payment of interest under this section shall submit to the Secretary an application that—

“(1) indicates whether the qualified housing for which the grant, loan guarantee, or payment of interest is sought is located in a qualified community;

“(2) identifies the applicant;

“(3) indicates whether the applicant prefers to receive a grant, loan guarantee, or payment of interest under this section;

“(4) describes how the applicant would ensure the adequate maintenance of qualified housing assisted under this section;

“(5) demonstrates a need for qualified housing in a qualified community, which may include a deficiency of affordable housing, a deficiency of habitable housing, or the

need to modernize, renovate, or repair housing;

“(6) describes the expected impact of the grant, loan guarantee, or payment of interest on—

“(A) educators, public safety officers, and medical providers in a qualified community, including the impact on recruitment and retention of educators, public safety officers, and medical providers; and

“(B) the economy of a qualified community, including—

“(i) any plans to use small business concerns for the construction, modernization, renovation, or repair of qualified housing; and

“(ii) the short- and long-term impact on the rate of employment in the qualified community; and

“(7) describes how the applicant would ensure that qualified housing assisted under this section is used for educators, public safety officers, and medical providers.

“(f) INPUT FROM STATE DIRECTOR OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT.—The State Director of Rural Development for a State may submit to the Secretary an evaluation of any application for a qualified project in the State for which an application for assistance under this section is submitted and the Secretary shall take into consideration the evaluation in determining whether to provide assistance.

“(g) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants and making loan guarantees and payments of interest under this section, the Secretary shall give priority to an applicant that is—

“(1) a State educational agency or local educational agency;

“(2) an educational service agency;

“(3) a State or local housing authority;

“(4) an Indian tribe or tribal organization;

“(5) a tribally designated housing entity;

“(6) a local government; or

“(7) a consortium of any of the entities described in paragraphs (1) through (6).

“(h) LIMITATION.—The Secretary may provide assistance to the same applicant under only 1 of subsections (b), (c), and (d).

“(i) REQUIREMENT.—As a condition of eligibility for a grant, loan guarantee, or payment of interest under this section, at least 1 named applicant shall be required to maintain ownership of the qualified housing that is the subject of the grant, loan guarantee, or payment of interest during the greater of—

“(1) 15 years; or

“(2) the period of the loan for which a loan guarantee or payment of interest is made under this section.

“(j) REPORTING.—

“(1) BY APPLICANTS.—Not later than 2 years after the date on which an applicant receives a grant, loan guarantee, or payment of interest under this section, the applicant shall submit to the Secretary a report that—

“(A) describes how the grant, loan guarantee, or payment of interest was used; and

“(B) contains an estimate of the number of jobs created or maintained by use of the grant, loan guarantee, or payment of interest.

“(2) BY GAO.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this section, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report evaluating the program under this section.

“(k) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this section \$50,000,000 for fiscal year 2014, and each fiscal year thereafter.

“(2) AVAILABILITY.—Any amounts appropriated to carry out this section shall remain available for obligation by the Secretary during the 3-year period beginning on the date of the appropriation.

“(3) USE OF FUNDS.—Of any amounts appropriated for a fiscal year to carry out this section, the Secretary shall use—

“(A) not less than 50 percent to make grants under this section;

“(B) not more than 5 percent to carry out national activities under this section, including providing technical assistance and conducting outreach to qualified communities; and

“(C) any amounts not expended in accordance with subparagraphs (A) and (B) to make loan guarantees and payments of interest under this section.

SA 938. Mr. BEGICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1150, after line 15, add the following:

SEC. 12213. DENALI COMMISSION REAUTHORIZATION.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ‘Denali Commission Reauthorization Act of 2013’.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION.—Section 303 of the Denali Commission Act of 1998 (42 U.S.C. 3121 note; Public Law 105-277) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

“(1) COMPOSITION.—The Commission shall be composed of 7 members with a Statewide perspective and knowledge regarding rural Alaska matters (including transportation, health, education and training, energy, economic development, community and regional planning, design, construction, and maintenance of rural infrastructure, workforce development, and communication infrastructure and systems), of whom—

“(A) 5 shall be appointed by the Secretary of Commerce (referred to in this title as the ‘Secretary’), of whom—

“(i) 1 shall represent the views and perspectives of an organized labor or vocational training group within the State of Alaska;

“(ii) 1 shall represent the views and perspectives of Native Corporations (as defined in section 3 of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1602));

“(iii) 1 shall have experience relating to project management and construction in rural Alaska;

“(iv) 1 shall represent the views and perspectives of rural local government interests in the State of Alaska; and

“(v) 1 shall represent the views and perspectives of rural tribal interests in the State of Alaska;

“(B) 1 shall be the Governor of the State of Alaska or an individual selected by the Secretary from nominations submitted by the Governor; and

“(C) 1 shall be the Federal Cochairperson of the Commission, to be appointed by the Secretary in accordance with paragraph (3).

“(2) DATE OF APPOINTMENTS.—The appointments of the members of the Commission under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1) shall be made not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the Denali Commission Reauthorization Act of 2013.

“(3) FEDERAL COCHAIRPERSON.—

“(A) RECOMMENDATIONS.—Not later than 30 days after the date of appointment of the members of the Commission described in paragraph (2), those members shall submit to the Secretary recommendations for an individual to serve as Federal Cochairperson of the Commission under paragraph (1)(C).

“(B) SELECTION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of receipt of the recommendations under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall appoint an individual to serve as Federal Cochairperson of the Commission.

“(ii) CONSIDERATION.—In appointing the Federal Cochairperson under clause (i), the Secretary may take into consideration, but shall not be required to select, any individual recommended under subparagraph (A).

“(C) TREATMENT.—The Federal Cochairperson shall be a nonvoting member of the Commission.

“(D) VACANCY.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Any vacancy in the position of Federal Cochairperson shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

“(ii) INTERIM FEDERAL COCHAIRPERSON.—Before vacating the position of Federal Cochairperson, the Federal Cochairperson shall appoint to serve as Interim Federal Cochairperson, for the period beginning on the date on which the vacancy in the position of Federal Cochairperson occurs and ending on the date on which a new Federal Cochairperson is appointed under clause (i), the staff member of the Commission with the most seniority.

“(4) STATUS.—No member of the Commission (other than the Federal Cochairperson) shall be considered to be an employee of the Federal Government for any purpose.”; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking “The Federal Cochairperson” and inserting the following:

“(1) FEDERAL COCHAIRPERSON.—The Federal Cochairperson”; and

(B) by striking the second and third sentences and inserting the following:

“(2) MEMBERS.—

“(A) TERMS.—A member of the Commission shall be appointed for a term of 4 years, except that, of the members first appointed—

“(i) the members appointed under clauses (ii) and (iv) of subsection (b)(1)(A) shall be appointed for terms of 3 years; and

“(ii) the members appointed under clauses (i) and (iii) of subsection (b)(1)(A) shall be appointed for terms of 2 years.

“(B) VACANCIES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—A vacancy on the Commission—

“(I) shall not affect the powers of the Commission;

“(II) shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made; and

“(III) shall be subject to any conditions that applied with respect to the original appointment.

“(ii) FILLING UNEXPIRED TERM.—An individual selected to fill a vacancy shall be appointed for the unexpired term of the member replaced.

“(C) EXPIRATION.—The term of any member shall not expire before the date on which the successor of the member takes office.”.

(c) FUNDING REQUIREMENTS; DUTIES.—Section 304 of the Denali Commission Act of 1998 (42 U.S.C. 3121 note; Public Law 105-277) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 304. FUNDING REQUIREMENTS; DUTIES.

“(a) COST SHARE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out any construction project or activity under this Act, the Commission shall require a cost share of—

“(A) up to 50 percent of the total cost of the construction project or activity; or

“(B) for a construction project or activity carried out in a distressed community (as determined by the department of labor and workforce development of the State of Alaska or by the Commission), up to 20 percent of the total cost of the construction project or activity.

“(2) PRECONSTRUCTION PROCEDURES.—The cost-share requirements under paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to preconstruction procedures.

“(b) PUBLIC COMMENTS.—The Commission members and the Federal Cochairperson shall seek comments from rural Alaska communities and other stakeholder groups regarding rural development needs.

“(c) DUTIES.—The members of the Commission shall—

“(1) advise the Commission regarding coordinated infrastructure planning (including annual and multiyear strategies) among and for—

“(A) rural Alaska communities;

“(B) the State of Alaska;

“(C) Federal agencies; and

“(D) other governmental and nongovernmental entities;

“(2) establish a list of priorities of the Commission for rural Alaska communities on an annual basis, including funding recommendations and the means by which the recommendations—

“(A) address multiyear strategies; and

“(B) are coordinated with—

“(i) rural Alaska communities;

“(ii) the State of Alaska;

“(iii) Federal agencies; and

“(iv) other government and nongovernmental entities;

“(3) review ongoing and completed Commission-funded projects and programs for compliance with stated objectives and outcomes; and

“(4) examine Commission-funded projects and programs—

“(A) for consistency and standardization; and

“(B) to determine a means of improving the management and success of future Commission-funded projects and programs.

“(d) OPERATIONAL MATTERS.—The Federal Cochairperson (and not the members of the Commission) shall be responsible for Commission operational matters, including budgetary matters.”.

(d) POWERS OF COMMISSION.—Section 305 of the Denali Commission Act of 1998 (42 U.S.C. 3121 note; Public Law 105-277) is amended by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following:

“(d) DETAIL OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES; AGREEMENTS, GRANTS, AND PAYMENTS.—

“(1) DETAIL OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.—Any employee of the Federal Government may be detailed to the Commission—

“(A) without reimbursement; and

“(B) without interruption or loss of civil service status or privilege.

“(2) AGREEMENTS, GRANTS, AND PAYMENTS.—The Commission, acting through the Federal Cochairperson, may enter into contracts and cooperative agreements, award grants, and make payments necessary to carry out the purposes of the Commission.”.

(e) COMMISSION PERSONNEL MATTERS.—

(1) COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS.—Section 306 of the Denali Commission Act of 1998 (42 U.S.C. 3121 note; Public Law 105-277) is amended by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

“(a) COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the members of the Commission shall serve without compensation.

“(2) FEDERAL COCHAIRPERSON.—The Federal Cochairperson shall be compensated at the annual rate prescribed for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code.”.

(2) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—Section 306(b) of the Denali Commission Act of 1998 (42 U.S.C. 3121 note; Public Law 105-277) is amended—

(A) by striking “The members” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the members”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) WAIVER.—A member of the Commission may waive all or any portion of the travel expenses provided to the member under paragraph (1).”.

(3) INSPECTOR GENERAL.—Section 306 of the Denali Commission Act of 1998 (42 U.S.C. 3121 note; Public Law 105-277) is amended by striking subsection (h) and inserting the following:

“(h) INSPECTOR GENERAL.—The Commission shall use the services of the Inspector General of the Department of Commerce.”.

(f) REAUTHORIZATION.—The first section 310 of the Denali Commission Act of 1998 (42 U.S.C. 3121 note; Public Law 105-277) (relating to authorization of appropriations) is amended by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Commission such sums as are necessary to carry out this title, in accordance with the purposes of this title, for fiscal year 2014 and each fiscal year thereafter.”.

(g) REPEALS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) EXEMPTION FROM FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.—Section 308 of the Denali Commission Act of 1998 (42 U.S.C. 3121 note; Public Law 105-277) is repealed.

(B) ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE.—The second section 310 of the Denali Commission Act of 1998 (42 U.S.C. 3121 note; Public Law 105-277) (relating to the Economic Development Committee) is repealed.

(h) BUDGET COMMITTEE.—The Denali Commission Act of 1998 (42 U.S.C. 3121 note; Public Law 105-277) (as amended by subsection (g)(1)) is amended by inserting after section 307 the following:

“SEC. 308. BUDGET COMMITTEE.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Denali Commission Reauthorization Act of 2013, the Federal Cochairperson shall establish a Budget Committee to serve the Commission.

“(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The Budget Committee shall be composed of 3 members, of whom—

“(1) 1 shall be the Governor of the State of Alaska or a member of the Commission selected in accordance with section 303(b)(1)(B);

“(2) 1 shall be a Federal employee or detailee with expertise in the Federal budget process, to be selected by the Federal Cochairperson; and

“(3) 1 shall be a member of the Commission, to be selected by the members of the Commission.

“(c) DUTIES.—The Budget Committee shall—

“(1) review the operating budget of the Commission; and

“(2) make appropriate recommendations to the Federal Cochairperson.

“(d) COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The members of the Budget Committee shall serve without compensation.

“(2) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—The members of the Budget Committee shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for employees of agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Budget Committee.”.

(i) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 307 of the Denali Commission Act of 1998 (42 U.S.C. 3121 note; Public Law 105-277) is amended by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

“(c) DEMONSTRATION HEALTH PROJECTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—To demonstrate the value of adequate health facilities and services to the economic development of the region, the Secretary of Health and Human Services may make interagency transfers to the Commission to plan, construct, and equip demonstration health, nutrition, and child care projects, including hospitals, health care clinics, and mental health facilities (including drug and alcohol treatment centers).”

“(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this subsection.”

(2) Section 8G(a)(2) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by striking “the Denali Commission.”

SA 939. Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. COWAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 421, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

SEC. 42 . PURCHASE OF HALAL AND KOSHER FOOD FOR EMERGENCY FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Section 202 of the Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983 (7 U.S.C. 7502) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) KOSHER AND HALAL FOOD.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall finalize and implement a plan—

“(1) to increase the purchase of Kosher and Halal food from food manufacturers with a Kosher or Halal certification to carry out the program established under this Act if the Kosher and Halal food purchased is cost neutral as compared to food that is not from food manufacturers with a Kosher or Halal certification; and

“(2) to modify the labeling of the commodities list used to carry out the program in a manner that enables Kosher and Halal food bank operators to identify which commodities to obtain from local food banks.”

SA 940. Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 121 . ANTIMICROBIAL DRUG USE RESEARCH AND EDUCATION GRANTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall make available competitive research and education grants for the purpose of improving the knowledge and study of antimicrobial drug use in agriculture and antimicrobial resistance, including—

(1) antimicrobial use practices in major food animal species and the correlation of the practices to antimicrobial resistance trends;

(2) roles and associations that disease incidence and infection control have in antimicrobial use practices and trends;

(3) development of better veterinary diagnostics, infection control, preventative practices, housing, or husbandry, or other techniques to reduce the need for antimicrobial drug use; and

(4) identification of effective and scalable techniques that improve animal health and reduce antimicrobial drug use, including, at a minimum, genetics, diet, husbandry, and hygiene.

(b) ADMINISTRATION.—Paragraphs (4), (7), (8), and (11)(B) of subsection (b) of the Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act (7 U.S.C. 450i) shall apply with respect to the making of grants under this section.

(c) FUNDING.—Of amounts made available to the Secretary in appropriations Acts for programs and purposes relating to the purposes of this section, the Secretary shall use to carry out this section such sums as the Secretary determines to be appropriate for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.

SA 941. Mrs. GILLIBRAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 42 . INTERIM PROGRAM TO IMPROVE FOOD SAFETY.

(a) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section are—

(1) to ensure the effective use of resources, and program fidelity, to support food safety, interstate commerce, and the integrity of the United States meat supply for export markets; and

(2) to remedy repeated program failures described in documents, including—

(A) the audit report of the Inspector General of the Department of Agriculture numbered 24601-0001-41;

(B) the management challenges report of the Office of the Inspector General of the Department dated 2011; and

(C) the reports of the Government Accountability Office numbered—

- (i) 10-203;
- (ii) 04-247; and
- (iii) 02-902.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AFFECTED SUPERVISOR.—The term “affected supervisor” means an individual serving as, or in any similar capacity as, an inspector-in-charge or an administrator of a food safety program of the Department—

(A) onsite at a facility of the Department; or

(B) at the circuit or regional level.

(2) DEPARTMENT.—The term “Department” means the Department of Agriculture.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Assistant Secretary for Administration.

(c) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish an interim program to improve food safety, under which the Secretary shall appoint a public health examiner to ensure the integrity of the food safety programs of the Department.

(d) DUTIES OF PUBLIC HEALTH EXAMINER.—(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the program under this section, the public health examiner shall—

(A) evaluate, and modify as necessary, the process in effect on the date of enactment of this Act for evaluating the performance of affected supervisors;

(B) employ—

(i) objective, independent individuals with expertise in public health to serve as evaluators of affected supervisors; and

(ii) such additional staff as the public health examiner determines to be necessary to carry out the program;

(C) ensure the use by affected supervisors of objective, data-driven implementation metrics, as applicable, including—

(i) proper, complete, and valid documentation;

(ii) proper enforcement in response to serious and repeat offenses; and

(iii) the provision of proper correlation, supervision, and mission support for onsite personnel;

(D) provide appropriate professional development, reassignment, or other disposition of affected supervisors with a pattern of failing to implement program policies to ensure proper response to significant noncompliance issues;

(E) improve applicable management controls within the Department, including in the Public Health Information System;

(F) to the maximum extent practicable, reduce subjectivity in program implementation; and

(G) terminate the provision of payment awards under the public health human resources system of the Department for affected supervisors against whom the public health examiner or an evaluator employed under subparagraph (B) has identified any serious program implementation failure, until—

(i) each such failure is completely resolved;

(ii) effective corrective actions have been implemented with respect to each such failure; and

(iii) the public health examiner submits to the Committees on Appropriations, Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, and Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, and the Committees on Appropriations, Agriculture, and Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, a report describing the corrective actions.

(2) USE OF SAVINGS.—Any amounts saved by the Federal Government as a result of the termination of payment awards under paragraph (1)(G) shall be transferred to the Secretary for use in carrying out the program under this section.

(e) SUNSET.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The program under this section shall terminate on the date that is 4 years after the date of establishment of the program.

(2) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than 54 months after the date of establishment of the program under this section, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a final report describing the results of the program.

(f) FUNDING.—The Secretary shall use to carry out this section for each applicable fiscal year—

(1) not less than \$2,500,000 of the amounts made available to the Secretary in appropriations Acts for programs and purposes relating to the Food Safety Inspection Service and the Office of Food Safety; and

(2) the amounts transferred to the Secretary under subsection (d)(2).

SA 942. Mrs. GILLIBRAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1150, after line 15, add the following:

SEC. 12 . AUDIT OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH HUMAN RESOURCES SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall commence an audit of the pay-for-performance project of the Food Safety and Inspection Service, the Public Health Human Resources System, to determine—

(1) if the program was properly and consistently implemented;

(2) if the program was effective; and

(3) to what extent there was waste, fraud, abuse, or mismanagement of funds in the program.

(b) REPORT.—On completion of the audit required by subsection (a), the Comptroller

General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report containing the results of the audit.

SA 943. Mr. BEGICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 877, after line 18, insert the following:

SEC. 6208. GAO REPORT ON UNIVERSAL SERVICE REFORMS.

(a) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of the report required under subsection (b) is to aid Congress in monitoring and measuring the effects of a series of reforms by the Federal Communications Commission (in this section referred to as the “FCC”) intended to promote the availability and affordability of broadband service throughout the United States.

(b) **REPORT.**—The Comptroller General of the United States shall prepare a report providing detailed measurements, statistics, and metrics with respect to—

(1) the progress of implementation of the reforms adopted in the FCC’s Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking adopted on October 27, 2011 (FCC 11–161) (in this section referred to as the “Order”);

(2) the effects, if any, of such reforms on retail end user rates during the applicable calendar year for—

(A) local voice telephony services (including any subscriber line charges and access recovery charges assessed by carriers upon purchasers of such services);

(B) interconnected VoIP services;

(C) long distance voice services;

(D) mobile wireless voice services;

(E) bundles of voice telephony or VoIP services (such as local and long distance voice packages);

(F) fixed broadband Internet access services; and

(G) mobile broadband Internet access services;

(3) any disparities or trends detectable during the applicable calendar year with respect to the relative average (such as per-consumer) retail rates charged for each of the services listed in paragraph (2) to consumers (including both residential and business users) located in rural areas and urban areas;

(4) any disparities or trends detectable during the applicable calendar year with respect to the relative average (such as per-consumer) retail rates charged for each of the services listed in paragraph (2) as between incumbent local exchange carriers subject to price cap regulation and those subject to rate-of-return regulation;

(5) the effects, if any, of those reforms adopted in the Order on average fixed and mobile broadband Internet access speeds, respectively, available to residential and business consumers, respectively, during the applicable calendar year;

(6) any disparities or trends detectable during the applicable calendar year with respect to the relative average fixed and mobile broadband Internet access speeds, respectively, available to residential and business consumers, respectively, in rural areas and urban areas;

(7) the effects, if any, of those reforms adopted in the Order on the magnitude and pace of investments in broadband-capable networks in rural areas, including such investments financed by the Department of Agriculture’s Rural Utilities Service under the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 901 et seq.);

(8) any disparities or trends detectable during the applicable calendar year with respect

to the relative magnitude and pace of investments in broadband-capable networks in rural areas and urban areas;

(9) any disparities or trends detectable during the applicable calendar year with respect to the magnitude and pace of investments in broadband-capable networks in areas served by carriers subject to price cap regulation and areas served by carriers subject to rate-of-return regulation;

(10) the effects, if any, of those reforms adopted in the Order on adoption of broadband Internet access services by end users; and

(11) the effects, if any, of such reforms on State universal service funds or other State universal service initiatives, including carrier-of-last-resort requirements that may be enforced by any State.

(c) **TIMING.**—On or before December 31, 2013, and annually thereafter for the following 5 calendar years, the Comptroller General shall submit the report required under subsection (b) to the following:

(1) The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

(2) The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate.

(3) The Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives.

(4) The Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives.

(d) **DATA INCLUSION.**—The report required under subsection (b) shall include all data that the Comptroller General deems relevant to and supportive of any conclusions drawn with respect to the effects of the FCC’s reforms and any disparities or trends detected in the items subject to the report.

SA 944. Mrs. GILLIBRAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1064, after line 21, add the following:

SEC. 11 AUTOMATIC REVIEWS OF LARGE CLAIMS.

Section 508(j) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(j)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) **REVIEWS.**—For the purpose of automatic reviews of large claims under this section, the Corporation shall establish the loss threshold at \$50,000.”

SA 945. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 269, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

“(c) **SELECTION CRITERIA.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subtitle, for an eligible activity identified in subparagraph (B) or (E) of section 1271A(2), the Secretary shall not consider prior irrigation history when—

“(1) selecting eligible partners under section 1271B; or

“(2) entering into contracts with producers under section 1271C.

SA 946. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1150, after line 15, add the following:

SEC. 12213. TERMINATION OF THE PARTNERSHIP FOR NUTRITION ASSISTANCE INITIATIVE.

Effective on the date of the enactment of this Act, the memorandum of understanding entered into on July 22, 2004, by the Secretary and the Secretary of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Mexico and known as the “Partnership for Nutrition Assistance Initiative” is terminated and shall have no force or effect of law.

SA 947. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 4002, insert the following:

SEC. 4003. SYSTEMATIC ALIEN VERIFICATION FOR ENTITLEMENTS.

Section 5 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2014) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(o) **SYSTEMATIC ALIEN VERIFICATION FOR ENTITLEMENTS.**—

“(1) **DEFINITION OF SATISFACTORY IMMIGRATION STATUS.**—In this subsection, the term ‘satisfactory immigration status’ means an immigration status under which an individual is eligible for benefits under the supplemental nutrition assistance program, if the individual otherwise meets the requirements of this Act.

“(2) **DECLARATION.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—As a condition of eligibility for the supplemental nutrition assistance program, the Secretary shall require each head of a household seeking to participate in the program to submit to the applicable State agency a written declaration in accordance with subparagraph (B), which the head of household shall sign under penalty of perjury.

“(B) **CONTENTS.**—The head of household shall certify in the written declaration under subparagraph (A) that each member of the household is—

“(i) national of the United States (as that term is defined in section 101(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)); or

“(ii) in a satisfactory immigration status.

“(3) **DOCUMENTATION.**—

“(A) **NATIONALS OF THE UNITED STATES.**—Subject to subparagraph (B), for each member of a household for which a certification is made under clause (i) of paragraph (2)(B), the head of household shall submit to the State agency administering the supplemental nutrition assistance program documentation demonstrating that each such member is a national of the United States that is—

“(i) a document showing birth in the United States;

“(ii) a United States consular report of birth;

“(iii) a United States passport;

“(iv) a Certificate of Naturalization; or

“(v) a Certificate of Citizenship.

“(B) **SATISFACTORY IMMIGRATION STATUS.**—Subject to subparagraph (B), for each member of a household for which a certification is made under clause (ii) of paragraph (2)(B), the head of household shall submit to the State agency administering the supplemental nutrition assistance program—

“(i) alien registration documentation or other proof of immigration registration issued by the Secretary of Homeland Security that contains—

“(I) the alien admission number of the individual; and

“(II) the alien file number of the individual; or

“(ii) any other document that the State agency determines constitutes reasonable

evidence of a satisfactory immigration status.

“(C) ADULT HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS.—An individual who is 18 years of age or older and who is a member of a household for which a certification is made under clause (i) or (ii) of paragraph (2)(B) shall submit to the State agency the documentation described in subparagraph (A) or (B) on such individual’s own behalf.

“(4) SYSTEMATIC ALIEN VERIFICATION FOR ENTITLEMENTS PROGRAM.—For documentation described in paragraph (3)(B), the State agency to which the documentation is submitted shall use the alien admission number or alien file number of the individual to verify the immigration status of the individual using the Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements Program of the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services.”.

SA 948. Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. JOHANNIS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 355, between lines 7 and 8, insert the following:

SEC. 40 . RESTORING PROGRAM INTEGRITY TO CATEGORICAL ELIGIBILITY FOR THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The second sentence of section 5(a) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2014(a)) is amended by striking “receives benefits under a State program” and inserting “receives assistance (as defined in section 260.31 of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on January 1, 2013) under a State program”.

(b) RESOURCES.—Section 5(j) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2014(j)) is amended by striking “receives benefits under a State program” and inserting “receives assistance (as defined in section 260.31 of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on January 1, 2013) under a State program”.

Beginning on page 355, strike line 8 and all that follows through page 357, line 15, and insert the following:

SEC. 4002. ELIMINATING THE LOW-INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE LOOPHOLE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2014) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)(11)(A), by striking “(other than” and all that follows through “et seq.)” and inserting “(other than payments or allowances made under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) or any payments under any other State program funded with qualified State expenditures (as defined in section 409(a)(7)(B)(i) of that Act (42 U.S.C. 609(a)(7)(B)(1))))”;

(2) in subsection (e)(6)(C), by striking clause (iv); and

(3) in subsection (k)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking subparagraph (C);

(ii) by redesignating subparagraphs (D) through (G) as subparagraphs (C) through (F), respectively; and

(iii) by striking paragraph (4).

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 2605(f) of the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8624(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “(1)”;

(2) by striking paragraph (2).

Beginning on page 379, strike line 15 and all that follows through page 380, line 15, and insert the following:

SEC. 4011. ELIMINATING STATE BONUSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 16 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025) is amended by striking subsection (d).

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 16 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the first sentence of paragraph (4), by striking “payment error rate” and all that follows through “subsection (d)” and inserting “liability amount or new investment amount under paragraph (1) or payment error rate”;

(B) in the first sentence of paragraph (5), by striking “payment error rate” and all that follows through “subsection (d)” and inserting “liability amount or new investment amount under paragraph (1) or payment error rate”;

(2) in subsection (i)(1), by striking “subsection (d)(1)” and inserting “subsection (c)(2)”.

SEC. 4012. ELIMINATING DUPLICATIVE EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING.

(a) FUNDING OF EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAMS.—Section 16 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025) is amended by striking subsection (h).

(b) ADMINISTRATIVE COST-SHARING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 16(a) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025(a)) is amended in the first sentence, in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “(other than a program carried out under section 6(d)(4))” after “supplemental nutrition assistance program”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 17(b)(1)(B)(iv)(III)(hh) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2026(b)(1)(B)(iv)(III)(hh)) is amended by striking “(g), (h)(2), or (h)(3)” and inserting “or (g)”.

(B) Section 22(d)(1)(B)(ii) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2031(d)(1)(B)(ii)) is amended by striking “(g), (h)(2), and (h)(3)” and inserting “and (g)”.

(c) WORKFARE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 20 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2029) is amended by striking subsection (g).

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 17(b)(1)(B)(iv)(III)(jj) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2026(b)(1)(B)(iv)(III)(jj)) is amended by striking “or (g)(1)”.

On page 385, strike lines 19 through 22 and insert the following:

SEC. 4016. ELIMINATING THE NUTRITION EDUCATION GRANT PROGRAM.

Section 28 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2036a) is repealed.

On page 390, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 4019. TERMINATING AN INCREASE IN BENEFITS.

Section 101(a) of division A of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–5; 123 Stat. 120; 124 Stat. 2394; 124 Stat. 3265) is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) TERMINATION.—The authority provided by this subsection shall terminate after September 1, 2013.”.

SA 949. Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. JOHANNIS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 4002 and insert the following:

SEC. 4002. ELIMINATING THE LOW-INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE LOOPHOLE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2014) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)(11)(A), by striking “(other than” and all that follows through “et seq.)” and inserting “(other than payments or allowances made under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) or any payments under any other State program funded with qualified State expenditures (as defined in section 409(a)(7)(B)(i) of that Act (42 U.S.C. 609(a)(7)(B)(1))))”;

(2) in subsection (e)(6)(C), by striking clause (iv); and

(3) in subsection (k)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking subparagraph (C);

(ii) by redesignating subparagraphs (D) through (G) as subparagraphs (C) through (F), respectively; and

(iii) by striking paragraph (4).

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 2605(f) of the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8624(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “(1)”;

(2) by striking paragraph (2).

SA 950. Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. JOHANNIS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 4012 and insert the following:

SEC. 4012. ELIMINATING DUPLICATIVE EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING.

(a) FUNDING OF EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAMS.—Section 16 of Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025) is amended by striking subsection (h).

(b) ADMINISTRATIVE COST-SHARING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 16(a) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025(a)) is amended in the first sentence, in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “(other than a program carried out under section 6(d)(4))” after “supplemental nutrition assistance program”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 17(b)(1)(B)(iv)(III)(hh) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2026(b)(1)(B)(iv)(III)(hh)) is amended by striking “(g), (h)(2), or (h)(3)” and inserting “or (g)”.

(B) Section 22(d)(1)(B)(ii) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2031(d)(1)(B)(ii)) is amended by striking “(g), (h)(2), and (h)(3)” and inserting “and (g)”.

(c) WORKFARE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 20 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2029) is amended by striking subsection (g).

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 17(b)(1)(B)(iv)(III)(jj) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2026(b)(1)(B)(iv)(III)(jj)) is amended by striking “or (g)(1)”.

SA 951. Mrs. BOXER (for Mr. HARKIN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 309, to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the Civil Air Patrol; as follows:

On page 15, line 5, strike “dyes” and insert “dies”.

On page 15, line 6, insert before the period the following: “, and amounts received from the sale of such duplicates shall be deposited in the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund”.

On page 15, strike line 10 and all that follows through line 20.

SA 952. Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. McCONNELL, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title XII, insert the following:

Subtitle _____—Industrial Hemp Farming Act

SECTION 12 _____ . SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Industrial Hemp Farming Act of 2013”.

SEC. 12 _____ . EXCLUSION OF INDUSTRIAL HEMP FROM DEFINITION OF MARIHUANA.

Section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (16)—
 (A) by striking “(16) The” and inserting “(16)(A) The”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:
 “(B) The term ‘marihuana’ does not include industrial hemp.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:
 “(57) The term ‘industrial hemp’ means the plant *Cannabis sativa* L. and any part of such plant, whether growing or not, with a delta-9 tetrahydrocannabinol concentration of not more than 0.3 percent on a dry weight basis.”.

SEC. 12 _____ . INDUSTRIAL HEMP DETERMINATION BY STATES.

Section 201 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 811) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(i) **INDUSTRIAL HEMP DETERMINATION.**—If a person grows or processes *Cannabis sativa* L. for purposes of making industrial hemp in accordance with State law, the *Cannabis sativa* L. shall be deemed to meet the concentration limitation under section 102(57), unless the Attorney General determines that the State law is not reasonably calculated to comply with section 102(57).”.

SA 953. Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. COBURN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1101, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following:

SEC. 11 _____ . LIMITATION ON PREMIUM SUBSIDY BASED ON AVERAGE ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME.

Section 508(e) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(e)) (as amended by section 11030(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(9) **LIMITATION ON PREMIUM SUBSIDY BASED ON AVERAGE ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME.**—

“(A) **DEFINITION OF AVERAGE ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME.**—In this paragraph, the term ‘average adjusted gross income’ has the meaning given the term in section 1001D(a) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308-3a(a)).

“(B) **LIMITATION.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subtitle and beginning with the 2014 reinsurance year, in the case of any producer that is a person or legal entity that has an average adjusted gross income in excess of \$750,000 based on the most recent data available from the Farm Service Agency as of the beginning of the reinsurance year, the total amount of premium subsidy provided with respect to additional coverage under subsection (c), section 508B, or section 508C issued on behalf of the producer for a reinsurance year shall be 15 percentage

points less than the premium subsidy provided in accordance with this subsection that would otherwise be available for the applicable policy, plan of insurance, and coverage level selected by the producer.

“(C) **APPLICATION.**—

“(i) **STUDY.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the Government Accountability Office, shall carry out a study to determine the effects of the limitation described in subparagraph (B) on—

“(I) the overall operations of the Federal crop insurance program;

“(II) the number of producers participating in the Federal crop insurance program;

“(III) the level of coverage purchased by participating producers;

“(IV) the amount of premiums paid by participating producers and the Federal Government;

“(V) any potential liability for participating producers, approved insurance providers, and the Federal Government;

“(VI) different crops or growing regions;

“(VII) program rating structures;

“(VIII) creation of schemes or devices to evade the impact of the limitation; and

“(IX) administrative and operating expenses paid to approved insurance providers and underwriting gains and loss for the Federal government and approved insurance providers.

“(ii) **EFFECTIVENESS.**—The limitation described in subparagraph (B) shall not take effect unless the Secretary determines, through the study described in clause (i), that the limitation would not—

“(I) significantly increase the premium amount paid by producers with an average adjusted gross income of less than \$750,000;

“(II) result in a decline in the crop insurance coverage available to producers; and

“(III) increase the total cost of the Federal crop insurance program.”.

floor privileges for the remainder of the debate on S. 954, the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Nona McCoy and Kevin Batteh, who have been detailed to my staff, be granted the privilege of the floor for the remainder of the farm bill debate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. RES. 65

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 4 p.m. on Wednesday, May 22, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 43, S. Res. 65; that there be 60 minutes for debate equally divided and controlled in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate proceed to vote in relation to the resolution; that if the resolution is agreed to, the preamble be agreed to and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

AWARDING A CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Banking Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 309 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:
 A bill (S. 309) to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the Civil Air Patrol.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask unanimous consent the Harkin amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to, the bill as amended be read three times and passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

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

The amendment (No. 951) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To make technical corrections)

On page 15, line 5, strike “dyes” and insert “dies”.

On page 15, line 6, insert before the period the following: “, and amounts received from the sale of such duplicates shall be deposited in the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund”.

On page 15, strike line 10 and all that follows through line 20.

The bill (S. 309), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time and passed, as follows:

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship will meet on May 22, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room 428A Russell Senate Office building to hold a roundtable entitled “Bridging the Skills Gap: How the STEM Education Pipeline Can Develop a High-Skilled American Workforce for Small Business.”

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on May 20, 2013, at 10 a.m., in SH-216 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to continue its executive business meeting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Kevin Norton, a detailee to our committee, Heather Arnold, John Newton, and Eric Hansen, fellows for the committee, be granted

S. 309

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The unpaid volunteer members of the Civil Air Patrol (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "CAP") during World War II provided extraordinary humanitarian, combat, and national services during a critical time of need for the Nation.

(2) During the war, CAP members used their own aircraft to perform a myriad of essential tasks for the military and the Nation within the United States, including attacks on enemy submarines off the Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico coasts of the United States.

(3) This extraordinary national service set the stage for the post-war CAP to become a valuable nonprofit, public service organization chartered by Congress and designated the Auxiliary of the United States Air Force that provides essential emergency, operational, and public services to communities, States, the Federal Government, and the military.

(4) The CAP was established on December 1, 1941, initially as a part of the Office of Civil Defense, by air-minded citizens one week before the surprise attack on Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, out of the desire of civil airmen of the country to be mobilized with their equipment in the common defense of the Nation.

(5) Within days of the start of the war, the German Navy started a massive submarine offensive, known as Operation Drumbeat, off the east coast of the United States against oil tankers and other critical shipping that threatened the overall war effort.

(6) Neither the Navy nor the Army had enough aircraft, ships, or other resources to adequately patrol and protect the shipping along the Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico coasts of the United States, and many ships were torpedoed and sunk, often within sight of civilians on shore, including 52 tankers sunk between January and March 1942.

(7) At that time General George Marshall remarked that "[t]he losses by submarines off our Atlantic seaboard and in the Caribbean now threaten our entire war effort".

(8) From the beginning CAP leaders urged the military to use its services to patrol coastal waters but met with great resistance because of the nonmilitary status of CAP civilian pilots.

(9) Finally, in response to the ever-increasing submarine attacks, the Tanker Committee of the Petroleum Industry War Council urged the Navy Department and the War Department to consider the use of the CAP to help patrol the sea lanes off the coasts of the United States.

(10) While the Navy initially rejected this suggestion, the Army decided it had merit, and the Civil Air Patrol Coastal Patrol began in March 1942.

(11) Oil companies and other organizations provided funds to help pay for some CAP operations, including vitally needed shore radios that were used to monitor patrol missions.

(12) By late March 1942, the Navy also began to use the services of the CAP.

(13) Starting with 3 bases located in Delaware, Florida, and New Jersey, CAP aircrews (ranging in age from 18 to over 80) immediately started to spot enemy submarines as well as lifeboats, bodies, and wreckage.

(14) Within 15 minutes of starting his patrol on the first Coastal Patrol flight, a pilot had sighted a torpedoed tanker and was coordinating rescue operations.

(15) Eventually 21 bases, ranging from Bar Harbor, Maine, to Brownsville, Texas, were

set up for the CAP to patrol the Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico coasts of the United States, with 40,000 volunteers eventually participating.

(16) The CAP used a wide range of civilian-owned aircraft, mainly light-weight, single-engine aircraft manufactured by Cessna, Beech, Waco, Fairchild, Stinson, Piper, Taylorcraft, and Sikorsky, among others, as well as some twin engine aircraft, such as the Grumman Widgeon.

(17) Most of these aircraft were painted in their civilian prewar colors (red, yellow, or blue, for example) and carried special markings (a blue circle with a white triangle) to identify them as CAP aircraft.

(18) Patrols were conducted up to 100 miles off shore, generally with 2 aircraft flying together, in aircraft often equipped with only a compass for navigation and a single radio for communication.

(19) Due to the critical nature of the situation, CAP operations were conducted in bad weather as well as good, often when the military was unable to fly, and in all seasons, including the winter, when ditching an aircraft in cold water would likely mean certain death to the aircrew.

(20) Personal emergency equipment was often lacking, particularly during early patrols where inner tubes and kapok duck hunter vests were carried as flotation devices, since ocean worthy wet suits, life vests, and life rafts were unavailable.

(21) The initial purpose of the Coastal Patrol was to spot submarines, report their position to the military, and force them to dive below the surface, which limited their operating speed and maneuverability and reduced their ability to detect and attack shipping, because attacks against shipping were conducted while the submarines were surfaced.

(22) It immediately became apparent that there were opportunities for CAP pilots to attack submarines, such as when a Florida CAP aircrew came across a surfaced submarine that quickly stranded itself on a sand bar. However, the aircrew could not get any assistance from armed military aircraft before the submarine freed itself.

(23) Finally, after several instances when the military could not respond in a timely manner, a decision was made by the military to arm CAP aircraft with 50- and 100-pound bombs, and to arm some larger twin-engine aircraft with 325-pound depth charges.

(24) The arming of CAP aircraft dramatically changed the mission for these civilian aircrews and resulted in more than 57 attacks on enemy submarines.

(25) While CAP volunteers received \$8 a day flight reimbursement for costs incurred, their patrols were accomplished at a great economic cost to many CAP members who—

(A) used their own aircraft and other equipment in defense of the Nation;

(B) paid for much of their own aircraft maintenance and hangar use; and

(C) often lived in the beginning in primitive conditions along the coast, including old barns and chicken coops converted for sleeping.

(26) More importantly, the CAP Coastal Patrol service came at the high cost of 26 fatalities, 7 serious injuries, and 90 aircraft lost.

(27) At the conclusion of the 18-month Coastal Patrol, the heroic CAP aircrews would be credited with—

(A) 2 submarines possibly damaged or destroyed;

(B) 57 submarines attacked;

(C) 82 bombs dropped against submarines;

(D) 173 radio reports of submarine positions (with a number of credited assists for kills made by military units);

(E) 17 floating mines reported;

(F) 36 dead bodies reported;

(G) 91 vessels in distress reported;

(H) 363 survivors in distress reported;

(I) 836 irregularities noted;

(J) 1,036 special investigations at sea or along the coast;

(K) 5,684 convoy missions as aerial escorts for Navy ships;

(L) 86,685 total missions flown;

(M) 244,600 total flight hours logged; and

(N) more than 24,000,000 total miles flown.

(28) It is believed that at least one high-level German Navy Officer credited CAP as one reason that submarine attacks moved away from the United States when he concluded that "[i]t was because of those damned little red and yellow planes!".

(29) The CAP was dismissed from coastal missions with little thanks in August 1943 when the Navy took over the mission completely and ordered CAP to stand down.

(30) While the Coastal Patrol was ongoing, CAP was also establishing itself as a vital wartime service to the military, States, and communities nationwide by performing a wide range of missions including, among others—

(A) border patrol;

(B) forest and fire patrols;

(C) military courier flights for mail, repair and replacement parts, and urgent military deliveries;

(D) emergency transportation of military personnel;

(E) target towing (with live ammunition being fired at the targets and seven lives being lost) and searchlight tracking training missions;

(F) missing aircraft and personnel searches;

(G) air and ground search and rescue for missing aircraft and personnel;

(H) radar and aircraft warning system training flights;

(I) aerial inspections of camouflaged military and civilian facilities;

(J) aerial inspections of city and town blackout conditions;

(K) simulated bombing attacks on cities and facilities to test air defenses and early warning;

(L) aerial searches for scrap metal materials;

(M) river and lake patrols, including aerial surveys for ice in the Great Lakes;

(N) support of war bond drives;

(O) management and guard duties at hundreds of airports;

(P) support for State and local emergencies such as natural and manmade disasters;

(Q) predator control;

(R) rescue of livestock during floods and blizzards;

(S) recruiting for the Army Air Force;

(T) initial flight screening and orientation flights for potential military recruits;

(U) mercy missions, including the airlift of plasma to central blood banks;

(V) nationwide emergency communications services; and

(W) a cadet youth program which provided aviation and military training for tens of thousands.

(31) The CAP flew more than 500,000 hours on these additional missions, including—

(A) 20,500 missions involving target towing (with live ammunition) and gun/searchlight tracking which resulted in 7 deaths, 5 serious injuries, and the loss of 25 aircraft;

(B) a courier service involving 3 major Air Force Commands over a 2-year period carrying more than 3,500,000 pounds of vital cargo and 543 passengers;

(C) southern border patrol flying more than 30,000 hours and reporting 7,000 unusual sightings including a vehicle (that was apprehended) with 2 enemy agents attempting to enter the country;

(D) a week in February 1945 during which CAP units rescued seven missing Army and Navy pilots; and

(E) a State in which the CAP flew 790 hours on forest fire patrol missions and reported 576 fires to authorities during a single year.

(32) On April 29, 1943, the CAP was transferred to the Army Air Forces, thus beginning its long association with the United States Air Force.

(33) Hundreds of CAP-trained women pilots joined military women's units including the Women's Air Force Service Pilots (WASP) program.

(34) Many members of the WASP program joined or rejoined the CAP during the post-war period because it provided women opportunities to fly and continue to serve the Nation that were severely lacking elsewhere.

(35) Due to the exceptional emphasis on safety, unit and pilot training and discipline, and the organization of the CAP, by the end of the war a total of only 64 CAP members had died in service and only 150 aircraft had been lost (including its Coastal Patrol losses from early in the war).

(36) It is estimated that up to 100,000 civilians (including youth in its cadet program) participated in the CAP in a wide range of staff and operational positions, and that CAP aircrews flew a total of approximately 750,000 hours during the war, most of which were in their personal aircraft and often at risk to their lives.

(37) After the war, at a CAP dinner for Congress, a quorum of both Houses attended with the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President thanking CAP for its service.

(38) While air medals were issued for some of those participating in the Coastal Patrol, little other recognition was forthcoming for the myriad of services CAP volunteers provided during the war.

(39) Despite some misguided efforts to end the CAP at the end of the war, the organization had proved its capabilities to the Nation and strengthened its ties with the Air Force and Congress.

(40) In 1946, Congress chartered the CAP as a nonprofit, public service organization and in 1948 made the CAP an Auxiliary of the United States Air Force.

(41) Today, the CAP conducts many of the same missions it performed during World War II, including a vital role in homeland security.

(42) The CAP's wartime service was highly unusual and extraordinary, due to the unpaid civilian status of its members, the use of privately owned aircraft and personal funds by many of its members, the myriad of humanitarian and national missions flown for the Nation, and the fact that for 18 months, during a time of great need for the United States, the CAP flew combat-related missions in support of military operations off the Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico coasts.

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL.

(a) AWARD.—

(1) AUTHORIZED.—The President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall make appropriate arrangements for the award, on behalf of Congress, of a single gold medal of appropriate design in honor of the World War II members of the Civil Air Patrol collectively, in recognition of the military service and ex-

emplary record of the Civil Air Patrol during World War II.

(2) DESIGN AND STRIKING.—For the purposes of the award referred to in paragraph (1), the Secretary of the Treasury shall strike the gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions, to be determined by the Secretary.

(3) SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Following the award of the gold medal referred to in paragraph (1) in honor of all of its World War II members of the Civil Air Patrol, the gold medal shall be given to the Smithsonian Institution, where it shall be displayed as appropriate and made available for research.

(B) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Smithsonian Institution should make the gold medal received under this paragraph available for display elsewhere, particularly at other locations associated with the Civil Air Patrol.

(b) DUPLICATE MEDALS.—Under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, the Secretary may strike and sell duplicates in bronze of the gold medal struck under this Act, at a price sufficient to cover the costs of the medals, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses, and amounts received from the sale of such duplicates shall be deposited in the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund.

(c) NATIONAL MEDALS.—Medals struck pursuant to this Act are national medals for purposes of chapter 51 of title 31, United States Code.

NATIONAL PUBLIC WORKS WEEK

Mrs. BOXER. I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 149, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 149) designating the week of May 19 through May 25, 2013, as "National Public Works Week."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid on the table, with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 149) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, MAY 21, 2013

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. on Tuesday, May 21, 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 majority controlling the first half and the Republicans controlling the final half; that following morning business, the Senate resume consideration of S. 954, the farm bill; and 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

Mrs. BOXER. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:06 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, May 21, 2013, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

JON M. HOLLADAY, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, VICE EVAN J. SEGAL.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. CURTIS M. SCAPAROTTI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. MARION GARCIA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. HECTOR LOPEZ

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. DEBORAH P. HAVEN

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 20, 2013:

THE JUDICIARY

SHERI POLSTER CHAPPELL, OF FLORIDA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA.

MICHAEL J. MCSHANE, OF OREGON, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON.