

postpone the meeting in San Francisco about the formation of the United Nations. But Truman said: No, we are going to go ahead because this is something the world needs and America is uniquely positioned to lead.

Ever since its start, in funding and support, through good times and bad, through controversies Senator RUBIO described on the floor, this United Nations has worked hard to do good, worked hard to achieve an ideal that may be impossible to achieve. It is a tribute to the U.S. role as a global leader that the United Nations exists today.

I was also struck again by many of the challenges—the challenges of a tough globe, the challenges of U.N. problems in the ethics and finance area, the challenges that confuse many Americans as we look at the U.N., principally those referred to by my colleague Senator MENENDEZ, a history of anti-Semitism at the U.N. that confuses us as we watch it.

What are we to do with this institution that we birthed, more than any other nation, that still offers great hope and service every day, yet still needs significant change? I think what we should do is put a strong person in to be U.S. Ambassador, and Samantha Power is that individual. She has the strength to tackle the challenges that need tackling at the U.N. She has had the career, as described by earlier speakers, as a war correspondent, a writer, somebody who snuck across borders to take photos of atrocities in Darfur and then bring them to the attention of the world. Her writings and her activism have inspired generations of activists around the world to take up the cause of human rights.

She has been the President's senior adviser on matters in the United Nations in the last 4 years. To focus on this issue, here is what Samantha Power has done in that role to help deal with this issue of anti-Semitism at the U.N. and the double standard in the treatment of Israel. She worked to ensure the closest possible cooperation between the United States and Israel at the U.N., where she championed efforts to stand up against attempts to delegitimize Israel. She was key to the decision of the United States to boycott the deeply flawed "Durban II" conference in 2009, which turned into an event to criticize Israel. She helped mobilize efforts for the U.N. sanctions against Iran. She has challenged unfair treatment of Israel by U.N. bodies, including the one-sided Goldstone Report, and efforts to single out Israel in the Security Council after the Turkish flotilla incident, and she opposed the unilateral moves in the U.N. by the Palestinians that could undermine prospects for a negotiated peace agreement between Palestine and Israel, and how hopeful we are at the events this week, and we pray it goes forward and finds positive possibility. This is the activity she has had helping the U.N. while she was not the U.N. Amba-

sador. I want her in that seat so she can carry forward on those initiatives and others.

She will champion efforts to protect persecuted Christians and other religious minorities in the Middle East and beyond, and she helped spearhead the creation of new tools for genocide prevention and she led the administration's efforts to combat human trafficking, all values of which we can be proud if they would be on display at the United Nations.

I said during her hearing the one thing that made me scratch my head a bit about her when I heard she was nominated is I think of her primarily as a very blunt and outspoken person, and blunt and outspoken is not always the best job description of a diplomat. But in the case of the United Nations, with the challenges there, the challenges in the needed financial reform, the challenges in the need to push back against some instances of anti-Semitism, the challenges of ethics and other issues, we need blunt and outspoken at the United Nation. We don't need vague and ambiguous. We need the kind of strong leadership that Samantha Power would provide.

I think of many United Nations Ambassadors. It has been an "A" list of people from Henry Cabot Lodge to President George H.W. Bush before he was President to Bill Richardson and Andrew Young. We can think of many. But the two I think of most—I guess I think of them because they are Irish Americans—when I think of Samantha Power is Daniel Moynihan and Jeane Kirkpatrick, strong United Nations Ambassadors who stood proudly for the values of this country, who gave no quarter, who were good diplomats but did not hesitate to call the truth whenever and wherever they saw it. I think Samantha Power will do the same, and that I is why I support her nomination.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of my distinguished colleague from Virginia. He is a very thoughtful member of the committee. I appreciate his remarks on behalf of Ms. Power.

With that, I yield all remaining time. I ask for the yeas and nays.

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

Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

There is a sufficient second.

The question is, Shall the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Samantha Power, of Massachusetts, to be the Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the Representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations?

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE).

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

The result was announced—yeas 87, nays 10, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 200 Ex.]

YEAS—87

| | | |
|------------|--------------|-------------|
| Alexander | Fischer | Mikulski |
| Ayotte | Flake | Moran |
| Baldwin | Franken | Murkowski |
| Baucus | Gillibrand | Murphy |
| Begich | Graham | Murray |
| Bennet | Grassley | Nelson |
| Blumenthal | Hagan | Portman |
| Blunt | Harkin | Pryor |
| Boozman | Hatch | Reed |
| Boxer | Heinrich | Reid |
| Brown | Heitkamp | Risch |
| Burr | Hirono | Roberts |
| Cantwell | Hoeven | Rockefeller |
| Cardin | Isakson | Sanders |
| Carper | Johanns | Schatz |
| Casey | Johnson (SD) | Schumer |
| Chambliss | Johnson (WI) | Sessions |
| Chiesa | Kaine | Shaheen |
| Coats | King | Stabenow |
| Coburn | Kirk | Tester |
| Cochran | Klobuchar | Thune |
| Collins | Leahy | Toomey |
| Coons | Levin | Udall (CO) |
| Corker | Manchin | Udall (NM) |
| Cornyn | Markey | Warner |
| Crapo | McCaskill | Warren |
| Donnelly | McConnell | Whitehouse |
| Durbin | Menendez | Wicker |
| Feinstein | Merkley | Wyden |

NAYS—10

| | | |
|----------|-------|--------|
| Barrasso | Lee | Shelby |
| Cruz | Paul | Vitter |
| Enzi | Rubio | |
| Heller | Scott | |

NOT VOTING—3

| | | |
|--------|----------|--------|
| Inhofe | Landrieu | McCain |
|--------|----------|--------|

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table.

The President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

PROMOTING ENERGY SAVINGS IN RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS AND INDUSTRY—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 154, S. 1392.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 154 (S. 1392), a bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

PROVIDING FOR A CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE SENATE AND ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to S. Con. Res. 22.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 22) providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and an adjournment of the House of Representatives.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to 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 concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 22) was agreed to, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 22

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the Senate recesses or adjourns on any day from Thursday, August 1, 2013, through Sunday, August 11, 2013, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until 12:00 noon on Monday, August 12, 2013, or such other time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns on Monday, August 12, 2013, it stand adjourned until 12:00 noon on Monday, September 9, 2013, or such other time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the House adjourns on any legislative day from Friday, August 2, 2013, through Friday, September 6, 2013, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. on Monday, September 9, 2013, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Majority Leader of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, or their respective designees, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate and the Minority Leader of the House, shall notify the Members of the Senate and House, respectively, to reassemble at such place and time as they may designate if, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

PROMOTING ENERGY SAVINGS IN RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS AND INDUSTRY—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

EXPRESSING GRATITUDE FOR COOPERATION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, for this session, this work period, we have done a

lot of work, and it has turned out quite well. None of us got what we wanted, but we all got something. I appreciate the cooperation of Democrats and Republicans this afternoon. It is always during the last few hours before a recess that problems come up, and this is an adjournment, so it is even more difficult. So I am grateful to everyone for their participation and their cooperation.

As for Senator GRASSLEY, he has left the floor, but I wish to express my appreciation to him. He had an issue that took us a while to work through, and it all worked out for the better for not only he and Senator LEAHY but, most importantly, for our staff.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to enter into a colloquy with Senator STABENOW.

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

THE FARM BILL

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, as the two Chambers prepare to go to conference on the farm bill, I rise to request a commitment from the distinguished chairwoman of the Senate Agriculture Committee to protect the Senate farm bill's vital provision to end direct payments outright.

While I commend the chairwoman for her leadership in facilitating the full and immediate elimination of direct payments in the Senate-passed farm bill, many of my colleagues may be surprised to learn that section 1101 of the House-passed farm bill contains a carve-out that would actually continue direct payments to cotton farmers at a rate of 70 percent in 2014 and a rate of 60 percent in 2015.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, this House-passed extension of direct payments would cost taxpayers an estimated \$823 million.

Already a poster child for Federal largesse, direct payments have more recently become synonymous with waste, fraud, and abuse. As the Washington Post put it, recent analyses of the program have found that it subsidizes people who aren't really farming: the idle, the urban, and, occasionally, the dead.

Investigations have uncovered taxpayer-backed direct payments being paid to billionaires, to New York City condo dwellers, and to nonfarming homeowners who happen to live on former farmlands.

Direct payments have also been the target of a series of scathing reports published by the GAO, the most recent of which went so far as to question the purpose and need for direct payments, stating that they did not "align with principles significant to integrity, effectiveness, and efficiency in farm bill programs." The report went on to recommend that Congress consider eliminating direct payments outright.

I ask the distinguished chairwoman, was the unsustainable cost and the pattern of waste, fraud, and abuse associated with direct payments the impetus for the chairwoman to ensure that this

subsidy was fully and immediately eliminated in the most recent Senate-passed farm bill?

Ms. STABENOW. I thank my colleague from Arizona for his passion on this issue.

Yes, it has been my goal from the beginning of this farm bill process to end unnecessary subsidies and to clean up areas of waste, fraud, and abuse starting with the direct payment program. The program is indefensible in this current budget climate. It makes absolutely no sense to pay farmers when they don't suffer a loss and to pay people who aren't even farming.

That is also why we included the strongest reforms to the commodity programs in the history of the farm bill, eliminating payments to people who are not farming and tightening the AGI requirements and the amount any single farmer can receive.

We even have reformed the crop insurance program. The No. 1 thing we have heard from listening to farmers all across this country is that they need market-based risk management tools.

Farming is an extremely risky business. Farmers plant seeds in the spring and hope that by the time the harvest rolls around there will have been enough rain and the right temperatures to give them a good crop. That is why we strengthened crop insurance and made that available to farmers growing different kinds of crops—because we want farmers to have skin in the game. As I have always said, that is about farmers paying a bill for crop insurance, not getting a check from the direct payment program.

Mr. FLAKE. To the chairwoman's credit, the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry has maintained a sustained effort to eliminate direct payments. In fact, between the 2012 and 2013 Senate farm bills and the majority's sequester replacement legislation, 76 current Members of the Senate—76 current Members of the Senate—have voted for the full and immediate elimination of direct payments.

Does the chairwoman agree that even the limited \$823 million extension of direct payments found in the House-passed bill would be at odds with the recorded votes of a supermajority of the Senate?

Ms. STABENOW. My friend from Arizona is correct. The Senate has repeatedly voted to end direct payments.

Mr. FLAKE. To that end, I respectfully request that the distinguished chairwoman make a commitment that she will protect the Senate's vital provision and work to ensure that any conference report brought before the Senate achieves a full and immediate elimination of direct payments.

Ms. STABENOW. Yes, that is my intention. I strongly agree we should not be spending taxpayer dollars to fund these direct payment subsidies, and I will do everything I can to make sure the conference committee adopts the Senate version on this issue.