



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JANUARY 7, 2014

No. 3

## Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

### PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Out of the depths we lift our hearts to You, O God, waiting for Your providence to prevail more than they who watch for sunrise. Guide our Senators to find hope in Your presence as they trust the unstoppable cycle of seed time and harvest. Lord, give our lawmakers such reverence for You that they will stand for right although the heavens fall. May they delight in any work they do for You and tire of any rest that is apart from You. Create in them clean hearts, which no unworthy purpose may tempt aside. May they wait for the power of Your Spirit, working through their faith, to do more than they can ask or imagine.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

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

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

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 I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

### SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 265, S. 1845, the unemployment insurance extension.

I ask unanimous consent that the leader time that I use and that of Senator MCCONNELL not count against the half hour that the proponents and opponents of this legislation have to speak, 15 minutes on each side.

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

Mr. REID. The vote will drag a little bit but not very much. My remarks are fairly short.

The Senate will recess from 12:30 p.m. to 2:15 p.m. to allow for weekly caucus meetings.

### UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Mr. REID. Over the last 45 months America's private sector has done OK—not great but done pretty well. Eight million jobs have been created. The stock market is booming and even the housing market is starting to show signs of life.

A number of States were hit so hard with the decline of the housing market. Nevada was hit the hardest, and California, Florida, Michigan—a number of States—were hit very hard. But even in those States the housing market is turning around a little bit—not enough but turning around. It is clear that the economy is picking up steam—not enough steam but picking up steam.

But for far too many Americans these bright headlines that I have just announced touting good economic news don't match the darker reality of their lives. They sit at the kitchen table—if they are lucky to have a kitchen table—and they are juggling their bills.

It was brought to my attention on the way to work this morning about how hard it is for so many people. On Constitution Avenue, as we were wait-

ing for a light, I could see off to the left a news camera and a reporter trying to wake up somebody who had been spending the night on the pavement—not on the grates where the heat comes up. They kept pushing and pushing. I could see they were talking to him. He or she didn't come out of that bundle of material on that sidewalk.

I don't know if this man is one of the long-term unemployed. I don't know. But there are lots of people who are in desperate shape. They may not be sleeping on a sidewalk on Constitution Avenue 14 blocks from the White House, but there are people in America who are desperate for help.

There are 1.3 million people who have already lost their unemployment insurance benefits. This is not good for the country. We are told by economists that for every \$1 we spend on unemployment benefits it gets \$1.50 back to us just like that. So we have to start understanding that we have a country where not everyone is benefiting from what is going on with these headlines I just reported.

Over the last 30 years the income and wealth of the top 1 percent has increased 300 percent. The middle class dropped almost 10 percent. Think about it, 300 percent; the middle class about a 10-percent drop.

I haven't even mentioned the poor. They have been hit harder than anyone else. When I say this, it is true. The rich are getting a lot richer and the poor are getting poorer. The middle class is being squeezed.

I have nothing against people of wealth. It is great we live in a country where people can make a lot of money, but we have to understand there are people who are really hurting. For those who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own—and millions of them have struggled for months to find new work—a booming stock market of increasing corporate profits is of little comfort to them.

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



Printed on recycled paper.

Fortunately, Americans looking for work have been able to rely on unemployment insurance to get them through the tough times. But for 1.3 million people, no deal; 20,000 are veterans returning from wars in Afghanistan and Iraq.

At the end of last year, only a few days ago, Congress failed to extend unemployment emergency insurance for Americans who have been looking for work for more than 6 months. We have never in the history of our country had long-term unemployment such as today—never in the history of our Republic. Yet we are turning 1.3 million people away. Are they going to be the next ones sleeping on some street—wherever they come from—trying to stay warm?

For many Americans these benefits make the difference between being able to live a decent life—not a good life, a decent life—and going hungry or becoming homeless.

Let us go back to 2012. In 2012 unemployment insurance helped 2.5 million people, including 600,000 children, from going into the rolls of poverty. We don't have all the results from last year. These families live in red States, blue States, Republicans, Democrats, or Independents. We shouldn't turn our backs on them.

In the past, we have worked together. Did we complain when President Bush came to us? Unemployment was nowhere near where it is now. There were enough long-term unemployed, and we automatically together extended those benefits. Not today. We are not doing it because we can't get the Republicans to help us. We have reached out the hand to hardworking Americans struggling to get by.

I would hope we can get a few Republicans to join DEAN HELLER of Nevada, a conservative Senator. Join with DEAN HELLER, a junior Senator from Nevada, and help get this legislation passed.

In the latest round of emergency assistance, George Bush was the person who signed that bill. At the time the unemployment rate was about 5.5 percent. Today in Nevada and Rhode Island—the State of Senator JACK REED, who will speak—it is about 9 percent.

The long-term unemployment rate today is more than double what it was at the time that we let emergency job assistance expire. Senator HELLER understands. I am troubled that most of Senator HELLER's Republican colleagues, according to what we are hearing in the press, callously turned their backs on the long-term unemployed.

I am saddened. I hope that we can get them to move over and help us to help these people who need it so very much. Failing to restore emergency assistance would not only be a crushing blow to the long-term unemployed, it would be a blow to our economy.

Americans use their unemployment benefits to buy food and fuel at local gas stations, to pay their landlords or to purchase for a child a winter coat.

That is why for every dollar we spend on unemployment benefits, I repeat, the economy grows by \$1.50. This investment in our fellow Americans is one of the most effective ways to spark and sustain an economic recovery.

Last night the senior Senator from Texas, a Republican, asked that we delay this vote until today. I was pleased to do that. He called this a serious issue, and he is very correct. The senior Senator from Texas is correct. This is a serious issue. It is as serious to people outside Nevada as it is to those people from Nevada who have been out of work for so long. People from Nevada have written and called my office, calling and begging for a little more time.

For every job that is available, there are three that are unemployed in America. We Democrats stand united in support of this extension. Republicans need to take this seriously as well as we.

I hope Republicans remember that during hard times, that during times of high unemployment—regardless of who is in the White House or who led this Chamber—Congress is always willing to put politics aside and put American families first.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

#### UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I indicated to the majority leader I was going to ask unanimous consent, which I am prepared to do at this point. I have to admit, I am a little surprised at the fervor with which the majority is dedicated to reviving the expired emergency unemployment benefits after they ignored the issue all of last year. I am sure there are many on my side who would like to see these additional weeks of benefits extended if—as the Speaker of the House indicated he supported—we could find a way to extend them without actually adding to the national debt.

To that end I would like to propose that we be allowed—my side be allowed—to offer an amendment to pay for these benefits by lifting the burden of ObamaCare's individual mandate for 1 year and take care of our veterans who were harmed by the recently agreed-to budget deal while we are in the same amendment, and once that is disposed of we can have an actual de-

bate on this issue and an amendment process in the Senate, which hasn't happened very often in recent times.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that if cloture is invoked on the motion to proceed to S. 1845, all postcloture time be yielded back and the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill and that my amendment with Senator HATCH be the first amendment in order and that there be up to 1 hour of debate on the amendment divided in the usual form; that following the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate then proceed to a vote in relation to that amendment. I further ask unanimous consent that following the disposition of that amendment, it be in order for the majority leader or his designee to offer an amendment and it be in order for the leaders or their designees to continue to offer amendments in alternating fashion, which used to be the way we did business around here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object—and I appreciate how candid my Republican counterpart is and I say that seriously—I do speak with some, or I try, though I am not real good at speaking with a lot of fervor, as everyone knows—but I feel very strongly about this issue. For people who are unemployed and can't find a job, it is a tough deal. I have, fortunately, always had a job. I can't say the same for my family, especially my dad. So I do speak with as much fervor as I am capable on this issue.

The reason I mention I am glad my friend is being so candid is—listen to this—no one can in any way dispute my facts. For every \$1 spent, we get \$1.50 back. That doesn't add to the deficit. So as I see this picture from the consent request, I am seeing that we are going to take away ObamaCare, which 9 million new people have and are signing up at the rate of thousands every day. We are going to take away their benefits, in some form or fashion, and we are going to trump the bipartisan agreement we have with MIKULSKI and ROGERS. They are coming up with an omnibus bill. I know my friend has already stated he initially was against the budget deal, but I would bet that is addressed in this deal MIKULSKI and ROGERS will come up with—this helping of veterans.

So this is a guise to obstruct, as has been happening during the 5 years President Obama has been President of the United States, and I object with as much fervor as I can.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, over the past several days, we have seen a number of stories about how Democrats plan to spend the year gearing up for the November elections by making an issue out of economic hardships faced by Americans; in other words, instead of working on reforms that would actually help people overcome the challenges so many of them

face in this economy, Democrats plan to exploit those folks for political gain. It is pretty amazing when you think about it.

We are now in the sixth year—the sixth year—of the Obama administration. We all know the stock market has been doing great, so the richest among us are doing fine. But what about the poor? What about working-class folks? What about folks who work in industries liberals don't approve of, such as coal? How many of these Americans have been doing well during the Obama economy?

Record numbers of them are having a perfectly terrible time. One indicator is the growth of the Food Stamp Program. Consider this: Since the President took office, the number of Americans who have signed up for food stamps has literally skyrocketed—skyrocketed. It is up almost half. Nearly 4 out of 10 unemployed Americans are trapped—literally trapped—in long-term unemployment. What is worse, the poorest Americans are the ones who have often had the hardest time recovering in this economy.

Yes, the President took office in the midst of an economic crisis. No one disputes that. But for many Americans, a terrible situation seems to have only gotten worse over the course of this administration. For the President to turn around and try to blame his political opponents for the suffering we have seen out there takes a pretty good amount of nerve. It also assumes a collective case of national amnesia. It would take a collective case of national amnesia to reach those conclusions because, remember, these are the same folks who gave us the stimulus, who gave us tax increases, who gave us ObamaCare, and all of it was done in the name of helping the little guy, in the name of greater equality.

What has it given us? It has given us this mess we have in our country: record numbers of long-term unemployed, record numbers on food stamps, people losing their health care plans, others seeing the premiums shoot up when they can least afford it, and now another call, one more call, for a government fix.

Washington Democrats have shown almost no interest for 5 years in working together on ways to create the kind of good, stable, high-paying jobs people want and need. This is a real disservice, first and foremost, to those who are struggling the most out there—from the college graduate who suddenly finds herself wondering why she has huge student loan debts but no prospects of work to the 50-year-old dad who has worked his whole adult life but suddenly can't find a job that meets either his needs or his potential. Yet this administration's proposed solution is just to slap another bandaid from Washington on it and call it a day.

Yes, we should work on solutions to support those who are out of work through no fault of their own, but

there is literally no excuse to pass unemployment insurance legislation without also finding ways to create good, stable, high-paying jobs and also trying to find the money to pay for it. So what I am saying is, let us support meaningful job creation measures and let us find a way to pay for these UI benefits so we are not adding to an already completely unsustainable debt.

Unfortunately, the administration seems almost totally disinterested in solutions that don't put government in the lead, and it seems nearly incapable of working with those who don't share that belief. That, in many ways, is precisely why we are in the situation we are in—because it is only when one believes government is the answer to all of our problems that we talk about unemployment insurance instead of job creation and the minimum wage instead of helping people reach their maximum potential.

It is time to get away from “temporary government programs” and give the American people the tools they need to drive an economy that truly works for them and for their families. We could start with one of the real bright spots in our economy; that is, energy, a field that is poised to help our economy create literally millions of jobs, if only the administration would get out of the way.

Another area in which we should be able to work together is health care. By almost any metric—affordability, accessibility, even the ratio of cancellations to enrollments—this law has imposed more pain and more distress than many had ever thought possible. Centrists, moderates, conservatives, just about any sensible person outside the congressional Democratic leadership in Washington has long understood this. But now even the left is starting to come to grips with the painfully obvious fact that the law it fell in love with can't possibly work.

Last week one of the great pooh-bahs of the left admitted that “ObamaCare is awful,” calling it “the dirty little secret many liberals have avoided saying out loud.” I don't agree with that man on much else, including his broader ideas on health care, but it is good to hear a grandee of the left at least admit this isn't working.

His words point to a larger truth, that the President's amen chorus had ample opportunity to speak truth to power when it mattered and that most—most—chose to remain silent. For that the law's apologists have left the American people to pay the price.

Let me read part of a letter I recently received from Jennifer Bell, a constituent of mine in Hopkinsville. This is what she said:

I have less coverage than I did before. I didn't get to keep my policy that I was happy with. Every dollar I have to pay more is a dollar taken from my family. I never thought that in America we would be forced to purchase something we cannot afford. We worked hard to get where we are. Now we are being forced to pay more in order to pay for somebody else's insurance. How is that fair?

I hear you, Jennifer. Everyone on this side of the aisle hears those concerns.

Here is something else. Many Kentuckians are finding ObamaCare is about more than just higher premiums and cuts to Medicare. It is also about a lack of access to doctors and hospitals. One of the most leftwing papers in my State recently ran a big story about how many ObamaCare coverage networks exclude—exclude—so many of the hospitals my constituents want to use.

A few weeks ago, the majority leader basically said criticisms of ObamaCare amounted to jokes. He might like to think this is all some joke, but the constituents who have been writing me about the consequences of this failed law don't see it that way.

I know this must weigh heavily on our Democratic colleagues. I know they can't see so many Americans hurting because of decisions they made and feel absolutely nothing.

Let me say this to our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. It is a new year and a time for new beginnings. If you are ready to work with us, we are here. Together we can start over on health care. Together we can give the American people the kind of health care reform they deserve—reform that can lower costs and improve the quality of care.

But as with solving the problems of joblessness and unemployment, it is something we can only do together.

I yield the floor.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

#### EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION EXTENSION ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 1845, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 265, S. 1845, a bill to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes.

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

The assistant majority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, on the side supporting the pending motion, there is 15 minutes under the unanimous consent agreement and a similar amount of time on the other side. If all time is used, I would notify Members our rollcall vote will be about 11 o'clock.

I ask unanimous consent that on our side, supporting the motion, I be allowed 5 minutes, Senator REED of Rhode Island 5 minutes, and Senator KLOBUCHAR of Minnesota 5 minutes.

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I listened carefully to the Republican leader today. Here is what he said.

If we are going to give 1.3 million Americans unemployment insurance which has now expired, we have to pay for it. Then he suggested how he would pay for it. He would pay for it by attacking ObamaCare. That is no surprise. But the provision he would attack is the individual mandate—the mandate that people buy health insurance. Well, what is the impact of that? The mandate that people have the responsibility to buy health insurance is necessary if we are going to protect Americans from being discriminated against who have preexisting conditions in their families. Follow me now. In order to make sure a parent with a child who has asthma or a child who has diabetes can still buy health insurance, we needed to expand the insurance pool. We expanded the insurance pool by saying to everyone across America: You have the responsibility to buy health insurance.

So what Senator MCCONNELL, on behalf of Senate Republicans, is suggesting is this: If we are going to give 1.3 million Americans unemployment insurance, we have to say to everyone living in America we can no longer keep our promise that health insurance will not discriminate against your family because of a preexisting condition. Wow. What a tradeoff, 1.3 million people get unemployment benefits over 300 million Americans lose the protection of discrimination in their health insurance because of a preexisting condition in their families. That is the Republican logic: Help the unemployed but at the expense of 300 million American families and their health insurance protection.

It is interesting to note that we have had a dramatic increase in people living in the Commonwealth of Kentucky—represented by Senator MCCONNELL—when it comes to the Affordable Care Act. Governor Beshear, a Democrat, is promoting affordable care in Kentucky and has one of the most successful efforts under way across America. Yet every day the Senators from Kentucky both come to the floor and criticize the very program that is so popular in their State.

The second point I want to make is this: All we are asking for this morning is a vote to start the debate on unemployment insurance benefits. We are asking 5 Republicans to join 55 Democrats to let us debate whether we extend unemployment benefits across America. It is that simple. At about 11:00 that vote will take place.

This used to be a bipartisan issue.

The Presiding Officer of New Jersey is the newest Member of the Senate, and I welcome him again.

There was a time when Republican Presidents thought unemployment compensation was a pretty good idea. Why? Because families with bread-

winners who are out of work need to feed their children, need to feed themselves. Senator MCCONNELL criticizes this program as a temporary government handout. Let me tell you, if you don't have food on the table, you need a temporary helping hand so you can put food on the table so you are strong enough tomorrow to look for jobs again. That is what it is all about, and they don't get it. They say we should be talking about creating jobs. What about creating some food in the bellies of children? What about paying the utility bill or the rent or keeping the lights on or keeping the place that you live warm enough while you are out looking for a job? That is part of the reality facing people across America. There were 81,867 individuals in my home State of Illinois who lost their benefits between Christmas and New Year. They have written me letters.

Ryan, a 35-year-old man with two children from Antioch, IL, writes to me about how difficult it is for him to keep his family together as he continues day after weary day looking for a job. What I hear from the Republican leader is: Well, isn't it a shame that Ryan doesn't have a job? But we can't let government come in and provide the solution.

Well, historically government has stepped up when the private sector cannot or will not. In this case, we know it is absolutely essential.

What we need to have is five Republicans to at least give us a chance this morning at 11 to move forward on the debate on unemployment insurance. This is basic and it is humane. It used to be bipartisan before the tea party takeover of the Republican Party. I hope there are enough moderates left on the Republican side to join us to make this a bipartisan issue again. Helping people keep their families together, the lights on, the heat in their homes, and food on the table while they are looking for a job is not a government giveaway. For goodness sake, it defines who we are as a nation. If we can't stand and help these people looking for work, then it is a sad commentary on who we are, where we are, and our principles.

Finally, this notion of thrashing out at ObamaCare every time there is an issue coming up on the floor has reached its extreme today, when the Republican leader would eliminate the protection against discrimination for preexisting conditions for 300 million Americans in order to provide unemployment benefits for 1.3 million.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, could the Presiding Officer instruct me when I reach the 4-minute mark?

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

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise with my colleagues to support this motion to bring this legislation to the floor to begin a debate.

There were 1.3 million Americans who were pushed off an economic cliff

on December 28 when their extended unemployment benefits ended. They are searching for work. They have to search for work. They are in a market where there are typically two or three applicants for one job.

Yesterday I read a story from the Washington Post that talked about the opening of a new dairy plant in Maryland. They were expecting a lot of interest in the 36 jobs: 1,600 applicants. I would wager that many of those applicants never thought in their lives, after being a vice president of sales in a company or a sophisticated manager of the financial aspects of a company, that they would be applying for work in a dairy. Some of them might even be on extended benefits, and that is the only thing keeping them whole. And they are looking for work, 1,600 applicants for 36 jobs.

This is not unique to Maryland. It is in my home State of Rhode Island. It is in States all across this country, Nevada, Tennessee, Arizona, States with unemployment numbers above the national average of 7 percent. In my case, it is 9 percent. We have to help these families. And as Senator DURBIN pointed out, we have done this on a bipartisan basis until very recently.

This is a smart economic program. This program, according to CBO, will create 200,000 jobs next year if we extend it. Those are 200,000 jobs we are going to give away. And the minority leader was talking about how we have to do more to create jobs around here. Well, if we don't pass this measure, CBO has told us we are going to forfeit 200,000 jobs. So from an economic basis in this country, this is smart. But from a human basis, this helps people who have worked—and the only way you qualify for this program is if you worked and then you are let go through no fault of your own. So we have to do that.

Colleagues on the other side are talking about: Well, we have to pay for these benefits. This is a selective sort of notion, because, frankly, the last time we extended these benefits in January of 2013, it was not offset and the vote was 89–8. It included tax provisions and other provisions, but we extended these benefits, unpaid for, 89–8. Yet now we have to pay for these benefits.

What Senator HELLER and I have done is said: Listen, we need to help these people now. Let's do a 90-day extension, provide retroactive relief, and help these 1.3 million—and it will grow, because several million more people will lose their benefits this year. Let's do it, and then let's sit down and work on this program.

But let me also remind my colleagues, we have made significant changes to the unemployment insurance program. In early 2012, we had a conference report between the House and the Senate which made changes in unemployment insurance. We reduced the total time from 99 weeks to 73 weeks. We created the work-sharing

program, a very innovative program which allows people to collect for part of the week but also stay employed the rest of the week. It is a program which has helped companies all across the country, small companies in particular. We have given States more flexibility on job training. We have given States more flexibility in oversight of their programs. We have made changes. We are willing to listen to thoughtful proposals again. But we can't do it on the backs of 1.3 million Americans who have lost the only benefit they have.

If we really want to talk about job training, if we want to talk about co-operation, why haven't we been able to reauthorize the Workforce Investment Act since 1998? We have not made the changes in workforce training that affect this whole country—not just the unemployed but those young people who are trying to move out of high school and junior college into the workforce. We haven't done it. Why? Well, from 1998 until 2007, we had a Republican Congress. Since 2007, we have been struggling very mightily with an economic crisis. And we have made progress.

But if we want to start cooperating, let's bring the Workforce Investment Act to the floor. It has passed the committee on a bipartisan basis. Let's bring it to the floor. Let's help people.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DURBIN. Would the Senator yield for a question?

How much time is remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask the Senator from Rhode Island under that time to yield for the following question.

I don't know if the Senator was on the floor when the Republican leader said he wanted to pay for the cost of these unemployment benefits by eliminating the individual mandate under the Affordable Care Act—which is the key element in protecting families who have children with preexisting conditions—cancer survivors, children with diabetes, children with asthma. As I understood the Republican leader, he believes that the best way to take care of people who are unemployed and can't feed their children is to deny the protections of the Affordable Care Act for those families who have children with preexisting conditions. Would the Senator from Rhode Island comment on whether that is a good trade for either side?

Mr. REED. I think it is a terrible trade. It is not just about families with children, it is about many of these working adults who, if they have a pre-existing condition, lose their coverage. It is not just a question of children. That I think is very sensitive. Without the Affordable Care Act, if you get sick, you can't get coverage. The only way you can get coverage if you are middle-aged is if you are healthy and you don't need it. When you needed it, the insurance companies took it away—before the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. DURBIN. If I might ask another question to the Senator from Rhode Island from the time allotted on our side, I listened carefully to the speech given by the Republican leader this morning.

I see my colleague from New York here, so I will yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank my friends from Illinois and Rhode Island.

How much time is remaining on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 1 minute 30 seconds.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I see what is going on here. Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle know the power of this issue but don't really want to vote for it, and so they are putting impossible logjams in the path.

Who would believe that on this side of the aisle we would delay an important part of the ACA which would hurt—as my colleagues from Illinois and Rhode Island brought out—parents who have kids with cancer? We are not going to do that, and we are not going to do it on the fly.

So what I would say to my colleagues is if you believe in unemployment benefits and extending them, pass them clean and simple. Don't play games. Don't put obstacles in their path that you know would be insurmountable. Get it done.

I make one other point. The bottom line is very simple: People want to work. People who have lost their jobs after working decades for a company are knocking on doors every day. They are going online. They are desperate to work.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. This idea that unemployment benefits encourage them not to work is balderdash.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. I yield back all time on the Republican side.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 265, S. 1845, a bill to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes.

Jack Reed, Richard J. Durbin, Martin Heinrich, Thomas R. Carper, Charles E. Schumer, Dianne Feinstein, Patty Murray, Bernard Sanders, Angus S. King, Jr., Al Franken, Tom Harkin, Jeff Merkley, Elizabeth Warren, Sheldon Whitehouse, Barbara Boxer, Richard Blumenthal, Sherrod Brown.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S. 1845, a bill to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) would have voted "nay."

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 60, nays 37, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 2 Leg.]

#### YEAS—60

Ayotte	Hagan	Murphy
Baldwin	Harkin	Murray
Baucus	Heinrich	Nelson
Bennet	Heitkamp	Portman
Blumenthal	Heller	Pryor
Booker	Hirono	Reed
Boxer	Johnson (SD)	Reid
Brown	Kaine	Rockefeller
Cantwell	King	Sanders
Cardin	Klobuchar	Schatz
Carper	Landrieu	Schumer
Casey	Leahy	Shaheen
Coats	Levin	Stabenow
Collins	Manchin	Tester
Coons	Markey	Udall (CO)
Donnelly	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Durbin	Menendez	Warner
Feinstein	Merkley	Warren
Franken	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murkowski	Wyden

#### NAYS—37

Alexander	Fischer	Moran
Barrasso	Flake	Paul
Blunt	Graham	Risch
Boozman	Grassley	Roberts
Burr	Hoeven	Rubio
Chambliss	Inhofe	Scott
Coburn	Isakson	Sessions
Cochran	Johanns	Shelby
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Toomey
Cornyn	Kirk	Vitter
Crapo	Lee	Wicker
Cruz	McCain	
Enzi	McConnell	

#### NOT VOTING—3

Begich	Hatch	Thune
--------	-------	-------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 60, the nays are 37. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

Mr. LEVIN. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mrs. BOXER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not an order to reconsider; it is a separate cloture motion.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I am so pleased that six Republicans—six out of all the Republicans—joined with us—every Democrat present—to reach that magic 60 votes we needed to proceed to consider the unemployment compensation bill.

I think it is so important to recognize that Federal unemployment programs have been extended no less than 28 times since 1958—15 times under Republican Presidents and 13 times under Democratic Presidents. So this is nothing new—this is nothing new—and the fact that it has been made such a big deal is incomprehensible given the circumstances of us recovering from the greatest recession since the Great Depression, with a very special number, a very large number. The fact is we have a long-term unemployment rate that is very high, way higher than normal.

The fact is, since we have extended Federal unemployment benefits so many times it should not be a problem, it is shocking it is a problem. In November 2008, unemployment insurance was extended with bipartisan support without an offset, which seems to be the excuse the Republicans have for not voting with us.

What is very interesting about that is these are the same Republicans who voted to go to war twice and put those wars on the credit card—never paid for them. These are the same Republicans who voted for tax cuts to billionaires and multimillionaires and never paid for it. Yet still, when it comes to the middle class, oh, they cannot possibly extend unemployment benefits without paying for it. If anyone knows anything about economics, they should know that when we are trying to stimulate jobs and stimulate the economy—not depress jobs and lose jobs—we do not contract spending.

We have already dealt with deficits, and we continue to deal with deficits. I want to show the progress we have made under President Obama. This is something we never hear from the Republicans. They would make us feel deficits are raging, as they were under George W. Bush.

When President Obama took over, he inherited a \$1.4 trillion deficit from George Bush. George Bush inherited surpluses from Bill Clinton. It took him—and I am exaggerating—15 minutes to change it: two wars on a credit card, no problem, no offsets; tax cuts to billionaires, no problem, no offsets—and the deficits soared to \$1.4 trillion.

When President Obama came in, he not only had to deal with raging deficits, he had to deal with the worst recession since the Great Depression, and all we hear from the Republican side is: This President did not do enough here, did not do enough there. Nothing is enough.

We are now in a situation where this deficit has been cut in half—cut in half—down to \$560 billion, and we want to see it disappear, just as we did when

Bill Clinton was President and the Democrats passed a budget that balanced and set in motion a surplus, which was destroyed when George W. Bush was President. Let's be clear on the history. There are facts. There are stubborn things. They are real. These are the facts.

Now we come to a place where we want to extend long-term unemployment benefits for those who got deeply hurt in this great recession, and we hear that we have to offset it, which goes against the economic experts who say it is important that we stimulate this economy and keep these jobs rolling.

Remember, in the President George W. Bush recession, we had a similar extended benefit. It was not offset. It was extended twice in 2003 with strong bipartisan support and no offset. So why is it when a Republican is President the Republicans say: OK, let's help the unemployed without an offset, without spending cuts. But when a Democrat is President, oh no, we could not do it?

Honestly, it just is so political on its face. Democrats have been consistent. Whether a Republican is President or a Democrat is President, we want to help the middle class. We want to help the unemployed. That is the difference between the parties. I say God bless those six Republicans who joined with us today so we can do our job and help the long-term unemployed.

The long-term unemployment rate is 2.6 percent—the long-term unemployment rate, twice as high as it was at any other time that these extended unemployment benefits were allowed to expire. Let me say that again, how urgent this is. The long-term unemployment rate—that means people who have been out of work for a long time, 6 months or more, is 2.6 percent, twice as high as it was at any other time in our history where we have extended unemployment benefits.

There are almost three unemployed people for every job opening nationwide. Let me repeat. There are almost three unemployed people for every job opening nationwide. We need to understand, while some of our Republican colleagues are blaming the unemployed and saying it is a disservice to give them unemployment compensation, that these folks are actively looking for jobs. That is part of the deal.

First of all, this is insurance. Second of all, they are looking for work. Third of all, they are stuck in the situation where it is not their fault. A Christmas present was given by the Republicans to the 1.3 million unemployed. That Christmas present was: Sorry, you are not getting your unemployment benefits. We left here without being able to deal with it.

But today we have a chance, a chance to do the right thing. In California, my State alone, there are 222,000 people who have lost their extended unemployment benefits. An additional 1.9 million people are projected to lose their benefits over the next 6 months if

unemployment insurance is not extended.

What are these grandiose amounts of money that people get when they are long-term unemployed: \$300 a week, on average—\$300 a week, on average. So for our colleagues to say that people want to be purposefully unemployed to collect \$300 a week, could I tell you, try living on \$300 a week. If you are lucky, you can keep a roof over your head but you have to be pretty lucky. If you are lucky, you can get maybe a little bit of nutrition. That \$300 a week is a lifeline. They can put some groceries on the table, pay their rent, and cover the expenses they have in looking for a job.

This keeps American families afloat at a critical time. I want to give you a few stories from my home State of the real face of long-term unemployment and why we have to vote to extend these benefits. One woman wrote:

I am 58 years old and am receiving unemployment benefits for the first time in my life. I am currently receiving my first federal extension. I was laid off because the non-profit I was working for lost a major portion of its state funding.

Getting unemployment benefits is not preventing me from looking for work. In fact, people getting extended unemployment benefits are required to prove they're looking for work. I spend hours every week filling out applications and posting my resume without result.

Tell me, how am I, and thousands like me supposed to pay my rent and eat? I agree that Washington should "focus on job creation" but that should be in addition to, not instead of, extending benefits. I beg you,—

She writes to me—

Please extend unemployment benefits. Thank you.

Another Californian wrote from Los Angeles:

After working 27 years for one employer, the bad economy finally led to my layoff and my first time ever on unemployment.

Remember, this person worked 27 years for one employer.

I was told that because of the bad economy, I would get up to 63 weeks with the Federal Extension. Now I'm being told without further action from Congress and the President, my benefits end at the end of the year even though that leaves me 3 months short. After paying into the system for 32 years, this is the only time I have ever asked for anything back and this is how I'm treated.

There are other stories. Kaitlyn of Twentynine Palms, 24 years old, lost her \$450-a-week benefit when the Federal extension expired. She is a Marine Corps veteran, the mother of two young kids. She has been searching for work. The family cannot move because her husband, a veteran of the Afghanistan and Iraq wars must remain near the combat center until he is discharged from the Marines.

The loss of her benefits will cut deeply into the couple's income. Smith said, "The family is already skimping on basics, including heat."

Including heat.

"I have to keep the house at 55 degrees even though I have two little girls, ages 2½ and 1½."



Keeping the house at 55 degrees. That is a story which appeared in the Los Angeles Times on New Year's Eve.

Laura Walker, a 63-year-old paralegal has been looking for work since January when she was laid off from a California law firm. She counted on her benefits that have now run out.

Not all of us have savings and a lot of us have to take care of family because of what happened in the economy, said Walker, of Santa Clarita, who said she has applied for at least three jobs a week and shares an apartment with her unemployed son, his wife and two children. It's going to put my family and me out on the streets.

That appeared in Bloomberg News on December 31.

We have a story of a software engineer who lives in San Diego County. She is one of 18,000 San Diego County residents to lose their payments. She says her \$450 weekly unemployment payment goes to food, dental insurance, and other living necessities. She has tried zealously to find work. She has volunteered. She has attended meetings. She has cold called. She has written letters. She has joined the Project Management Institute of San Diego. She said:

I haven't been sitting here watching soap operas. I would go to work tomorrow, or today. I really am tired of this.

That story appeared in the San Diego Tribune. I ask unanimous consent that several additional stories be printed in the RECORD.

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

Cindy Snow, of Beaumont, CA, lost her job as a social worker in April when the San Bernardino school system terminated the child-care program where she worked. Her husband, employed in the construction industry, has been without a job since 2009. They have been relying on assistance from the California Housing Finance Agency to cover a \$1,424-a-month payment on their home.

When she loses her unemployment benefits, she said, the family will no longer qualify for the housing assistance. "Why are they using us as pawns? They're playing games with people's lives," Snow said, referring to politicians in Washington.

—Bloomberg News, 12/30/13

Steven Swanson of Madera Ranchos, CA, worked for 33 years in wholesale, mostly in beverage sales, before losing his job in 2011. Since then, he estimates that he's submitted resumes for more than 500 positions and in the last six months filled out more than 200 job applications—all to no avail.

"I want a job, I want to work," said Swanson whose daughter and son-in-law live with him and pay rent to help him keep up the mortgage on the house he owns. "As a taxpayer, I paid into the system for a lot of years. For them to just shut it off and say, 'These people need to get weaned off and get a job'—well, yeah, I need to get a job. But for them to suggest that I just go get welfare or go get food stamps—that's why I'm frustrated with the Republican Party. They just don't get it."

—Fresno Bee, 1/2/14

Mrs. BOXER. So here you have the facts. I will just recap them. We have a situation where the long-term unem-

ployment rate—those looking for work and out of work for more than 6 months is higher than it has ever been, 2.6 percent.

We have a situation where we are coming out of the worst recession since the Great Depression. Even though President Obama has done an amazing job on job creation, creating 8 million private sector jobs in his time—8 million private sector jobs under President Obama. We lost more than 600 million private sector jobs by the end of 8 years under George W. Bush. But we still have a problem. How many private sector jobs were lost in the recession? More than 8 million. So we need to re-store those jobs.

So this is not the time—when you go for a job and there are three applicants for one job—to tell people they are cut off from unemployment.

Here is the issue. In a State that has a really good economy with a very low unemployment rate, less than about 5 percent, the full extension does not go forward. It only goes forward to States that have a high unemployment rate. So it is targeted. It is not going to States where there is a boom going on or a really strong economy. It goes to States that have a tough unemployment rate, and have all these people coming for one job opening.

In some States it is five to one. Remember, the average is almost three to one, three people for every job. In some States they are doing better. Maybe there is just two people for every job. But there are three nationally. In some States it is way higher. So we are just saying at this particular point in time: Let's extend this for a 3-month period. Do it without offsets, because when you offset you cut something else and you constrict the economy at a time when you should be expanding it. Two-thirds of the time we have never paid for unemployment extensions. Under George W. Bush, who started the current program, we never did—at least in the beginning we did not.

We care about jobs in this country. Everybody does. If we extend unemployment insurance, we would prevent the loss of 240,000 jobs. You say: Why? That is because when folks get their checks, what do they do with it? They go down to the store, and they spend it buying food for their families. They do not hold back. They pay their rent. The landlord gets that check and spends that check. So it is an immediate boon to the economy and an immediate fact that we can definitely prove that jobs are not lost because economic activity in those communities goes down.

We are talking, in my State, of 46,000 jobs that will be lost if we do not correct this problem. The Congressional Budget Office has said another year-long extension, if we do this and do it for a year—this particular bill is only a few months extension—if we did it for a year, we would add two-tenths of 1 percent to our gross domestic product.

Extending unemployment insurance is one of the most cost effective ways

to grow the economy and create jobs. In the end, that reduces the deficit. So all of this talk to cut this and cut that to pay for this, it is counterproductive because you will pull back on gross domestic product growth, and there will be less revenue coming into the government.

So I do not see how this extension of unemployment is anything but a win-win. It is an obvious win-win. If you took the politics out of it, you would do the right thing, Republicans, because you have done it in the past. When Republicans were President, you did it without an offset. You did not hold up a bill. You passed it. You stimulated the economy. You create more jobs. The deficit then goes down even faster than it is going down. Look at how it is coming down.

There is no reason why we have to cut something that then depresses spending over here, while doing unemployment over here. It does not make sense. I was an economics major a long time ago. So I am not saying that I am up to date on the latest theories. But one thing we know makes sense: When you are trying to create jobs, when you are trying to get out of a recession, you do not turn to austerity, especially since we have wrapped our arms around this deficit. It has been hard to do. But who would have thought we could have done it. We did it.

So we do not have to say now that, while we give an unemployment extension on the one hand, we are going to cut something on the other hand and lose those jobs over there. It does not make sense. Then you put those people on unemployment. It really does not make sense.

Would I vote to give a little higher tax rate to the billionaires? I just watched a documentary called "Park Avenue." This is what they said. I have not fact-checked it, so we have to fact check this. But this is what the documentary said: Approximately 400 or 500 families are worth more than 150 million Americans—net worth. That is what they said. We are going to fact-check it this afternoon. If I am wrong, I will correct the RECORD.

That is what the movie said: 450, 500 families have more net worth than half the population of America.

That is the income inequality.

So would I pay for this by putting a little tax on the billionaires? Oh, yes, I would. But I don't wish to start cutting programs: education, housing, health care, whatever they come up with, which then means people would be laid off.

We can do this. We are not afraid to cut spending. We are not afraid to reduce the deficit. We did it under Bill Clinton. We got a surplus, and we are doing it under Barack Obama.

I defy any Republican to show me how this shapes up in a bad way with the Bush record, which was taking surpluses that George Bush inherited and turning it into massive deficits and literally no job creation. It was 1.1 million jobs created, compared to cutting

the deficit in half after President Barack Obama inherited the worst recession since the Great Depression, creating 8 million new jobs in the private sector alone and reducing the deficit by half.

We know what we are doing, despite what they say, and it is OK, because at the end of the day the facts are the facts. I didn't make up this chart. This is a chart that comes from the Congressional Budget Office. These are their numbers.

The stories I have told and that I have put in the RECORD are poignant. There are people out there who are at their wit's end holding their lives together, keeping their homes at 55 degrees when they have little children in them, not knowing if they can pay the rent, not knowing if they can go to the grocery store, not knowing if they will be homeless, not knowing what the future holds.

The least we can do, the least we can do in this Chamber is stand and fight for them.

What are we here for anyway? Are we here for the Koch brothers? I hope not. The billionaires are doing just fine. This country is a great country. It is a great country because everyone can dream to go to the top. But if we lose the middle class and we are not there with the safety net when they fall, we will lose everything and this country will not resemble the America I grew up in and that I knew. I had nothing and my husband had nothing. He lost his father when he was only a young boy. His mother was a school crossing guard and raised three boys.

In this country, my husband went to college, to law school, and started his own law firm, his own small business. That is what America is.

But when we were in trouble when we were young, we knew we had the hope and the dream. It was real. It wasn't unreachable. It was reachable because there was a safety net, and part of that safety net is unemployment insurance. Part of that safety net is extending it for the long-term unemployed.

I am going to close with a couple of facts about health care because I am so tired of the "bad news bears" coming out here every day whining about ObamaCare. I wish to tell everyone some of the good news about health care because we don't hear it enough.

Across this country, over 2.1 million Americans have enrolled through the exchanges in private health insurance—2.1. It is pretty amazing, and I wish to state some more facts.

In California, I wish to tell you what is happening. We have our own exchange, Covered California, coveredCA.com. What has happened so far we don't hear around the beltway. All we hear is: ObamaCare is bad. ObamaCare is bad.

I wish to tell some stories of what is truly happening and these facts will catch up as well, such as 400,000 Californians now have coverage through the California exchange, private coverage.

We have more than 200,000 Californians on Medi-Cal, which is California's Medicaid Program.

A truly great number is more than 1 million California families—not people, families, so we are talking about probably a few million people—have begun the process of applying for coverage.

Across the country, I can state—and we know we have had our bumps in the road—today we are resolving some of those bumps. We had about 2 percent of the people who wound up in a problem where they couldn't get the insurance they wanted. President Obama fixed that problem.

Now we have that 2-percent problem down to way less than .2 percent, very few families. Let's get that clear. Will there be more bumps? Yes. Will we fix them, yes. Are we still worried about the few thousand families who need our help? Yes. We will fix it.

I don't shy away from this. If we have a problem, we fix it. Somebody point out to me any business that doesn't have a few problems in the rollout, and I will say that is pretty amazing.

We had problems with the rollout. It was bad. We are fixing it, and the proof is in the pudding. Today, 9 million Americans have new secure health insurance; 2.1 million, on that other chart, have received it through all the different exchanges, 2.1 million; 3.9 million have enrolled in Medicaid; and 3 million young adults can now stay on their parents' plans. There were bumps in the road, we fixed them, and we will continue to do so, but this is a good story.

I wish to read from some constituents who have written to me about the Affordable Care Act. These are real people speaking, not politicians, not I—them.

Mary Natwick of Monrovia signed up for a platinum plan for her family of three through the Covered California Web site. Even though she makes too much to qualify for a subsidy and even though she purchased the highest level plan, she is saving \$1,000 a month on her premiums and she has a lower deductible.

Mary wrote:

Needless to say, we are thrilled beyond belief. Please accept our gratitude, and pass on our thanks to all who voted for this bill.

This is a constituent who likes ObamaCare and she thanks the Senator from Oregon, Mr. MERKLEY.

David Specter of Ventura and his wife are young retirees, 62 and 58. Their old premiums cost \$882 a month. Now because David and his wife qualify for subsidized premiums on the Covered California exchange, they will pay a total of \$434 a month with lower deductibles. That is \$400 a month in savings. Calculate what that means in 1 year, \$400 a month. They can spend it in the neighborhood, in the movies, at a restaurant, in the grocery store, on a vacation, gifts for their grandkids.

David wrote:

Thank you so much for supporting the Affordable Care Act. It may not be perfect, but it sure makes a big difference for us.

I think that sums it up for me. The Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, may not be perfect, but it sure is making a difference for Americans—so far 9 million strong, and it will be way more than that.

Maya Walls of San Diego was diagnosed with breast cancer at 27 years of age. Since that diagnosis 20 years ago, she has either kept working to maintain insurance or paid very high COBRA premiums in between her jobs to keep her coverage and to avoid pre-existing condition exclusions. That is because, as we know, until ObamaCare became the law of the land, insurers could walk out on people once they got sick.

Two years ago, Maya lost her job. In September she held her breath and went without coverage. On October 1, she found out she finally qualified for California's new expanded Medicaid Program, which she had never qualified for before.

She wrote:

Please do not give an inch on the ACA. This is the first time I have taken a deep breath in 20 years. Thank you.

I see we have a new Presiding Officer, and I wish to retell this story.

This is a story of one of my constituents who was diagnosed with breast cancer at 27 years of age. Since that diagnosis she was so scared she would lose her insurance because of her pre-existing condition that she kept paying very high COBRA premiums. When she finally ran out of options, she lost her insurance and just found out she qualified for the new expanded Medicaid.

She wrote:

Please do not give an inch on the ACA. This is the first time I have taken a deep breath in 20 years.

I say to the American people—I hope a few will hear my voice—nothing in life is perfect. No bill is perfect. No business is perfect. No one is perfect; no individual, no President, no Senator for sure. But we see a problem, and we do our best to step up to the plate.

If things go wrong, as it did with the rollout, we get mad about it, but we fix it, and we don't go back to the problems we had before of kids being kicked off their parents' insurance and having no insurance, of people being told: Sorry. You have asthma or you have cancer or you have high blood pressure. We can't help you.

Those days are over. Being a woman was a preexisting condition. Having been a victim of sexual assault was a preexisting condition. If someone was in an abusive relationship, they said: You are just too high of a risk, and they walked away.

There were lifetime caps on our policies. There were annual caps on our policies, gender discrimination, pre-existing condition discrimination, all of that.

I am going to say anyone who wants to repeal ObamaCare or the Affordable Care Act will go back to those days.

I will never forget reading a New American Foundation study that said,



if we hadn't changed health care in this country, we were getting to a place where premiums would have risen to about 50 percent of our incomes, on average, for at least half of American households. At that point, who is going to be able to afford insurance?

I met people who were praying on their hands and knees to turn 65. As we get older we say: Oh, my God. I want to stay young.

People were saying: Let me get to my 65th birthday so I can get Medicare because I have no insurance.

That is what I heard from my constituents.

What I hear may not be perfect, but it is saving their lives: Fix what is a problem, Senator. You can.

I thank the President for acting to make sure the people who got those cancellation notices—it was about 2 percent of all Americans—were able to stay on similar insurance for an extended period of time.

Yes, we will fix what the problems are, but we will also rejoice when we get letters such as I am getting from all over my State. I ask unanimous consent to have three additional stories printed in the RECORD.

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

John Nunnemacher is a 43-year-old freelance graphic artist from San Jose and the last time he had health insurance was 15 years ago, when his employer paid for his coverage. But as of January 1, John is covered by a plan he can finally afford. He told the San Jose Mercury News, "I hoped this day would come. I worried that it wouldn't. And I'm very glad that it finally has."

Amy Torregrossa, 27, is from San Francisco. She has been without insurance since July, when coverage through her partner's company ended because he changed jobs. She has a congenital heart defect and a history of high blood pressure. She no longer runs, she said, because "if I twist my ankle or get hit by a car... any doctor visit is so expensive." She signed up on Covered California for a silver plan costing \$310 a month. She made sure her cardiologist was in the insurer's network and plans to schedule a checkup for early next year.

Michel Stong, 57, is a self-employed product designer. For many years, she could not afford any insurance at all because of a false-positive test for lupus, which incorrectly flagged her as someone with a pre-existing condition. For the past 15 years, she could afford only catastrophic insurance. Now, thanks to a tax credit, she will pay \$55 a month with no deductible and a \$3 copay for doctor visits. "It just blows my mind that I can get health insurance for this price! I can finally afford checkups, tests, and age-related visits."

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, we will tell those stories and we will counteract the stories we hear.

In closing, I wish to say—because I know the Senator from Oregon has been waiting patiently—the reason I took to the floor to talk about health care is to make the point that it is the middle class and the working poor who are truly being helped—that is so important in this time of income inequal-

ity—and make the point that we make sure we extend the unemployment compensation to the long-term unemployed as they, through no fault of their own, are trying to keep their house and home together, which is so critical.

I thank my six Republican colleagues who showed courage, stepped up, and allowed us to get on this bill. I hope we pass it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I wish to make a few very brief comments, and the first is this: In the budget agreement that was hammered out right before we left for the holidays, a provision was inserted by Congressman RYAN that changed the COLA details for our veterans. This provision is outrageous. It is changing the retirement deal in the middle of a person's service or, for many of our veterans, even after they have retired—between the time they have retired and the time they reach age 62. In the coming days of this week, I hope this body can come together and reverse this provision which unfairly changes the terms of retirement for our veterans. Our veterans stood up for us as a nation when they were overseas, and we must stand up for them here at home.

Secondly, I would like to express hope for the bipartisan spirit that led to an agreement to debate the bill regarding restoring emergency unemployment. I had eight townhalls over the weekend, and I can tell you that it strikes people as fundamentally unfair that States with high unemployment, such as my home State of Oregon—that these weeks of emergency unemployment, which was a deal hammered out in a bipartisan fashion under a Republican President, President Bush, should be set asunder.

Indeed, on December 28, 18,000 Oregon families got a lump of coal in their stockings, and in the course of this coming year another 58,000 Oregon families will be thrown out in the cold, if you will, due to the failure to reauthorize this program. Indeed, the failure to reauthorize it not only affects directly those families who need a longer bridge to the next job because of the high unemployment levels, but it also affects the economy, destroying an estimated 4,000 jobs. Our citizens want to see us create jobs, not destroy jobs.

So I hope the bipartisan spirit that led to our agreeing to debate restoring the emergency unemployment program will lead to our actually reauthorizing the emergency unemployment program.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, this new year represents an opportunity for us to refocus and plan for our year ahead. Unfortunately, for millions of Americans their focus will be on trying to stay afloat over the next

year while they search for work. All of us here know there is no more important issue for middle-class families across America right now than jobs and the economy. This is what they want their elected officials to be focused on, and it is exactly what I think we ought to be working on every day.

By reaching a bipartisan agreement last month, we did a number of things to work toward that goal. First of all and importantly, we showed the American people that Members of Congress can work together, that we can listen to each other, and that we can get into a room and talk frankly without trying to hurt each other politically. Second, by breaking through that partisanship, we finally ended that seemingly never-ending cycle of lurching from crisis to crisis. Third, we showed that "compromise" isn't a dirty word and that there is a big coalition that is ready to make some sacrifices politically to get things done. Finally and importantly, for our efforts to continue to grow our economy, we gave American families and businesses the certainty they need to grow.

Of course, there is much more to do. As much as we are heartened by the headlines that predict a strong economy this year, we understand just how fragile our recovery still is, with millions of Americans still out of work.

Now is the time to redouble our efforts, not shrink from the challenges we face, because the truth is that all the economic predictions in the world mean nothing if we don't continue to support policies that help our middle class. That work absolutely starts with extending unemployment benefits for the millions of Americans who have been losing their benefits since December 28.

Because unemployment assistance goes right back into the economies of communities large and small, non-partisan economists have found it is one of the most effective ways to build a recovery that lasts. Those same economists have said that failure to continue these benefits will cost us over 200,000 jobs. And renewing these benefits is simply the right thing to do at a time when millions of American families continue to teeter on the brink in States where unemployment remains stubbornly high.

I have come to the Senate floor today with the hope that we can continue with the bipartisan momentum we saw with today's cloture vote and that we have seen over the last few weeks and take a final vote to provide a lifeline for millions of Americans. This should be an easy issue. It would be simply wrong to cut off the support while our economy continues to struggle and so many workers are really having difficulty finding work. Right now, in fact, there are three unemployed workers for every single job opening. If every opening were filled tomorrow, we would still have more than 7 million American workers across the country without a job to even apply for. More

than one-third of all unemployed workers have been out of a job for 6 months or longer—above historic averages and higher than in past recoveries.

Millions of Americans are unemployed today not because they do not want to work, not because they do not have valuable skills, but simply because they found themselves in an economy that isn't creating jobs as quickly as needed. These unemployed workers are desperate to get back on the job, and unemployment benefits make all the difference for them and their families while they scour the want ads, pound the pavement, and send out resume after resume.

I have received story after story from workers and families across my home State of Washington about what unemployment benefits have meant to them and what losing them would mean for their future. These men and women can't afford to have the rug pulled out from under them and are now struggling with each day that passes.

One of these stories came from a woman named Carol from Puyallup in my home State. She is a nurse. She was laid off from her job. She decided that in order to make ends meet she would start her own legal nurse consulting business, so she enrolled in classes to help her hone her entrepreneurial skills. While taking those classes, Carol relied on her unemployment benefits to get by. Then, not only were her benefits slashed significantly due to sequestration, but Carol just found out she was one of the 25,000 people in Washington State whose benefits were completely cut off on December 28.

As a leader in the classroom, Carol has spoken to many other soon-to-be business owners who are suffering. In the face of unexpected job loss, they now feel as if they are being punished for deciding to chart a new course in their lives. They are creating work for themselves and potentially others but now have to decide whether they can continue following that dream without the critical support unemployment benefits provide them.

Carol is not alone. I heard from a woman who was laid off from her job at a plant in Keyport, WA, early last year. She told me:

Living in Kitsap County, we are geographically isolated, and finding work with so many qualified applicants right now is much more difficult. This year, I have applied for over 200 jobs and in spite of a stellar resume, have only gotten four phone interviews. I have lowered my standards throughout the year and applied for jobs far below my pay grade to no avail . . . my husband and I have had to claim bankruptcy . . . and I truly worry about losing my home and displacing my children.

Madam President, that is what people are facing today.

Finally, there is Traci, a woman from Everett. She is a former executive assistant with 20 years of experience. After taking time off from work to care for her dying mother and a daughter who was suffering from bipolar dis-

order and drug addiction, Traci found herself without a job. Shortly after her mother passed, Traci fell ill, making it difficult for her to look for work.

While Traci was receiving unemployment benefits, they were barely enough to cover the care her daughter required. Traci told me that she now can't afford food and has lost over 50 pounds. She even asked that I send her a video of the speech I am making right here as she won't be able to tune in today because she had to get rid of her television in the process of finding savings. Like so many others, Traci is searching high and low for that one break, and she told me, "I just need time for someone to give me a chance."

For Traci, unemployment benefits are not the solution. A job is what she wants. But they provide her with some critical support while she takes care of her family and tries to find that work.

Those are just a few of the stories I have heard, but there are a lot like them. Millions of people across America, including an almost additional 28,000 in my State, stand to lose the benefits they count on if Congress doesn't act soon. These workers are not looking for a handout. They do not want to be a burden. But they need support while they work to get back on their feet and back on the job.

In this struggling economy, renewing these benefits is truly crucial. The non-partisan Congressional Budget Office has said that renewing unemployment benefits is one of the most effective policy tools we have to boost the economy and get money in the pockets of consumers. So I am really hopeful the Senate will act quickly, without political games, because failure to do so wouldn't just be devastating for the families who count on this, it would also hurt many small businesses and communities to have the billions of dollars pulled away from consumers who spend it every month on food and rent and clothing.

Last month's budget deal provided us with a glimmer of bipartisan hope coming into this new year. However, we have to continue working together to focus on improving the economy for middle-class Americans. We cannot afford to allow this lifeline to be cut off.

The stories I shared today, like so many others, are heartbreaking, but they also show the fierce determination exhibited by so many who are out of work in the struggle to get back on their feet. They are the stories of people who are applying for work far below their own qualifications, going back to school to earn the skills needed to change careers or waking up every day to scour for jobs in their communities that all too often lack opportunity. I believe it is Congress that needs to match their determination and grit. We took an important first step today, and I know unemployed workers I have heard from are watching. Today's vote is a glimmer of hope for them. We can't let it fade. We need to move on and pass this extension quickly, and the House needs to follow suit.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in postcloture on the motion to proceed to S. 1845.

#### FARM BILL CONFERENCE

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I congratulate Senator REID, who I know worked extraordinarily hard to get the votes for this.

I read something someone wrote in the press, saying they are afraid that Senator REID didn't talk about these issues enough yesterday on the floor. I would point out that you can either talk or do. I thought he spoke quite well, but he basically spent the time lining up the votes and won. A lot of people talk about what they want to do. Senator REID usually gets it accomplished. As one who has served here longer than anybody else in this body, I would rather see people get things done, and he did.

Speaking of things to get done in this new year, the farm bill remains as one of the Nation's top legislative priorities. Yet it has languished in Congress's in-box. As the Senate begins this new session, it is a relief—at last—to be able to say that there are new glimmers of hope that Congress is nearing the point of being able to complete work on a farm bill.

We passed this farm bill twice in the Senate. I compliment the chair of the Agriculture Committee, Senator STABENOW. She brought together Democrats and Republicans, many of us who served at one time or another as either chair or ranking member or both on that committee, and said: Why don't we just do it the old-fashioned way? Instead of just talking about it, why don't we actually sit down, write it, and bring something to the floor that can pass? We did, and it passed twice. While over in the House, the bill languished for quite some time before they decided to move forward.

Chairwoman STABENOW and Chairman LUCAS from the House worked throughout the holiday break. My own staff, Adrienne Wojciechowski and Rebekah Weber, have worked very hard with them to produce a bipartisan, comprehensive bill that addresses the needs of farmers, families, communities, and taxpayers.

A farm bill is a dynamic element of our agriculture economy, and of our overall national economy. A farm bill touches every family, in ways large and small. It has now been more than 460 days since the last farm bill expired. That is well over a year ago. Since then, American farmers have

struggled to make long-term planting decisions, and more than 20 programs—such as those affecting organic certification cost-sharing, beginning farmers, relief from livestock disasters, renewable energy, and rural small businesses—all have been stranded without funding. Rural small businesses are a major part of my State and the Presiding Officer's State. But every State has some rural area that is extremely important.

This farm bill limbo is part of a string of artificial made-by-Congress dilemmas. Farm bill limbo hurts not only farmers, but their communities, and our economy. It hampers efforts to help those who are struggling the most in our communities, with food security for their families. It holds us back from making greater gains toward energy security.

Last month, the Republican leadership in the House of Representatives proposed a short farm bill extension. Short extensions are nothing new here on Capitol Hill. Most of us know them by the term “kicking the can down the road.” They patch things over from one crisis to the next. But just as a temporary extension to fund government offers neither certainty nor meaningful change, a short extension of the farm bill would not provide farmers the certainty they need to plan, or funding for stranded programs. Farming is a business, and saddling farmers with this needless uncertainty makes their difficult work even more difficult. Even worse, the proposed House extension would prolong direct payment subsidies for another year, senselessly costing taxpayers untold millions of dollars. At this point, the only acceptable path forward is to deliver a full, five-year, comprehensive farm bill by the end of January. Moving forward on the farm bill not only will avoid the so-called “dairy cliff,” but it also will help families put food on the table, improve conservation efforts, support regional farming, and put an end to wasteful subsidies.

This farm bill marks the seventh time that I have served as a member of a Farm Bill Conference Committee. I know how difficult it is to bring complex, five-year bills to the floor and ultimately to final passage after a conference. I don't in any way diminish the difficulty in that. I know; I have been there, and I have done that.

While there have been many significant changes in agricultural policy since the 1981 farm bill, which I had the privilege to write, one thing has remained the same: No farm bill is easy, and no farm bill is perfect. But to finalize a farm bill, the Senate and House must work together to reach bipartisan agreement. It means, whether you are a Republican or Democrat, forget the symbolism and start dealing with the substance. Stop rhetoric and go to reality.

The conference committee is making steady progress, and Chairwoman STABENOW and Chairman LUCAS deserve

credit, and our appreciation, for working closely together to bridge the wide differences between our two bills. The cuts it includes will not go unnoticed, as we have already seen spending reductions from the sequester, followed by the end of the Recovery Act nutrition benefits. We can talk here on the floor. We are all going to collect our paycheck every month. But we sometimes forget these cuts and policy changes affect real people in real ways. So we have to continue to do the best we can.

Speaking as a Vermonter, I would note that every farm bill is important to Vermont, just as every farm bill is important to every State represented in this body. Farm bills make real differences in our quality of life, and the fact that Congress every 5 years or so would renew and pass a farm bill was once something Americans could take for granted. This is the first time we have not been able to do so.

The delays have been unfortunate, and they have been needless. But I am increasingly hopeful that this recent dark chapter is coming to a close. Farmers and families around the Nation are looking to us to pass forward-looking, fiscally responsible, and regionally sensitive food and farm policy—and the two have to be together, both the food and the farm policy. Farmers have to be able to plan, but families have to know, when their children go to school, they are going to be fed. Every teacher will tell you that a hungry child doesn't learn. If children aren't learning, what are we doing for the next generation? That is our responsibility.

Now is the time, without further delay, to enact a farm bill that will strengthen the Nation and support the economy. I know we are up to this challenge. We have done it twice already in this body, forging a bipartisan coalition. I am hoping the other body, notwithstanding some of the Republicans who tried to block it, will come forward and speak, not just for a small part of one political party, but speak for all Americans.

Before I yield, I ask unanimous consent that all the time during the recess count postclosure on the motion to proceed to S. 1845.

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

Mr. LEAHY. I yield the floor.

#### RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:32 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. BALDWIN).

EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT  
COMPENSATION EXTENSION  
ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, last month the President of the United States gave a speech on what has come to be known by the code words “income inequality,” which means different things to different people. He also talked about a very important aspect of that, and that is upward income mobility. In other words, we want to make sure that somebody who goes to work in a restaurant bussing tables can work their way up the income and education ladder to where they can actually own their own restaurant and create jobs and opportunities for other people. The President called it “the defining challenge of our time.”

Well, the timing, coming as it has, one might be forgiven from wondering whether the President and his allies want to change the subject from ObamaCare. We know that the rollout of ObamaCare has been an unmitigated disaster, and, frankly, there is more to come. We can certainly understand why the President might want to change the subject. But while he is changing the subject, Republicans should embrace the challenge of discussing this: What are the policies that have resulted in income inequality and insufficient upward mobility when it comes to jobs in America?

Of course, the President, you might predict, has talked about his proposed solutions, which are creating more government programs and more spending, including up to \$6 billion of money that we have to borrow from China and our other creditors just to extend the unemployment insurance program by 3 months. My question is: What happens after that 3 months? I don't want to be rash, but I will make a prediction that the Democrats will say: We need another 3 months. After that, they will say: We need another 3 months. Before you know it, unemployment insurance has been extended beyond the half-year mark, which is the basic program, to another full year beyond that at a cost of \$25 billion.

Just to put all of this in context, the Federal Government spent \$250 billion for extended unemployment insurance benefits since 2008. Of course, the President did not mention some of the primary causes for income inequality and the loss of upward mobility because he is responsible for a lot of that, along with his allies. He failed to mention that under his administration America has suffered the longest period of high unemployment since the Great Depression, and he failed to mention his signature health care law. I mentioned that a moment ago. He is trying to pivot to another subject, but inevitably we find ourselves coming back to ObamaCare and its negative impact on job creation and the 40-hour workweek.

We know that ObamaCare has done a number of things in the short period of time since it began the rollout, which was October 1st. Millions of people have lost their existing insurance coverage. In fact, more people have lost their insurance coverage than have

signed up for ObamaCare or even Medicaid. Then there is the issue of skyrocketing insurance premiums. So I thought the idea was: How do we make health care more affordable? In fact, instead of making health care better and more affordable, it has become less affordable.

We are not just talking about the insurance premiums, we are talking about deductibles. We have all heard the stories of people signing up on the ObamaCare exchanges only to find out: Yeah, they have health insurance, but you know what, the first \$5,000 per person is the deductible, which effectively means—for all practical purposes—that person is self-insured. That is a deal breaker for many hard-working middle-class Americans.

We know, of course, that even organized labor has complained about the fact that ObamaCare has turned full-time work into part-time work. Why is that? For employers who put their employees on a 30-hour workweek, they are not required, under the law, to pay for health care benefits. But if you have a full-time worker, you are required to pay for health care benefits. So what is happening is that many employers are cutting people back from 40 hours to 30 hours with a commensurate loss of income.

Recently, I was in Tyler, TX, sitting around a table at a restaurant when one gentleman who owns a restaurant said that because of ObamaCare one of the single moms who works in his restaurant lost her 40-hour workweek job. He had to cut her down to 30 hours. So she had to get two 30-hour jobs in order to get by. In other words, she now has to work 60 hours instead of working 40 hours, and obviously she is worried about the lack of time she has with her children in addition to having lost her full-time job.

The President has also failed to mention a number of other items which have contributed to income inequality and the loss of upward mobility, such as the medical device tax that is a feature of ObamaCare. In Texas we have a number of medical device companies that came to see me after the ObamaCare legislation passed.

They said: We have a duty to our shareholders not to spend their money inefficiently, and so our only alternative is to expand our existing facility in Costa Rica rather than in Texas. So the jobs that would have been created in Texas effectively moved to Costa Rica because of the medical device tax. So much for job creation and reducing income inequality and enhancing upward mobility.

The President also declined to talk about his refusal to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline. Of course, this is a pipeline that would start in Canada and end up in Port Arthur, TX, in an area we call the Golden Triangle. We happen to have a lot of refineries there that can refine that oil into gasoline, jet fuel, and other products for Americans consumers.

The President promised the country he would make a decision by the end of 2013. I may have missed something during the holidays, but I don't recall the President making any announcement whatsoever on the Keystone XL Pipeline. Not only would it produce thousands of good well-paying jobs, it would also produce a dependable supply of energy from a friendly country—the nation of Canada.

What else did the President fail to mention in his income inequality and upward mobility speech? He failed to mention how the impact of his regulatory policies are piling hundreds of billions of dollars of additional costs on small businesses.

For example, the small banks in Texas have told me that they have hired new people, but the people they hired are the people who help us comply with the Dodd-Frank regulations. This bill—just to remind everybody—was filed to address the abuses on Wall Street that led to the subprime loan crisis and collapse in 2008. As we now know, while Wall Street was the target of Dodd-Frank and these regulations, Main Street is the collateral damage. Yes, people are being hired but not for the purpose of loaning more money and helping small businesses start and grow their businesses but, rather, just to comply with new government regulations.

What else did the President fail to mention in his discussion about the lack of jobs and upward mobility? He failed to mention his proposed greenhouse gas rules, which will kill jobs and drive up energy costs.

He failed to mention that during the so-called Obama economic recovery—the President has now been President for 5 years. He can't blame this on George Bush anymore. But during the so-called Obama economic recovery, real median household income has fallen more than \$2,500. At the same time that real household median income has fallen by \$2,500, households are finding that their health care insurance costs have gone up by \$2,500, for a net loss of \$5,000 for most hard-working American families.

The President has failed to acknowledge—in his discussion of slow economic growth—high unemployment. He has failed to mention that the economic recovery following the 2008 recession has been the weakest U.S. recovery since World War II.

Economists ordinarily say that after a recession there will be sort of a V-shaped recovery—once you hit the bottom, you come out of it very quickly and the economy grows fast. Under the Obama recovery, that has been flatlined to anemic growth, which is not fast enough or strong enough to hire more American workers.

Indeed, we have the lowest percentage of Americans actually in the workforce in the last 30 years. What that means is that even though the unemployment rate is roughly 7 percent—that is on a national basis—millions of

people have simply dropped out of looking for a job because they see the prospects for finding work so dim.

The President also failed to mention that his 2009 stimulus package—at that time you may remember that Speaker PELOSI said: Our goal is to make timely, targeted, and temporary investments in government spending to help stimulate the economy and help bring down the unemployment rate.

The President later joked and said—we found out it wasn't a funny joke—that “shovel ready” didn't actually mean it was shovel ready, which was absolutely true. He failed to add that his 2009 stimulus package added more than \$1 trillion to the national debt, which now stands at \$17.3 trillion. That is equivalent to more than \$54,000 worth of debt for every man, woman, and child living in America today.

I don't think anyone in their right mind believes we can continue down this same path of racking up more and more debt by borrowing more and more money without having some negative consequences at some point in the future. One thing we do know will occur is that the present generation that is racking up all of this debt will probably not be around to have to pay it back, but the next generation and beyond will.

If the President wants to have an honest debate about income inequality, he needs to be honest about his own record, and he needs to talk about it in a holistic context.

A few months ago, the New York Times reported that the trend of rising inequality “appears to have accelerated during the Obama administration.” Indeed, according to one measure of the income gap, inequality has increased about four times faster under President Obama than it did under President George W. Bush.

Here is the reality: If we want to reduce income inequality, we need to boost economic growth. That is the debate we should be having and which this side of the aisle embraces—not how we can pay more government benefits to people who can't find work or artificially fix the price of wages. We need to figure a way to benefit the entire country by growing the economy.

Largely—at least where I come from—people say there are three things that the Federal Government can do to help grow the economy: Get out of the way, get off our back, and get your hand out of our pocket. Those are three things the Federal Government could do which would help the economy grow, create more opportunity, and deal with this issue of income equality in an effective sort of way.

So we need to boost economic growth. That is the debate we should be having—how do we create more jobs, or actually how do we allow the private sector to create more jobs? We tried having the government spend borrowed money to create more jobs, and that did not turn out so well. So now we need to figure a way to get out of the

way so the private-sector economy can create the jobs that will put Americans back to work and deal with this issue of income inequality once and for all.

As we saw last night, instead of trying to actually solve the problem, sometimes I am tempted to think that the majority leader and his allies really want a political issue rather than a solution to the problem, because we saw last night the majority leader was ready to have a vote with 17 Senators missing because of the storms around the country. We know people could not get back because of cold weather and storms and flight cancellations and the like, and I predict if we had had the vote last night, the cloture vote that we had today would have failed, and that would have fit very nicely into the majority leader's and the President's desire to change the subject from ObamaCare to Republicans blocking this unemployment compensation bill.

It did not turn out that way because we had the vote here this morning. We embrace the opportunity to talk about our progrowth alternatives, which will actually make life better for the American people, not worse, as the policies of this administration have over the last 5 years.

Basically, we know that the demand is this: to extend long-term unemployment benefits beyond the half year, which is the basic program, another 3 months, and to put the entire \$6.5 billion tab on our national credit card. But I ask you, What is going to happen after 3 months? Will the President and his allies be back asking for another 3 months and another \$6.5 billion in deficit spending that will be added to the debt? I think so. How about in 9 months? If we extend it for two 3-month periods, we will be here for another one that will extend it to 9 months and beyond, ad infinitum—\$25 billion in added deficit and debt spending—unless we solve the root of the problem.

Republicans would prefer that we offset any real extension with spending cuts that would make it revenue neutral. We would also like to reform the unemployment insurance program so it delivers better results to the unemployed.

For example, if there is one thing that most people who are unemployed need it is the opportunity for job skills training. We ought to make sure things such as Pell grants are available for people during that 26-week period of time they are on unemployment, that they can go to a community college in their own town and learn new job skills, and so they do not have to be stuck in the same old position. They could learn new job skills, which will open a whole new world of opportunity for them when it comes to jobs.

Before I conclude, I want to mention a few numbers that help put the Obama economy in perspective. According to the Joint Economic Committee, the economy grew during the first 4 years of the Reagan administration by 22.3

percent—22.3 percent. During the first 4 years of the Obama administration, it was about 9 percent—less than half. Why is that? Why is it that the economy grew during the first 4 years of the Reagan administration by 22 percent; in the first 4 years of the Obama administration by about 9.2 percent?

As I pointed out, there are some good reasons why this recovery has been anemic and so slow and why so many people are still struggling to find work. If the Obama recovery had been as strong as the Reagan recovery, we would have millions more private-sector jobs. Isn't that what we want? The recipients of unemployment insurance compensation do not want to receive a government check. What they want is the dignity and the self-confidence and the opportunity to provide for their family that comes with a good job. That is what is missing in this whole equation and this transparent political exercise to play gotcha at their expense.

We know it was President Reagan's economic strategies, combined with permanent, broad-based tax cuts and sensible regulatory policies that helped grow the economy. By contrast, President Obama's strategy is to combine massive tax increases—including the payroll tax, a year ago January—with a regulatory bonanza. We do not have to speculate about what the impacts of President Obama's policies are. We are living with them today.

So I would say to President Obama, if you really want to reduce income inequality and promote upward mobility, we want to have that conversation. Let's get back to the policies, though, that have worked so well in the past, not those which have failed us and the American people during the last 5 years. Let's put a stop to regulations that do not pass a cost-benefit test. Let's do what we need to expand domestic energy production and create jobs.

Do you know where the two lowest unemployment rates in the country are? Bismarck, ND, and Midland, TX, and that is because of the shale energy renaissance that has created jobs. If you can pass a commercial driver's license test, you can get a job driving a truck with a high school degree in both of those places and earn between \$75,000 and \$100,000 a year; the lowest unemployment in the country but this administration's policies have made it harder and harder for those jobs to be created, along with the Keystone Pipeline and the jobs that would create.

We need also to reform our Tax Code to encourage more investment. We need to reward earned success so that small businesses can be started, so existing small businesses can expand. All of the President's policies, including, of course, most notably, ObamaCare, have made that harder. We need to do what we can, as I said, to expand domestic energy production and create jobs. We need to reform unemployment insurance to get more people back into

the workforce by making sure they have the job training they need to learn employable skills.

Then, of course, the subject that will not go away—notwithstanding the President's most earnest desire—that is, we need to dismantle ObamaCare before it does any more harm to our health care system and our broader economy. We need to replace it with more affordable coverage that lets consumers keep the doctor they trust—a promise that ObamaCare made, but a promise that has been broken, as too many people already know.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. CORNYN. I will.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. I was just walking through the Chamber and I had the opportunity to visit with some of my colleagues in the back, and I heard what my colleague from Texas was saying, and I just want to add a couple things, if I could. One is to say he is absolutely right in terms of the underlying problem here, which is a weak economy, and really a historically weak economy. Never coming out of a recession have we had a recovery this weak.

The Senator made that point well—that typically we go into a recession in sort of a V formation. We go in and then come back out with a relatively strong recovery from a relatively deep recession. That certainly happened in 1981, where at this point in Ronald Reagan's recovery we had created over 8 million new jobs. Unfortunately, we are not creating the new jobs that we created in these other recoveries. As a result, we do have these problems with folks who are both unemployed and long-term unemployed.

I think it is important to note that we now have historic levels of long-term unemployment, people who have been out of work for more than a half year, more than 26 weeks—the highest levels ever. So something is not working. It is different this time. I think what is not working is that some of our basic structural institutions—such as our tax system, our regulatory system, the regulations that have come from ObamaCare, and so on—are adding more and more burdens to the economy.

The historic debt and deficits the Senator talked about are also adding to our economic woes. It is hurting the economy today, and it is certainly unfair, I would say even immoral to put that burden on future generations. Some of the young people who are here today are going to get left holding the bag for the \$17 trillion national debt we now have—\$145,000 for every family in Texas or Ohio.

So the Senator makes the right points. We have to get this economy moving. There are some very specific policy proposals the Senator has outlined that we ought to turn to. The President has talked about tax reform, he has talked about regulatory relief,

but he has not delivered. If we do not get at those issues, we are not going to ultimately solve the problem.

But here we find ourselves within a few hours of having voted to proceed on a debate on whether we do extend unemployment insurance for people for the next 3 months beyond the normal unemployment insurance that would be out there. Most States provide about 6 months of unemployment insurance, about 26 weeks; some States a little more, some States a little less. What we are talking about is how much do you add at the Federal level as emergency unemployment benefits? I did vote, along with some of my other colleagues on both sides of the aisle, to proceed to this debate. As the Senator said earlier—I heard him—perhaps that was not what the majority leader was hoping for because maybe he wanted more of a political issue. But I did so because I took to heart what was said on the other side of the aisle about the fact that we are going to now have a debate.

I think this debate breaks down into a couple things. One is, how do you deal with paying for this? Because, as we indicated, this economy is not going to grow until we deal with these historic levels of debt and deficit.

How ironic would it be if we were saying: We are going to help those who are unemployed by making it harder to get the economy moving—by not doing anything with regard to the debt and deficit, in fact, adding to it.

So what I am going to be filing is an amendment. It is a very simple amendment that says let's pay for this extension for 3 months. I just heard my colleague from Texas saying he would support that. Others, I hope, on both sides will support this. The specific idea that we have is let's take the proposal out of the President's budget that says if you are on Social Security disability and, therefore, not working, you, of course, should not be getting unemployment insurance. It is in the President's budget. I would also say trade adjustment assistance, of course, should not be available to you because you are not working by definition.

So it is basically tightening up some of the provisions in current law to make them work better. That provides the funding to be able to say: OK, let's go ahead and extend unemployment insurance, but only for a few months while we do sit down and work on these bigger problems that the Senator from Texas has taken a lead on and talked about today. I hope that is where we will end up, that we will actually pay for this rather than adding to the burden and making the economy even weaker by adding to our deficit.

Second, I think we need to have an honest discussion, even in the next couple of days here, as to how to make the unemployment system itself work better. Unemployment insurance, as has been noted, is not connecting people to jobs. That is the reason we have these historic levels of long-term unemployment.

The Senator mentioned the Pell grants, for instance, being available to people who are on unemployment insurance. That is incredibly important, but also having our worker retraining programs at the Federal level work better for those folks who are uninsured. I think we should engage in that topic now—not only on how do we pay for this, but how do we actually make the unemployment insurance system work for the people who are unemployed?

The Federal Government spends over \$15 billion a year in worker retraining programs—47 programs spread over 9 different departments and agencies. Often the right hand does not know what the left hand is doing. The GAO, which looks at these issues—the General Accountability Office—has said there is duplication in most of these programs, and only a handful—four or five—are seeing the kind of performance measures you would want to have in a Federal program.

So there is a great opportunity here on a bipartisan basis for us to get those worker retraining programs working better and into the hands of the people who really need the retraining to match skills with jobs. In Ohio—and I am sure the same is true in Texas—we have a lot of jobs going wanting right now. We have about 100,000 jobs available. We have about 400,000 people out of work. How do you connect those? A big part of that is providing the skills to those workers to be able to access those jobs that are available that do require a higher skill—maybe it is advanced manufacturing, maybe it is biotechnology.

The Federal Government is not providing that help right now. Those worker retraining skills that are needed are not being provided. So I do think there is an opportunity here for us to pay for this, to be sure we are not adding to the debt and deficit, at a time when the economy is too weak already, and, second, to provide the skills workers need—Pell grants and so on—to actually give people some hope and give people some additional tools to be able to access this economy and these jobs that are available and get this economy moving again.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. CORNYN. Before the distinguished Senator from Ohio leaves the floor, I did not know he was coming down, but I am delighted he did. Not only is he an expert and former Director of the Office of Management and Budget, distinguished Member of the House, now the Senate, and a great new addition since 2010, he understands these issues, particularly the fiscal issues, better than most of us.

But the Senator makes a very important point. I am worried, based on what the majority leader did last night, that they preferred to have a “gotcha” moment, have the bill fail at the very outset, rather than have a fulsome debate and a realistic discussion about what the alternatives are to basically per-

manently paying people not to work, through virtually a permanent extension of unemployment.

More than most people, the Senator from Ohio, when he came to this Chamber, said what we need is a jobs program. So he advocated among those in our Republican conference. He said: We need a positive program for how do we facilitate the economy, the private sector, creating those jobs. Of course, he described the amendment that he intends to offer on this bill, not only to pay for this 3-month extension, which would be a welcome measure, but also to reform the unemployment system so that people can learn skills that actually match them with the jobs that do exist.

I would add, while the Senator is on the floor, that as he knows, there are a lot of other good ideas that will be offered this week by this side of the aisle, but it is entirely dependent upon the majority leader allowing that sort of fulsome debate and those ideas to come to the floor and be available for a vote, things such as the Forty Hours Is Full Time Act that Senator COLLINS has promoted, the medical device tax which I talked about, the repeal sponsored—the chief sponsor, Senator HATCH of Utah.

Senator BARRASSO from Wyoming has got one that would repeal the health insurance tax from ObamaCare, which is a direct passthrough to consumers. Senator PAUL, Senator MCCONNELL have their economic freedom zones idea to help blighted areas where unemployment is high, and to create a way for the private sector to be incentivized to come in and start jobs and to create opportunity.

We have got regulatory reform bills and proposals. We have got the Keystone XL Pipeline idea. I know Senator LEE and Senator RUBIO have both recently come up with some very visionary ideas about how do we fight the war on poverty in a realistic sort of way. But my point is that whether we are going to get into that debate and give a full and fair consideration of all of these ideas about how to solve this problem depends on the majority leader allowing amendments to be offered and voted on.

I would ask the Senator from Ohio what his expectation is in that regard, and what the consequences would be if the majority leader decides to deny any amendments and basically shut down this process?

Mr. PORTMAN. I appreciate the Senator yielding. I would say that having listened to some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle speak earlier today prior to the vote about what their intentions were, including one of the authors of the legislation, and one of the leaders in the Senate, it seems to me they are interested in a debate. They encouraged those from the Republican side to vote yes on the motion to proceed, with the understanding that there would be the opportunity then to at least discuss these issues



and to therefore offer amendments and to have what the Senate typically has had over the years, which is the opportunity for some give-and-take, and the opportunity to have voices heard, people representing both the States on the Democratic side and the Republican side of the aisle. So I am hopeful we will have that debate. That is my expectation.

I plan to file an amendment to pay for the unemployment insurance extension, and I know a lot of support will come from both sides of the aisle for that. I also hope to be able to offer other amendments that have to do with growing the economy in a more direct way. The Senator mentioned regulatory reform, for instance.

We have bipartisan proposals on this side of the aisle that are intended to take the unemployment situation and deal with it in a broader context of reducing the burdens on small businesses, for instance. When you try to get a permit, for instance, from the Federal Government right now, sometimes with an energy project, sometimes there are as many as 34 different permits you have to obtain. That is one reason we are not seeing investment in some of the energy projects we would like to see. It is a great potential for our economy right now. We can make the potential even greater and achieve it if we can do something on the regulatory reform side. So these are all issues that ought to be part of the broader discussion as to how to increase economic growth and therefore to increase jobs and opportunity for people who find themselves unemployed and are looking for those job skills and are looking for the jobs that are open.

I look forward to that debate over the next few days. That is certainly my expectation. I hope that Members on both sides would come down to the well and offer their amendments, have them voted up or down in the great tradition of the Senate.

Mr. CORNYN. I thank the Senator for responding to that question.

I would point out, in conclusion, that this bill extends unemployment benefits for 3 months at a cost of \$6.5 billion, right now which is unpaid for. But if the amendment of the Senator from Ohio is adopted, there is the solution to that problem, along with reform of the job training components of our current unemployment compensation system.

But if we are unable to have this broader debate, we will find ourselves right back here in 3 more months because none of the underlying problems, of which high unemployment and low growth are symptoms, will have been addressed. So what I hope—and I would love to be optimistic about the majority leader's willingness to allow those amendments and allow those votes and have that fulsome debate. If he does not, then we have had a 3-month patch and we will be right back here with the same problems confronting us, with the

underlying symptoms of an anemic economy, with slow economic growth and high unemployment.

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.

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

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

Mrs. FISCHER. I rise today on behalf of over 37,000 unemployed Nebraskans and nearly 21 million Americans who are searching for work. The vast majority of these men and women are jobless through no fault of their own. They are the real-life casualties of failed Washington policies. They are our friends, our neighbors, and in many cases they are our family members. They are decent people, and they are desperate to regain the dignity of a full day of labor.

We have had 5 years of economic fits and starts—glimmers of hope dashed by the harsh reality of persistent economic headwinds. But the weak job reports and the Pollyanna claims of recovery don't tell the full story. Our real unemployment rate or the total percentage of unemployed and underemployed workers tops 13 percent, significantly higher than the 7 percent reported by the Department of Labor in November. That is nearly 21 million people out of work. At the same time our labor force participation rate is at 63 percent, a near 35-year low.

The greatness of a nation cannot endure without work for its people. It is not only about putting food on the table. It is about the ability of families to buy a home, to save for their kids' college education, and to retire with a modest nest egg. It is about hard-working moms and dads in need of the simple assurance that their government isn't going to pass laws that intentionally make life harder for them.

I am interested in promoting thoughtful economic policies that increase employment opportunities and make life a little bit easier for our people. But instead of a laser focus on job creation, politicians in Washington seem to pivot from issue to issue, frantically chasing the topic du jour. Jobless Americans aren't interested in who is to blame; they are interested in who is going to fix this mess and how.

Congress has returned to Washington for a new year, a new chance to take on daunting challenges, such as joblessness in America. We have all been informed by the media and the so-called wise men of Washington that 2014 will be a year in which very little is accomplished. The pundits point to election-year politicking, and some Members are fretting about taking those very tough votes. There is no will for action, they say. There is no chance for any kind of compromise, they claim.

The 21 million Americans without jobs are counting on us to do our job.

They expect and they demand that we do better. Promoting policies to create jobs is not election-year rhetoric; it is the duty of the people's government.

The best way to support the unemployed is not to just extend the benefits; we need to grow the economy, and we need to provide paychecks for families.

Lately, there has been a lot of talk about income inequality or the need to bridge the gap between rich and poor. Some argue that deficit spending is the way to go, while others insist on increasing the minimum wage.

Arthur Brooks, the president of the American Enterprise Institute, offers a different take on how to best conquer the income divide. In a July 31, 2013, opinion piece published in the Wall Street Journal, Brooks notes:

Again and again, the president offers a higher minimum wage as a solution. Yet as the overwhelming majority of economists have argued for decades, the minimum wage actually harms the poorest and most marginalized workers—those with the most tenuous grip on their jobs.

In January, a study from the National Bureau of Economic Research surveyed the most recent studies and concluded: "The evidence still shows that minimum wages pose a tradeoff of higher wages for some, against job losses for others."

Brooks continues:

The story for strivers and entrepreneurs is no better. Scott Shane of Case Western Reserve University has shown that business formation fell by 17.3% between 2007 and 2009. Launching a business is never a walk in the park, especially given the explosion of red tape at all levels of government.

While it is still possible for the educated and comfortable, government bureaucracy can crush entrepreneurship entirely for those at the bottom of the income scale.

As a pro-poor rule of thumb, I suggest this: If you want to start a landscaping business, all you should need is a lawn mower, not an accountant and a lawyer to help you hack through all the red tape before setting up shop.

I think Brooks is right.

Regulatory overreach is also holding back American business. Regulations can be helpful. They ensure the health and safety of Americans. However, overregulation places unnecessary burdens on small business owners, and it does stifle economic growth. A homebuilder in Nebraska once told me that he was fined \$7,000 for leaning a ladder against a wall.

There is solid legislation out there to address the rampant redtape. Here are a few examples.

The Regulatory Responsibility for our Economy Act of 2013 is a bill that was introduced by Senator PAT ROBERTS that I am cosponsoring. It requires the executive branch to repeal duplicative and onerous rules currently hindering our Nation's job creators. It also requires Federal agencies to modify, streamline, or repeal significant regulatory actions that are unnecessary or overly burdensome. The legislation ensures that regulations put forth by the administration account for their economic impact on American businesses. It ensures stakeholder input and promotes innovation.

These simple commonsense policies are a good start toward relieving business owners of some of the unnecessary challenges they face in these already difficult economic times. I believe and I know many Nebraskans believe that executive agencies should be held accountable for the rules they put in place which directly affect our economic growth and our job creation.

Another key way we can spur economic growth is through broad-based tax reform. Our current tax system is arcane and riddled with loopholes for special interests from the eighties. It is time that we simplify our Tax Code so that we can encourage progrowth behavior.

Whenever I travel in my State and I meet with Nebraska's business owners, both large and small, I hear the same message over and over: We need more certainty. We need more certainty.

They need more certainty in the Tax Code, they need more certainty in health care, and they need more certainty in the regulatory environment. A business cannot grow today if it cannot adequately predict its needs for tomorrow.

This is especially true for small business owners, who are responsible for 64 percent of all net new private sector jobs. Jobs will come when these entrepreneurs have confidence that the bureaucrats are going to get off their backs. Jobs won't come from just another DC Government program.

I believe we must shift the focus of economic growth from government-driven regulation to private sector innovation. The great government-controlled experiment has failed us yet again, so it is time for a change of course.

There is no shortage of good ideas out there. My colleagues and I have introduced dozens of bills to directly address job creation by repealing specific regulations, preventing new burdensome mandates, and encouraging a fairer tax system. But so far we haven't had any form of meaningful debate. Why? Why can't we debate in this body in a meaningful way? I believe it is because we are restricted in this Senate by what we can actually vote on. It is a radical form of control, and we are tired of it. Rather than allowing an open amendment process, the majority leader has locked this place down. We hear constant calls to end obstruction, but if we are being honest, we would all acknowledge that the primary obstruction here is in the broken, nonexistent amendment process.

My friend and colleague Senator COBURN recently noted in the Wall Street Journal:

Mr. Reid had already used Senate rules to cut off debate and prevent the minority from offering amendments 78 times—more than all other Senate majority leaders combined.

Why?

It appears designed to advance a partisan political agenda—show votes in an election year. In other words, let's airdrop bills on the floor and prevent

any form of modification or improvement. That seems to be routine business around here these days, and it is shameful.

It is my hope that in this new year all thoughtful ideas will get a vote. It is my hope that in this new year we will actually get a chance to amend bills. That is the only way we can actually pass legislation to improve the lives of the American people.

I look forward to putting forth my own proposals to fulfill my duty to the people of Nebraska to get our friends and our neighbors back to work. Rather than focusing on issues that divide us, I hope my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, will come together to support policies that promote opportunities for all.

Show votes might make for good election-year politics, but make no mistake—they are bad policy. And unfortunately it is “we the people” who pay the steep price for politics over policy.

I am excited for another year here in the Senate where I can represent my friends and neighbors, Nebraskans from back home, and I look forward to helping put Americans back to work in the year ahead. Our citizens send us here to do a job and they are counting on us, so let's not let them down.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, the Chair and I earlier today were part of a historic majority—a very bipartisan majority—that voted 60 to 37 to extend unemployment insurance for millions of Americans across this country who are struggling to make ends meet, to keep their families together, to keep a roof over their heads—basic essentials not only to continue living but to continue searching for work. These Americans are not without a work ethic. In fact, they are devastated by being out of work for so long with such destructive results for their sense of self-worth and their family.

This measure is limited in its scope and significance. It is only a procedural vote on a temporary measure for 3 months, and only a partial solution to the grave and pressing issue of putting Americans back to work, restoring employment for Americans who want to work and keep their families together, but it is profoundly important.

I want to thank my colleagues, Senators REED of Rhode Island and HELLER of Nevada, as well as all of our colleagues who voted for it, and even many of my colleagues who may have voted against it but were torn and, hopefully, will vote for it on final passage. I urge all my colleagues to get this job done so we can send it to the House of Representatives and make sure it is approved there.

What is significant about this measure is in fact it was bipartisan. It was overwhelming. It shows Congress is listening; that it is heeding the calls for

action from those 4 million Americans, including over 60,000 of them in my home State of Connecticut, who need this measure so they can continue seeking work, hopefully successfully.

It is a temporary fix, but it is a measure with profound significance for those men and women who courageously are facing the searing facts of life during long-term joblessness. One of those individuals, in fact, from Connecticut, very courageously appeared with the President earlier today. Katherine Hackett of Moodus, CT, is the parent of two sons in the military, who herself is struggling to keep the heat on and put food on her table. She described her situation in introducing President Obama when he spoke about this problem earlier today. I am proud she is at the forefront of this fight, and I am proud to be fighting with her so that Americans have the benefit of unemployment insurance when they are unemployed for longer than the 26 weeks that is recognized under the statute.

This story is one of numbers. We can't deny the statistics. The great recession may have ended for a lot of Americans, but it continues for the unemployed, the jobless, particularly long-term jobless. Those numbers have become almost mind-numbing, but they are very significant. According to a report recently released by the Joint Economic Committee, 3 years after the recession ending in 1991, long-term unemployment was at 1.3 percent. Three years after the recession ending in 2001, long-term unemployment was also at 1.3 percent. Today, long-term unemployment is double those numbers, at 2.6 percent.

Here we are, 4 years after the supposed end of the recession in 2009 with double the percentage of long-term unemployed that we had in previous recessions. Our economy simply is not growing fast enough or creating enough jobs to end that persistently high rate of long-term unemployment. About 4 million Americans, more than one-third of unemployed Americans, have been looking for work for 6 months or more.

In my home State of Connecticut, long-term unemployment has become even more prevalent among those who have lost their jobs. In fact, 43.6 percent, or almost half of Connecticut's overall unemployed population, are long-term unemployed. That means over 60,000 people.

But those numbers are less convincing and compelling than the human stories. I was proud and moved to sit with a number of my fellow Connecticut citizens—hard-working, dedicated people of all ages, some of whom have spent lifetimes working for a single employer only to find themselves rejected and released. Many of them told me they expected to find work right away, within a couple of weeks, and here they are—more than 6 months later, many of them—still struggling to find work and working to improve

their skills so they can match the job opportunities that may exist.

Rosa Dicker, who has been out of work for almost a year, is a former health insurance project manager who also has experience with health care reform implementation in Massachusetts, our neighboring State. Rosa has sent out 500 job applications in the past year. I almost misstated that figure. I thought it was 50. It is 500 job applications in the past year. And she has been granted how many interviews? She has interviewed three times.

Nyrsa Cruz, an experienced social worker with a master's degree, has also been unemployed since early 2013. Despite hours and hours she has devoted to countless job applications, she has been unable to find work.

Michael Kubica, unemployed after years of experience in the insurance and publishing industries, went back to school to pursue an MBA. Yet despite his educational experience, despite his degrees, despite his dedication, he has been unable to secure more than temporary holiday season work.

Anyone who suggests the long-term unemployed are somehow content or have decided to stay out of work or have abandoned the search ought to talk to people in their own communities—people such as Rosa, Nyrsa, or Michael, who have struggled and worked to find suitable jobs. They are driven, passionate, and absolutely dedicated.

One woman I met, Erin London, described it this way:

My whole family is impacted. My son asks, "Am I going to be able to go to college?" I don't know how to answer. I don't want him to know I am scared.

Imagine yourself as a parent thinking—and we have all thought it—I don't want him or her to know I am scared.

Another Connecticut woman, Alicia Nesbitt, was proud to be working and to have worked continuously since the age of 16, until she was unemployed. Now she depends on food stamps and heating assistance.

These stories are powerful and compelling, even more so than the numbers and statistics, shocking as they are. I hope we will heed those human stories when we come back tomorrow and the next day to vote on this bill.

In the long term we need measures such as targeted tax credits and skills training so people can be matched with jobs and so they can prepare for the jobs of the future. Pathways Back to Work is a bill I have introduced that supports creation of new jobs as well as training for the ones that exist. I have introduced it with my colleagues Senators MURPHY and GILLIBRAND, and I think it would do a great deal to address the fundamental underlying challenges that are keeping unemployed people from reconnecting with the world of work. But these measures are for next week or the week after. Right now, the urgency of this week is passing a measure that is fundamentally

important to keep people moving forward, searching for work, and to keep our economy moving forward.

Those folks who receive unemployment insurance use it to buy clothes or food or a car that drives the economy, provides for the kinds of consumer demand we need to enable our economy to continue moving forward. So we are helping these folks avoid the precipice of poverty and homelessness, which makes their job search even more difficult, but we are also helping our economy. All of us who want job creation and economic progress want it to be our Nation's priority and success.

I am proud to stand and join Senators REED and HELLER, and thank also our majority leader Senator REID for their leadership, because our most urgent task is to move our economy forward, provide these unemployment benefits as soon as possible, and then look toward more permanent measures—skills training, the Pathways Back to Work Act, veterans programs that will enable all Americans to enjoy more equally the benefits of the greatest nation in the history of the world.

The challenge of our growing inequality is also our growing inequity. This measure is a start—a temporary, limited start—in the right direction toward making America fulfill its great promise for the future.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor today, and as I do so, Washington has an incredible opportunity for a new beginning—a beginning that would begin by listening to the American people and what the American people want, and not just what Washington and the Democrats in this body think is best for all the American people.

According to a new Associated Press poll, most Americans say health care reform is the top issue they want the government to work on this year—the top issue they want government to work on this year. Fifty-two percent of people have said that is what they are asking us to work on.

People have seen—and I heard about this all around Wyoming over the Christmas holiday—the complete failure of the health care law's big rollout last year. They saw President Obama and they saw Washington Democrats break one promise after another. As a matter of fact, one of the President's promises was designated "the lie of the year." The American people have lost faith this administration can ever get health care reform right.

It wasn't just a bad Web site. The President said: Well, the Web site was bad. He said: The health care law is more than a Web site.

In spite of what the Obama administration has said, it wasn't all fixed last year because the Web site is just the tip of the iceberg. And huge Web site failures? Absolutely. I heard it everywhere I went around Wyoming, and I

actually even heard it brought up when I was in Afghanistan visiting the troops on New Year's Day.

So it is not just the Web site, with the higher premiums, canceled coverage, can't keep your doctor, fraud and identity theft, higher copays and higher deductibles; the Web site continues to be just the tip of the iceberg.

Beyond all of those things we have been talking about coming down the line and hitting the American people, we have also seen even more problems surface already this year.

Here is a headline from the Wall Street Journal, January 3: "Consumers Hit Snags as Health Law Kicks In." The snags? We can imagine what they are. People have been going to the doctor, going to the pharmacy looking for help, and even though they signed up for insurance in the new exchange, it turns out they can't be found. They are not in the system.

So Web site failures? Absolutely. Insurance companies aren't sure who is signed up with them. People aren't sure if they are covered. Doctors aren't sure who is covered.

Doctors, as a result of their training, their compassion, their care for human beings, are trying their best to help their patients. They have been fighting a losing battle against the exchanges and all of the problems with the new Washington-mandated health insurance. One Chicago doctor tried for 2 hours to verify the new insurance for a patient who was scheduled for surgery. The office manager finally gave up. The doctor went ahead with the surgery without what should have been a routine approval from the insurance company.

Here is another problem some people are going to have to deal with this year. The Associated Press ran an article headlined "Adding a baby to health plan is not easy." Every day, babies are born and need to be included in the family's health plan. For common life changes such as having a baby, you would normally just call your insurance company and they would take care of it from there. Not under this law. If you have to buy your insurance through one of the new health care exchanges, it is not that simple. According to the article, "the HealthCare.gov website can't handle new baby updates, along with a list of other life changes including marriage and divorce, a death in the family, a new job or a change in income, even moving to a different community." Yet the Obama administration and the Secretary of Health and Human Services says the Web site is fixed. It can't handle a baby being born, marriage, divorce, moving, change in income. It can't handle any of those things, and they claim it is fixed.

Here is another problem that has turned up. Washington Democrats said the law would lead to fewer people visiting emergency rooms—I heard it right here on this floor: fewer people getting their care in emergency

rooms—and that would reduce expenses. The reality is very different. The New York Times, Friday morning, January 3: “Emergency Visits Seen Increasing With Health Law. Doubt Cast on Savings.” But Democrats on this floor said that emergency visits would decrease and that it would save money. That is not what the New York Times says. They said, “Oregon Medicaid Test at Hospitals Found Rise of 40 Percent.” The Wall Street Journal, in the same issue, talks about how the Medicaid expansion drives up emergency room visits. The Washington Post said, “Study: Expanding Medicaid Doesn’t Reduce ER trips. It increases them.”

Democrats don’t want to talk about all these problems. They don’t want to talk about all of the reform bills which Republicans passed in the House last year but which never got a vote in the Senate in spite of our efforts to try to get votes on those bills. Democrats hope people believe what they are saying, accept their claims that the Web site is working fine and that all the law’s problems have been fixed. The American people see through this. They know that what has been done to them by this administration is not right.

It is time for Washington Democrats to play it straight with the American people and to make a new beginning on health care reform. I am not talking about more fake fixes like the one we saw right before Christmas. That was the Obama administration quietly announcing that people whose insurance had been canceled because of the law could apply for a hardship exemption to avoid the individual mandate.

Well, the newer numbers have come out. There are now more than 5 million health insurance cancellations in 35 States. And we don’t even know how many were canceled in Texas, Ohio, Virginia, South Carolina, Missouri, and Wisconsin. We don’t know those numbers yet. So we know that a minimum of 5 million people have received cancellation notices and the anxiety that comes with that, as well as the anger. When people tried to replace the plans they lost, many found that their premiums would skyrocket and their deductibles would be higher than ever.

I find it interesting that Democrats I have talked to said: Well, January 1 has come, so the numbers aren’t going to go up anymore. That is just not true. I was just in my office and got off the phone with a friend in Douglas, WY. He is a pharmacist and provides health insurance for employees. He has fewer than 50 employees, so it is not mandatory under the law that he do so, but he does it anyway and he has done it for years. But Gary is in a situation where he has now received a letter of cancellation of his own insurance policy, and it was dated January 1. This is not something from last year; this is something dated January 1, 2014. It is a letter from the Madison National Life Insurance Company to Gary Shatto at Shatto’s Frontier Drug in Douglas, WY.

“Important Notice.” Can you imagine getting this letter and opening it? “Important Notice” in bold print. “This Affects Your Insurance Contract Rights. Please Read Carefully.” That would get your attention.

This notice is to inform your company that Madison National Life Insurance Company . . . will be exiting the employer small group major medical insurance market in Wyoming effective June 30, 2014 at midnight.

Exiting June 30, 2014, at midnight.

So what this tells us is these numbers are going to go up because, at 3,000, the numbers in Wyoming are such that we know more people are going to get cancellation notices. And this isn’t just for Gary; this is for everybody who works there.

They “will be exiting the employer small group major medical insurance market in Wyoming effective June 30, 2014 at midnight. This decision was prompted by the increased regulation since the federal government’s passage of its recent federal health care reform, commonly referred to as the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (“PPACA”).

“The increased regulation will make it difficult for Madison National to continue to operate and compete meaningfully in Wyoming’s small group major medical market. As such, your referenced insurance coverage will terminate at midnight on June 30, 2014.”

This is what people are going to continue to deal with, letters like this continuing to go out, a new round of letters going out January 1.

The President of the United States needs to be honest with the American people about the significant damage his health care law is doing to families all across the country. And as the employer mandate—which the President has delayed for a year—kicks in this year, we are going to see more and more letters like this and more and more people dumped, losing their insurance, in spite of the President’s claim that “if you like your coverage, you can keep your coverage.” No wonder the folks who look into these things have labeled it the “lie of the year.”

The White House continues to try to do this little bandaid approach. Now they say they are going to let some Americans buy catastrophic coverage. That is an idea I proposed to the President at the White House health care roundtable back in February of 2010. After 25 years of practicing medicine, I know that for some people catastrophic coverage is the right option. For many people it is, and it encourages patients to be smart consumers of medical services. But at our meeting 4 years ago President Obama said that these plans were suitable only for the wealthy, that they weren’t good ideas. He said that letting people be smarter consumers wouldn’t help. Now he has changed his mind.

Don’t expect him to admit that Republicans were right all along. The President said: Well, the Republicans

have no ideas. If they have some ideas, they can bring them to him. There were a number of different bills and proposals by Republicans. The President seems to want to ignore that just as much as he wants to ignore the problems and the misery his health care law has caused for so many people all around the country.

Instead of trying to patch this terrible health care law together with chicken wire and duct tape, it is time for Democrats in Washington to admit that this entire law is failing the American people because it absolutely hurts so many American families. Then we can move on to talking about real reforms to give people access to quality, affordable health care. That is the year’s top priority of the American people, and it needs to be our top priority in the Senate.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Extension Act. That would be S. 1845. This is legislation that will continue to be a critical safety net for workers who have fallen on tough times through no fault of their own. Just a few short hours ago, as you know, the Senate sent a strong message by voting to move forward on this vital legislation to restore unemployment insurance for the more than 1 million Americans whose benefits expired on December 28.

I wish to thank Senator JACK REED and Senator HELLER for their bipartisan leadership on this issue. This is a very important step in providing economic security for the millions of Americans who lost their unemployment benefits at the end of the year or who will lose them this year if Congress does not act.

By helping people to stay on their feet after an unexpected job loss, unemployment insurance has kept millions of Americans out of poverty. Rather than removing the safety net these people rely on, we should be focused on policies that help the long-term unemployed get back to work, including the help that will allow them to pay their rent and fill their gas tanks while they are searching for jobs.

Yesterday I released the Joint Economic Committee report making the economic case for extending the Federal support for our unemployment insurance, designed to keep long-term unemployed Americans above water as they search for work. Approximately 1.3 million workers, as we know, lost their unemployment benefits on December 28. Barring Congressional action, benefits will expire for an additional 3.6 million over the next year. In

my home State of Minnesota, roughly 8,500 people lost benefits at the end of last year and about 65,000 Minnesotans will lose benefits by the end of December of 2014.

These are people who may have had a plant close in their town. Maybe their position was eliminated and no one is hiring. Either way, these are people who have been paying into the system for their working lives and we need to see them through to their next job.

This is especially important at a time of stubbornly high long-term unemployment. For most Americans, State-funded unemployment insurance lasts 26 weeks. Yet the average unemployment spell lasts 10 weeks longer. In 2008, as our country went into the worst downturn since the Great Depression, Congress authorized Federal support for extended unemployment benefits for those who were out of work for more than 26 weeks. For people struggling to find work during those dark days, the extension was a lifeline. For the millions of Americans still searching for work as our economy recovers, it is a critical safety net.

Our economy, as we know, has come a long way since the downturn began, with the national unemployment rate now lower than it has been in 5 years. In my home State of Minnesota we are doing even better. The unemployment rate is more than two points below the national average. We are proud of that for our businesses. We are proud of that for our workers.

But there is a problem that remains. While the overall workforce is growing stronger every day, we are still facing significant challenges with long-term unemployment. At 2.6 percent, that is people long-term unemployed more than 6 months, it is more than twice what it was when Congress last allowed Federal unemployment insurance to expire after the recessions of 1990–1991 and 2001. In fact, in our report we have a graph that shows that literally this unemployment rate we are facing now for the long-term unemployed is twice what it has been in any other year when we faced a decision in Congress and decided in fact to terminate those benefits.

Literally, that long-term unemployment rate is now twice what it was in those other years. That is why there is so much concern about stopping the benefits at this point.

In Minnesota, our long-term unemployment rate is 1.4 percent, much better than it is in many States in the country, but too many Minnesota communities are still hurting, with unemployment rates reaching as high as 9.5 percent in Clearwater County in Minnesota.

Given the numbers, Federal support for unemployment insurance is more important than ever for the long-term unemployed. Extending this critical safety net is fair. American families, struggling against long-term unemployment, are working hard to find a job, to put food on the table, to pay

their bills. They are not exactly the ones who have seen the upturn from the stock market that many people have seen in the last years. They are not the ones who have seen their stocks rise. They don't have stocks. They are just trying to put food on the table for their families. They are not faceless, nameless charity cases. They are our neighbors, they are our family members, and they are our friends. In fact, nearly one out of every five Americans has either received or is living with someone who has received Federal unemployment benefits since 2008. That is 69 million people. Almost 24 million long-term unemployed workers have directly benefited and another 45 million Americans, including nearly 17 million children, are living with someone who is receiving unemployment insurance.

These benefits help carry families through long unemployment spells, pay the mortgage, rent, utilities. While the average unemployment insurance benefit of \$300 per week only replaces about one-third of an individual's average weekly wage, unemployment insurance benefits have kept 11 million Americans out of poverty; 2.5 million in 2012 alone. That is 2.5 million Americans kept out of poverty because of this program.

In 13 States, over 40 percent of those who are unemployed have been out of work for more than 26 weeks and have exhausted their State-funded benefits. Nationally nearly 38 percent of unemployed workers are long-term unemployed. These are the workers, the 4.9 million Americans who will lose their unemployment insurance if we fail to pass this bill. These benefits help them to keep looking for work, support their children and families, and contribute to the economy.

The longer a person is unemployed, the more difficult it is for that person to find a job. Skills atrophy and professional networks dry up. But you can't go on a job interview if you cannot even fill up your car with gas, so we also need to make sure the long-term unemployed are not left high and dry after State-funded unemployment benefits run out.

Addressing long-term unemployment is a problem that calls for an all-of-the-above solution. We need to do more to support American workers.

This is the right thing to do. We also know it is better for the economy. The CBO has found that each dollar of unemployment insurance increases the GDP by as much as \$1.90, and extending the Federal unemployment benefits through 2014 would boost GDP by a .2 percentage point and increase employment by 200,000 jobs. Failing to extend Federal unemployment benefits will cost the economy 240,000 jobs, according to the Council of Economic Advisors. Those are the numbers with which we are dealing.

We also know if we look at the suggestions of the debt commission—something that I think is a very impor-

tant body of work and has some very good ideas in it—their idea is trying to get about \$4 trillion in debt reduction. We are something above \$2.6 trillion of the way there with more to do, but the point is there are ways to get there. One of my favorite ways is to pass the immigration bill. CBO has found that in the second 10 years that will actually save \$700 billion on the debt by making people pay taxes, by bringing them out of the shadows so they pay fines. That is what we are dealing with.

If we want to look at ways to reduce our debt, I don't think we should be doing it on the backs of the most vulnerable, those kids, those people who are long-term unemployed who still have not been able to find a job. In many States it is still a very difficult economy. Especially for the long-term unemployed, this is the right thing to do. We shouldn't leave these Americans in the lurch. We need to restore this critical safety net and focus on getting Americans back to work.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I come to the floor to talk about an amendment I will seek to offer on the pending bill, amendment No. 2603.

We all sympathize with those who are struggling to find work in a difficult economy, and I want to see people get back to work. Certainly a short-term extension for those who are relying on unemployment insurance—if it is paid for—will allow a transition for those who are out of work. What we need to do most in this Chamber is to give them an opportunity to get a good-paying job. The focus in this Chamber, most of all, needs to be on enacting progrowth policy that will encourage both small and large businesses to thrive and grow in our economy and create jobs.

I have voted today to begin debate on the legislation to provide a temporary extension of unemployment insurance. I voted to begin this debate because I believe both sides of the aisle can find a way to grant this temporary extension to those who are struggling to find work in this difficult economy while making sure we don't add to the \$17 trillion of debt that also threatens our country and our economy.

I continue to believe that any temporary extension in a long-term unemployment benefit should be paid for in a responsible manner. So I have submitted an amendment, Ayotte amendment No. 2603. I think it is an amendment that makes a ton of sense.

Let me tell you what this amendment does. This amendment pays for

the 3-month extension of unemployment insurance. It fixes the unfair cut to the military cost of living that was just enacted in the budget I voted against. I felt this was unfair to those who have served in our military and were singled out for cuts to their retirement benefits, unlike anyone else, and it included, by the way, those who were retired because they had a medical retirement. In other words, those who many of us—I know the Presiding Officer has visited Walter Reed, as have I; those who have lost arms, legs—they have received a medical retirement, and their cost of living was cut under this budget as well.

So my amendment not only would pay for this temporary unemployment insurance for those who are struggling to find work, to give them a transition to get them back to work, but it would also pay to fix and reverse this unfair cut in military retirement benefits—many who, by the way, have served multiple tours for our country and have sacrificed a tremendous amount because they moved around, because they served both in Iraq and Afghanistan, on behalf of our country.

It would also give approximately \$7 billion toward reducing our deficit.

The way I pay for this is to fix an egregious problem in our Tax Code. It is a problem that was identified by the Treasury IG. It is, frankly, egregious. This is a problem in our Tax Code that has allowed illegal immigrants to claim a refundable tax credit for children who should not be entitled to it—children that do not even live in the United States of America or may not even exist. Why? Because when someone claims this refundable tax credit, they do not have to include a Social Security number on their return. A Treasury IG report identified this problem.

This amendment—a simple fix that would require a Social Security number for anyone who is claiming the additional child tax credit on their tax return—is estimated to save approximately \$20 billion over the next 10 years. So paying for reversing the cost-of-living increase for those who have sacrificed so much for our country, paying for a temporary unemployment insurance extension for those who are struggling to find work, and reducing our deficit by approximately \$7 billion over 10 years—all three of those things are done by fixing an egregious problem in our Tax Code.

The audit of the Treasury IG in 2011 reported that individuals who are not authorized to work in the United States of America received \$4.2 billion by claiming this additional child tax credit. The audit found that the payment of Federal funds through this tax benefit appears to provide an additional incentive for aliens to enter, reside, and work in the United States without authorization, which contradicts Federal law and policy to remove such incentives.

The audit was based upon an analysis of tax returns filed by persons with in-

dividual taxpayer identification numbers which are issued to individuals who are required to have a taxpayer ID number for tax purposes but are not eligible for a Social Security number because they are not authorized to work in the United States of America.

Again, this saves approximately \$20 billion over the next 10 years.

Let me tell you how egregious this is. Here are some of the reports about this problem in our Tax Code. It is fraud. This is fraud we are going to fix here. This is good government. We should fix this now, regardless. This \$20 billion is money that should not be going out the door over 10 years.

Here are some examples from Indiana. In fact, I just saw walk into the Chamber one of my colleagues from Indiana, Senator COATS. In Indiana, a local television station found that an undocumented worker who was interviewed at his home in southern Indiana by a reporter admitted his address was used this year to file tax returns by four other undocumented workers who do not even live there. Those four workers claimed 20 children who live in one residence, and, as a result, the IRS sent the illegal immigrants tax refunds totaling over \$29,000.

The local station has found many undocumented workers are claiming tax credits for children who live in Mexico. Many children who do not even live in this country are being used by those committing fraud on the IRS to claim this tax credit.

In Indiana, a tax preparer who acted as a whistleblower to an Indiana news station said: “We’ve seen sometimes 10 or 12 dependents—most times nieces and nephews—on these tax forms. The more you put on there, the more you get back.” The whistleblower had thousands of examples.

Another example from the whistleblower: “We’ve got an over \$10,000 refund for nine nieces and nephews,” he said, pointing to the words “niece” and “nephew” listed on the tax form nine separate times. “We’re getting an \$11,000 refund on this tax return.” “There are seven nieces and nephews,” he said, pointing to another set of documents. “I can bring out stacks and stacks. It’s just so easy, it’s ridiculous.”

In North Carolina, investigators uncovered more than 1,000 tax returns linked to eight addresses in that state last May, with refunds worth more than \$5 million. Investigators tied at least 17 tax returns, totaling more than \$62,000 in refunds, to a Charlotte, NC, apartment one woman leased. At another apartment nearby, investigators discovered 153 returns, valued at over \$700,000 in refunds.

Another address in the same apartment complex had 236 returns worth \$1.1 million in refunds.

At another Charlotte apartment complex, investigators traced 398 returns to two apartments, totaling more than \$1.9 million in additional child tax credits, with no guarantee that the

children even existed or lived in the United States of America.

Another North Carolina woman owned a tax preparation business. A search of that business and her home turned up more returns, dozens of uncashed U.S. Treasury checks, a FedEx box containing dozens of foreign birth certificates, and a notary public stamp and signature stamp listing her as a notary. That fraud case by the IRS totaled over \$5 million.

In Tennessee, a search warrant prepared by the IRS claims that a Murfreesboro, TN, tax company encouraged undocumented workers to lie on their tax returns by claiming children who live in Mexico as dependents. The IRS says that the Tennessee tax preparer has filed 6,000 tax returns over the last 3 years and although his clients only paid \$3.3 million in taxes, they were able to claim more than \$17 million in refunds. The refunds left the United States on the hook for \$14 million.

So here is the question in this Chamber. The question is, Should we fix egregious fraud in our Tax Code, where we have people, who are not entitled to work in this country, claiming tax refunds for children, some of whom have not been determined to exist, some of whom do not even live in our country? Should we fix that in our Tax Code? Isn’t that good government?

And if we fix it, we can use the payoff, the \$20 billion that the Joint Tax Committee has estimated to save over the next 10 years, to do the following: to provide for a 3 month temporary extension of unemployment insurance to those Americans who are struggling for work right now; to fix the unfair cut to our military retirees, including those who have gotten a medical retirement, those who are our wounded warriors who have been injured, many of them serving in Afghanistan and Iraq; and return \$7 billion to the Treasury.

So here is the choice. Only in Washington would this be the choice: We can fix the egregious problem with the Tax Code, where there is all kinds of fraud and save billions of dollars; we can fix it for those who have sacrificed the most—the unfair cuts to their cost-of-living increase—those who have served our country admirably, and our wounded warriors; and return money to reduce the deficit or what? We can be denied a vote. I hope I will get a vote on this amendment. It is pretty outrageous if I am not granted a vote on this amendment to prevent tax fraud that needs to be fixed on behalf of the taxpayers in this country.

If I cannot get a vote to take that \$20 billion to help struggling workers and to fix the unfair cuts to those who have sacrificed the most and taken the bullets for this country and also to help fix our deficit—only in Washington would that be a tough choice for anyone. How do you vote against doing that?

I really hope the majority leader will allow a vote on this commonsense



amendment that will allow us to help struggling workers without adding to the \$17 trillion debt, that will allow us to say to our men and women who have sacrificed the most: We are not going to continue to target you with these unfair cuts to your cost of living, when no one else has sacrificed under this budget agreement like that—and particularly our wounded warriors—and to say to the American public: We are going to fix fraud in our Tax Code, and also take some money and apply it to the deficit.

It makes so much sense that only in Washington would I even be asking the question on the Senate floor: Will I get a vote on this commonsense amendment that allows us to do important things for the Nation and fixes egregious fraud in our Tax Code, putting taxpayer dollars to uses that they should be put to.

I end with the hope that I will get a vote on this commonsense amendment and that my colleagues will support this amendment.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I would like to discuss today's vote, as others who have come down here.

First of all, it is important to understand that this was a vote on whether to start debate. I was one of those who joined several of my colleagues saying: Yes, this ought to be debated. It was not a vote to pass or not pass the legislation. That will come.

But the frustration that so many of us have had over this past year in particular of not being able to participate in the process of legislating boiled over at the end of the year and ended with a change in the rules in the way the Senate has operated for more than 200 years and stuffed the desires of the minority to be able to participate in certain areas regarding nominations. Now there is some talk about doing the same for legislation.

That frustration has led many of us to try to rethink: How can we get back to what is called regular order—the way the Senate has always operated in the past, the way it operated when I came here in my first tranche in the Senate.

I started in the House of Representatives back in 1980. I was part of a minority for four straight terms. There are majority rules. If one is in the minority, they do not have a whole lot of authority. Maybe at that time we held the White House under Ronald Reagan. He had the ability to go above a Congress which did not support him but went to the American people, and through their efforts many changed their minds in the majority party and supported the policies of President Reagan.

When I came to the Senate in 1989, I was asked: What is the difference between the House and the Senate? You are in the minority in the Senate. You were in the minority in the House. I

said: The difference is like going to legislative heaven from a place a lot lower than that in the House, because any Senator, majority or minority, had the opportunity to offer an amendment, to offer an alternative, to offer a statute, to participate in the effort to pass better legislation.

Any Senator had that in the minority. The majority leader, then-Senator George Mitchell, the Democratic leader, honored that. It was honored throughout my term in the Senate. I was then gone for 12 years and came back. I thought I was coming back to that same process, only to find that, no, the whole process has been changed.

We do not have the rights we once had. We do not have the opportunities we had. I came here to represent the people of Indiana and their wishes. Yet now I am in a position where I do not even have a chance to offer an amendment. I do not have even have a chance to offer an alternative or a substitute saying: Look. This may be a legitimate issue. I cannot support what is being handed to us take it or leave it. It deserves debate. It deserves alternatives. It deserves to give us an opportunity to try to convince our colleagues that a majority of us can work together to pass legislation.

That is the kind of legislation that works, as opposed to some of the legislation we are dealing with now that has been enacted simply by one-party rule. I think looking back on the Affordable Care Act, so-called ObamaCare, those who supported it wish now that it did have bipartisan support, that it was worked out, that some of the alternatives that were presented by Republicans were debated and perhaps supported. Maybe we would be in a different position now.

It is not right to characterize a vote on a procedural motion to say let's go forward and open this for debate, the opportunity to have amendments. That is why I voted for it. Unemployment insurance is a legitimate issue, policy issue to debate. I cannot support the proposal that was brought before us. But I can support going forward to discuss that proposal, to look at the alternative, to offer my own amendments and see if our thoughts, our ideas prevail.

I am hoping that is what will happen. That is up to the majority leader Senator REID. Mr. President, 2013 did not offer us very many—in fact, very few—opportunities to do that. We ended up on a very sour note in 2013. It was good we had that break and we are back, the second day of a new session of Congress. I hope Members on both sides of the aisle reflected over this period of time on how we can return the Senate to its original intent, how we can get back to so-called regular order, so we can have legitimate debate on the floor, we can go back and forth with our colleagues.

I think if we amend this, it will be a better bill. We do not think that bill is

the one that ought to address this problem, but here is a substitute. Let's debate it. Then let's have a vote. Some of us will win and some of us will lose. But every one of us will have the opportunity to have their voice heard, their amendment voted on, their alternative evaluated, and perhaps work in a bipartisan way to come up with something constructive.

So that was the purpose for leaving most of my party and voting for the motion to proceed, to go forward. Here we are. Now we have a chance to debate it. Senator AYOTTE was on the floor speaking before me, Senator PORTMAN, Senator CORNYN, all proposing ways in which we can offset the cost.

We all know we are adding to our debt and deficit on a daily basis. We have not come to grips with that. Yet the future consequences for this country, our economy, our children, our grandchildren, future generations is something we are all going to be ashamed of if we do not try to impose some discipline. How do we do that?

We made many efforts going all the way back to Simpson-Bowles. All of the major efforts, we were unable to get the President's support for any of those, even though he commissioned the Simpson-Bowles group, which was bipartisan. But nevertheless, we have not yet to this point been able to get that large effort in place that will put us on the path to fiscal health.

But one thing we can do is when we have programs—new programs, an extension of programs such as this—come before us, we can say: Let's, one, reform this so we achieve what we want to achieve, and, No. 2, let's make sure we do not add more taxpayer dollars to our deficit spending and our debt. Let's offset it with something.

For those who say we cannot cut a penny more, for goodness' sake, the organizations—the Federal organizations, the Office of Management and Budget, the Congressional Research Service, on and on, GAO and others, have proposed numerous ways of billions of dollars, hundreds of billions of dollars in savings for programs that are deemed wasteful and fraudulent.

Senator AYOTTE just mentioned specific examples, some in my State, of abuses of the system. There are concerns about abuse of the unemployment insurance, people seeing this not as a help to getting a job and getting back into the workforce but seeing this as yet another entitlement benefit they can receive without putting the effort in to get meaningful employment.

We have the responsibility to bring forward measures that I think give people a connection between unemployment and their ability to get employed. That has been suggested by Senator PORTMAN and others here. Senator CORNYN also talked about that. So whether it is an offset in order to pay for this so we do not go further in debt and use taxpayer money for excess

spending, when we know over here is waste and fraud and abuse in programs that have been deemed dysfunctional, unnecessary, the Federal Government never should have been involved in this process in the first place, why not take those programs that have been recommended to us by nonpartisan agencies of the Federal Government?

Senator COBURN has spent his career down here pointing out excessive, outrageous, egregious waste that has gone on and a misuse of taxpayer dollars. That is not how to run a government. My State has had to face this. They have faced up to it. We made the tough decisions. Of course, there have been interest groups supporting every possible item we spend money on. But we separated the necessary, the efficient, the effective from the unnecessary, ineffective.

We now have been rated as the most taxpayer conscious friendly State in the Nation. Our per capita tax impact on Hoosiers in Indiana is the lowest of any State in the Nation. We have an efficient, effective government that has a AAA credit rating, that has been deemed business friendly, taxpayer friendly, residential friendly, family friendly. It is a good place to live because we are not wasting taxpayer dollars. People are tired of spending money on what does not work.

I have gotten way off my intended statement. But I guess I am expressing my frustrations over the inability to participate in the process that can bring about better use of the taxpayers' dollars and more effective government. I think I speak for a lot of people on both sides of the aisle, that the way to do this is simply not to freeze out debate, not to freeze out amendments, not to freeze out the opportunity to offer alternatives. By moving through this motion to proceed, I am hoping this is a step forward to returning to a process in which we are able to do what I just suggested.

This decision is going to be up to the majority leader. If he wants honest debate, if he wants the American people and all of us in this Chamber to know—to examine alternatives, if he wants to be conscientious about spending taxpayer dollars, allow us the opportunity to offer some offsets.

Senator AYOTTE had a specific and I think very compelling offset. If we took a fraction of the money that we would save, we can cover the cost of this extension, if that is where we think we should go. I think major reforms need to be made to this program, and we ought to be emphasizing getting people back to work rather than how to keep extending unemployment. But the two go somewhat hand in hand.

There are people in Indiana and other places who have made every possible effort to get a job and have come up short. We need to be sensitive to the plight of those people, but we do not need to be sensitive to those who have taken advantage of this program and are abusing this program who simply

say: I do not have to work because the government will send me a check; when I add up all of my benefits, I am doing as well as I could if I worked. That is not the kind of policy we ought to be advocating or enabling in the Senate.

As I said, there are numerous alternatives or ways in which we can find a way to pay for this, if we can also put the reforms in place that mean we ought to go forward with this particular program. Let me suggest three. My colleagues have suggested others also, which I support. Any one of these could work. This program is scored at about a cost of six point something billion dollars.

This is a program, a policy, which requires taxpayers, in order to claim refundable portions of the child tax credit, it would require them to provide a Social Security number. I mean, this is so elementary, it is unbelievable to discover that a government agency has said: This is not in place. In other words, if you want to qualify for a refundable child tax credit, you have to verify who you are by giving them your Social Security number, so they can check to see if this is legitimate or not legitimate.

Senator AYOTTE laid out a situation where people were claiming 10, 15, 20 exemptions for children who did not even live in the United States, who were not even citizens. I was embarrassed that one of examples came from my State. But I think it is true of all States. But the savings to put a good bit of common sense into a program is scored not by DAN COATS, not by a Republican Senator but by a government agency. It is scored at \$27 billion.

So here is a program that wants to spend \$6.6 billion. Republicans say: First of all, we have problems with the program. I may or may not support extending this. But if it does get extended, surely we do not want to dump more money, more future debt, onto our children and grandchildren. So let's take this \$27 billion, or a fraction of that \$27 billion, and pay for this.

Let me offer another option: a delay for 1 year of the individual employer mandates under ObamaCare, the legislation I introduced in the Senate. If the President has delayed the mandates for businesses, should not he offer the same delay to families and individuals as a simple issue of fairness? What is the score—\$30 billion.

A third option: Prohibit those who are eligible for unemployment insurance from claiming Social Security disability benefits. Under the law, one must be able to work to qualify for unemployment benefits.

Yet some people claiming unemployment benefits are also claiming Social Security disability benefits. We can't make some of this stuff up. Savings: roughly \$6 billion, maybe more, that, if we want to support this bill, would be a pay-for. So whether it is a pay-for or whether it is the necessary policy changes to make the program more effective—including, and I would suggest,

a number of efforts that have been proposed by my colleagues in terms of better connecting the unemployed with those who are seeking, with the employers.

I can't tell you how many employers I have talked to in Indiana who have said: I have jobs.

I have talked to others, but the bottom line is this. There are people out there who look at what I have to offer. It is not the greatest, but it is a job. It covers benefits, and it is a step forward for them.

But they say: It doesn't match what I am getting from the government, so I think I will take a pass.

This is not America and not the principles that made America the kind of country it is. We should not be enablers in that regard through legislation that we pass.

I hope that we can have a full and open debate on this bill and move to policies that will grow and create jobs, and that we will adopt a practice of paying for new spending with offsets from known waste, fraud, and abuse that has been documented by government agencies.

Can't we at least do that? Can't we at least agree, in the future interest of our country, both fiscally, domestically, on a number of issues, for all of the reasons that I have articulated or tried to articulate, this makes sense?

Breaking with some of the past ways I have given my vote, I have said I am going to vote for the motion to proceed, and I going to challenge the majority leader to look at this and say let's run this place differently in 2014 than it was in 2013. Let's not be afraid of debate. Let's not be afraid of amendments. Let's let the yeas be yeas and the nays be nays. Let's give everybody an opportunity to state their case, to offer an alternative, and to be recognized. As a Member of the Senate, and the way this Senate was designed to be and traditionally for over 200 years it has been, let's move back to that.

What happens next is now up to the majority leader. The ball is in his court.

Had we not passed the motion to proceed with the support of Republican help, then we wouldn't have given the majority leader the need to make a decision.

What kind of a Senate do we want in 2014? A Senate that is doing what the American people want us to do, representing the people of our State with their interests, representing our beliefs about how government should be run, how it should be funded, having an open and honest debate, not afraid to take votes, trying to construct good policy for the future of this country? We can't do that if this body is run by one person saying: My way or the highway. You are in the minority. Tough break.

This is a chance for the majority leader. Let's give us the opportunity and return this back to the Senate it was once and always has been until lately. It is up to the majority leader.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. I am here today with some good news. This week the government will fix something that was broken. I know that some people wish to deny that is possible, but hear me out.

Five years ago, during the 2008 financial crisis, we witnessed firsthand that the market for home mortgages was badly broken. The fundamental problem was that many lenders issued mortgages without any concern about whether the borrower would be able to repay those mortgages in the long run. Why would they do that? They did it because they could immediately sell the mortgage to another financial institution. If the borrower couldn't pay, that would turn out to be somebody else's problem.

We all know what happened next. Millions of these dangerous mortgages were bundled together, sliced, diced, slapped with AAA ratings, and then sold to retirement funds, local governments, and investors all over the country. When borrowers couldn't make their monthly payments, those bundles of mortgages began collapsing, and the effects were felt in every corner of the economy.

This Friday, that basic business model will change, thanks to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's new mortgage rules. When these rules go into effect, lenders will be able to issue a mortgage only after they determine that the borrower has the ability to repay it.

Lenders will no longer be able to make loans they know will blow up and then feed those dangerous loans into the financial system. Because of the consumer agency's new rules, families will be safer. Pension funds and other investors will be safer. Our whole economy will be safer—not completely safe, but with a new cop on the beat, it will be safer.

The new rules will fix other problems as well. Before the crisis, some mortgage brokers who were supposed to be helping consumers find the best mortgage were actually taking money from lenders to steer those consumers into higher-cost loans. The CFPB's new rules will prohibit this sort of under-the-table dealing and protect consumers from being tricked by people they think they can trust.

The rules will also address many of the mortgage servicing problems that emerged during the crisis. After mortgages were sold off, bundled, and cut up into pieces for various investors, too

many borrowers were unable to track down clear information about their accounts. Some of the companies responsible for servicing their loans took days or even weeks to give them credit for their payments.

When borrowers fell behind, these servicers often began foreclosure proceedings without giving people full information about the options they had to modify their loans. The consumer agency's new rules will help clean up the mortgage servicing industry so more families can keep up with their payments and stay in their homes.

CFPB Director Rich Cordray and his hardworking and incredibly talented staff have worked for a long time to put these new rules together, and its rules will reshape the mortgage market for the better. They will give people a better chance to buy homes and a better chance to keep those homes. They will force mortgage lenders and servicers to compete by offering better rates and customer service, not by tricking and trapping people. These rules will help markets work better, and they will reduce the risk that the economy will crash again.

Our work is not done. The march toward financial reform has been too slow, and the chances of another crisis, while dialed back in some areas, remain unacceptably high in others. Even today, the too-big-to-fail banks that nearly crashed the global economy in 2008 are nearly 40 percent bigger than they were back then.

Yes, we have more work to do on dangerous banking practices, but this week marks an important milestone. Six years ago, I noted that it was impossible to buy a toaster with a one-in-five chance of bursting into flames and burning your house down, but it was possible to take out a mortgage that had the same one-in-five chance of putting a family out on the street.

The point was that consumers had the Consumer Products Safety Commission to keep people safe from dangerous toasters, and they needed the same kind of agency to keep people safe from dangerous and deceptive financial products.

In the years since, we have built that agency. It has already returned nearly \$1 billion to consumers who were cheated, and it has helped tens of thousands of consumers resolve complaints against financial institutions. Now, this Friday, that agency will put in place some commonsense rules that will make a real difference for millions of families who own—or someday hope to own—their own home.

The consumer bureau's new mortgage rules show, once again, that government can fix problems. Sure, we have to work hard. We have to fight against those who benefit from the broken system, and we have to stick with it even when the odds are against us. But when we do those things, real change is possible in this country. We are seeing that up close this week.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### THE FEDERAL RESERVE

Mr. SHELBY. Madam President, last night here in the Senate we confirmed Janet Yellen to be the next Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. I firmly opposed her confirmation. In 2010 I also voted against Dr. Yellen's nomination to serve as Vice Chairman of the Federal Reserve. I want to explain.

At that time I stated my deep concerns about Dr. Yellen's Keynesian bias toward inflation as a member of the Federal Open Market Committee and her poor record of bank regulation as president of the San Francisco Federal Reserve. Those concerns have not faded; rather, they are magnified in light of the importance of the position to which Dr. Yellen has now been confirmed, and that is the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve.

It is not just that the Chairman of the Fed is perhaps the most powerful individual in the global economy; it is that the institution itself is in utterly uncharted waters. I believe we need a Federal Reserve Chairman with the record and resolve to navigate our economy through this incredibly delicate situation. In my judgment, I thought Dr. Yellen was not that person.

The Federal Reserve's balance sheet currently stands at \$4 trillion.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the balance sheet as of January 1 of this year.

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

#### 8. CONSOLIDATED STATEMENT OF CONDITION OF ALL FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS

[Millions of dollars]

Assets, liabilities, and capital	Eliminations from consolidation	Wednesday Jan 1, 2014	Change since	
			Wednesday Dec 25, 2013	Wednesday Jan 2, 2013
<b>Assets:</b>				
Gold certificate account .....		11,037	0	0
Special drawing rights certificate account .....		5,200	0	0
Coin .....		1,955	-8	-148
Securities, unmortgaged premiums and discounts, repurchase agreements, and loans .....		3,952,587	-7,327	+1,113,092
Securities held outright (1) .....		3,756,159	-6,835	+1,086,566
U.S. Treasury securities .....		2,208,775	-54	+542,657

## 8. CONSOLIDATED STATEMENT OF CONDITION OF ALL FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS—Continued

[Millions of dollars]

Assets, liabilities, and capital	Eliminations from consolidation	Wednesday Jan 1, 2014	Change since	
			Wednesday Dec 25, 2013	Wednesday Jan 2, 2013
Bills (2) .....	.....	0	0	0
Notes and bonds, nominal (2) .....	.....	2,103,871	-1	+523,399
Notes and bonds, inflation-indexed (2) .....	.....	91,379	0	+16,639
Inflation compensation (3) .....	.....	13,525	-53	+2,619
Federal agency debt securities (2) .....	.....	57,221	0	-19,562
Mortgage-backed securities (4) .....	.....	1,490,162	-6,781	+563,471
Unamortized premiums on securities held outright (5) .....	.....	208,610	-492	+37,730
Unamortized discounts on securities held outright (5) .....	.....	-12,352	+20	-10,788
Repurchase agreements (6) .....	.....	0	0	0
Loans .....	.....	171	-21	-416
Net portfolio holdings of Maiden Lane LLC (7) .....	.....	1,541	0	+128
Net portfolio holdings of Maiden Lane II LLC (8) .....	.....	63	0	+2
Net portfolio holdings of Maiden Lane III LLC (9) .....	.....	22	0	0
Net portfolio holdings of TALF LLC (10) .....	.....	109	0	-747
Items in process of collection .....	(0)	165	+4	-22
Bank premises .....	.....	2,289	-1	-42
Central bank liquidity swaps (11) .....	.....	272	-1	-8,617
Foreign currency denominated assets (12) .....	.....	23,821	+35	-1,181
Other assets (13) .....	.....	24,579	-1,637	+3,987
<b>Total assets .....</b>	<b>(0)</b>	<b>4,023,640</b>	<b>-8,935</b>	<b>+1,106,451</b>
Note: Components may not sum to totals because of rounding. Footnotes appear at the end of the table.				
<b>Liabilities:</b>				
Federal Reserve notes, net of F.R. Bank holdings .....	.....	1,197,920	+2,719	+71,059
Reverse repurchase agreements (14) .....	.....	315,924	+164,667	+212,653
Deposits .....	(0)	2,445,620	-174,717	+822,821
Term deposits held by depository institutions .....	.....	0	0	0
Other deposits held by depository institutions .....	.....	2,249,070	-201,663	+740,398
U.S. Treasury, General Account .....	.....	162,399	+68,506	+77,941
Foreign official .....	.....	7,970	-10	+1,660
Other .....	(0)	26,181	-41,550	+2,822
Deferred availability cash items .....	(0)	1,127	-87	-66
Other liabilities and accrued dividends (15) .....	.....	8,035	-1,514	-311
<b>Total liabilities .....</b>	<b>(0)</b>	<b>3,968,627</b>	<b>-8,930</b>	<b>+1,106,158</b>
<b>Capital accounts:</b>				
Capital paid in .....	.....	27,507	-2	+147
Surplus .....	.....	27,507	-2	+147
Other capital accounts .....	.....	0	0	0
<b>Total capital .....</b>	<b>(0)</b>	<b>55,014</b>	<b>-4</b>	<b>+294</b>
Note: Components may not sum to totals because of rounding.				

Mr. SHELBY. A recent Bloomberg analysis contains figures that help us put this staggering number—\$4 trillion—into perspective.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD that Bloomberg article.

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

[From Bloomberg, Dec. 17, 2013]

**FED'S \$4 TRILLION IN ASSETS DRAW  
LAWMAKERS' SCRUTINY**

(By Jeff Kearns)

The Federal Reserve's balance sheet is poised to exceed \$4 trillion, prompting warnings its record easing is inflating asset-price bubbles and drawing renewed lawmaker scrutiny just as Janet Yellen prepares to take charge.

The Fed's assets rose to a record \$3.99 trillion on Dec. 11, up from \$2.82 trillion in September 2012, when it embarked on a third round of bond buying. Policy makers meet today and tomorrow to decide whether to start curtailing the \$85 billion monthly pace of purchases.

Among Fed officials, "there's discomfort in the sense that the portfolio could grow almost without limit," former Fed Vice Chairman Donald Kohn said last week during a panel discussion in Washington. Kohn said there was "discomfort in the potential financial stability effects" and added: "There's some legitimacy in those discomforts."

Fed Governor Jeremy Stein has said some credit markets, such as corporate debt, show signs of excessive risk-taking, while not posing a threat to financial stability. Representative Jeb Hensarling, chairman of the House committee that oversees the Fed, last week said he plans "the most rigorous examination and oversight of the Federal Reserve in its history."

While any effort to rewrite the law establishing Fed powers lacks support from Democrats who control the Senate, the scrutiny is undesirable for central bankers who believe "independence is priceless," said Laura Rosner, a U.S. economist at BNP Paribas SA in New York.

**NOT WELCOME**

**THE FED APPROACHES A TAPER ON TIPTOE**

"It's not a welcome development that a lot more time and focus is spent on answering questions" from Congress, said Rosner, a former researcher at the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. Lawmakers may also use the size of the balance sheet to "draw attention to concerns they have about the Fed's responsibilities and growing role in financial regulation."

Chairman Ben S. Bernanke, whose second four-year term ends next month, has quadrupled Fed assets since 2008 with bond purchases intended to lower long-term borrowing costs and reduce unemployment. Vice Chairman Yellen, who may win Senate confirmation this week to replace Bernanke, has been a supporter of the policy.

The Fed has said it will keep buying bonds until the outlook for the labor market has "improved substantially." Thirty-four percent of economists surveyed by Bloomberg Dec. 6 predicted the Fed will start reducing purchases this month, while 26 percent forecast January and 40 percent said March.

**ASSETS HELD**

The Fed's balance sheet exceeds the gross domestic product of Germany, the world's fourth-largest economy. It's enough to cover all U.S. federal government spending for more than a year. It could pay off all student and auto loans in the country with \$2 trillion to spare, Fed data show. The central bank's assets are set to exceed the \$4.1 trillion held by BlackRock Inc. (BLK), the world's largest asset manager.

The third round of quantitative easing probably will total \$1.54 trillion before it

ends, bringing the balance sheet to \$4.36 trillion, according to economists in the survey.

"This is a stimulus of the first order. It's just unprecedented," Alabama Republican Senator Richard Shelby said in an interview last week. "The Fed is an independent body, but we can point out what they're doing."

Jeffrey Lacker, president of the Richmond Fed and a critic of the Fed's bond buying, said in a Dec. 9 speech he expects the Fed policy makers to discuss reducing purchases at this week's meeting. Adding to the balance sheet "increases the risks" associated with exiting stimulus, he said.

**'REAL RISK'**

Shelby, a five-term senator and past chairman of the Banking Committee sees "a real risk" the balance sheet will ignite inflation. So far, there's little sign that's happening: a measure of prices watched by the Fed rose 0.7 percent in October from a year earlier, below the central bank's 2 percent target and the least in four years.

At 22 percent of the \$16.9 trillion U.S. economy, the balance sheet is surpassed by those of other major central banks as a percentage of gross domestic product, according to third-quarter data compiled by Haver Analytics in New York. In the euro zone, the figure is 24 percent, and in Japan, it's about 44 percent.

That doesn't mollify Republican critics. When Yellen started to make global comparisons at her Senate confirmation hearing last month, Shelby interrupted her.

"I'm asking about the Federal Reserve of the United States of America," he said.

**WARNING SIGNS**

Yellen is set to take over amid warnings that assets from leveraged loans to farmland are showing signs of froth.

The Fed and other U.S. banking regulators have said they want to crack down on underwriting standards in the market for high-risk, high-yield loans.

Non-bank lenders such as mutual funds, hedge funds and pools of collateralized loan obligations, bought \$630 billion of the loans this year, surpassing the 2007 peak of \$581.5 billion, according to data compiled by Bloomberg.

Sales of high-yield, high-risk bonds, rated below Baa3 by Moody's Investors Service and lower than BBB- at Standard & Poor's, soared to an annual record of \$373.2 billion this year, data compiled by Bloomberg show. That compares with \$149.2 billion in 2006, the year before the start of the credit crisis.

The extra yield investors demand to hold speculative-grade bonds rather than government debt reached 411 basis points, or 4.11 percentage points, last week, the least since October 2007, according to Bank of America Merrill Lynch index data. Spreads ended the week at 412 basis points.

#### RECORD LOANS

Sales of institutional loans have also reached an annual record, soaring 71 percent from 2012 to \$627.1 billion, according to data compiled by Bloomberg.

Potential losses on the Fed's investments are also cause for concern and "something we will be watching," Representative John Campbell, a California Republican who leads the House Financial Services subcommittee on monetary policy and trade, said in February.

The Fed sent a record \$88.4 billion to the Treasury in 2012 and \$75.4 billion in 2011, up from \$31.7 billion in 2008. Most of the income was from interest on assets bought under the quantitative easing program.

The risk for the Fed is that rising interest rates reduce the value of its bond holdings, potentially causing losses if the central bank had to sell the securities back into the open market.

"Losses are dangerous for the Fed from a political perspective because they would be a risk to its independence," said Roberto Perli, a partner at Cornerstone Macro LP in Washington.

#### DEFICIT SPENDING

Campbell and Hensarling also say the Fed's purchases of government debt are encouraging deficit spending by allowing the government to borrow cheaply. The yield on the 10-year Treasury note has averaged 2.31 percent this year, compared with a 6.61 percent mean over the past half century.

"The Fed's additional extraordinary purchases of Treasury bonds have supported the Obama administration's trillion-dollar deficits," Hensarling said at a Dec. 12 hearing.

Yellen says bond purchases have put Americans back to work. Asset purchases helped the private sector add 7.8 million workers since 2010 and boosted home prices and auto sales, Yellen said in her confirmation hearing, adding that the progress will let the central bank get back to more normal monetary policy.

#### JOBLESS RATE

The jobless rate has fallen to 7 percent from a 26-year high of 10 percent in October 2009. Since then, the economy has regained most of the jobs it lost during the 18-month recession ended in June 2009.

"The balance sheet is growing because that's how the Federal Reserve thinks it's going to accomplish the mandates that Congress gave to it" for full employment and price stability, Kohn, now a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution's Hutchins Center on Fiscal and Monetary Policy in Washington, said in an interview last week.

Still, policy makers haven't spurred the growth they expected. Officials forecast 2013 growth of 2 percent to 2.3 percent in September, down from a 2.3 percent to 2.8 percent estimate in March.

"QE turned out to be a safety net, a floor, a way to catch the economy to keep it from crashing," said Steve Blitz, chief economist at ITG Investment Research Inc. in New York. "A safety net to catch a falling economy is not the same thing that can springboard the economy to a higher rate of growth."

Mr. SHELBY. The article contains the following three comparisons that I found more than interesting. Four trillion dollars is equivalent to 24 percent of the U.S. GDP. That is greater than the GDP of the world's fourth largest country—Germany. Think about it. Four trillion dollars is twice the amount of all student and auto debt in this country. Yes, \$4 trillion far surpasses even the amount of money the Federal Government spends in an entire year.

This brings me to my next point. Many hold the misconception in this country that China is the world's largest owner of U.S. debt. That is not true. In fact, the Federal Reserve's balance sheet shows the Federal Reserve itself is by far the largest holder of U.S. Treasury bonds. With \$2.2 trillion in Treasury debt, the Fed holds nearly \$900 billion more than China does, if you can think in those terms. The Fed holds more in Treasury bonds than do China and most of the eurozone combined.

The rate of acceleration with which the Federal Reserve is purchasing Treasuries should be alarming to all Americans. On the day of President Obama's first inauguration, the Federal Reserve held \$475 billion in Treasuries. Today it holds \$2.2 trillion in Treasuries. That represents a 363-percent increase in the past 5 years.

It is no coincidence that President Obama has greatly accelerated our national debt over that same period of time. There is a connection. When he took office, the national debt stood at a large \$10.6 trillion. That is a lot of money. Today it stands at \$17.3 trillion—5 years later. I believe the Federal Reserve is aiding and abetting the failed policies and the reckless spending of the Obama administration.

But the Fed's binge on Treasuries alone doesn't tell the full story of its exploding balance sheet. The Federal Reserve's portfolio is also loaded with nearly \$1.5 trillion of mortgage-backed securities. I have long been concerned that this aggressive and extraordinary purchasing program is artificially propping up home prices, and this is especially pertinent since an overheated housing market greatly contributed to the financial crisis that caused this situation in the first place.

Taken altogether, the Federal Reserve has added more than \$3 trillion to its balance sheet since early 2008, just before the investment bank Bear Stearns failed and the Federal Reserve stepped in.

I realize that sometimes it is easy to become lost in all of these huge figures I have been sharing. I brought a simple chart that illustrates the magnitude of the Federal Reserve's actions. It shows

here the size of the Federal Reserve's balance sheet by decade, from its creation in 1913, 100 years ago, to present day. As we can see, it took 95 years for the Federal Reserve's balance sheet to reach \$1 trillion. But look at the incredible spike in just a few years since, in the red here. Here we are today, just 5 years later, at \$4 trillion and growing.

Let's call this what it is: a backdoor stimulus program through monetary policy. Very complicated, yes, but very important. It dwarfs even the fiscal stimulus package President Obama rammed through Congress during his first days in office about 5 years ago. President Obama's fiscal stimulus package totaled \$787 billion—a lot of money—and I have just described the Fed's monetary stimulus package as nearly four times larger and growing.

This highly unconventional monetary policy poses huge risks to our economy—namely, inflation in the future and a devaluation of our currency. I realize that current inflation expectations are relatively low and anchored. However, again we are in completely uncharted territory. Should inflation expectations become unglued, prices could increase uncontrollably. There is simply no playbook that I am aware of on how to deal with such a situation successfully.

Yes, I also understand that the Fed has recently announced it will modestly scale back its so-called quantitative easing program. The Fed will still purchase tens of billions of dollars of securities each month.

Make no mistake—the Fed's balance sheet will continue to expand rapidly. How long will this continue? We don't know. How large will the Fed's balance sheet ultimately grow? We don't know. Will the Fed be able to contain inflation if it does begin to rise? Again, we don't know. And when will the Federal Reserve actually begin to unwind the balance sheet—which will be tricky? Again, we don't know. How exactly does the Federal Reserve plan to unwind the balance sheet? Again, we don't know, and I don't believe they know.

I raise these points because I met with Dr. Yellen in my office and attended her confirmation hearing in the Banking Committee. I received no meaningful answers to any of those questions, only the usual platitudes that so often mark such meetings.

If I may, I will now turn briefly to the subject of bank regulation, which is very important in this country—a primary and critical function of the Federal Reserve.

I have been a member of the Banking Committee since I first came to the Senate in 1987. I served on the committee through many difficult times in the financial markets, including the savings and loan crisis and the 2008 financial crisis. In all of my experience, I have never seen a financial institution fail that was well managed, well capitalized, and well regulated. The

fact is that so many financial institutions failed in 2008 and 2009 in no small part because the Federal Reserve failed spectacularly in its role as their regulator. I think that is a given.

As President of the San Francisco Fed from 2004 to 2010, Dr. Yellen presided over a regional housing bubble and failed to restrain the excesses in the market. Yet, despite this record of failure, she now runs the most powerful bank regulatory institution in the world—the Federal Reserve. I guess failure begets promotion in President Obama's view. We have seen it time and again.

This is all the more important considering that the Fed gained even greater power under the Dodd-Frank financial regulation law despite the fact that the Federal Reserve's own failures contributed to the need for financial reform in the first place.

In light of Dr. Yellen's weak touch as a bank regulator and her strong inclination to print more and more money, I firmly opposed her nomination. Only time will tell, but I believe a vote in the affirmative is one many of my colleagues will come to regret.

Madam President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I presume we are in a quorum call. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### GLOBAL WARMING

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I am back today for the 54th time to urge my colleagues to wake up to what carbon pollution is doing to the Earth's climate and oceans. We see the facts all around us, but can't seem to penetrate the politics of Congress.

We, in this body, are willfully ignoring changes we have never seen before, changes that threaten our planet and its rich array of plant and animal life, our homes, farms, and factories, and our very health and well being.

Carbon-driven climate change can be seen in warming surface temperatures and shifting seasons, but perhaps nowhere is carbon pollution doing more harm than in our oceans. The year 2013 brought ample new evidence of these changes in our oceans.

People often talk about climate change as if it were a theory. Here is what we know. We know that the oceans are warming. That is not a theory; that is a measurement. It is done with thermometers. It is not complicated. Sea level, we know, is rising; that is another measurement. It is very simple. We could do it with a yardstick. Oceans are becoming more acidic. Every American with an aquarium measures acidity with litmus paper. Again, it is simple measurement and proven facts.

If we put those proven facts into context, let's look at geologic context. Ac-

cording to an article published in 2012 in the journal *Science*, our current rate of carbon dioxide emissions—mainly from burning fossil fuels—is enough to cause the most severe changes to the chemistry of our oceans in 300 million years, and 300 million years ago is before the dinosaurs.

We know the oceans are warming. The oceans have absorbed more than 90 percent of the excess heat in the atmosphere between 1971 and 2010, according to a 2013 report by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

Here is where the heat goes: 93.4 percent goes into the ocean. The rest we are seeing, 2.3 percent, goes into the atmosphere. Our oceans are really taking the brunt of the added heat.

We also know that sea level is rising. We know this. It is driven not only by melting glaciers carrying water into the seas and raising their level, but also by ocean water expanding. As water warms, it expands. The principle of thermal expansion is known in every science class in this country.

At the Newport tide gauge in Rhode Island, sea level is up almost 10 inches since the 1930s. So that means that storms driving the sea against Rhode Island's coast have 10 more inches of sea to throw against our homes and infrastructure.

Recent satellite measurements from the University of Colorado Sea Level Research Group show 3.2 millimeters of sea level rise per year from 1993 to 2013. Between 1901 and 2010, that rate was estimated at 1.7 millimeters per year. So the rate of increase has nearly doubled, and that means sea level rise is very likely speeding up. That is all stuff we measure. That is not theory.

The IPCC report also projects—conservatively, in my view—that sea level will likely rise one-half to one full meter by the year 2100 if we do nothing to dial back carbon pollution. Obviously, the other estimates are for far more extreme sea level rise.

We know the oceans are becoming more acidic. Oceans not only absorb 90 percent of the heat that has come from climate change, they are absorbing about 30 percent of the carbon itself. The carbon itself goes to the surface of the ocean, and it is absorbed there. Roughly 600 gigatons worth of carbon have been pumped into our oceans as a result. As all that carbon dissolves into the oceans, what happens? Ocean water becomes more acidic. It is a chemistry experiment you can duplicate in any simple lab. Indeed, if you do the measurement, we have gotten about 26 percent more acidic—the seas have—since the Industrial Revolution. That was reported, again, last year by the International Programme on the State of the Ocean.

The rate of change in ocean acidity—we can see it is speeding up—is already faster than at any time measured in the past 50 million years according to research published in the journal *Nature Geoscience*. Yet we sleep walk

here in Congress, narcotized by polluter money.

Ocean acidification and warming are fundamentally altering our undersea environment—what Pope Francis in his recent exhortation called the “ocean wonder world.” These changes, among other things, have made the world's coral reefs extremely vulnerable to decay and bleaching. Areas such as the Great Barrier Reef—one of the great global wonders of the world off the coast of Australia—has already experienced large-scale bleaching.

As a boy, I used to scuba dive in the Andaman Sea. If you go back now—30 years later—it is heavily bleached. These are pictures that were taken in 2002 by the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority, and they clearly show a once lush and vibrant reef now gone and barren.

Worsening this bleaching would be particularly hard on countries whose people depend on the bounty of the reef for their protein, sustenance, and economy. Remember, the reefs are the ocean's nurseries, and they support food and economic stability as well as pretty tropical fish.

New research also suggests that even the most remote depths of the ocean will suffer the consequences of climate change. A study published in the journal *Global Change Biology* looked at various climate models to predicate changes in food supply throughout the world's oceans. The models predict that the changes to our ocean could lead to a worldwide drop in sea floor dwelling life by the year 2100.

The North Atlantic—off our shores in Massachusetts and in Rhode Island—may lose more than one-third of all deep-sea marine life. These drastic changes from our carbon pollution are daunting ones—particularly for our ocean State of Rhode Island. Our way of life in Rhode Island, like the Presiding Officer's in Massachusetts, has always been closely tied to the sea. Yet here in Congress we ignore all of that and continue perilously sleepwalking through history.

The Obama administration has at last put forward a Climate Action Plan, the cornerstone of which will be EPA regulations to limit greenhouse gas emissions from new and existing powerplants. Our 50 worst powerplants—in terms of emission—put out more carbon pollution than the entire country of Canada and the entire country of Korea. So solving that problem is vitally important.

The plan also directs executive branch agencies to take concrete steps to safeguard the American people and our interest in the world against the harmful effects of excessively high temperatures, melting ice, ocean acidification, and sea level rise.

These are important steps, but they must ultimately be backed up by congressional action. EPA regulations and executive orders will never have the same economy-wide effect as a congressionally approved carbon fee, for instance.



The sweeping changes taking place in our oceans make adapting to these changes particularly important along our coastlines. Warmer waters and higher seas load the dice for more damaging storms. Our coastal counties in this country harbor 39 percent of the country's population and account for 41 percent of our GDP.

Let's look at our ports, for example. According to a 2009 National Ocean Economics Program report: "Three-quarters of all United States trade passes through estuary ports." No wonder, then, that the American Association of Port Authorities is taking climate change seriously—working to reduce carbon pollution and stave off its effects, rather than waiting for Congress to awaken from our slumber.

American ports are switching trucks and cranes from diesel to electric and installing onshore power supply to ships, thus reducing emissions from the port and from idling vessels. Likewise, the International Association of Ports and Harbors has launched the World Ports Climate Initiative to reduce the CO<sub>2</sub> output from port-related activities.

In my State, the Rhode Island Climate Change Commission reported:

Inundation of the state's ports and railroads may reduce interstate access, affecting economic viability and potentially limiting imports and exports. Sea level rise may also reduce navigational clearances for the State's bridges, additionally limiting access.

These changes will be particularly harmful for the Port of Providence, which today brings hundreds of millions of dollars to the region.

We need strong Federal action to reduce the carbon emissions that are threatening our coastal communities. We must also take firm Federal action to adapt ourselves, and our States and our coastal communities, to the changes that we can no longer avoid because of what we have already pumped into the atmosphere and the harm we have already done.

This is a real threat. It is embarrassing, and it is wrong for Congress and the Senate to continue to ignore it. Somebody who knew something about looming threats was Sir Winston Churchill. He gave this advice:

One ought never to turn one's back on a threatened danger and try to run away from it. If you do that, you will double the danger. But if you meet it promptly and without flinching, you will reduce the danger by half.

That is good advice. What's embarrassing and wrong is that not only are we failing to meet it promptly—and flinching—but that failure and that flinching is the result of special interest influence in this body.

We face uncommon challenges and they demand uncommon resolve. America has not overcome past crises by pretending they did not exist; that state of play is preposterous for us to embark from. We actually have clear scientific understanding of the problem. The doubt is passed, the jury is in, and the verdict has been delivered. Yet

we lack the will of leadership to forge a solution. Another great leader who knew something of leadership in times of crisis was President Lincoln. He understood that the greatest challenges require clear vision and brave thinking. When faced with a crisis, President Lincoln said:

The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew, and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves, and then we shall save our country.

It is past time to disenthral ourselves of the corrupt thrall of polluting special interests. It is time, at last, to wake up and get to work on the job we have before us.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I want to share in some remarks Senator AYOTTE had relative to the amendment she submitted that would pay for the unemployment insurance extension and veteran pensions benefits. I will just say her pay-for is an issue that I have had some experience with. I offered several years ago an amendment to fix the same problem, and I was disappointed when the majority leader, Senator REID, objected to that amendment.

Senator AYOTTE's amendment would pay for the jobless benefits of unemployed Americans and restore veterans' pensions by cutting off fraudulent tax payments to illegal aliens. This is a very simple concept. There is a clear abuse going on here that needs to be fixed, and it should have been fixed a long time ago.

The amendment contains an offset of \$20 billion—\$20 billion—by closing this loophole and ending this abuse of American tax dollars. Remember, the veterans' retirement benefit reductions in their retirement plans that were voted on recently in this body—part of the Ryan-Murray budget agreement—only saved \$6 billion over 10 years by altering the retirement benefits of veterans. So this amendment—closing the tax loophole—would save \$20 billion over 10 years.

In 2011—this is when the matter first came to my attention by the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration. Each Department has an inspector general. The inspectors general are part of the Obama administration, but they take pride in their independence, and they are by and large a very valuable part of the American Government.

So this Treasury Inspector General made this statement in a report:

Millions of people are seeking this tax credit who, we believe, are not entitled to it. We have made recommendations to the IRS as to how they could address this, and they have not taken sufficient action in our view to solve the problem.

A clear statement by the Inspector General of the U.S. Treasury Department that there were problems with this policy, and they could be fixed,

and the Internal Revenue Service was failing to take steps to fix the problem.

One press report that highlighted the abuses occurring within this program reported that an illegal alien admitted that his address was used to file tax returns by four other illegal workers. All were in the country working illegally, and they filed tax returns. Did they file the tax returns to pay taxes? No. They filed the tax returns to get a tax credit back from the government, a check from the government. They claimed 20 dependents living inside their residence, and the Internal Revenue Service sent the illegal tax filers \$30,000—direct checks from the U.S. Government, from the U.S. Department of Treasury, went to them. They filed a return, they said they had all these children, and they were given \$30,000.

According to the report, none of those dependents lived in the United States or had even visited the United States. The illegal alien in the story justified the enormous tax fraud by saying: "If the opportunity is there and they can give it to me, why not take advantage of it?"

Well, this is an interesting development. Let's go along a little further. As the Treasury Inspector General himself said: "The payment of Federal funds through this tax benefit appears to provide an additional incentive for aliens to enter, reside, and work in the United States without authorization, which contradicts Federal law and policy to remove such incentives."

So the inspector general took the obvious position that it is the government's position that people who enter the country illegally ought not to receive tax credit checks from Uncle Sam and that this policy not only encouraged that, it encouraged more people to come to America to claim benefits, as this person who entered the country illegally said: If they can give it to me, why not take advantage of it?

Now one of the things I have learned as I have traveled the world is, a lot of people have an exaggerated opinion of the wealth and power of the United States. You meet good people in underdeveloped countries, and they say: Why doesn't the United States do this, that, and the other—as if we had unlimited power, unlimited money, and unlimited ability to solve the problems they face at any given time.

So a lot of people, maybe, when they come to the country do not realize we are a nation of limited resources and we cannot be wasting money, we cannot be having people enter our country contrary to the law, undocumented, working, taking jobs that Americans need, and then sending them big checks—\$30,000 for children who do not even exist or certainly have never been in the United States.

How do they do it? They use an ITIN, an individual tax identification number. They do not have Social Security numbers. They have a tax ID number. Why? That is a tax number that the Treasury Department came up with to

allow noncitizens who do not have Social Security numbers to pay taxes to Uncle Sam. That is what it was supposed to be used for. These clever individuals have figured out a way—they do not qualify for a Social Security number, so they get an ITIN number, and then they immediately start filing a tax return, claiming benefits, tax credits for children they may not even have or are not in the country, and they are not entitled to it. It is billions of dollars. According to the best estimates we have, if this loophole were closed—that the Treasury Department themselves has identified—it would save \$20 billion over 10 years. Well, that is a lot of money.

In fact, in 2011, they claimed—and I do not know why it is not more—that illegal aliens received a staggering \$4.2 billion in refundable tax credits in 2010. So in 2010, they received illegally \$4.2 billion under this program. Can you imagine that? That is more than the budget of the State of Alabama—the general fund budget of the State. This was in 2010, and it has been growing substantially. It is probably more than that now.

So the legislation Senator AYOTTE proposes would fix this problem, and it is time we fixed it. I cannot imagine why anyone would oppose it. The House has passed legislation already that would fix this problem and it died in the Senate. Senator REID refused to bring it up. He obstructed its passage. It should have long since been passed.

So I pose a question to my colleagues: Which would you rather do? Would you cut the retirement benefits of men and women who served this country for 20 years or more in the U.S. military, being deployed in harm's way, placing their lives at risk—even those who are disabled as a result of service in the U.S. military in combat zones; they have their retirement cut too—would you choose to cut their pay to save \$6 billion, when you could cut out a totally unjustified claim of tax credits of \$20 billion? Is it political correctness run amok that we are dealing with here? Why can't we fix this? So I think this is something that needs to be fixed. It is past due to be fixed.

Senator AYOTTE is correct to raise it as a legitimate pay-for for unemployment compensation and veterans' retirement, and I salute her for it. It is something I pushed for, and I offered a very similar amendment when the Murray-Ryan bill moved through the Senate. I think it is something we need to work on.

We are not talking about as much as we should now the chatter has receded a little bit—but our deficit situation is still very grim. We now have a current debt of \$17 trillion. That is unprecedented in the history of the United States. It has doubled in recent years. They are the kind of deficits we have never seen before, and it is something we have to address.

Mr. J.T. Young, in the Washington Times, a former member of the Depart-

ment of Treasury, I believe, in the Bush administration, and a former staffer on the Budget Committee, wrote that what we are seeing in our budgeting is a tip of the iceberg. The interest payments we are making now—some \$250 billion a year on the \$17 trillion we owe—is a tip of the iceberg. Because if interest rates return to their 40-year average, we are going to see a dramatic increase in interest payments on that debt.

When we say we have \$17 trillion, we are talking about money the U.S. Government has borrowed so it could spend. That borrowed money comes from a source. Much of the source of that money are foreign nations. The largest creditor is China. They loan us money, and we pay them interest every year.

Right now interest rates are low, unusually low, exceedingly low according to historic averages, and most people expect they are not going to stay low. The bond market is already slipping because people expect interest rates to go up, making their bonds less valuable. All the experts—virtually all—expect we will have a rising interest rates in the year to come.

Our Congressional Budget Office analyzes the debt of the United States and our whole fiscal policy—taxing and spending and income and outgo and has calculated that 10 years from today, under their baseline budget plan, with interest rates increasing, and the increased deficits—the deficits every year that we will have that will add to the \$17 trillion—in 10 years we will be paying interest, each year, of over \$800 billion.

Mr. YOUNG refers to that as a “third entitlement.” Actually, under these figures, it looks as though that interest payment will exceed Social Security's payment and Medicare's payment and the Defense Department. Not together, but each. This is a stunning danger that we face. So it is not mean-spirited to say that before we pass an unemployment compensation extension beyond our historic levels that we need to ask: Will we just borrow all the money, or will we look around this government and find places to save money such as the child tax credit going to people without Social Security numbers illegally in the country? What should we do?

The challenge we face is how to confront the rising debt. Every year, every month, virtually, some other issue rises before the Senate. It sounds persuasive and it is something we want to do, sometimes it is something we really need to do. Certainly Americans are hurting today. There is no doubt about that. There are a lot of reasons for it. We need to work to reverse those trends. Middle America, poor America are not doing well financially.

One reason is, there are millions of people in the country illegally taking jobs, pulling down wages and reducing the employment prospects of American citizens. There is no doubt about that.

President Obama proposed, and this Senate voted by a sizable majority, to double the amount of guest workers who come into America. Meanwhile, they come before the Senate and say: We need another \$7 billion in unemployment benefits because we have too much unemployment in America. How can that possibly resonate logically with the American people? We should control immigration in America. We are a very generous nation of immigrants. We support immigration. One million people enter our country every year legally. We have guest workers who come every year.

The immigration bill that was before us, that was voted on by this body, would have not ended the illegality it would reduce it only by 40 percent or so, according to the Congressional Budget Office. But it would have doubled the legal flow of guest workers to America. What a stunning number, at a time of high unemployment, low wages, and the lowest workplace participation rate this country has seen since the 1970s.

Americans are having a hard time finding work. So we have our colleagues, our Senate majority, who voted for that immigration bill, ranting to the Senate, demanding now that we extend unemployment insurance, demanding that we raise the minimum wage. Well, I would like to see the wages of Americans go up, all of them. I would like to see people make \$15, \$18, \$25, \$30 an hour. We need more of that kind of growth and prosperity in America. But I am not comfortable with the Federal Government setting wages and price controls in this country. It has never worked effectively.

We should do things that make sense. We should create economic policies that create prosperity. We should not import large increases in labor in America when we have huge numbers of people here that are unemployed. That is just common sense.

I want to share with our colleagues some thoughts about where we are with regard to the unemployment insurance extension legislation that is now before us. Since 2009, the Senate has required that any extension of unemployment insurance benefits be paid for because we agreed that we need to reduce the amount of money we are borrowing. We are spending considerably more than we take in. We are going to have to raise the debt ceiling again next month so we can borrow even more money. So all of the money my colleagues want to spend on extending unemployment insurance, unless some savings are found elsewhere in the government, will be borrowed. The legislation that is before us now borrows every cent of it. Every cent of the \$7 billion that is proposed will be borrowed.

We are \$17 trillion in debt, much owed to foreign creditors. It does not seem wise to do this. This is the wrong thing. In the past, Congress has paid for unemployment insurance extensions. This is unprecedented, an

extranormal unemployment insurance extension. The current amount is always out there, but because the unemployment rate has been high, we have extended it up to 99 weeks. We paid for this in 2009. We paid for it in 2011, and we paid for it in 2012.

So clearly the Senate's policy approach has been consistent in recent years to pay for this. Many remember our former colleague, Jim Bunning, that Hall of Fame baseball pitcher, who stood right back here and objected to this one time before, I think it was in 2009, all alone and he insisted that it be paid for, and eventually he prevailed. It caused quite a stir. He stopped the train until there was an agreement to pay for this.

According to a report yesterday in *National Journal*, some Senators want to rush this bill through now and will worry about paying for it later. They will promise to pay for it later. This "spend now, pay later" policy is how we racked up \$17 trillion in debt. It is smoke and mirrors. If you do not in this Congress agree to pay for something before it is spent, it is not going to be paid for later. We have got debt in the hundreds of billions of dollars every year and we are certainly not going to go back and pay for more, pay down the money we spent the year before. We have got to deal with the year we are in. If we do that, it would be helpful. This is how we go broke.

But what I want to say is, fundamentally, the spending provided for in this extension of unemployment insurance violates the spirit of the Budget Control Act of 2011. It spends money above what we agreed to spend. It should not be done. We need to know, every one of us, that by voting for this bill, you are voting to violate the promise you made to the American people in August of 2011 that we would limit the growth in spending, not cut spending, but limit the growth in spending, that we would raise the debt ceiling \$2.1 trillion so that money could be borrowed and be spent, but we would reduce, over 10 years, the growth in spending enough to offset that increase. That was the bargain that was made.

More importantly, this legislation violates the budget agreement that was passed into law, the Murray-Ryan bill that was signed by President Obama just before Christmas—just a few weeks ago. The ink is barely dry on that agreement and my colleagues now are proposing to bust it completely. This has become too common. This is too much how we operate here. Some of our Members take umbrage at the fact that millions of Americans are unhappy with us in Washington. People complain about how we are doing our jobs. They say the Tea Party people are angry and therefore they are evil people. Well, why should they not be angry with us? We promised not to spend over a certain amount of money and we have repeatedly voted to do that since 2011.

We voted in December to contain spending and maintain spending levels.

Now, in January, as soon as the year began, we have a proposal to add \$7 billion to the debt above what we agreed to spend. So I think the American people have a right to be hot with us. We need to vote some people out of here. If we do not change the spending habit, this country is going to be facing a fiscal catastrophe as independent observers have warned us for years.

Next month, the President is going to ask Republicans for our help in passing a bill that raises the debt ceiling. We have already hit the debt ceiling again. So he will be asking for us to raise it again, because we need to borrow more money because we haven't cut spending. We are spending more money than comes in. We are spending that every year. The President wants to keep spending and not reduce spending. So he is asking us to raise the debt ceiling to let him borrow even more than the \$17 trillion we have. They are going to threaten, cajole, and try to scare Americans with horror stories of imminent financial collapse if we do not agree to raise the debt ceiling. We know that is coming. Hopefully we will reach an agreement that will raise the debt ceiling but get some real reforms in this government and bring down the rate of growth in spending in this country.

But how can we talk about promise to contain spending in the future when we have got a bill before us right now that blatantly violates the Budget Act? All we are doing is spending more money, borrowing more money, and raising the debt ceiling even faster than otherwise would be the case. This is the wrong direction for America. We need to be reducing our deficit, not voting to increase deficits. This is simple and plain. We need to be reducing deficits.

We need to be working every day, as the American people have told us, to bring our spending under control. Wasteful Washington spending is threatening America. The Federal Government already taxes too much, spends too much, borrows too much, regulates too much. It is time for us to live within our means, to balance our budget. That includes finding offsets and spending savings to pay for any extension of unemployment insurance or really any other proposal for new spending.

This Congress has not been doing that. I would note that in the *New York Times* recently, Jonathan Weisman wrote this:

The drive to extend unemployment insurance has put both parties into awkward political positions. Mr. Reid opened the second session of the 113th Congress Monday by declaring: "The rich keep getting richer. The poor keep getting poorer, and the middle class are under siege." It was hardly an endorsement for an economy entering its sixth year under President Obama's watch.

Gene Sperling, the President's economic advisor, just said this recently. "Three people are looking for every one job open."

So what are we to do about this? What do we say about this? I would

say, colleagues, that while hopefully we can help unemployed Americans today with some sort of a benefit that we will pay for in a financially sound manner, hopefully we will see wages rise. We need to see wages rise, in my opinion, because I think the middle class is under siege. I think poor people are getting hammered in this current economy.

But I will ask this question: Who has been setting the agenda economically for America for the last 5 years? Has not President Obama taxed more? Hasn't he regulated more? Has he not spent more? Hasn't he borrowed more? Hasn't ObamaCare, the Affordable Care Act, hammered American businesses and caused them to lay off workers and hire people part time rather than full time?

Actually two-thirds of the people hired in 2013 were hired part time. This is not healthy. Things are not going well. The model that is planned that we are seeing overall is not working.

How much longer will it take for people to recognize that? The promises were made. If we just send out more checks, if we pass more stimulus bills, if we spend more money, if we do all these things, somehow this will create growth and prosperity in America. But all this time, we have been increasing the debt dramatically, trillion-plus-dollar deficits for 4 years. We have never seen anything like this in American history.

The debt itself is a detriment and a depressant to economic growth in America. It causes fear and concern throughout the entire American populace and the world, unease about the future of the United States with these kinds of debts.

The point I would make is let's do some things that fix the disease, and the disease is an excessive government domination of the economy that is suppressing growth and prosperity, suppressing wages, and government actions that create more unemployment and part-time employment than is necessary and should be happening. That is the problem we need to be addressing. The symptoms of that are being addressed when we deal with unemployment insurance or mandatory wage rates.

I thank the Chair and my colleagues for the opportunity to share these thoughts. I really do believe Senator AYOTTE's proposal to deal with the waste and fraudulent abuse of tax money through the improper use of the ITIN—the individual tax identification number—is very real. It is very effective, would save billions of dollars, and would help us pay for some of the things we would like to do. That is what we should be doing, not adding more debt to the people of America.

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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

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

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

Mr. REED. I come to the floor this evening to express my hope that the bipartisan effort that brought this 3-month bill to the floor can be sustained as we go forward so that we can swiftly help the 1.3 million long-term unemployed workers who were cut off from these benefits on December 28. As many of my colleagues have discovered from going back to their home States, in many cases these folks are desperate. This benefit was the difference between things we take for granted—having a car to be able to get to a job, having a cell phone so they can get a message saying they have a job interview, paying for heat in the cold weather, putting groceries on the table. For many people, this is truly an emergency.

That is why working with Senator HELLER, whom I applaud for his vision, collaboration, and for his sense in terms of the difficulties of his constituents and, nationally, many people, and for his effort—he did a superb job. What we sensed was we needed to provide relief immediately. Longer term, there are issues to address, and my colleagues have been on the floor discussing these issues, but immediately we have 1.3 million Americans, and every day many more who need help go off the rolls.

I hope we can move very expeditiously and provide at least this short-term aid. Then, of course, we have very significant issues going forward for the entire-year extension, which I hope ultimately we can resolve.

In addition to Senator HELLER, I wish to thank all of my colleagues. Particularly, I thank Senators COLLINS, MURKOWSKI, PORTMAN, AYOTTE, and COATS for their support, along with all of our Members of the Democratic caucus who came together.

Now we have the challenge of providing this relief and then thinking creatively, constructively, and collaboratively about how we provide this relief at least through the full year. I hope we can extend the program for the next 90 days immediately and quickly, but that other issue is certainly before us.

I understand also that my colleagues have raised issues about the structure of the program, about whether this spending—even the short-term spending—should be offset. Again, I go back to the point that we have 1.3 million Americans—and growing each day—who are looking for immediate help, not thoughtful, careful, long-term deliberation. That was the logic behind moving to a 90-day extension, getting it done, and then going forward and dealing with inherently more difficult issues for a full-year program.

We already understand that short-term lapse from the 28th until today

has already had dramatic impacts on families. This is what I think my colleagues have heard, seen, and read about when they have gone home. Men and women who worked for decades, never thinking they would ever use their unemployment benefits, which they have earned since they started working, are now suddenly facing a weakened job market where there are nearly three people for every one job, where there are issues of skill training for the new jobs that are emerging. These are very difficult challenges.

I think what finally led us to at least this point of moving forward was the perception that this program is not subject to some arcane abuse by people in the system; this is for working men and women who, through no fault of their own, lost their jobs, who are desperately looking for jobs, and they are our neighbors and our constituents—many of whom we thought and they thought would never be in this predicament. They have families, elderly parents, and young children. They have responsibilities.

They have something else too, which I think we sometimes don't give enough credit for: They want to work. They have spent a life, many of them, working to a position of responsibility where they are using all of their talents. The idea that they are just going to give that up for the only available job, which might be working at a counter at a fast-food restaurant—that is a challenge not only to your pocketbook, but that is a challenge to your person, to who you are—we have to recognize that also.

These benefits are usually helpful to people in so many different capacities.

As I said, we are trying to deal with a situation where people have been let go through no fault of their own. If someone quits, they don't qualify. If they are fired, they don't qualify. Many of these people are unemployed as a result of the new economy—information technology that makes their job something that can be done away with; mergers, acquisitions, and downsizing that caused the bottom line of a corporation to grow, but they are out of a job. We have to deal with it, and we have to deal with it as we have done so many times before by providing these long-term unemployment benefits.

We also have to do it because it is good for our economy. The CBO estimates that if we do not renew UI for the full year 2014, we will lose 200,000 jobs because the weekly benefits, which are rather modest—\$300 to \$350 a week—go almost immediately from the recipient into the economy. It is the reason some grocery stores can keep two or three extra people on, because the demand is still there. It is the reason some service stations can keep the extra mechanic on, because the demand is still there. If we shut down that demand, we will have 200,000 more people—ironically—who will qualify, at least initially, for State unemployment benefits.

This is about our economy.

I would like to draw our attention to the report our colleague Senator AMY KLOBUCHAR did as the vice chair of the Joint Economic Committee. It was very thoughtfully done. It is not a surprise given that it was authored in large part by Senator KLOBUCHAR. This report touches on these important issues and notes that “unemployment insurance (UI) has kept more than 11 million people out of poverty since 2008—including 1.8 million adults and 620,000 children in 2012 alone. People of all demographic and socio-economic backgrounds have been helped by unemployment insurance following a job loss.”

This cuts across the whole spectrum. Again, how does someone get to qualify? They have to work. I would suspect that every one of my colleagues would say this country should be all about work, rewarding work, and if someone loses a job through no fault of their own, give them a chance to get back in the workforce.

The reality of this economic downturn has been so pervasive that it has affected virtually every American. And so unemployment insurance has been a key part of the recovery. We all know that economists who have looked at this program suggest there is anywhere from a \$1.50 to \$1.60 benefit for every \$1 we put in the economy. Economically, for the national economy as a whole, this is a very powerful tool to keep economic growth, expansion, and demand moving forward. That is exactly what we need to keep the economy growing.

Indeed, one of the aspects of this recession and one of the aspects highlighted very insightfully by the report from the Joint Economic Committee is the long-term rate of unemployment. This might be a new structural phenomenon in our economy, but definitely something is happening out there.

I will go back to when I was a kid. Someone is on the third shift because they are the junior person. The recession comes and guess who gets laid off. The third shift. The second shift, the middle people, and the first shift, the most senior people, typically weren't touched. The economy came back, and that third shift got rehired, but those workers with 10, 15 years' experience were pretty safe.

Now that is not the case. Now we are seeing first, second, and third shift gone. Now we are seeing, well, this is a great opportunity, with interest rates at in some cases 1 percent—at least for the major financial institutions—to replace a lot of workers with a lot of machines. Let's do that. Let's get value. Let's downsize. Let's make sure we invest in capital. This is the phenomenon we are seeing, and it is causing some of this significant increase in long-term unemployment.

In the JEC report, they note:

The current long-term unemployment rate of 2.6 percent is twice as high as it was when Congress allowed emergency federal UI programs to expire after the 1990-91 and 2001 recessions.

Let me say that in my terms. Previously, we have never taken away these benefits when long-term unemployment has been so high, and these benefits are not directly responsible for long-term unemployment. The 26 weeks of the State benefit programs is for people who lose work and find it relatively quickly. This program, the one we are debating today, is specifically designed for those people who are having a difficult time finding work over a long period of time.

We are now at twice as high a level of unemployment as we were in previous recessions when we ended these benefits, which would suggest this is not the time to end these benefits.

Let me continue from the JEC report:

While employment prospects have improved for many jobless Americans (the national unemployment rate is 7.0 percent—the lowest rate in five years), finding work is challenging for the long-term unemployed. More than one-third of unemployed workers (roughly 4 million Americans) have been searching for work for more than 26 weeks, when state-funded UI benefits typically run out, and 2.8 million unemployed people have been searching for work for more than one year.

This is a phenomenon we have to deal with. This program we are discussing today is specifically designed for those long-term unemployed. So if there is one program that is responsive to one of the most salient aspects of this current recession, it is the long-term UI program because long-term unemployment seems to be the most difficult issue to resolve, even as our overall employment numbers continue to grow—not fast enough, but they are growing.

I want to also dispel the belief of some of my colleagues that these benefits only flow to one or two distinct constituencies. That this is a targeted program that provides some benefits, but it doesn't apply across the board. That is not the case. This is about every American from virtually every type of education, income, and ethnic background.

As the JEC report documents:

The 23.9 million Americans who have directly benefited from the EUC program since 2008 include people of all demographic and socioeconomic backgrounds . . . [I]n 2012, more than 60 percent of the recipients were between the ages of 25 and 54.

Let me stop. There is a stereotype out there that a lot of these folks are 18 year olds who had a job for a while but decided they would rather go skiing in Utah or snorkeling in the Caribbean, and what better way to do that than just essentially sort of perform so that when the layoffs come you get one—but so what, I am not going to look for work; I'm going to just go. Sixty percent of these people are 25 years old to 54 years old. They are starting the prime or are in the prime of their work career. They have responsibility. They typically have families. They have, probably, if they are in their 50s, been working for 30 years.

So this notion this is just a convenient time to take a vacation subsidized by the government is erroneous.

Let me continue from the report:

The remaining recipients were about evenly split between those younger than 25 and those 55 and older.

Again, the 55 and older—and this is very close to home—for these people it is a desperate struggle because they are caught right in the middle. They have a 75-year-old or 80-year-old mother or father; they have 30-year-old children and some younger who are going to school or they need the help. They have been working for 30-plus years. They have reached positions of responsibility in their firm and now, suddenly, for the first time—many is the case—they are without a job. That is not just economic, as I suggested. That also goes deeply to who they are, their value, and how they can help their family if they can't work. What is the effect on the family? How do they come home every day from looking for work without a job and not have it affect the family? This is the reality we are dealing with.

That is why, frankly, I have been pleading to at least get this program restored for 90 days. That will give us the time—not on the backs of the unemployed—but give us the time to do the work for a longer extension.

Now let me continue:

More than half the recipients in 2012 were white, while 22 percent were black, and 19 percent were Hispanic. The vast majority (85 percent) lived in households with more than one adult, and 43 percent lived in households with at least one child.

So these are not single transients who move around and are used to being unemployed and could work if they wanted to. These are people with real family responsibilities.

People of all levels of education have received EUC benefits. The majority of recipients in 2012 had earned a high school diploma, and almost one-fifth held a 4-year college degree.

These are people that have skills. They have at least got the credentials, which, again, 20 or 30 years ago put you into the workplace and probably kept you there, if you were diligent.

So I hope my colleagues take time to review this report. It is extremely useful. It shatters some stereotypes and reinforces the point this is about helping working Americans who need help.

I think the facts are clearly on the side of continuing this program, and I think the reality is they need the help now. If we can get them that help, then we will have the time to deliberate the very serious questions that my colleagues have raised; and they have raised them constructively and raised them sincerely about the long-term approach of this program. But to continue to trade legislative ideas on the floor while millions of Americans either are losing their benefits or are seeing the end come within days, weeks or months is not the right response.

So I urge my colleagues to move forward through these procedural hurdles.

Let's get this bill done as Senator HELLER and I have proposed it. Let's get it done, and then we have another huge challenge because we want, frankly, and I think the sentiment is across the board—if we are going to do this, let us at least continue it through the year 2014.

We are beginning to sense some positive economic shifts. We hope those materialize. We hope they come forward to the point where the unemployment rate, which has fallen—I heard the President today say when he took over we were losing 800,000 jobs a month. It was rocketing up into the stratosphere in some states, 12 percent, 14 percent. In Rhode Island it is still 9 percent. We have seen some progress—not enough in my State, in Nevada, and other States. But we have seen progress, and we hope that progress continues.

Indeed, one of the other aspects of this program, if we pass these benefits—and the economists have pointed it out, particularly if we pass them on an emergency basis—it will add more fuel to our economy, not less. It will add more demand. It will, in fact, increase growth at a time when everyone is on the floor talking about the fact that we just have to grow more jobs. Of course we do. But this program is, in a way, the proverbial two-fer. You help people who need help, and you help the economy grow faster—200,000 jobs at least.

So I really do think we should move forward as quickly as we can to get this Reed-Heller bill completed, and then we have a lot of careful, thoughtful, collaborative effort to engage in. Because if we want to go forward for a full year, which we do, we have other significant issues—not just the size of the program, but other issues as were brought up by my colleagues, and brought up very fairly, very constructively, and very thoughtfully.

So Madam President, my message is: No. 1, I thank my colleagues for giving us the chance to seriously debate this bill, and I urge them to pass it quickly, and then we will set ourselves up for another serious, thoughtful and constructive debate. That is my wish.

With that, Madam President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

## REMEMBERING PHIL EVERLY

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I rise today to bid farewell to a Kentucky son who became half of one of the most enduring and influential acts of country and rock and roll music. Phil Everly, of the hit-making duo the Everly Brothers, passed away this weekend at the age of 74.

Phil and his older brother Don brought their trademark close harmony singing, modeled in the Appalachian country and bluegrass music tradition, to rock and roll beginning in the late 1950s. With songs including "Bye Bye Love," "Wake Up Little Susie," and "All I Have to Do Is Dream," they consistently scored hits at the top of the charts.

The Everly Brothers are famous the world over and influenced musicians such as the Beatles, the Beach Boys, Bob Dylan, Simon and Garfunkel, and many others. But they were especially beloved in their family's home State of Kentucky, and particularly in Central City, in Muhlenberg County, western Kentucky, which was the site of the Everly Brothers' Labor Day Homecoming Music Festival every year.

This festival included many famous country and rock and roll music stars from the Everly Brothers themselves to Chet Atkins, Keith Urban, Billy Ray Cyrus, and Tammy Wynette. Money raised went to local charities.

Phil and Don Everly's musical career was the result of a lifetime spent singing. Phil and Don were born the sons of a Kentucky coal miner turned country musician, Ike Everly, and his wife Margaret. The family moved to pursue musical opportunities and ended up playing live country music on the radio in Shenandoah, IA. The whole family was spotlighted, from Mom and Dad Everly to Little Donnie and 6-year-old "Baby Boy Phil." Don and Phil spent their summers in their parents' home of Muhlenberg County.

As teenagers the Everly Brothers started their own careers, first as songwriters, then as performers. In 1957 they scored a No. 1 hit with "Bye Bye Love." In their trademark style, Phil sang the high harmony notes while Don sang baritone, their voices intertwining in a way that sounded easy but was difficult to duplicate.

They continued to have best-selling songs for several years, including 12 Billboard top 10 hits, and released the landmark country-rock album "Roots" in 1968 that included snippets of their old family radio show. The Beatles have said that the vocal harmonies from their first No. 1 hit, "Please Please Me" of 1963, were modeled after the Everly Brothers' 1960 hit song "Cathy's Clown." Phil was the author of one of the duo's best loved songs, "When Will I Be Loved?," which was a top 10 hit for Linda Ronstadt in 1975.

While older brother Don was born in Kentucky, younger brother Phil was actually born in Chicago on January 19, 1939. Nearly 50 years later, in 1988, the mayor of Central City gave Phil

Everly an honorary Kentucky birth certificate. "I really appreciate you making me a full-blown Kentuckian," Phil said as he received it. "I've been lying for a lot of years."

The Everly Brothers' Labor Day Homecoming Music Festival began in 1988 as a way for the Everly Brothers to show their gratitude to their hometown fans. In 2010, the Central City Tourism Commission opened the Muhlenberg County Music Museum, which showcases a complete collection of Don and Phil's albums and features a 1950s-style jukebox that plays their biggest hits.

Sadly, just before Phil's death, local western Kentucky fans of the Everly Brothers were planning a celebration of what would have been Phil's 75th birthday on January 19. Instead, the Central City Tourism Commission will host a memorial service at the museum on that day to celebrate Phil's life and music. Phil is survived by many family members and beloved friends, including his brother Don.

I know my colleagues will join me in expressing gratitude and appreciation for the wonderful music that Phil, along with his brother Don, provided the world. The music of the Everly Brothers continues to provide joy to people to this day. Kentucky is honored to have played such a role in the shaping of this extraordinary musical family.

## HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

## CALIFORNIA CASUALTIES

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to eight servicemembers from California or based in California who have died while serving our country in Operation Enduring Freedom since I last entered names into the record on July 10, 2013. This brings to 410 the number of servicemembers either from California or based in California who have been killed while serving our country in Afghanistan. This represents 18 percent of all U.S. deaths in Afghanistan:

LCpl Benjamin W. Tuttle, 19, of Gentry, AR, died July 14, 2013, at the Landstuhl Regional Medical Center following a medical evacuation from the aircraft carrier the USS *Nimitz*, CVN 68, during a scheduled port visit in the 5th Fleet Area of Responsibility. Lance Corporal Tuttle was assigned to Marine Fighter Attack Squadron 323, Marine Aircraft Group 11, 3rd Marine Aircraft Wing, I Marine Expeditionary Force, Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, CA.

SPC Nicholas B. Burley, 22, of Red Bluff, CA, died July 30, 2013, in Pul-E-Alam, Afghanistan, of injuries sustained when enemy forces attacked his unit with indirect fire. Specialist Burley was assigned to the 6th Squadron, 8th Cavalry Regiment, 4th Infantry Brigade Combat Team, 3rd Infantry Division, Fort Stewart, GA.

SPC Kenneth Clifford Alvarez, 23, of Santa Maria, CA, died August 23, 2013, in Haft Asiab, Afghanistan, from

wounds suffered when enemy forces attacked his unit with an improvised explosive device during combat operations. Specialist Alvarez was assigned to 2nd Engineer Battalion, 36th Engineer Brigade, White Sands Missile Range, NM.

SSG Robert E. Thomas Jr., 24, of Fontana, CA, died September 13, 2013, at Brooke Army Medical Center, Fort Sam Houston, TX, of wounds suffered during a non-combat related incident on April 21, 2013, in Maiwand, Afghanistan. Staff Sergeant Thomas was assigned to the 1st Battalion, 36th Infantry Regiment, 1st Brigade Combat Team, Fort Bliss, TX.

LCDR Landon L. Jones, 35, of Lompoc, CA, died September 22, 2013, as a result of an MH-60S Knighthawk helicopter crash while operating in the central Red Sea. Lieutenant Commander Jones was assigned to Helicopter Sea Combat Squadron Six at Naval Air Station North Island, San Diego, CA.

CWO Jonathon S. Gibson, 32, of Aurora, OR, died September 22, 2013, as a result of an MH-60S Knighthawk helicopter crash while operating in the central Red Sea. Chief Warrant Officer Gibson was assigned to Helicopter Sea Combat Squadron Six at Naval Air Station North Island, San Diego, CA.

CPT Jennifer M. Moreno, 25, of San Diego, CA, died October 6, 2013, in Zhari District, Afghanistan, of injuries sustained when enemy forces attacked her unit with an improvised explosive device. Captain Moreno was assigned to Madigan Army Medical Center, Joint Base Lewis-McChord, WA.

LCpl Matthew R. Rodriguez, 19, of Fairhaven, MA, died December 11, 2013, while conducting combat operations in Helmand Province, Afghanistan. Lance Corporal Rodriguez was assigned to 1st Combat Engineer Battalion, 1st Marine Division, I Marine Expeditionary Force, Camp Pendleton, CA.

## YELLEN NOMINATION

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, yesterday, the Senate voted to confirm Janet Yellen to be Chairman of the Federal Reserve. Regrettably, I was not in Washington and was not present for the vote. Had I been here, I would have voted no on this nomination. While Ms. Yellen may be well-qualified for this position, I do not support her nomination due to her support of monetary policies such as quantitative easing, QE, that have distorted the markets and artificially stimulated the economy. With interest rates at record lows, economic growth continues to be anemic and unemployment rates are higher than normal. During her confirmation hearing, Ms. Yellen admitted that there are "costs and risks" associated with the QE program but still signaled support. QE has done little more than increase uncertainty in our economy and opened the door for high interest rates in the future. The Federal Reserve must stop this ill-conceived,



wholly irresponsible approach and Congress and the administration must enact fiscally responsible policies that strengthen the middle class by creating jobs, growing the economy and cutting the red tape that continues to hamper the private sector.

#### BUDGET ACT SECTION 114(c)

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I rise to enter into a colloquy with the Senator from Ohio, Mr. PORTMAN, to discuss section 114(c) of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013, which establishes a deficit-neutral reserve fund to replace sequestration.

Before I turn to Senator PORTMAN for his questions, I would like to note that the Senate has relied on reserve funds for nearly 30 years to help it carry out its priorities as part of the annual budget process. In fact, during debate on the 2014 budget resolution, the Senate considered or filed over 300 reserve funds. These included multiple amendments from Members of both parties to create new reserve funds. This particular reserve fund, section 114(c), was included and voted on as part of both the Senate Budget Committee-reported resolution and the Senate-passed budget resolution.

I would now like to turn to my colleague for his questions.

Mr. PORTMAN. I would like to thank the chairman of the Budget Committee for the opportunity to engage in this colloquy with her. As I understand it, the intent of the reserve fund under section 114(c) is to be available to adjust certain budgetary levels for deficit-neutral legislation that would replace sequestration. Do I have that correct?

Mrs. MURRAY. Yes, the bipartisan budget agreement reached between the House and Senate replaces some of the sequester cuts that otherwise would occur in 2014 and 2015. By avoiding sequestration and reaching agreement on bipartisan funding levels for 2014 and 2015, this agreement will provide relief to our families, servicemembers, and the economy. Sequestration, however, continues to remain in place, unmodified, for fiscal years 2016 through 2021. Assuming legislation met the necessary requirements specified in section 114(c), this reserve fund would be available to further address the harmful effects of sequestration.

Mr. PORTMAN. I thank the chairman for her response. There is a concern that the reserve fund in section 114(c) could deprive the minority of an opportunity to require 60 votes for legislation that would modify the statutory limits on discretionary spending and pay for some or all of that cost with new revenue. Is that concern accurate?

Mrs. MURRAY. I thank the Senator for his question. No, that concern is not accurate. While a useful tool to help the Senate carry out its priorities under the budget process, a reserve fund is limited in what it allows me to

do, in my capacity as chairman of the Budget Committee. In general, for legislation that meets the required criteria, reserve funds allow me to revise the levels adopted in a budget resolution and enforced in the Senate, such as committee allocations and the budgetary aggregates.

A reserve fund, however, does not have any impact on the standing rules of the Senate, including the cloture process and the need for 60 votes to end debate. Nothing in the Bipartisan Budget Act would change that process.

A reserve fund also does not waive budget points of order. I can use a reserve fund to revise the committee allocations and budgetary aggregates, such that legislation that meets the criteria of the reserve fund, including deficit neutrality, can be brought into compliance with the allocations and aggregates. But, it does not allow me to waive budget points of order that still may lie against the legislation following the reserve fund adjustment. Budget points of order generally can only be waived by unanimous consent or with 60 votes. Nothing in the Bipartisan Budget Act would change that.

Further, the Senator from Ohio proposed the specific hypothetical example of legislation that would increase the statutory limits on discretionary spending and offset some or all of those costs with new revenue. Recognizing this is a hypothetical scenario, I believe in that situation the legislation would be subject to a 60-vote point of order for violating section 306 of the Congressional Budget Act, which creates a point of order against legislation dealing with matters within the jurisdiction of the Budget Committee that has not been reported out of the Budget Committee. Ultimately, the Parliamentarian of the Senate determines whether points of order under section 306 lie against legislation, but legislation to alter the statutory limits in discretionary spending has historically been within the jurisdiction of the Budget Committee. A reserve fund would have no impact on a section 306 point of order and nothing in the Bipartisan Budget Act would change that.

In addition, legislation increasing the statutory caps on discretionary spending above the existing levels, as the Senator from Ohio outlines in his question, would also violate section 312(b) of the Congressional Budget Act, which prohibits consideration of legislation that would exceed any of the statutory limits on discretionary spending. The reserve fund in 114(c), like other reserve funds, deals only with Senate enforcement and would have no impact on that point of order. Again, nothing in the Bipartisan Budget Act would change that.

Finally, I would suggest to my colleague that legislation originating in the Senate rather than in the House of Representatives that raises revenue would likely be subject to a "blue slip" and returned back to the Senate by the

House of Representatives. Again, nothing in the Bipartisan Budget Act would change that process.

Mr. PORTMAN. I thank the Chairman for her answer. I understand that we were discussing a hypothetical example. I thank her for engaging with me in this colloquy.

#### VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, last night, due to airline flight delays in South Dakota and Minneapolis, I missed the roll call vote on the confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 452, Janet L. Yellen, of California, to be Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of 4 years. Had I been present for this vote, I would have voted no.

Madam President, last night, due to airline flight delays in South Dakota and Minneapolis, I missed the roll call cloture vote on the motion to proceed to S. 1845. Had I been present for this vote, I would have voted no.

#### U.S. CADET NURSE CORPS

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, today I wish to recognize the women of the U.S. Cadet Nurse Corps. Approximately 125,000 American women served as Corps members during World War II, providing comfort and care at hospitals across the country, including in New Hampshire. Most of the former Corps members are now in their eighties, and it is incumbent upon us to ensure that the lessons of their service are remembered for the benefit of future generations.

In March of 1943, Congresswoman Frances P. Bolton of Ohio, a strong believer in the power of nurses in the healing process, introduced legislation to ensure that the supply of nurses in the United States would be large enough to meet the increasing demands of the war effort, especially as large numbers of experienced nurses left the country to serve overseas. The Bolton Act promised a free nursing education in exchange for a commitment to serve in the Cadet Nurse Corps for the duration of the war.

Driven by the immediate need for more nurses, Corps members worked overtime to finish their studies within a compressed study schedule and began to perform nursing duties even before they had formally graduated. This on-the-job training ensured that civilians and recovering servicemembers continued to receive necessary medical care even as much of the medical community was focused on the war front.

Members of the U.S. Cadet Nurse Corps took an oath to dedicate themselves to the triumph of life over death at a time when this perpetual struggle took on previously unseen dimensions. Like many of the American soldiers fighting overseas, these women were predominantly young, recent high school graduates who, when confronted with the call to serve their country,

answered unhesitatingly and in large numbers.

I ask my colleagues in the Senate to join me in thanking all former Cadet Nurse Corps members for their service to the country and for their the selfless commitment to the nursing profession.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, 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.)

#### PROPOSED AGREEMENT FOR CO-OPERATION BETWEEN THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE IN TAIWAN (AIT) AND THE TAIPEI ECONOMIC AND CULTURAL REPRESENTATIVE OFFICE IN THE UNITED STATES (TECRO) CONCERNING PEACEFUL USES OF NUCLEAR ENERGY—PM 26

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 Foreign Relations:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress, pursuant to sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2153(b), (d)) (the "Act"), the text of a proposed Agreement for Cooperation Between the American Institute in Taiwan (AIT) and the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States (TECRO) Concerning Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy (the "Agreement"). I am also pleased to transmit my written approval, authorization, and determination concerning the Agreement, and an unclassified Nuclear Proliferation Assessment Statement (NPAS) concerning the Agreement. (In accordance with section 123 of the Act, as amended by title XII of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-277), a classified annex to the NPAS, prepared by the Secretary of State in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, summarizing relevant classified information, will be submitted to the Congress separately.) The joint memorandum submitted to me by the Secretaries of State and Energy and a letter from the Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) stating the views of the Commission are also enclosed. An addendum to

the NPAS containing a comprehensive analysis of the export control system of Taiwan with respect to nuclear-related matters, including interactions with other countries of proliferation concern and the actual or suspected nuclear, dual-use, or missile-related transfers to such countries, pursuant to section 102A of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 403-1), as amended, is being submitted separately by the Director of National Intelligence.

The proposed Agreement has been negotiated in accordance with the Act and other applicable law. In my judgment, it meets all applicable statutory requirements and will advance the nonproliferation and other foreign policy interests of the United States.

The proposed Agreement provides a comprehensive framework for peaceful nuclear cooperation with the authorities on Taiwan based on a mutual commitment to nuclear nonproliferation. The proposed Agreement has an indefinite term from the date of its entry-into-force, unless terminated by either party on 1 year's written notice. The proposed Agreement permits the transfer of information, material, equipment (including reactors), and components for nuclear research and nuclear power production. The Agreement also specifies cooperation shall be in accordance with the provisions of the Agreement and applicable legal obligations, including, as appropriate, treaties, international agreements, domestic laws, regulations, and/or licensing requirements (such as those imposed by the NRC in accordance with 10 CFR 110 and the Department of Energy in accordance with 10 CFR 810). It does not permit transfers of Restricted Data, sensitive nuclear technology and facilities, or major critical components of such facilities. The proposed Agreement also prohibits the possession of sensitive nuclear facilities and any engagement in activities involving sensitive nuclear technology in the territory of the authorities represented by TECRO. In the event of termination of the proposed Agreement, key nonproliferation conditions and controls continue with respect to material, equipment, and components subject to the proposed Agreement.

Over the last two decades, the authorities on Taiwan have established a reliable record on nonproliferation and on commitments to nonproliferation. While the political status of the authorities on Taiwan prevents them from formally acceding to multilateral nonproliferation treaties or agreements, the authorities on Taiwan have voluntarily assumed commitments to adhere to the provisions of multilateral treaties and initiatives. The Republic of China ratified the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) in 1970 and ratified the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction (the

"Biological Weapons Convention" or "BWC") in 1972. The authorities on Taiwan have stated that they will continue to abide by the obligations of the NPT (i.e., those of a non-nuclear-weapon state) and the BWC, and the United States regards them as bound by both treaties. The authorities on Taiwan follow International Atomic Energy Agency standards and directives in their nuclear program, work closely with U.S. civilian nuclear authorities, and have established relationships with mainland Chinese civilian authorities with respect to nuclear safety. A more detailed discussion of the domestic civil nuclear activities and nuclear nonproliferation policies and practices of the authorities on Taiwan, including their nuclear export policies and practices, is provided in the NPAS and in a classified annex to the NPAS submitted separately. As noted above, an addendum to the NPAS containing a comprehensive analysis of the export control system of the authorities on Taiwan with respect to nuclear-related matters is being submitted to you separately by the Director of National Intelligence.

I have considered the views and recommendations of the interested agencies in reviewing the proposed Agreement and have determined that its performance will promote, and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to, the common defense and security. Accordingly, I have approved the Agreement and authorized its execution and urge the Congress to give it favorable consideration.

This transmission shall constitute a submittal for purposes of both sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Act. My Administration is prepared to begin immediately the consultations with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee as provided in section 123 b. Upon completion of the 30 days of continuous session review provided for in section 123 b., the 60 days of continuous session review provided for in section 123 d. shall commence.

BARACK OBAMA.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, January 7, 2014.

#### 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. BROWN:

S. 1896. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the new markets tax credit and provide designated allocations for areas impacted by a decline in manufacturing; 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 Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. ALEXANDER,

Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. AYOTTE, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. Res. 329. A resolution expressing support for the goals and ideals of the biennial USA Science & Engineering Festival in Washington, DC and designating April 21 through April 27, 2014, as “National Science and Technology Week”; considered and agreed to.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 178

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 178, a bill to provide for alternative financing arrangements for the provision of certain services and the construction and maintenance of infrastructure at land border ports of entry, and for other purposes.

S. 209

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 209, a bill to require a full audit of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal reserve banks by the Comptroller General of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 249

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 249, a bill to provide for the expansion of affordable refinancing of mortgages held by the Federal National Mortgage Association and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation.

S. 267

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 267, a bill to prevent, deter, and eliminate illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing through port State measures.

S. 269

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 269, a bill to establish uniform administrative and enforcement authorities for the enforcement of the High Seas Driftnet Fishing Moratorium Protection Act and similar statutes, and for other purposes.

S. 270

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 270, a bill to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to establish a United States Ambassador at Large for Arctic Affairs.

S. 411

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 411, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 653

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 653, a bill to provide for the establishment of the Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia.

S. 1011

At the request of Mr. JOHANNES, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1011, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of Boys Town, and for other purposes.

S. 1099

At the request of Mr. JOHANNES, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1099, a bill to ensure that individuals do not simultaneously receive unemployment compensation and disability insurance benefits.

S. 1150

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1150, a bill to posthumously award a congressional gold medal to Constance Baker Motley.

S. 1204

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKE) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1204, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to protect rights of conscience with regard to requirements for coverage of specific items and services, to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit certain abortion-related discrimination in governmental activities, and for other purposes.

S. 1349

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1349, a bill to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes.

S. 1431

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1431, a bill to permanently extend the Internet Tax Freedom Act.

S. 1456

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1456, a bill to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Shimon Peres.

S. 1468

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1468, a bill to create two additional judge positions on the court established by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978

and modify the procedures for the appointment of judges to that court, and for other purposes.

S. 1467

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1467, a bill to establish the Office of the Special Advocate to provide advocacy in cases before courts established by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 and for other purposes.

S. 1468

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1468, a bill to require the Secretary of Commerce to establish the Network for Manufacturing Innovation and for other purposes.

S. 1495

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1495, a bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to issue an order with respect to secondary cockpit barriers, and for other purposes.

S. 1595

At the request of Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1595, a bill to establish a renewable electricity standard, and for other purposes.

S. 1610

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1610, a bill to delay the implementation of certain provisions of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012, and for other purposes.

S. 1696

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1696, a bill to protect a woman's right to determine whether and when to bear a child or end a pregnancy by limiting restrictions on the provision of abortion services.

S. 1709

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1709, a bill to require the Committee on Technology of the National Science and Technology Council to develop and update a national manufacturing competitiveness strategic plan, and for other purposes.

S. 1737

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1737, a

bill to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend increased expensing limitations and the treatment of certain real property as section 179 property.

S. 1778

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1778, a bill to require the Attorney General to report on State law penalties for certain child abusers, and for other purposes.

S. 1796

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1796, a bill to increase the participation of women, girls, and underrepresented minorities in STEM fields, to encourage and support students from all economic backgrounds to pursue STEM career opportunities, and for other purposes.

S. 1798

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1798, a bill to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not counted as full-time employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 1802

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1802, a bill to provide equal treatment for utility special entities using utility operations-related swaps, and for other purposes.

S. 1810

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1810, a bill to provide paid family and medical leave benefits to certain individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 1846

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1846, a bill to delay the implementation of certain provisions of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012, and for other purposes.

S. 1869

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON)

were added as cosponsors of S. 1869, a bill to repeal section 403 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013, relating to an annual adjustment of retired pay for members of the Armed Forces under the age of 62, and to provide an offset.

S. 1894

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1894, a bill to provide for the repeal of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act if it is determined that the Act has resulted in increasing the number of uninsured individuals.

## SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 329—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF THE BIENNIAL USA SCIENCE & ENGINEERING FESTIVAL IN WASHINGTON, DC AND DESIGNATING APRIL 21 THROUGH APRIL 27, 2014, AS “NATIONAL SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY WEEK”

Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. AYOTTE, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 329

Whereas science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (referred to in this preamble as “STEM”) are essential to the future global competitiveness of the United States;

Whereas advances in technology have resulted in significant improvement in the daily lives of individuals in the United States;

Whereas scientific discoveries are critical to curing diseases, solving global challenges, and an increased understanding of the world;

Whereas the future global economy will require a workforce that is educated in science and engineering specialties;

Whereas educating a new generation of individuals in the United States in STEM is crucial to ensure continued economic growth;

Whereas increasing the interest of the next generation of students in the United States, particularly young women and underrepresented minorities, in STEM is necessary to maintain the global competitiveness of the United States;

Whereas science and engineering festivals have attracted millions of participants and inspired a national effort to promote science and engineering;

Whereas thousands of universities, museums, science centers, STEM professional societies, educational societies, government agencies and laboratories, community organizations, elementary and secondary schools, volunteers, corporate and private sponsors, and nonprofit organizations have come together to organize the USA Science & Engineering Festival in Washington, DC in April 2014;

Whereas the USA Science & Engineering Festival will reinvigorate the interest of young people in the United States in STEM and highlight the important contributions of science and engineering to the competitiveness of the United States through exhibits on topics that include human spaceflight,

medicine, engineering, biotechnology, physics, and astronomy; and

Whereas scientific research is essential to the competitiveness of the United States, and events like the USA Science & Engineering Festival promote the importance of scientific research and development to the future of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) expresses support for the goals and ideals of the USA Science & Engineering Festival to promote scholarship in science and an interest in scientific research and development, as the cornerstones of innovation and competition in the United States;

(2) supports festivals, such as the USA Science & Engineering Festival, that focus on the importance of science and engineering to the daily lives of individuals in the United States through exhibits on topics that include human spaceflight, medicine, engineering, biotechnology, physics, and astronomy;

(3) congratulates all individuals and organizations whose efforts will make possible the USA Science & Engineering Festival, highlighting the accomplishments of the United States in science and engineering;

(4) encourages families and children to participate in the activities and exhibits of the USA Science & Engineering Festival that will occur in Washington, DC, and across the United States as satellite events of the festival; and

(5) designates April 21 through April 27, 2014, as “National Science and Technology Week”.

## AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2603. Ms. AYOTTE (for herself, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. MORAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. GRAHAM) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2604. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2605. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2606. Mr. COBURN (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. KING, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. BEGICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2607. Mr. COBURN (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. KING, and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2608. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2609. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2610. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2611. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2612. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the

bill S. 1845, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

#### TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

**SA 2603.** Ms. AYOTTE (for herself, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. MORAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. GRAHAM) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . REPEAL OF REDUCTIONS MADE BY BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2013.**

(a) **REPEAL.**—Section 403 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 is repealed as of the date of the enactment of such Act.

(b) **SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER REQUIRED TO CLAIM THE REFUNDABLE PORTION OF THE CHILD TAX CREDIT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subsection (d) of section 24 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) **IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENT WITH RESPECT TO TAXPAYER.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any taxpayer for any taxable year unless the taxpayer includes the taxpayer’s Social Security number on the return of tax for such taxable year.

“(B) **JOINT RETURNS.**—In the case of a joint return, the requirement of subparagraph (A) shall be treated as met if the Social Security number of either spouse is included on such return.

“(C) **LIMITATION.**—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to the extent the tentative minimum tax (as defined in section 55(b)(1)(A)) exceeds the credit allowed under section 32.”.

(2) **OMISSION TREATED AS MATHEMATICAL OR CLERICAL ERROR.**—Subparagraph (I) of section 6213(g)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“(I) an omission of a correct Social Security number required under section 24(d)(5) (relating to refundable portion of child tax credit), or a correct TIN under section 24(e) (relating to child tax credit), to be included on a return.”.

(3) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Subsection (e) of section 24 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting “WITH RESPECT TO QUALIFYING CHILDREN” after “IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENT” in the heading thereof.

(4) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

**SA 2604.** Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . TRANSPARENCY OF COVERAGE DETERMINATION.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives and the Financial Clerk of the Senate shall make publically available the determinations of each member of the

House of Representatives and each Senator, as the case may be, regarding the designation of their respective congressional staff (including leadership and committee staff) as “official” for purposes of requiring such staff to enroll in health insurance coverage provided through an Exchange as required under section 1312(d)(1)(D) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18032(d)(1)(D)), and the regulations relating to such section.

(b) **FAILURE TO SUBMIT.**—The failure by any member of the House of Representatives or Senator to designate any of their respective staff, whether committee or leadership staff, as “official” (as described in subsection (a)), shall be noted in the determination made publically available under subsection (a) along with a statement that such failure permits the staff involved to remain in the Federal Employee Health Benefits Program.

(c) **PRIVACY.**—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to permit the release of any individually identifiable information concerning any individual, including any health plan selected by an individual.

**SA 2605.** Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 6, after line 11, add the following:

**SEC. 7. STATE CONTROL OF ENERGY DEVELOPMENT AND PRODUCTION ON ALL AVAILABLE FEDERAL LAND.**

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **AVAILABLE FEDERAL LAND.**—The term “available Federal land” means any Federal land that, as of May 31, 2013—

(A) is located within the boundaries of a State;

(B) is not held by the United States in trust for the benefit of a federally recognized Indian tribe;

(C) is not a unit of the National Park System;

(D) is not a unit of the National Wildlife Refuge System; and

(E) is not a Congressionally designated wilderness area.

(2) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(3) **STATE.**—The term “State” means—

(A) a State; and

(B) the District of Columbia.

(b) **STATE PROGRAMS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A State—

(A) may establish a program covering the leasing and permitting processes, regulatory requirements, and any other provisions by which the State would exercise its rights to develop all forms of energy resources on available Federal land in the State; and

(B) as a condition of certification under subsection (c)(2) shall submit a declaration to the Departments of the Interior, Agriculture, and Energy that a program under subparagraph (A) has been established or amended.

(2) **AMENDMENT OF PROGRAMS.**—A State may amend a program developed and certified under this section at any time.

(3) **CERTIFICATION OF AMENDED PROGRAMS.**—Any program amended under paragraph (2) shall be certified under subsection (c)(2).

(c) **LEASING, PERMITTING, AND REGULATORY PROGRAMS.**—

(1) **SATISFACTION OF FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS.**—Each program certified under this section shall be considered to satisfy all applicable requirements of Federal law (including regulations), including—

(A) the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.);

(B) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.); and

(C) the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.).

(2) **FEDERAL CERTIFICATION AND TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS.**—Upon submission of a declaration by a State under subsection (b)(1)(B)(i)—

(A) the program under subsection (b)(1)(A) shall be certified; and

(B) the State shall receive all rights from the Federal Government to develop all forms of energy resources covered by the program.

(3) **ISSUANCE OF PERMITS AND LEASES.**—If a State elects to issue a permit or lease for the development of any form of energy resource on any available Federal land within the borders of the State in accordance with a program certified under paragraph (2), the permit or lease shall be considered to meet all applicable requirements of Federal law (including regulations).

(d) **JUDICIAL REVIEW.**—Activities carried out in accordance with this section shall not be subject to judicial review.

(e) **ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT.**—Activities carried out in accordance with this section shall not be subject to subchapter II of chapter 5, and chapter 7, of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the “Administrative Procedure Act”).

**SA 2606.** Mr. COBURN (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. KING, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. BEGICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

**SEC. 7. ENDING UNEMPLOYMENT PAYMENTS TO JOBLESS MILLIONAIRES AND BILLIONAIRES.**

(a) **PROHIBITION.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no Federal funds may be used to make payments of unemployment compensation (including such compensation under the Federal-State Extended Compensation Act of 1970 and the emergency unemployment compensation program under title IV of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008) to an individual whose adjusted gross income in the preceding year was equal to or greater than \$1,000,000.

(b) **COMPLIANCE.**—Unemployment Insurance applications shall include a form or procedure for an individual applicant to certify the individual’s adjusted gross income was not equal to or greater than \$1,000,000 in the preceding year.

(c) **AUDITS.**—The certifications required by subsection (b) shall be auditable by the U.S. Department of Labor or the U.S. Government Accountability Office.

(d) **STATUS OF APPLICANTS.**—It is the duty of the states to verify the residency, employment, legal, and income status of applicants for Unemployment Insurance and no Federal funds may be expended for purposes of determining an individual’s eligibility under this Act.

(e) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The prohibition under subsection (a) shall apply to weeks of unemployment beginning on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

**SA 2607.** Mr. COBURN (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. KING, and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

**SEC. 7. PROHIBITION ON PAYMENT OF BENEFITS BASED ON RECEIPT OF UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 224 the following new section:

“PROHIBITION ON PAYMENT OF BENEFITS BASED ON RECEIPT OF UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

“SEC. 224A. (a) If for any month prior to the month in which an individual attains retirement age (as defined in section 216(l)(1))—

“(1) such individual is entitled to benefits under section 223, and

“(2) such individual is entitled for such month to unemployment compensation,

the total of the individual's benefits under section 223 for such month and of any benefits under subsections (b) through (h) of section 202 for such month based on the individual's wages and self-employment income shall be reduced to zero.

“(b)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the head of any Federal agency shall provide such information within its possession as the Commissioner may require for purposes of making a timely determination under this section for reduction of benefits payable under this title, or verifying other information necessary in carrying out the provisions of this section.

“(2) The Commissioner is authorized to enter into agreements with States, political subdivisions, and other organizations that administer unemployment compensation, in order to obtain such information as the Commissioner may require to carry out the provisions of this section.

“(3) Any determination by the Commissioner pursuant to this section shall be subject to the requirements described in section 205(b)(1), including provision of reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

“(c) For purposes of this section, the term ‘unemployment compensation’ has the meaning given that term in section 85(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to benefits payable for months beginning after 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

**SA 2608.** Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

**TITLE II—PATHWAYS BACK TO WORK**

**SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the “Pathways Back to Work Act of 2013”.

**SEC. 202. ESTABLISHMENT OF PATHWAYS BACK TO WORK FUND.**

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States an account, which shall be known as the Pathways Back to Work Fund (referred to in this title as “the Fund”), consisting of such amounts as are paid to the Fund under subsection (b).

(b) PAYMENT INTO THE FUND.—Out of any amounts in the general fund of the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, there is appropriated \$12,500,000,000, which shall be paid to the Fund, to be used by the Secretary of Labor to carry out this title.

(c) PERIOD OF AVAILABILITY.—The amounts appropriated under this title shall be available for obligation by the Secretary of Labor through December 31, 2014, and shall be

available for expenditure by recipients of grants and subgrants under this title through September 30, 2015.

**SEC. 203. AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Using the amounts available through the Fund under section 202(b), the Secretary of Labor shall, subject to subsection (b)—

(1) allot \$8,000,000,000 in accordance with section 204 to provide subsidized employment to unemployed, low-income adults;

(2) allot \$2,500,000,000 in accordance with section 205 to provide summer employment and year-round employment opportunities to low-income youth; and

(3) use \$2,000,000,000 in accordance with section 206 to award grants on a competitive basis to local entities to carry out work-based training and other work-related and educational strategies and activities of demonstrated effectiveness to unemployed, low-income adults and low-income youth to provide the skills and assistance needed to obtain employment.

(b) RESERVATION.—The Secretary of Labor may reserve not more than 1 percent of the amounts available through the Fund under each of paragraphs (1) through (3) of subsection (a) to pay for the costs of technical assistance, evaluations, and Federal administration of this title.

**SEC. 204. SUBSIDIZED EMPLOYMENT FOR UNEMPLOYED, LOW-INCOME ADULTS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) ALLOTMENTS.—From the funds available under section 203(a)(1), the Secretary of Labor shall make an allotment or provide assistance under subsection (b) to each State that has a State plan approved under subsection (c) and to each outlying area and recipient under section 166(c) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2911(c)) that meets the requirements of this section, for the purpose of providing subsidized employment opportunities to unemployed, low-income adults.

(2) GUIDANCE.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this title, the Secretary of Labor, in coordination with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall issue guidance regarding the implementation of this section. Such guidance shall, consistent with this section, include procedures for the submission and approval of State and local plans and the allotment and allocation of funds, including reallocation and reallocation of such funds, that promote the expeditious and effective implementation of the activities authorized under this section.

(b) STATE ALLOTMENTS.—

(1) RESERVATIONS FOR OUTLYING AREAS AND TRIBES.—Of the funds described in subsection (a)(1), the Secretary of Labor shall reserve—

(A) not more than  $\frac{1}{4}$  of 1 percent to provide assistance to outlying areas to provide subsidized employment to unemployed, low-income adults; and

(B) 1.5 percent to provide assistance to recipients under section 166(c) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2911(c)) to provide subsidized employment to unemployed, low-income adults.

(2) STATES.—After determining the amounts to be reserved under section 203(b) and paragraph (1), the Secretary of Labor shall allot the remainder of the funds described in subsection (a)(1) among the States by allotting—

(A) one-third on the basis of the relative number of unemployed individuals in areas of substantial unemployment in each State, compared to the total number of unemployed individuals in areas of substantial unemployment in all States;

(B) one-third on the basis of the relative excess number of unemployed individuals in

each State, compared to the total excess number of unemployed individuals in all States; and

(C) one-third on the basis of the relative number of disadvantaged adults and youth in each State, compared to the total number of disadvantaged adults and youth in all States.

(3) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of the formula described in paragraph (2)—

(A) AREA OF SUBSTANTIAL UNEMPLOYMENT.—The term “area of substantial unemployment” means any contiguous area that has a population of at least 10,000, and that has an average rate of unemployment of at least 6.5 percent for the most recent 12 months, as determined by the Secretary of Labor.

(B) DISADVANTAGED ADULT OR YOUTH.—The term “disadvantaged adult or youth” means an individual who is age 16 or older who received an income, or is a member of a family that received a total family income, that, in relation to family size, does not exceed the higher of—

(i) the poverty line; or

(ii) 70 percent of the lower living standard income level.

(C) EXCESS NUMBER.—The term “excess number” means, used with respect to unemployed individuals in a State, the higher of—

(i) the number that represents the number of unemployed individuals in excess of 4.5 percent of the civilian labor force in the State; or

(ii) the number that represents the number of unemployed individuals in excess of 4.5 percent of the civilian labor force in areas of substantial unemployment in such State.

(4) REALLOTMENT.—If the Governor of a State does not submit a State plan by the date specified in subsection (c)(2)(B), or a State does not receive approval of a State plan, the amount the State would have been eligible to receive pursuant to the formula under paragraph (2) shall be transferred within the Fund and added to the amounts available for competitive grants under section 203(a)(3).

(c) STATE PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For a State to be eligible to receive an allotment of funds under subsection (b), the Governor of the State shall submit to the Secretary of Labor a State plan in such form and containing such information as the Secretary may require. At a minimum, such plan shall include—

(A) a description of the strategies and activities to be carried out by the State, in coordination with employers in the State, to provide subsidized employment opportunities to unemployed, low-income adults, including strategies relating to the level and duration of subsidies consistent with subsection (e)(2);

(B) a description of the requirements the State will apply relating to the eligibility of unemployed, low-income adults, consistent with section 208, for subsidized employment opportunities, which requirements may include criteria to target assistance to particular categories of such adults, such as individuals with disabilities or individuals who have exhausted all rights to unemployment compensation;

(C) a description of how the funds allotted to provide subsidized employment opportunities will be administered in the State and (if administered by entities described in subsection (d)(1)(A)) in local workforce investment areas, in accordance with subsection (d);

(D) a description of the performance outcomes to be achieved by the State through the activities carried out under this section and the processes the State will use to track the performance, consistent with guidance provided by the Secretary of Labor regarding



such outcomes and processes and with section 207(b);

(E) a description of the coordination of activities to be carried out with the funds provided under this section, with activities under title I of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2801 et seq.), the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families established under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (referred to in this title as the “TANF program”; 42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.), and other appropriate Federal and State programs that may assist unemployed, low-income adults in obtaining and retaining employment;

(F) a description of the timelines for implementation of the activities described in subparagraph (A), and the number of unemployed, low-income adults expected to be placed in subsidized employment by calendar quarter;

(G) assurances that the State will report such information relating to fiscal, performance, and other matters as the Secretary of Labor may require and as the Secretary determines is necessary to effectively monitor the activities carried out under this section; and

(H) assurances that the State will ensure compliance with the requirements, restrictions, labor standards, and other provisions described in section 207(a).

#### (2) SUBMISSION AND APPROVAL OF STATE PLAN.—

(A) SUBMISSION WITH OTHER PLANS.—The State plan described in paragraph (1) may be submitted in conjunction with the State plan modification or other request for funds by the State required under section 205, and may be submitted as a modification to a State plan that has been approved under section 112 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2822).

#### (B) SUBMISSION AND APPROVAL.—

(i) SUBMISSION.—The Governor shall submit the State plan described in paragraph (1) to the Secretary of Labor not later than 75 days after the date of enactment of this title and the Secretary shall make a determination regarding the approval or disapproval of such plan not later than 45 days after the submission of such plan. If the plan is disapproved, the Secretary may provide a reasonable period of time in which the plan may be amended and resubmitted for approval.

(ii) APPROVAL.—The Secretary of Labor shall approve a State plan that the Secretary determines is consistent with the requirements of this section and reasonably appropriate and adequate to carry out the objectives of this section. If the plan is approved, the Secretary shall allot funds to the State under subsection (b) within 30 days after such approval.

(3) MODIFICATIONS TO STATE PLAN.—The Governor may submit a modification to a State plan under this subsection, consistent with the requirements of this section.

#### (d) ADMINISTRATION WITHIN THE STATE.—

(1) OPTION.—The State may administer the funds for activities under this section through—

(A) the State and local entities responsible for the administration of the formula program of workforce investment activities for adults under subtitle B of title I of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2811 et seq.);

(B) the State agency or agencies responsible for the administration of the TANF program; or

(C) a combination of the entities and agency or agencies described in subparagraphs (A) and (B).

#### (2) WITHIN-STATE ALLOCATIONS.—

(A) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—The Governor may reserve not more than 5 percent of the

funds made available through the allotment under subsection (b)(2), for administration and technical assistance, and shall allocate the remainder, in accordance with the option elected under paragraph (1)—

(i) among local workforce investment areas within the State in accordance with subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of subsection (b)(2), except that for purposes of such allocation references in paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (b) to a State shall be deemed to be references to a local workforce investment area and references to all States shall be deemed to be references to all local workforce investment areas in the State involved; or

(ii) through entities responsible for the administration of the TANF program in local areas, in such manner as the State agency or agencies responsible for the administration of the TANF program may determine to be appropriate.

#### (B) LOCAL PLANS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In a case in which the responsibility for the administration of the activities described in subsection (e) is to be carried out by the entities described in paragraph (1)(A), in order to receive an allocation for a local workforce investment area under subparagraph (A)(i), a local workforce investment board, in partnership with the chief elected official for the local workforce investment area, shall submit to the Governor, not later than 30 days after the submission of the State plan, a local plan for the use of such funds under this section. Such local plan may be submitted as a modification to a local plan approved under section 118 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2833).

(ii) CONTENTS.—The local plan described in clause (i) shall contain the information described in subparagraphs (A) through (H) of subsection (c)(1), as applied to the local workforce investment area.

(iii) APPROVAL.—The Governor shall approve or disapprove the local plan submitted under clause (i) not later than a date (referred to in this clause as the “final determination date”) that is the later of the 30th day after the submission of the local plan or the 30th day after the approval of the State plan. The Governor shall approve the local plan unless the Governor determines that the plan is inconsistent with the requirements of this section or is not reasonably appropriate and adequate to carry out the objectives of this section. If the Governor has not made a determination by the final determination date, the plan shall be considered to be approved. If the plan is disapproved, the Governor may provide a reasonable period of time in which the plan may be amended and resubmitted for approval. If the plan is approved, the Governor shall allocate funds to the local workforce investment area involved under subparagraph (A)(i) within 30 days after such approval.

(C) REALLOCATION OF FUNDS TO LOCAL WORKFORCE INVESTMENT AREAS.—In a case described in subparagraph (B)(i), if a local workforce investment board and chief elected official do not submit a local plan by the date specified in subparagraph (B)(i), or the Governor disapproves a local plan, the amount the local workforce investment area would have been eligible to receive pursuant to the formula under subparagraph (A)(i) shall be allocated to local workforce investment areas that receive approval of their local plans under subparagraph (B). Each such local workforce investment area shall receive a share of the total amount available for reallocation under this subparagraph, in accordance with the area's share of the total amount allocated under subparagraph (A)(i) to such local workforce investment areas.

#### (e) USE OF FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The funds made available under this section shall be used to provide subsidized employment for unemployed, low-income adults. The entities or agencies described in subsection (d)(1) may use a variety of strategies in recruiting employers and identifying appropriate employment opportunities, but shall give priority to providing employment opportunities likely to lead to unsubsidized employment in emerging or in-demand occupations in the area served through the grant involved. Funds made available under this section may be used to provide support services, such as transportation and child care, that are necessary to enable such adults to participate in subsidized employment opportunities.

(2) LEVEL OF SUBSIDY AND DURATION.—The entities or agencies described in subsection (d)(1) may determine the percentage of the wages and costs of employing a participant for which an employer may receive a subsidy with the funds made available under this section, and the duration of such subsidy, in accordance with guidance issued by the Secretary of Labor in coordination with the Secretary of Health and Human Services. The entities or agencies may establish criteria for determining such percentage or duration, using appropriate factors such as the size of the employer and type of employment.

(3) LIMITATION.—Not more than 10 percent of the funds allocated to a local workforce investment area under subsection (d)(2)(A)(i) may be used for the costs of administration of this section.

(f) COORDINATION OF FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary of Labor shall administer this section in coordination with the Secretary of Health and Human Services to ensure the effective implementation of this section.

#### SEC. 205. SUMMER EMPLOYMENT AND YEAR-ROUND EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR LOW-INCOME AND DISCONNECTED YOUTH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—From the funds available under section 203(a)(2), the Secretary of Labor shall make an allotment or provide assistance under subsection (c) to each State that has a modification to a State plan approved under section 112 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2822) (referred to in this section as a “State plan modification”) (or other State request for funds specified in guidance under subsection (b)) approved under subsection (d) and to each outlying area and recipient under section 166(c) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2911(c)) (referred to in this section as a “Native American grantee”) that meets the requirements of this section, for the purpose of providing summer employment and year-round employment opportunities to low-income youth.

(b) GUIDANCE AND APPLICATION OF REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) GUIDANCE.—Not later than 20 days after the date of enactment of this title, the Secretary of Labor shall issue guidance regarding the implementation of this section.

(2) PROCEDURES.—Such guidance shall, consistent with this section, include procedures for—

(A) submission and approval for State plan modifications, for such other forms of requests for funds by the State as may be identified in such guidance, for modifications to local plans approved under section 118 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2833) (referred to individually in this section as a “local plan modification”), or for such other forms of requests for funds by local workforce investment areas as may be identified in such guidance, that promote the expeditious and effective implementation of the activities authorized under this section; and

(B) the allotment and allocation of funds, including reallocation and reallocation of such funds, that promote such implementation.

(3) REQUIREMENTS.—Except as otherwise provided in the guidance described in paragraph (1) and in this section and other provisions of this title, the funds provided for activities under this section shall be administered in accordance with the provisions of subtitles B and E of title I of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2811 et seq., 2931 et seq.) relating to youth activities.

(c) STATE ALLOTMENTS.—

(1) RESERVATIONS FOR OUTLYING AREAS AND TRIBES.—Of the funds described in subsection (a), the Secretary of Labor shall reserve—

(A) not more than  $\frac{1}{4}$  of 1 percent to provide assistance to outlying areas to provide summer employment and year-round employment opportunities to low-income youth; and

(B) 1.5 percent to provide assistance to Native American grantees to provide summer employment and year-round employment opportunities to low-income youth.

(2) STATES.—After determining the amounts to be reserved under section 203(b) and paragraph (1), the Secretary of Labor shall allot the remainder of the funds described in subsection (a) among the States in accordance with the subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of section 204(b)(2).

(3) REALLOTMENT.—If the Governor of a State does not submit a State plan modification or other State request for funds specified in guidance under subsection (b) by the date specified in subsection (d)(2)(B), or a State does not receive approval of such State plan modification or request, the amount the State would have been eligible to receive pursuant to the formula under paragraph (2) shall be transferred within the Fund and added to the amounts available for competitive grants under section 203(a)(3).

(d) STATE PLAN MODIFICATION OR REQUEST.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For a State to be eligible to receive an allotment of funds under subsection (c), the Governor of the State shall submit to the Secretary of Labor a State plan modification, or other State request for funds specified in guidance under subsection (b), in such form and containing such information as the Secretary may require. At a minimum, such State plan modification or request shall include—

(A) a description of the strategies and activities to be carried out to provide summer employment opportunities and year-round employment opportunities, including linkages to training and educational activities, consistent with subsection (f);

(B) a description of the requirements the States will apply relating to the eligibility of low-income youth, consistent with section 208, for summer employment opportunities and year-round employment opportunities, which requirements may include criteria to target assistance to particular categories of such low-income youth, such as youth with disabilities, consistent with subsection (f);

(C) a description of the performance outcomes to be achieved by the State through the activities carried out under this section and the processes the State will use to track the performance, consistent with guidance provided by the Secretary of Labor regarding such outcomes and processes and with section 207(b);

(D) a description of the timelines for implementation of the activities described in subparagraph (A), and the number of low-income youth expected to be placed in summer employment opportunities, and year-round employment opportunities, respectively, by calendar quarter;

(E) assurances that the State will report such information relating to fiscal, performance, and other matters as the Secretary of Labor may require and as the Secretary determines is necessary to effectively monitor the activities carried out under this section;

(F) assurances that the State will ensure compliance with the requirements, restrictions, labor standards, and other provisions described in section 207(a); and

(G) for any employment opportunity that will provide participants with an industry-recognized credential, a description of the credential.

(2) SUBMISSION AND APPROVAL OF STATE PLAN MODIFICATION OR REQUEST.—

(A) SUBMISSION.—The Governor shall submit the State plan modification or other State request for funds specified in guidance under subsection (b) to the Secretary of Labor not later than 30 days after the issuance of such guidance. The State plan modification or other State request for funds may be submitted in conjunction with the State plan required under section 204(c).

(B) APPROVAL.—The Secretary of Labor shall approve or disapprove the State plan modification or request submitted under subparagraph (A) within 30 days after submission. The Secretary of Labor shall approve the modification or request unless the Secretary determines that the modification or request is inconsistent with the requirements of this section. If the Secretary has not made a determination within that 30-day period, the modification or request shall be considered to be approved. If the modification or request is disapproved, the Secretary may provide a reasonable period of time in which the modification or request may be amended and resubmitted for approval. If the modification or request is approved, the Secretary shall allot funds to the State under subsection (c) within 30 days after such approval.

(3) MODIFICATIONS TO STATE PLAN MODIFICATION OR REQUEST.—The Governor may submit further modifications to a State plan modification or other State request for funds specified under subsection (b), consistent with the requirements of this section.

(e) WITHIN-STATE ALLOCATION AND ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Of the funds allotted to the State under subsection (c), the Governor—

(A) may reserve not more than 5 percent of the funds for administration and technical assistance; and

(B) shall allocate the remainder of the funds among local workforce investment areas within the State in accordance with subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of section 204(b)(2), except that for purposes of such allocation references in paragraph (2) or (3) of section 204(b) to a State shall be deemed to be references to a local workforce investment area and references to all States shall be deemed to be references to all local workforce investment areas in the State involved.

(2) LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION OR REQUEST.—

(A) SUBMISSION.—In order to receive an allocation for a local workforce investment area under paragraph (1)(B), the local workforce investment board, in partnership with the chief elected official for the local workforce investment area, shall submit to the Governor, not later than 30 days after the submission by the State of the State plan modification or other State request for funds specified in guidance under subsection (b), a local plan modification, or such other request for funds by local workforce investment areas as may be specified in guidance under subsection (b), describing the strategies and activities to be carried out under this section.

(B) APPROVAL.—The Governor shall approve or disapprove the local plan modification or other local request for funds submitted under subparagraph (A) within 30 days after submission. The Governor shall approve the modification or request unless the Governor determines that the modification or request is inconsistent with the requirements of this section. If the Governor has not made a determination within that 30-day period, the modification or request shall be considered to be approved. If the modification or request is disapproved, the Governor may provide a reasonable period of time in which the modification or request may be amended and resubmitted for approval. If the modification or request is approved, the Governor shall allocate funds to the local workforce investment area within 30 days after such approval.

(3) REALLOCATION.—If a local workforce investment board and chief elected official do not submit a local plan modification, or other local request for funds specified in guidance under subsection (b), by the date specified in paragraph (2)(A), or the Governor disapproves such a modification or request, the amount the local workforce investment area would have been eligible to receive pursuant to the formula under paragraph (1)(B) shall be allocated to local workforce investment areas that receive approval of their local plan modifications or local requests for funds under paragraph (2). Each such local workforce investment area shall receive a share of the total amount available for reallocation under this subparagraph, in accordance with the area's share of the total amount allocated under paragraph (1)(B) to such local workforce investment areas.

(f) USE OF FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The funds made available under this section shall be used—

(A) to provide summer employment opportunities for low-income youth, with direct linkages to academic and occupational learning, and may be used to provide supportive services, such as transportation or child care, that are necessary to enable the youth to participate in the opportunities; and

(B) to provide year-round employment opportunities, which may be combined with other activities authorized under section 129 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2854), to low-income youth, giving priority to out-of-school youth who are—

(i) high school dropouts; or

(ii) recipients of a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent but who are basic skills deficient, unemployed, or underemployed.

(2) PROGRAM PRIORITIES.—In administering the funds under this section, the local board and chief elected official shall give priority to—

(A) identifying employment opportunities that are—

(i) in emerging or in-demand occupations in the local workforce investment area; or

(ii) in the public or nonprofit sector and meet community needs; and

(B) linking participants in year-round employment opportunities to training and educational activities that will provide such participants with an industry-recognized credential.

(3) PERFORMANCE ACCOUNTABILITY.—For activities funded under this section, in lieu of meeting the requirements described in section 136 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2871), States and local workforce investment areas shall provide such reports as the Secretary of Labor may require regarding the performance outcomes described in section 207(b)(5).

(4) LIMITATION.—Not more than 10 percent of the funds allocated to a local workforce

investment area under subsection (e)(1)(B) may be used for the costs of administration of this section.

**SEC. 206. WORK-RELATED AND EDUCATIONAL STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES OF DEMONSTRATED EFFECTIVENESS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—From the funds available under section 203(a)(3), the Secretary of Labor shall award grants on a competitive basis to eligible entities to carry out work-related and educational strategies and activities of demonstrated effectiveness.

(b) **ELIGIBLE ENTITY.**—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, an entity—

(1) shall include—

(A) a partnership involving a chief elected official, and the local workforce investment board, for the local workforce investment area involved (which may include a partnership with elected officials and workforce investment boards in the region and in the State); or

(B) an entity eligible to apply for a grant, contract, or agreement under section 166 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2911); and

(2) may include, in combination with a partnership or entity described in paragraph (1)—

(A) employers or employer associations;

(B) adult education providers or postsecondary educational institutions, including community colleges;

(C) community-based organizations;

(D) joint labor-management committees;

(E) work-related intermediaries; or

(F) other appropriate organizations.

(c) **APPLICATION.**—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, an entity shall submit to the Secretary of Labor an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require. At a minimum, the application shall—

(1) describe the strategies and activities of demonstrated effectiveness that the eligible entity will carry out to provide unemployed, low-income adults and low-income youth with skills that will lead to employment upon completion of participation related to such strategies and activities;

(2) describe the requirements that will apply relating to the eligibility of unemployed, low-income adults or low-income youth, consistent with section 208, for strategies and activities carried out under this section, which requirements may include criteria to target assistance to particular categories of such adults and youth, such as individuals with disabilities or individuals who have exhausted all rights to unemployment compensation;

(3) describe how the strategies and activities will address the needs of the target populations identified under paragraph (2) and the needs of employers in the local workforce investment area;

(4) describe the expected outcomes to be achieved by implementing the strategies and activities;

(5) provide evidence that the funds provided through the grant will be expended expeditiously and efficiently to implement the strategies and activities;

(6) describe how the strategies and activities will be coordinated with other Federal, State, and local programs providing employment, education, and supportive activities;

(7) provide evidence of employer commitment to participate with respect to the strategies and activities funded under this section, including identification of anticipated occupational and skill needs;

(8) provide assurances that the eligible entity will report such information relating to fiscal, performance, and other matters as the Secretary of Labor may require and as the Secretary determines is necessary to effec-

tively monitor the strategies and activities carried out under this section;

(9) provide assurances that the eligible entity will ensure compliance with the requirements, restrictions, labor standards, and other provisions described in section 207(a); and

(10) for any activity leading to the acquisition of an industry-recognized credential, a description of the credential.

(d) **PRIORITY IN AWARDS.**—In awarding grants under this section, the Secretary of Labor shall give priority to applications submitted by eligible entities from areas of high poverty and high unemployment, as defined by the Secretary, such as Public Use Microdata Areas designated by the Bureau of the Census.

(e) **USE OF FUNDS.**—An entity that receives a grant under this section shall use the funds made available through the grant to support strategies and activities of demonstrated effectiveness that are designed to provide unemployed, low-income adults or low-income youth with skills that will lead to employment as part of or upon completion of participation with respect to such strategies and activities. Such strategies and activities may include—

(1) on-the-job training, registered apprenticeship programs, or other programs that combine work with skills development;

(2) sector-based training programs that have been designed to meet the specific requirements of an employer or group of employers in that sector and for which employers are committed to hiring individuals upon successful completion of the training;

(3) training that supports an industry sector or an employer-based or labor-management committee industry partnership and that includes a significant work experience component;

(4) strategies and activities that lead to the acquisition of industry-recognized credentials in a field identified by the State or local workforce investment area as a growth sector or in-demand industry in which there are likely to be significant job opportunities in the short term;

(5) strategies and activities that provide connections to immediate work opportunities, including subsidized employment opportunities, or summer employment opportunities for youth, that include concurrent skills training and other supports;

(6) strategies and activities offered through career academies that provide students with the academic preparation and training, such as paid internships and concurrent enrollment in community colleges or other postsecondary institutions, needed to pursue a career pathway that leads to postsecondary credentials and in-demand jobs; and

(7) adult basic education and integrated basic education and training, for low-skilled adults, that are tied to employer workforce needs, hosted at community colleges or at other sites, to prepare individuals for jobs that are in demand in a local workforce investment area.

(f) **COORDINATION OF FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION.**—The Secretary of Labor shall administer this section in coordination with the Secretary of Education, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and other appropriate agency heads, to ensure the effective implementation of this section.

**SEC. 207. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS.**

(a) **LABOR STANDARDS AND PROTECTIONS.**—Activities provided with funds made available under this title shall be subject to the requirements and restrictions, including the labor standards, described in section 181 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2931) and the nondiscrimination provisions of section 188 of such Act (29 U.S.C.

2938), in addition to other applicable Federal laws.

(b) **REPORTING.**—The Secretary of Labor shall require the reporting of information relating to fiscal, performance, and other matters that the Secretary determines is necessary to effectively monitor the activities carried out with funds provided under this title. At a minimum, recipients of grants or subgrants under this title shall provide information relating to—

(1) the number of individuals participating in activities with funds provided under this title and the number of such individuals who have completed such participation;

(2) the expenditures of funds provided under this title;

(3) the number of jobs created pursuant to the activities carried out under this title;

(4) the demographic characteristics of individuals participating in activities under this title; and

(5) the performance outcomes for individuals participating in activities under this title, including—

(A) for adults participating in activities funded under section 204, performance on indicators consisting of—

(i) entry into unsubsidized employment;

(ii) retention in unsubsidized employment; and

(iii) earnings in unsubsidized employment;

(B) for low-income youth participating in summer employment activities under sections 205 and 206, performance on indicators consisting of—

(i) work readiness skill attainment, using an employer-validated checklist; and

(ii) placement in or return to secondary or postsecondary education or training, or entry into unsubsidized employment;

(C) for low-income youth participating in year-round employment activities under section 205 or in activities under section 206, performance on indicators consisting of—

(i) placement in or return to postsecondary education;

(ii) attainment of a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent;

(iii) attainment of an industry-recognized credential; and

(iv) entry into unsubsidized employment, retention, and earnings as described in subparagraph (A); and

(D) for unemployed, low-income adults participating in activities under section 206—

(i) entry into unsubsidized employment, retention, and earnings as described in subparagraph (A); and

(ii) attainment of an industry-recognized credential.

(c) **ACTIVITIES REQUIRED TO BE ADDITIONAL.**—Funds provided under this title shall only be used for activities that are in addition to activities that would otherwise be available in the State or local workforce investment area in the absence of such funds.

(d) **ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.**—The Secretary of Labor may establish such additional requirements as the Secretary determines may be necessary to ensure fiscal integrity, effective monitoring, and appropriate and prompt implementation of the activities under this title.

(e) **REPORT OF INFORMATION AND EVALUATIONS TO CONGRESS AND THE PUBLIC.**—The Secretary of Labor shall provide to the appropriate committees of Congress and make available to the public the information reported pursuant to subsection (b) and the evaluations of activities carried out with the funds reserved under section 203(b).

**SEC. 208. DEFINITIONS.**

In this title:

(1) **CHIEF ELECTED OFFICIAL.**—The term “chief elected official” means the chief

elected executive officer of a unit of general local government in a local workforce investment area or, in the case in which such an area includes more than one unit of general local government, the individuals designated under an agreement described in section 117(c)(1)(B) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2832(c)(1)(B)).

(2) **INDUSTRY-RECOGNIZED CREDENTIAL.**—The term “industry-recognized credential” means such a credential within the meaning of section 3 of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2302).

(3) **LOCAL WORKFORCE INVESTMENT AREA.**—The term “local workforce investment area” means such area designated under section 116 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2831).

(4) **LOCAL WORKFORCE INVESTMENT BOARD.**—The term “local workforce investment board” means such board established under section 117 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2832).

(5) **LOW-INCOME YOUTH.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “low-income youth” means an individual who is not younger than age 16 and not older than age 24 and is an individual described in subparagraph (B) or (C).

(B) **ELIGIBLE YOUTH.**—For purposes of this paragraph, an individual described in this subparagraph—

(i) meets the definition of a low-income individual provided in section 101(25) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2801(25)), except that—

(I) States and local workforce investment areas, subject to approval in the applicable State and local plan modifications and requests for funds, may increase the income level specified in subparagraph (B)(i) of such section to an amount not in excess of 200 percent of the poverty line for purposes of determining eligibility for participation in activities under section 205; and

(II) eligible entities described in section 206(b), subject to approval in the applicable applications for funds, may make such an increase for purposes of determining eligibility for participation in activities under section 206; and

(ii) is in one or more of the categories specified in section 101(13)(C) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2801(13)(C)).

(C) **YOUTH ELIGIBLE FOR SCHOOL LUNCHES.**—For purposes of this paragraph, an individual described in this subparagraph receives or is eligible to receive a free or reduced price lunch under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.).

(6) **OUTLYING AREA.**—The term “outlying area” means the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and the Republic of Palau (except during any period for which the Secretary of Labor determines that a Compact of Free Association is in effect and provides for Federal assistance for education or training).

(7) **POVERTY LINE.**—The term “poverty line” means a poverty line as defined in section 673 of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9902), applicable to a family of the size involved.

(8) **STATE.**—The term “State” means each of the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

(9) **UNEMPLOYED, LOW-INCOME ADULT.**—The term “unemployed, low-income adult” means an individual who—

(A) is age 18 or older;

(B) is without employment and is seeking assistance under this title to obtain employment; and

(C) meets the definition of a low-income individual specified in section 101(25) of the

Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2801(25)), except that—

(i) States and local entities described in section 204(d)(1)(A), subject to approval in the applicable State plans and local plans described in subsection (c) or (d) of section 204, or a State agency or agencies described in section 204(d)(1)(B), subject to approval in the State plan described in section 204, may increase the income level specified in subparagraph (B)(i) of such section 101(25) to an amount not in excess of 200 percent of the poverty line for purposes of determining eligibility for participation in activities under section 204; and

(ii) eligible entities described in section 206(b), subject to approval in the applicable applications for funds, may make such an increase for purposes of determining eligibility for participation in activities under section 206.

**SA 2609.** Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER REQUIRED TO CLAIM THE REFUNDABLE PORTION OF THE CHILD TAX CREDIT.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subsection (d) of section 24 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) **IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENT WITH RESPECT TO TAXPAYER.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any taxpayer for any taxable year unless the taxpayer includes the taxpayer’s Social Security number on the return of tax for such taxable year.

“(B) **JOINT RETURNS.**—In the case of a joint return, the requirement of subparagraph (A) shall be treated as met if the Social Security number of either spouse is included on such return.

“(C) **LIMITATION.**—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to the extent the tentative minimum tax (as defined in section 55(b)(1)(A)) exceeds the credit allowed under section 32.”.

(b) **OMISSION TREATED AS MATHEMATICAL OR CLERICAL ERROR.**—Subparagraph (I) of section 6213(g)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“(I) an omission of a correct Social Security number required under section 24(d)(5) (relating to refundable portion of child tax credit), or a correct TIN under section 24(e) (relating to child tax credit), to be included on a return.”.

(c) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Subsection (e) of section 24 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting “WITH RESPECT TO QUALIFYING CHILDREN” after “IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENT” in the heading thereof.

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

**SA 2610.** Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

**SEC. 7. DISQUALIFICATION ON RECEIPT OF DISABILITY INSURANCE BENEFITS IN A MONTH FOR WHICH UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION IS RECEIVED.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 223(d)(4) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 423(d)(4)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “(C)(i) If for any month an individual is entitled to unemployment compensation, such individual shall be deemed to have engaged in substantial gainful activity for such month.

“(ii) For purposes of clause (i), the term ‘unemployment compensation’ means—

“(I) ‘regular compensation’, ‘extended compensation’, and ‘additional compensation’ (as such terms are defined by section 205 of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act (26 U.S.C. 3304 note)); and

“(II) trade adjustment assistance under title II of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2251 et seq.).”.

(b) **TRIAL WORK PERIOD.**—Section 222(c) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 422(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6)(A) For purposes of this subsection, an individual shall be deemed to have rendered services in a month if the individual is entitled to unemployment compensation for such month.

“(B) For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term ‘unemployment compensation’ means—

“(i) ‘regular compensation’, ‘extended compensation’, and ‘additional compensation’ (as such terms are defined by section 205 of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act (26 U.S.C. 3304 note)); and

“(ii) trade adjustment assistance under title II of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2251 et seq.).”.

(c) **DATA MATCHING.**—The Commissioner of Social Security shall implement the amendments made by this section using appropriate electronic data.

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to months after March 2014.

**SA 2611.** Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DELAY IN APPLICATION OF INDIVIDUAL HEALTH INSURANCE MAN-DATE.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 5000A(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “2013” and inserting “2014”.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) Section 5000A(c)(2)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) by striking “2014” in clause (i) and inserting “2015”, and

(B) by striking “2015” in clauses (ii) and (iii) and inserting “2016”.

(2) Section 5000A(c)(3)(B) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “2014” and inserting “2015”, and

(B) by striking “2015” (prior to amendment by subparagraph (A)) and inserting “2016”.

(3) Section 5000A(c)(3)(D) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “2016” and inserting “2017”, and

(B) by striking “2015” and inserting “2016”.

(4) Section 5000A(e)(1)(D) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “2014” and inserting “2015”, and

(B) by striking “2013” and inserting “2014”.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in section 1501 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ DELAY IN APPLICATION OF EMPLOYER HEALTH INSURANCE MANDATE.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1513(d) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is amended by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “December 31, 2014”.

(b) **REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.**—

(1) **REPORTING BY EMPLOYERS.**—Section 1514(d) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is amended by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “December 31, 2014”.

(2) **REPORTING BY INSURANCE PROVIDERS.**—Section 1502(e) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is amended by striking “2013” and inserting “2014”.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the provision of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to which they relate.

**SA 2612.** Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

**SEC. 7. SUPPORTING NEW BUSINESSES.**

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Startup Act 3.0”.

(b) **FINDINGS.**—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Achieving economic recovery will require the formation and growth of new companies.

(2) Between 1980 and 2005, companies less than 5 years old accounted for nearly all net job creation in the United States.

(3) New firms in the United States create an average of 3,000,000 jobs per year.

(4) To get Americans back to work, entrepreneurs must be free to innovate, create new companies, and hire employees.

(c) **CONDITIONAL PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS FOR IMMIGRANTS WITH AN ADVANCED DEGREE IN A STEM FIELD.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 2 of title II of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1181 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 216A the following:

**“SEC. 216B. CONDITIONAL PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS FOR ALIENS WITH AN ADVANCED DEGREE IN A STEM FIELD.**

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security may adjust the status of not more than 50,000 aliens who have earned a master’s degree or a doctorate degree at an institution of higher education in a STEM field to that of an alien conditionally admitted for permanent residence and authorize each alien granted such adjustment of status to remain in the United States—

“(1) for up to 1 year after the expiration of the alien’s student visa under section 101(a)(15)(F)(i) if the alien is diligently searching for an opportunity to become actively engaged in a STEM field; and

“(2) indefinitely if the alien remains actively engaged in a STEM field.

“(b) **APPLICATION FOR CONDITIONAL PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS.**—Every alien applying for a conditional permanent resident status under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary of Homeland Security before the expiration of the alien’s student visa in such form and manner as the Secretary shall prescribe by regulation.

“(c) **INELIGIBILITY FOR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE.**—An alien granted conditional permanent resident status under this section shall not be eligible, while in such status, for—

“(1) any unemployment compensation (as defined in section 85(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986); or

“(2) any Federal means-tested public benefit (as that term is used in section 403 of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1613)).

“(d) **EFFECT ON NATURALIZATION RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT.**—An alien granted conditional permanent resident status under this section shall be deemed to have been lawfully admitted for permanent residence for purposes of meeting the 5-year residency requirement set forth in section 316(a)(1).

“(e) **REMOVAL OF CONDITION.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall remove the conditional basis of an alien’s conditional permanent resident status under this section on the date that is 5 years after the date such status was granted if the alien maintained his or her eligibility for such status during the entire 5-year period.

“(f) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) **ACTIVELY ENGAGED IN A STEM FIELD.**—The term ‘actively engaged in a STEM field’—

“(A) means—

“(i) gainfully employed in a for-profit business or nonprofit organization in the United States in a STEM field;

“(ii) teaching 1 or more STEM field courses at an institution of higher education; or

“(iii) employed by a Federal, State, or local government entity; and

“(B) includes any period of up to 6 months during which the alien does not meet the requirement under subparagraph (A) if such period was immediately preceded by a 1-year period during which the alien met the requirement under subparagraph (A).

“(2) **INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.**—The term ‘institution of higher education’ has the meaning given the term in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a)).

“(3) **STEM FIELD.**—The term ‘STEM field’ means any field of study or occupation included on the most recent STEM-Designated Degree Program List published in the Federal Register by the Department of Homeland Security (as described in section 214.2(f)(11)(i)(C)(2) of title 8, Code of Federal Regulations).”

(2) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents for the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 216A the following:

“Sec. 216B. Conditional permanent resident status for aliens with an advanced degree in a STEM field.”

(d) **GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE STUDY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to Congress on the alien college graduates granted immigrant status under section 216B of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by subsection (c).

(2) **CONTENTS.**—The report described in paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) the number of aliens described in paragraph (1) who have earned a master’s degree, broken down by the number of such degrees in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics;

(B) the number of aliens described in paragraph (1) who have earned a doctorate de-

gree, broken down by the number of such degrees in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics;

(C) the number of aliens described in paragraph (1) who have founded a business in the United States in a STEM field;

(D) the number of aliens described in paragraph (1) who are employed in the United States in a STEM field, broken down by employment sector (for profit, nonprofit, or government); and

(E) the number of aliens described in paragraph (1) who are employed by an institution of higher education.

(3) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection, the terms “institution of higher education” and “STEM field” have the meaning given such terms in section 216B(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by subsection (c).

(e) **IMMIGRANT ENTREPRENEURS.**—

(1) **QUALIFIED ALIEN ENTREPRENEURS.**—

(A) **ADMISSION AS IMMIGRANTS.**—Chapter 1 of title II of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1151 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

**“SEC. 210A. QUALIFIED ALIEN ENTREPRENEURS.**

“(a) **ADMISSION AS IMMIGRANTS.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security, in accordance with the provisions of this section and section 216A, may issue a conditional immigrant visa to not more than 75,000 qualified alien entrepreneurs.

“(b) **APPLICATION FOR CONDITIONAL PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS.**—Every alien applying for a conditional immigrant visa under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary of Homeland Security in such form and manner as the Secretary shall prescribe by regulation.

“(c) **REVOCATION.**—If, during the 4-year period beginning on the date that an alien is granted a visa under this section, the Secretary of Homeland Security determines that such alien is no longer a qualified alien entrepreneur, the Secretary shall—

“(1) revoke such visa; and

“(2) notify the alien that the alien—

“(A) may voluntarily depart from the United States in accordance to section 240B; or

“(B) will be subject to removal proceedings under section 240 if the alien does not depart from the United States not later than 6 months after receiving such notification.

“(d) **REMOVAL OF CONDITIONAL BASIS.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall remove the conditional basis of the status of an alien issued an immigrant visa under this section on that date that is 4 years after the date on which such visa was issued if such visa was not revoked pursuant to subsection (c).

“(e) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) **FULL-TIME EMPLOYEE.**—The term ‘full-time employee’ means a United States citizen or legal permanent resident who is paid by the new business entity registered by a qualified alien entrepreneur at a rate that is comparable to the median income of employees in the region.

“(2) **QUALIFIED ALIEN ENTREPRENEUR.**—The term ‘qualified alien entrepreneur’ means an alien who—

“(A) at the time the alien applies for an immigrant visa under this section—

“(i) is lawfully present in the United States; and

“(ii)(I) holds a nonimmigrant visa pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b); or

“(II) holds a nonimmigrant visa pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(F)(i);

“(B) during the 1-year period beginning on the date the alien is granted a visa under this section—

“(i) registers at least 1 new business entity in a State;

“(ii) employs, at such business entity in the United States, at least 2 full-time employees who are not relatives of the alien; and

“(iii) invests, or raises capital investment of, not less than \$100,000 in such business entity; and

“(C) during the 3-year period beginning on the last day of the 1-year period described in paragraph (2), employs, at such business entity in the United States, an average of at least 5 full-time employees who are not relatives of the alien.”.

(B) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in the first section of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) is amended by adding after the item relating to section 210 the following:

“Sec. 210A. Qualified alien entrepreneurs.”.

(2) CONDITIONAL PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS.—Section 216A of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1186b) is amended—

(A) by striking “Attorney General” each place such term appears and inserting “Secretary of Homeland Security”;

(B) in subsection (b)(1)(C), by striking “203(b)(5),” and inserting “203(b)(5) or 210A, as appropriate.”;

(C) in subsection (c)(1), by striking “alien entrepreneur must” each place such term appears and inserting “alien entrepreneur shall”;

(D) in subsection (d)(1)(B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “or 210A, as appropriate.”; and

(E) in subsection (f)(1), by striking the period at the end and inserting “or 210A.”.

(f) GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to Congress on the qualified alien entrepreneurs granted immigrant status under section 210A of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by subsection (e).

(2) CONTENTS.—The report described in paragraph (1) shall include information regarding—

(A) the number of qualified alien entrepreneurs who have received immigrant status under section 210A of the Immigration and Nationality Act, listed by country of origin;

(B) the localities in which such qualified alien entrepreneurs have initially settled;

(C) whether such qualified alien entrepreneurs generally remain in the localities in which they initially settle;

(D) the types of commercial enterprises that such qualified alien entrepreneurs have established; and

(E) the types and number of jobs created by such qualified alien entrepreneurs.

(g) ELIMINATION OF THE PER-COUNTRY NUMERICAL LIMITATION FOR EMPLOYMENT-BASED VISAS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 202(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1152(a)(2)) is amended—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking “AND EMPLOYMENT-BASED”;

(B) by striking “(3), (4), and (5),” and inserting “(3) and (4),”;

(C) by striking “subsections (a) and (b) of section 203” and inserting “section 203(a)”;

(D) by striking “7” and inserting “15”; and

(E) by striking “such subsections” and inserting “such section”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 202 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1152) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(3), by striking “both subsections (a) and (b) of section 203” and inserting “section 203(a)”;

(B) by striking subsection (a)(5); and

(C) by amending subsection (e) to read as follows:

“(e) SPECIAL RULES FOR COUNTRIES AT CEILING.—If it is determined that the total number of immigrant visas made available under section 203(a) to natives of any single foreign state or dependent area will exceed the numerical limitation specified in subsection (a)(2) in any fiscal year, in determining the allotment of immigrant visa numbers to natives under section 203(a), visa numbers with respect to natives of that state or area shall be allocated (to the extent practicable and otherwise consistent with this section and section 203) in a manner so that, except as provided in subsection (a)(4), the proportion of the visa numbers made available under each of paragraphs (1) through (4) of section 203(a) is equal to the ratio of the total number of visas made available under the respective paragraph to the total number of visas made available under section 203(a).”.

(3) COUNTRY-SPECIFIC OFFSET.—Section 2 of the Chinese Student Protection Act of 1992 (8 U.S.C. 1255 note) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “subsection (e)” and inserting “subsection (d)”;

(B) by striking subsection (d) and redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (d).

(4) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection—

(A) shall take effect as if enacted on September 30, 2012; and

(B) shall apply to fiscal years beginning with fiscal year 2013.

(h) TRANSITION RULES FOR EMPLOYMENT-BASED IMMIGRANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the succeeding paragraphs of this subsection and notwithstanding title II of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1151 et seq.), the following rules shall apply:

(A) For fiscal year 2013, 15 percent of the immigrant visas made available under each of paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 203(b) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1153(b)) shall be allotted to immigrants who are natives of a foreign state or dependent area that was not one of the two states with the largest aggregate numbers of natives obtaining immigrant visas during fiscal year 2011 under such paragraphs.

(B) For fiscal year 2014, 10 percent of the immigrant visas made available under each of such paragraphs shall be allotted to immigrants who are natives of a foreign state or dependent area that was not one of the two states with the largest aggregate numbers of natives obtaining immigrant visas during fiscal year 2012 under such paragraphs.

(C) For fiscal year 2015, 10 percent of the immigrant visas made available under each of such paragraphs shall be allotted to immigrants who are natives of a foreign state or dependent area that was not one of the two states with the largest aggregate numbers of natives obtaining immigrant visas during fiscal year 2013 under such paragraphs.

(2) PER-COUNTRY LEVELS.—

(A) RESERVED VISAS.—With respect to the visas reserved under each of subparagraphs (A) through (C) of paragraph (1), the number of such visas made available to natives of any single foreign state or dependent area in the appropriate fiscal year may not exceed 25 percent (in the case of a single foreign state) or 2 percent (in the case of a dependent area) of the total number of such visas.

(B) UNRESERVED VISAS.—With respect to the immigrant visas made available under each of paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 203(b) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1153(b)) and not reserved under paragraph (1), for each of fiscal years 2013, 2014, and 2015, not more than 85 percent shall be allotted to immigrants who are natives of any single foreign state.

(3) SPECIAL RULE TO PREVENT UNUSED VISAS.—If, with respect to fiscal year 2013, 2014, or 2015, the operation of paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection would prevent the total number of immigrant visas made available under paragraph (2) or (3) of section 203(b) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1153(b)) from being issued, such visas may be issued during the remainder of such fiscal year without regard to paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection.

(4) RULES FOR CHARGEABILITY.—Section 202(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1152(b)) shall apply in determining the foreign state to which an alien is chargeable for purposes of this subsection.

(i) CAPITAL GAINS TAX EXEMPTION FOR STARTUP COMPANIES.—

(1) PERMANENT FULL EXCLUSION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 1202 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“(a) EXCLUSION.—In the case of a taxpayer other than a corporation, gross income shall not include 100 percent of any gain from the sale or exchange of qualified small business stock held for more than 5 years.”.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(i) The heading for section 1202 of such Code is amended by striking “PARTIAL”.

(ii) The item relating to section 1202 in the table of sections for part I of subchapter P of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by striking “Partial exclusion” and inserting “Exclusion”.

(iii) Section 1223(13) of such Code is amended by striking “1202(a)(2).”.

(2) REPEAL OF MINIMUM TAX PREFERENCE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 57 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking paragraph (7).

(B) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Subclause (II) of section 53(d)(1)(B)(ii) of such Code is amended by striking “, (5), and (7)” and inserting “and (5)”.

(3) REPEAL OF 28 PERCENT CAPITAL GAINS RATE ON QUALIFIED SMALL BUSINESS STOCK.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (A) of section 1(h)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“(A) collectibles gain, over”.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(i) Section 1(h) of such Code is amended by striking paragraph (7).

(ii) Section 1(h) of such Code is amended by redesignating paragraphs (8), (9), (10), (11), (12), and (13) as paragraphs (7), (8), (9), (10), (11), and (12), respectively.

(II) Sections 163(d)(4)(B), 854(b)(5), 857(c)(2)(D) of such Code are each amended by striking “section 1(h)(11)(B)” and inserting “section 1(h)(10)(B)”.

(III) The following sections of such Code are each amended by striking “section 1(h)(11)” and inserting “section 1(h)(10)”:

(aa) Section 301(f)(4).

(bb) Section 306(a)(1)(D).

(cc) Section 584(c).

(dd) Section 702(a)(5).

(ee) Section 854(a).

(ff) Section 854(b)(2).

(IV) The heading of section 857(c)(2) is amended by striking “1(h)(11)” and inserting “1(h)(10)”.

(4) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to stock acquired after December 31, 2013.

(j) RESEARCH CREDIT FOR STARTUP COMPANIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 41 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(i) TREATMENT OF CREDIT TO QUALIFIED SMALL BUSINESSES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—At the election of a qualified small business, the payroll tax credit portion of the credit determined under



subsection (a) shall be treated as a credit allowed under section 3111(f) (and not under this section).

“(2) PAYROLL TAX CREDIT PORTION.—For purposes of this subsection, the payroll tax credit portion of the credit determined under subsection (a) for any taxable year is so much of such credit as does not exceed \$250,000.

“(3) QUALIFIED SMALL BUSINESS.—For purposes of this subsection—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘qualified small business’ means, with respect to any taxable year—

“(i) a corporation, partnership, or S corporation if—

“(I) the gross receipts (as determined under subsection (c)(7)) of such entity for the taxable year is less than \$5,000,000, and

“(II) such entity did not have gross receipts (as so determined) for any period preceding the 5-taxable-year period ending with such taxable year, and

“(ii) any person not described in subparagraph (A) if clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (A) applied to such person, determined—

“(I) by substituting ‘person’ for ‘entity’ each place it appears, and

“(II) in the case of an individual, by only taking into account the aggregate gross receipts received by such individual in carrying on trades or businesses of such individual.

“(B) LIMITATION.—Such term shall not include an organization which is exempt from taxation under section 501.

“(4) ELECTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a partnership or S corporation, an election under this subsection shall be made at the entity level.

“(B) REVOCATION.—An election under this subsection may not be revoked without the consent of the Secretary.

“(C) LIMITATION.—A taxpayer may not make an election under this subsection if such taxpayer has made an election under this subsection for 5 or more preceding taxable years.

“(5) AGGREGATION RULES.—For purposes of determining the \$250,000 limitation under paragraph (2) and determining gross receipts under paragraph (3), all members of the same controlled group of corporations (within the meaning of section 267(f)) and all persons under common control (within the meaning of section 52(b) but determined by treating an interest of more than 50 percent as a controlling interest) shall be treated as 1 person.

“(6) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this subsection, including—

“(A) regulations to prevent the avoidance of the purposes of paragraph (3) through the use of successor companies or other means,

“(B) regulations to minimize compliance and recordkeeping burdens under this subsection for start-up companies, and

“(C) regulations for recapturing the benefit of credits determined under section 3111(f) in cases where there is a subsequent adjustment to the payroll tax credit portion of the credit determined under subsection (a), including requiring amended returns in the cases where there is such an adjustment.”.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 280C(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) TREATMENT OF QUALIFIED SMALL BUSINESS CREDIT.—For purposes of determining the amount of any credit under section 41(a) under this subsection, any election under section 41(i) shall be disregarded.”.

(2) CREDIT ALLOWED AGAINST FICA TAXES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 3111 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) CREDIT FOR RESEARCH EXPENDITURES OF QUALIFIED SMALL BUSINESSES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a qualified small business which has made an election under section 41(i), there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by subsection (a) on wages paid with respect to the employment of all employees of the qualified small business for days in an applicable calendar quarter an amount equal to the payroll tax credit portion of the research credit determined under section 41(a).

“(2) CARRYOVER OF UNUSED CREDIT.—In any case in which the payroll tax credit portion of the research credit determined under section 41(a) exceeds the tax imposed under subsection (a) for an applicable calendar quarter—

“(A) the succeeding calendar quarter shall be treated as an applicable calendar quarter, and

“(B) the amount of credit allowed under paragraph (1) shall be reduced by the amount of credit allowed under such paragraph for all preceding applicable calendar quarters.

“(3) ALLOCATION OF CREDIT FOR CONTROLLED GROUPS, ETC.—In determining the amount of the credit under this subsection—

“(A) all persons treated as a single taxpayer under section 41 shall be treated as a single taxpayer under this section, and

“(B) the credit (if any) allowable by this section to each such member shall be its proportionate share of the qualified research expenses, basic research payments, and amounts paid or incurred to energy research consortiums, giving rise to the credit allowable under section 41.

“(4) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

“(A) APPLICABLE CALENDAR QUARTER.—The term ‘applicable calendar quarter’ means—

“(i) the first calendar quarter following the date on which the qualified small business files a return under section 6012 for the taxable year for which the payroll tax credit portion of the research credit under section 41(a) is determined, and

“(ii) any succeeding calendar quarter treated as an applicable calendar quarter under paragraph (2)(A).

“For purposes of determining the date on which a return is filed, rules similar to the rules of section 6513 shall apply.

“(B) OTHER TERMS.—Any term used in this subsection which is also used in section 41 shall have the meaning given such term under section 41.”.

(B) TRANSFERS TO FEDERAL OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE TRUST FUND.—There are hereby appropriated to the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund established under section 201 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401) amounts equal to the reduction in revenues to the Treasury by reason of the amendments made by paragraph (1). Amounts appropriated by the preceding sentence shall be transferred from the general fund at such times and in such manner as to replicate to the extent possible the transfers which would have occurred to such Trust Fund had such amendments not been enacted.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2012.

(k) ACCELERATED COMMERCIALIZATION OF TAXPAYER-FUNDED RESEARCH.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) COUNCIL.—The term “Council” means the Advisory Council on Innovation and Entrepreneurship of the Department of Commerce established pursuant to section 25(c)

of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3720(c)).

(B) EXTRAMURAL BUDGET.—The term “extramural budget” means the sum of the total obligations minus amounts obligated for such activities by employees of the agency in or through Government-owned, Government-operated facilities, except that for the Department of Energy it shall not include amounts obligated for atomic energy defense programs solely for weapons activities or for naval reactor programs, and except that for the Agency for International Development it shall not include amounts obligated solely for general institutional support of international research centers or for grants to foreign countries.

(C) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term “institution of higher education” has the meaning given the term in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a)).

(D) RESEARCH OR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—The term “research” or “research and development” means any activity that is—

(i) a systematic, intensive study directed toward greater knowledge or understanding of the subject studied;

(ii) a systematic study directed specifically toward applying new knowledge to meet a recognized need; or

(iii) a systematic application of knowledge toward the production of useful materials, devices, and systems or methods, including design, development, and improvement of prototypes and new processes to meet specific requirements.

(E) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Commerce.

(2) GRANT PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Each Federal agency that has an extramural budget for research or research and development that is in excess of \$100,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018, shall transfer 0.15 percent of such extramural budget for each of such fiscal years to the Secretary to enable the Secretary to carry out a grant program in accordance with this paragraph.

(B) GRANTS.—

(i) AWARDING OF GRANTS.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—From funds transferred under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall use the criteria developed by the Council to award grants to institutions of higher education, including consortia of institutions of higher education, for initiatives to improve commercialization and transfer of technology.

(II) REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS.—Not later than 30 days after the Council submits the recommendations for criteria to the Secretary under paragraph (3)(B)(i), and annually thereafter for each fiscal year for which the grant program is authorized, the Secretary shall release a request for proposals.

(III) APPLICATIONS.—Each institution of higher education that desires to receive a grant under this subsection shall submit an application to the Secretary not later than 90 days after the Secretary releases the request for proposals under subclause (II).

(IV) COUNCIL REVIEW.—

(aa) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall submit each application received under subclause (III) to the Council for Council review.

(bb) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The Council shall review each application received under item (aa) and submit recommendations for grant awards to the Secretary, including funding recommendations for each proposal.

(cc) PUBLIC RELEASE.—The Council shall publicly release any recommendations made under item (bb).

(dd) CONSIDERATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS.—In awarding grants under this subsection, the Secretary shall take into consideration the recommendations of the Council under item (bb)).

(ii) COMMERCIALIZATION CAPACITY BUILDING GRANTS.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall award grants to support institutions of higher education pursuing specific innovative initiatives to improve an institution's capacity to commercialize faculty research that can be widely adopted if the research yields measurable results.

(II) CONTENT OF PROPOSALS.—Grants shall be awarded under this clause to proposals demonstrating the capacity for accelerated commercialization, proof-of-concept proficiency, and translating scientific discoveries and cutting-edge inventions into technological innovations and new companies. In particular, grant funds shall seek to support innovative approaches to achieving these goals that can be replicated by other institutions of higher education if the innovative approaches are successful.

(iii) COMMERCIALIZATION ACCELERATOR GRANTS.—The Secretary shall award grants to support institutions of higher education pursuing initiatives that allow faculty to directly commercialize research in an effort to accelerate research breakthroughs. The Secretary shall prioritize those initiatives that have a management structure that encourages collaboration between other institutions of higher education or other entities with demonstrated proficiency in creating and growing new companies based on verifiable metrics.

(C) ASSESSMENT OF SUCCESS.—Grants awarded under this paragraph shall use criteria for assessing the success of programs through the establishment of benchmarks.

(D) TERMINATION.—The Secretary shall have the authority to terminate grant funding to an institution of higher education in accordance with the process and performance metrics recommended by the Council.

(E) LIMITATIONS.—

(i) PROJECT MANAGEMENT COSTS.—A grant recipient may use not more than 10 percent of grant funds awarded under this paragraph for the purpose of funding project management costs of the grant program.

(ii) SUPPLEMENT, NOT SUPPLANT.—An institution of higher education that receives a grant under this paragraph shall use the grant funds to supplement, and not supplant, non-Federal funds that would, in the absence of such grant funds, be made available for activities described in this subsection.

(F) UNSPENT FUNDS.—Any funds transferred to the Secretary under subparagraph (A) for a fiscal year that are not expended by the end of such fiscal year may be expended in any subsequent fiscal year through fiscal year 2018. Any funds transferred under subparagraph (A) that are remaining at the end of the grant program's authorization under this subsection shall be transferred to the Treasury for deficit reduction.

(3) COUNCIL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Council shall convene and develop recommendations for criteria in awarding grants to institutions of higher education under paragraph (2).

(B) SUBMISSION TO COMMERCE AND PUBLICLY RELEASED.—The Council shall—

(i) submit the recommendations described in subparagraph (A) to the Secretary; and

(ii) release the recommendations to the public.

(C) MAJORITY VOTE.—The recommendations submitted by the Council under subparagraph (A) shall be determined by a majority vote of Council members.

(D) PERFORMANCE METRICS.—The Council shall develop and provide to the Secretary recommendations on performance metrics to be used to evaluate grants awarded under paragraph (2).

(E) EVALUATION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days before the date on which the grant program authorized under paragraph (2) expires, the Council shall conduct an evaluation of the effect that the grant program is having on accelerating the commercialization of faculty research.

(ii) INCLUSIONS.—The evaluation shall include—

(I) the recommendation of the Council as to whether the grant program should be continued or terminated;

(II) quantitative data related to the effect, if any, that the grant program has had on faculty research commercialization; and

(III) a description of lessons learned in administering the grant program, and how those lessons could be applied to future efforts to accelerate commercialization of faculty research.

(iii) AVAILABILITY.—Upon completion of the evaluation, the evaluation shall be made available on a public website and submitted to Congress. The Secretary shall notify all institutions of higher education when the evaluation is published and how it can be accessed.

(4) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to alter, modify, or amend any provision of chapter 18 of title 35, United States Code (commonly known as the “Bayh-Dole Act”).

(I) ECONOMIC IMPACT OF SIGNIFICANT FEDERAL AGENCY RULES.—Section 553 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) REQUIRED REVIEW BEFORE ISSUANCE OF SIGNIFICANT RULES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Before issuing a notice of proposed rulemaking in the Federal Register regarding the issuance of a proposed significant rule, the head of the Federal agency or independent regulatory agency seeking to issue the rule shall complete a review, to the extent permitted by law, that—

“(A) analyzes the problem that the proposed rule intends to address, including—

“(i) the specific market failure, such as externalities, market power, or lack of information, that justifies such rule; or

“(ii) any other specific problem, such as the failures of public institutions, that justifies such rule;

“(B) analyzes the expected impact of the proposed rule on the ability of new businesses to form and expand;

“(C) identifies the expected impact of the proposed rule on State, local, and tribal governments, including the availability of resources—

“(i) to carry out the mandates imposed by the rule on such government entities; and

“(ii) to minimize the burdens that uniquely or significantly affect such governmental entities, consistent with achieving regulatory objectives;

“(D) identifies any conflicting or duplicative regulations;

“(E) determines—

“(i) if existing laws or regulations created, or contributed to, the problem that the new rule is intended to correct; and

“(ii) if the laws or regulations referred to in clause (i) should be modified to more effectively achieve the intended goal of the rule; and

“(F) includes the cost-benefit analysis described in paragraph (2).

“(2) COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS.—A cost-benefit analysis described in this paragraph shall include—

“(A)(i) an assessment, including the underlying analysis, of benefits anticipated from the proposed rule, such as—

“(I) promoting the efficient functioning of the economy and private markets;

“(II) enhancing health and safety;

“(III) protecting the natural environment; and

“(IV) eliminating or reducing discrimination or bias; and

“(ii) the quantification of the benefits described in clause (i), to the extent feasible;

“(B)(i) an assessment, including the underlying analysis, of costs anticipated from the proposed rule, such as—

“(I) the direct costs to the Federal Government to administer the rule;

“(II) the direct costs to businesses and others to comply with the rule; and

“(III) any adverse effects on the efficient functioning of the economy, private markets (including productivity, employment, and competitiveness), health, safety, and the natural environment; and

“(ii) the quantification of the costs described in clause (i), to the extent feasible;

“(C)(i) an assessment, including the underlying analysis, of costs and benefits of potentially effective and reasonably feasible alternatives to the proposed rule, which have been identified by the agency or by the public, including taking reasonably viable non-regulatory actions; and

“(ii) an explanation of why the proposed rule is preferable to the alternatives identified under clause (i).

“(3) REPORT.—Before issuing a notice of proposed rulemaking in the Federal Register regarding the issuance of a proposed significant rule, the head of the Federal agency or independent regulatory agency seeking to issue the rule shall—

“(A) submit the results of the review conducted under paragraph (1) to the appropriate congressional committees; and

“(B) post the results of the review conducted under paragraph (1) on a publicly available website.

“(4) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Any determinations made, or other actions taken, by an agency or independent regulatory agency under this subsection shall not be subject to judicial review.

“(5) DEFINED TERM.—In this subsection the term ‘significant rule’ means a rule that is likely to—

“(A) have an annual effect on the economy of \$100,000,000 or more;

“(B) adversely affect, in a material way, the economy, a sector of the economy, productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, public health or safety, or State, local, or tribal governments or communities; or

“(C) create a serious inconsistency or otherwise interfere with an action taken or planned by another agency.”.

(m) BIENNIAL STATE STARTUP BUSINESS REPORT.—

(1) DATA COLLECTION.—The Secretary of Commerce shall regularly compile information from each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia on State laws that affect the formation and growth of new businesses within the State or District.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 2 years thereafter, the Secretary, using data compiled under paragraph (1), shall prepare a report that—

(A) analyzes the economic effect of State and District laws that either encourage or inhibit business formation and growth; and

(B) ranks the States and the District based on the effectiveness with which their laws foster new business creation and economic growth.

(3) DISTRIBUTION.—The Secretary shall—

(A) submit each report prepared under paragraph (1) to Congress; and

(B) make each report available to the public on the website of the Department of Commerce.

(4) INCLUSION OF LARGE METROPOLITAN AREAS.—Not later than 90 days after the submission of the first report under this subsection, the Secretary of Commerce shall submit a study to Congress on the feasibility and advisability of including, in future reports, information about the effect of local laws and ordinances on the formation and growth of new businesses in large metropolitan areas within the United States.

(5) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this subsection.

(n) NEW BUSINESS FORMATION REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Commerce shall regularly compile quantitative and qualitative information on businesses in the United States that are not more than 1 year old.

(2) DATA COLLECTION.—The Secretary shall—

(A) regularly compile information from the Bureau of the Census' business register on new business formation in the United States; and

(B) conduct quarterly surveys of business owners who start a business during the 1-year period ending on the date on which such survey is conducted to gather qualitative information about the factors that influenced their decision to start the business.

(3) RANDOM SAMPLING.—In conducting surveys under paragraph (2)(B), the Secretary may use random sampling to identify a group of business owners who are representative of all the business owners described in paragraph (2)(B).

(4) BENEFITS.—The Secretary shall inform business owners selected to participate in a survey conducted under this subsection of the benefits they would receive from participating in the survey.

(5) VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION.—Business owners selected to participate in a survey conducted under this subsection may decline to participate without penalty.

(6) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 3 months thereafter, the Secretary shall use the data compiled under paragraph (2) to prepare a report that—

(A) lists the aggregate number of new businesses formed in the United States;

(B) lists the aggregate number of persons employed by new businesses formed in the United States;

(C) analyzes the payroll of new businesses formed in the United States;

(D) summarizes the data collected under paragraph (2); and

(E) identifies the most effective means by which government officials can encourage the formation and growth of new businesses in the United States.

(7) DISTRIBUTION.—The Secretary shall—

(A) submit each report prepared under paragraph (6) to Congress; and

(B) make each report available to the public on the website of the Department of Commerce.

(8) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this subsection.

(o) RESCISSION OF UNSPENT FEDERAL FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of all available unobligated funds for fiscal year 2013, the amount necessary to carry out this section and the amendments made by this section in appro-

priated discretionary funds are hereby rescinded.

(2) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall determine and identify from which appropriation accounts the rescission under paragraph (1) shall apply and the amount of such rescission that shall apply to each such account. Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall submit a report to the Secretary of the Treasury and Congress of the accounts and amounts determined and identified for rescission under the preceding sentence.

## AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

### SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 7, 2014, at 2:30 p.m. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE CONSTITUTION, CIVIL RIGHTS, AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights, and Human Rights, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on January 7, 2014, at 2:30 p.m., in room SH-216 of the Hart Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "The Syrian Refugee Crisis."

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

## SUPPORTING ENHANCED MARITIME SECURITY IN THE GULF OF GUINEA

Mr. REED. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to Calendar No. 270, S. Res. 288.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 288) supporting unenhanced maritime security in the gulf of Guinea and encouraging increased cooperation between the United States and West and Central African countries to fight armed robbery at sea, piracy, and other maritime threats.

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

Mr. REED. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 288) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

### S. RES. 288

Whereas, although the number of armed robbery at sea and piracy attacks worldwide dropped substantially in recent years, such

acts in the Gulf of Guinea are increasing, with more than 40 reported through October 2013 and many more going unreported;

Whereas the United States imported more than 315,000,000 barrels of oil through the region in 2012, and United States businesses have extensive fixed assets in the region that are important to United States energy security;

Whereas the nature of attacks in the Gulf of Guinea demonstrates an ongoing pattern of cargo thefts and robbery, often occurring in the territorial waters of West and Central African states;

Whereas there are countries in West and Central Africa that are susceptible to acts of armed robbery at sea and piracy that lack adequate law enforcement and naval capabilities to stop or deter such attacks;

Whereas acts of maritime crime raise the costs and risks of trade and commerce in Africa and beyond because the security of vessels, crews, and cargoes cannot be guaranteed;

Whereas shipping insurance premiums increase after such attacks, and in so doing, create disincentives for local, regional, and international investors and companies seeking to do business in the region;

Whereas imports provide indispensable goods and services for the people of West and Central Africa, generate port fees and customs duties for their governments, and are essential in spurring economic growth and development in the region;

Whereas the U.S. Strategy Toward Sub-Saharan Africa issued by President Barack Obama in June 2012 states, "It is in the interest of the United States to improve the region's trade competitiveness, encourage the diversification of exports beyond natural resources, and ensure that the benefits from growth are broad-based.;"

Whereas a vibrant trade relationship between Africa and its partners, including the United States, can lead to expanded economic opportunities that can spur competition, raise productivity, and facilitate job creation in the economies of all participating countries;

Whereas the African Union, in collaboration with numerous official and nongovernmental stakeholders, developed the "2050 Africa's Integrated Maritime Security" strategy (the 2050 AIM STRATEGY) which seeks "to address contending, emerging and future maritime challenges and opportunities in Africa . . . with a clear focus on enhanced wealth creation from a sustainable governance of Africa's oceans and seas";

Whereas the African Union's 2050 AIM STRATEGY seeks to combat "diverse illegal activities which include . . . arms and drug trafficking, human trafficking and smuggling, piracy, and armed robbery at sea", among other objectives;

Whereas the June 24–25, 2013, meeting of the Gulf of Guinea Maritime Security Heads of State Summit held in Cameroon marked the culmination of a United States Government-supported Economic Communities of Central African States (ECCAS) and Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS)-led initiative and process that produced an approved ECOWAS-ECCAS Memorandum of Understanding for regional cooperation, and adopted a Gulf of Guinea Code of Conduct to address maritime crime and a Heads of State Political Declaration;

Whereas ECOWAS and ECCAS states are working to cooperate and build their joint capacities in order to increase maritime security in the Gulf of Guinea and are working to achieve this goal with such partners as the United Nations Offices for West and Central Africa, the Gulf of Guinea Commission, the International Maritime Organization,

the Maritime Organization for West and Central Africa, and the African Union;

Whereas the United States Government in the Gulf of Guinea has focused on encouraging multi-layered regional and national ownership in developing sustainable capacity building efforts, including working with partners through the G8++ Friends of Gulf of Guinea Group, to coordinate United States Government maritime security activities in the region;

Whereas the United States Government has assisted the countries of West and Central Africa to enhance regional maritime security through programs such as the "African Partnership Station", operated by United States Naval Forces Africa "to build maritime safety and security by increasing maritime awareness, response capabilities and infrastructure", and the "African Maritime Law Enforcement Partnership", which "enables African partner nations to build maritime security capacity and improve management of their maritime environment through real world law enforcement operations, and through provision of diverse types of training and equipment assistance and participation in diverse regional maritime military exercises", as well as by employing analytical tools such as the Maritime Security Sector Reform Guide; and

Whereas United Nations Security Council Resolution 2039, "expressing its deep concern about the threat that piracy and armed robbery at sea in the Gulf of Guinea pose to international navigation, security and the economic development of states in the region", was unanimously adopted on February 29, 2012: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) condemns acts of armed robbery at sea, piracy, and other maritime crime in the Gulf of Guinea;

(2) endorses and supports the efforts made by United States Government agencies to assist affected West and Central African countries to build capacity to combat armed robbery at sea, piracy, and other maritime threats, and encourages the President to continue such assistance, as appropriate, within resource constraints; and

(3) commends the African Union, sub-regional entities such as the ECOWAS and ECCAS, and the various international agencies that have worked to develop policy and program frameworks for enhancing maritime security in West and Central Africa, and encourages these entities and their member states to continue to build upon these and other efforts to achieve that end.

#### REGARDING CRITICAL NEED FOR POLITICAL REFORM IN BANGLADESH

Mr. REED. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 273, S. Res. 318.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 318) expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the critical need for political reform in Bangladesh, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment to the title.

Mr. REED. I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed

to, the preamble be agreed to, the committee reported title amendment 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. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 318) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

#### S. RES. 318

Whereas the nation of Bangladesh was established in 1971 after a bitter war in which it split from Pakistan, and for many of the ensuing years until 1990, it was ruled by military governments;

Whereas political tensions have at times turned to violence in Bangladesh, undermining the democratic process;

Whereas the last parliamentary elections in Bangladesh originally scheduled for January 2007, were postponed indefinitely after the military intervened amid rising violence and questions about the electoral process's credibility;

Whereas a military-backed civilian caretaker government held power until December 2008 when Bangladeshis returned to the polls to elect a new parliament for the first time in many years;

Whereas ongoing antagonism between the country's two ruling parties, the Awami League and the Bangladesh Nationalist Party, distracts from the important needs of the country;

Whereas concerns have grown about religious extremism in the otherwise usually tolerant country;

Whereas the United States-Bangladesh relationship is strong and involves many shared interests, including regional economic integration, counterterrorism, counter-piracy, poverty alleviation, food security, regional stability, and mitigation of natural disasters;

Whereas bilateral trade between the United States and Bangladesh now tops \$6,000,000,000 annually, with major United States companies making significant long-term investments in Bangladesh;

Whereas the economy of Bangladesh has grown six percent per year over the last two decades, despite a range of challenges;

Whereas the poverty rate in Bangladesh dropped from 40 percent to 31 percent between 2005 and 2010—a notable accomplishment in a country in which poverty has been deep and widespread;

Whereas the Grameen Bank's revolutionary microfinance lending to the poor has helped reduce poverty not only in Bangladesh, but has served as an innovative and powerful model for helping the poor elsewhere in the world;

Whereas the Department of State, Congress, and other high profile international voices have recognized the Grameen Bank's innovative work and expressed great concern over actions by the Government of Bangladesh that undermine the Bank's independence;

Whereas Bangladesh, an example of a moderate and diverse Muslim-majority democracy, is scheduled to have national elections on January 5, 2014;

Whereas, in 2013, hundreds of Bangladeshis died in violent clashes as a result of political violence and unrest, and some opposition and human rights activists have been arrested;

Whereas trials held by the International Crimes Tribunal in Bangladesh—set up to prosecute those responsible for atrocities committed during Bangladesh's war of lib-

eration with Pakistan in 1971—have fallen short of international standards;

Whereas the Government of Bangladesh eliminated a constitutional provision requiring the governing party to cede power to a neutral caretaker government three months before an election;

Whereas the 18-member opposition coalition in Bangladesh called for numerous nationwide strikes and transportation blockades in 2013, resulting in dozens of deaths;

Whereas Bangladeshi students cannot attend school and complete mandatory exams due to the strikes and blockades and related violence;

Whereas many citizens of Bangladesh have had their work and daily activities disrupted due to the strikes and related violence, which come at a cost to the economy and stability of Bangladesh;

Whereas a stable, moderate, secular, Muslim-majority democracy with the world's seventh-largest population, and the world's fourth-largest Muslim population, will have lasting positive impacts in the region and beyond;

Whereas the success of the democratic process in Bangladesh is of great importance to the United States and the world; and

Whereas during the week of December 8, 2013, United Nations Assistant Secretary General Oscar Fernandez-Taranco visited Bangladesh to foster political dialogue between Bangladeshi political parties and leaders in order to bring a halt to violence and allow for a credible peaceful election: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) condemns the political violence in Bangladesh and urges political leaders in that country to engage directly and substantively in a dialogue toward free, fair, and credible elections;

(2) expresses great concern about the continued political deadlock in Bangladesh that distracts from the country's many important challenges;

(3) urges political leaders in Bangladesh to take immediate steps to rein in and to condemn the violence as well as to provide space for peaceful political protests;

(4) urges political leaders in Bangladesh to ensure the safety and access of observers in its upcoming elections;

(5) supports ongoing efforts by United Nations Assistant Secretary General Oscar Fernandez-Taranco to foster political dialogue between political factions in Bangladesh; and

(6) urges the Government of Bangladesh to ensure judicial independence, end harassment of human rights activists, and restore the independence of the Grameen Bank.

The title was amended so as to read: "A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the critical need for political dialogue in Bangladesh, and for other purposes."

#### EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE UKRAINIAN PEOPLE

Mr. REED. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 274, S. Res. 319.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 319) expressing support for the Ukrainian people in light of President Yanukovich's decision not to sign an Association Agreement with the European Union.

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

Mr. REED. Madam President, I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be 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. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 319) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

#### S. RES. 319

Whereas, according to a poll conducted in November 2013, a majority of the people of Ukraine supported signing a historic trade and political agreement with the European Union;

Whereas a closer association between Ukraine and the European Union has been supported by Ukrainian civil society, business leaders, and politicians across the political spectrum and would bring lasting political, democratic, and economic benefits to the people of Ukraine;

Whereas Ukraine successfully passed much of the legislation required to conform to European Union standards for signing an Association Agreement;

Whereas, on September 22, 2012, and November 18, 2013, the Senate unanimously passed resolutions calling for a demonstrable end to selective justice in Ukraine and expressing its belief that Ukraine's future lies with stronger ties to Europe, the United States, and others in the community of democracies;

Whereas the experience of countries such as Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia provides a positive example of increased economic opportunity, enhanced personal freedom, and good governance, which can also be realized by Ukraine;

Whereas the Government and people of Ukraine have the sovereign right to choose their own foreign policy and economic course, and no other country has the right to determine their political and economic orientation, nor decide which alliances and trade agreements they can join;

Whereas, on November 21, 2013, President Viktor Yanukovich suspended Ukraine's preparations for signing the Association Agreement one week before a critical European Union Summit in Vilnius, Lithuania;

Whereas the abrupt reversal on the eve of the summit following Russian economic coercion and to protect the narrow interests of some officials and individuals in Ukraine prompted hundreds of thousands of Ukrainians all across the country, especially young people and students, to protest the decision and stand in support of furthering Ukraine's Euro-Atlantic integration;

Whereas international nonprofit and non-governmental organizations provide essential care to needy Ukrainians, yet face direct threats and challenges to their existence and administrative and regulatory impediments, including challenges to operating with the tax-exempt status necessary to maximize the use of funds on the ground and threats to the fabric of civil society vital to democracy in Ukraine;

Whereas, on November 30, 2013, at Independence Square in Kyiv, special division police dispersed a peaceful demonstration of students and civil society activists who were calling on President Yanukovich to sign the Association Agreement;

Whereas approximately 35 individuals were detained or arrested, and dozens were hospitalized, some with severe injuries;

Whereas, on December 9, 2013, raids were conducted on three opposition media outlets and the headquarters of one opposition party;

Whereas, on December 11, 2013, Ukrainian authorities conducted an overnight police operation in an attempt to forcefully take control of Independence Square, but were resisted by brave Ukrainians who filled the square and rebuffed the police action;

Whereas all three former Presidents of Ukraine have underscored the need to refrain from violence and the importance of engaging in a dialogue with the opposition; and

Whereas Ukraine faces an impending economic crisis that can only be solved with long-term economic reforms: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) stands with the people of Ukraine and supports their sovereign right to chart an independent and democratic future for their country;

(2) urges leaders in the United States and the European Union to continue working together actively to support a peaceful and democratic resolution to the current crisis that moves Ukraine toward a future in the Euro-Atlantic community and a long-term solution to Ukraine's economic crisis;

(3) encourages demonstrators and members of the opposition and civil society in Ukraine to continue avoiding the use of violence and engage in a dialogue of national reconciliation;

(4) urges all political parties to refrain from hate speech or actions of an anti-Semitic or other character which further divide the Ukrainian people when they need to be united;

(5) calls on the Government of Ukraine to refrain from further use of force or acts of violence against peaceful protestors, and to respect the internationally recognized human rights of the Ukrainian people, especially the freedoms of speech and assembly;

(6) condemns the decision by Ukrainian authorities to use violence against peaceful demonstrators on November 30, December 1, and December 11, 2013, and calls for those responsible to be swiftly brought to justice and all detained nonviolent demonstrators to be immediately released; and

(7) notes that in the event of further state violence against peaceful protestors, the President and Congress should consider whether to apply targeted sanctions, including visa bans and asset freezes, against individuals responsible for ordering or carrying out the violence.

#### NATIONAL SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY WEEK

Mr. REED. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to S. Res. 329, submitted earlier today.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 329) expressing support for the goals and ideals of the biennial USA Science & Engineering Festival in Washington, DC and designating April 21 through April 27, 2014, as "National Science and Technology Week".

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

Mr. REED. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be 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. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 329) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

#### ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 8, 2014

Mr. REED. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. on Wednesday, January 8, 2014; that following the prayer and the 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 resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 1845, the unemployment insurance extension, postclosure, and that all time during adjournment count postclosure on the motion to proceed to S. 1845.

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

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REED. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:55 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, January 8, 2014, at 10 a.m.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

##### COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

SHARON Y. BOWEN, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A COMMISSIONER OF THE COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING APRIL 13, 2018, VICE BARTHOLOMEW CHILTON, RESIGNED.

##### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

ERIC ROSENBAUGH, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, VICE PAUL N. STOCKTON, RESIGNED.

DAVID B. SHEAR, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, VICE MARK WILLIAM LIPPERT, RESIGNED.

##### NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION

J. MARK MCWATERS, OF TEXAS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING AUGUST 2, 2019, VICE MICHAEL E. FRYZEL, TERM EXPIRED.

##### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

JANET GARVIN MCCABE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, VICE REGINA MCCARTHY, RESIGNED.

##### EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

DARCI L. VETTER, OF NEBRASKA, TO BE CHIEF AGRICULTURAL NEGOTIATOR, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR, VICE ISLAM A. SIDDIQUI.

##### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MAX SIEBEN BAUCUS, OF MONTANA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

## UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

PAIGE EVE ALEXANDER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, VICE MARA E. RUDMAN.

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

JOHN CHARLES CRUDEN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL, VICE IGNACIA S. MORENO, RESIGNED.

## DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

LEON RODRIGUEZ, OF MARYLAND, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION SERVICES, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, VICE ALEJANDRO N. MAYORKAS, RESIGNED.

## IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

*To be brigadier general*

COL. DONALD R. LINDBERG

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

*To be major general*

BRIG. GEN. WILLIAM D. COBETTO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be major general*

BRIG. GEN. BART O. IDDINS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be brigadier general*

COLONEL ROY-ALAN C. AGUSTIN  
COLONEL ROBERT G. ARMPFIELD  
COLONEL MARK A. BAIRD  
COLONEL DIETER E. BAREIHS  
COLONEL MITCHEL H. BUTIKOFER  
COLONEL MARK D. CAMERER  
COLONEL DOUGLAS A. COX  
COLONEL STEPHEN L. DAVIS  
COLONEL ERIC T. FICK  
COLONEL KEITH M. GIVENS  
COLONEL PAUL H. GUEMMER  
COLONEL GREGORY M. GUILLOT  
COLONEL GREGORY M. GUTTERMAN  
COLONEL DARREN E. HARTFORD  
COLONEL DAVID W. HICKS  
COLONEL BRIAN T. KELLY  
COLONEL DAVID A. KRUMM  
COLONEL PETER J. LAMBERT  
COLONEL EVAN M. MILLER  
COLONEL THOMAS E. MURPHY  
COLONEL DAVID S. NAHOM  
COLONEL MARY F. O'BRIEN  
COLONEL STEPHEN W. OLIVER, JR.  
COLONEL SCOTT L. PLEUS  
COLONEL JOHN T. RAUCH, JR.  
COLONEL CHRISTOPHER M. SHORT  
COLONEL KIRK W. SMITH  
COLONEL ROBERT W. STANLEY II  
COLONEL MARK E. WEATHERINGTON  
COLONEL STEPHEN C. WILLIAMS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be lieutenant colonel*

TERESA G. PARIS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be lieutenant colonel*

JOEL K. WARREN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be lieutenant colonel*

JEFFREY P. TAN

*To be major*

CRISTALLE A. COX

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be colonel*

ROBERT D. COXWELL  
ROBERT J. GRAZULIS  
AARON L. ULLMAN  
KENT A. WILLIAMS

*To be lieutenant colonel*

BRIAN E. EARP

*To be major*

CHRISTOPHER ALFARO

STEVEN M. ANDERSON  
JOHN H. BRINDLE  
TRENT L. FRITZ  
SHAWNARA GOVAN  
JOSHUA L. GREENSPAN  
JOSEPH A. JOHNSON  
MICHAEL D. JOHNSON  
JAMES M. KRAMER  
MATTHEW E. STIGLER  
WESTON D. TURNER  
SCOT L. WILLIAMS

## IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be major*

DAVID W. BRYANT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

*To be colonel*

JOSEPH B. BERGER III  
ERIK L. CHRISTIANSEN  
GAIL A. CURLEY  
JONATHAN HOWARD  
CHARLES T. KIRCHMAIER  
NICHOLAS F. LANCASTER  
JEFFERY D. LIPPERT  
DAVID E. MENDELSON  
MICHAEL E.J. MUELLER  
CHARLES C. POCHÉ  
LUIS O. RODRIGUEZ  
JOHN T. ROTHWELL  
MICHELLE L. RYAN  
WILLIAM D. SMOOT III

## IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be colonel*

BAMIDELE J. ABOGUNRIN  
JOSEPH T. ALLENA, JR.  
PHILIP G. ANTEKEIER  
HUGH L. ATKINSON  
IAN D. BRASURE  
TIMOTHY R. BRYANT  
DANIEL T. CANFIELD, JR.  
JAMES C. CARROLL III  
RONNIE A. CARSON, JR.  
BRIAN S. CHRISTMAS  
ROBERT M. CLARK  
CARL E. COOPER, JR.  
DARYL G. CRANE  
NICHOLAS E. DAVIS  
MICHAEL E. DEHNER  
THOMAS J. DODDS  
CRAIG R. DOTY  
ANDREW J. DRAKE  
HAROLD B. EGGERS  
CHRISTIAN T. ELLINGER  
DAREN J. ERIKSSON  
LY T. FECTEAU  
ROBERT A. FREELAND  
EDWARD A. GARLAND  
ERIC A. GILLIS  
DONALD A. GORDON  
JON L. HALVERSON  
CHRISTIAN D. HARSHBERGER  
CARLTON W. HASLE  
CARL C. HENGER  
PATRICK R. HITTLE  
JEFFREY C. HOLT  
BRIAN G. HUGHES  
MICHAEL J. JERNIGAN  
MATTHEW G. KELLY  
ERIC S. LIVINGSTON  
HENRY W. LUTZ III  
KENDALL A. MARTINEZ  
KEVEN W. MATTHEWS  
ROGER T. MCDUFFIE  
BOYD A. MILLER  
THOMAS P. MITALSKI  
MICHAEL C. MONTI  
DAVID C. MORIS  
BRIAN W. NEIL  
RICHARD F. NEITZLEY  
JULIE L. NETHERCOT  
JOHN M. NEVILLE, JR.  
ANDREW M. NIEBEL  
RICHARD E. PETERSEN  
MICHAEL A. PHILLIPS  
RICARDO T. PLAYER  
JOHN R. POLIDORO, JR.  
THOMAS E. PRENTICE  
MATTHEW PUGLISI  
MATTHEW B. REUTER  
ROBERT C. RICE  
CHRISTOPHER S. RICHIE  
RYAN S. RIDEOUT  
JEFFREY N. RULE  
MICHAEL V. SAMAROV  
JAMES A. SCHNELLE  
MICHAEL E. SCHUTTE  
KEVIN R. SCOTT  
CHANDLER P. SEAGRAVES  
DANIEL L. SHIPLEY  
TODD F. SIMMONS  
DIANA L. STANESZIEWSKI  
JAMES B. STONE IV

CLAY C. TIPTON  
STEPHEN K. VANRIPER  
MICHAEL C. VARICAK  
JOSEPH F. WADE  
WILLIAM M. WANDO  
MARTIN F. WETTERAUER III  
JOSEPH D. WILLIAMS  
CRAIG C. WIRTH  
JASON G. WOODWORTH  
JAY D. WYLLIE  
WILLIAM W. YATES  
DEVIN C. YOUNG  
PHILLIP M. ZEMAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be major*

ERNEST P. ABELSON II  
BRIAN W. ACKERSON  
STEVEN A. ADAIR, JR.  
THOMAS R. ADAME  
SAMUEL P. ADAMS  
KARIN B. ALISSANDRATOS  
STEVEN E. ALSOP  
RYAN A. ALTER  
MIGUEL ALVAREZ, JR.  
CLINTON S. ANDERSON  
CRAIG R. ANDERSON  
WILLIAM H. ANDERSON  
JOSEPH A. ANDREJACK  
MICHAEL G. ANKRUM  
ERIC M. ANTONELLI  
SCOTT D. ARMSTRONG  
LISA M. AROCHO  
CHRISTOPHER A. ASHINHURST  
DACHELLE E. AUGUSTINE  
DANIEL R. BALLARD  
ANDREW C. BANKSTON  
WILLIAM A. BARTHOLOMAE  
DAVID G. BATCHELER  
JEFFREY D. BAYSE  
MICHAEL C. BELL  
JOHN L. BELSHA  
CERA T. BENBOW  
SAMUEL A. BENEFIEL  
PETER D. BENNING  
DANIEL H. BENSON  
CLAUDE L. BERTHOLD  
JEREMY S. BEST  
ALISON M. BETSINGER  
JOSHUA K. BEYER  
BARNEY B. BLAINE  
JONATHAN C. BODWELL  
BROOKS W. BOEHLERT  
JEFFREY W. BOGLE  
AUSTIN C. BONNER  
JOHN A. BORING  
ANDREW J. BORMANN  
ERIC D. BOWER  
BRIAN V. BOYD  
CHARLES W. BOYD  
PATRICK M. BRALEY  
ROBERT G. BUICK  
NICHOLAS BUKOVAC  
JASON L. BULLIS  
MELVIN D. BURCH  
RICKY D. BURIA  
LARRY L. BUZZARD  
GERARDINE C. CAREY  
JOSHUA E. CARPENTER  
BENJAMIN C. CARRUTHERS  
ANDREW M. CASCI  
JASON CASTILLO  
JONATHAN I. CHAIKEN  
ROY E. CHEEKS, JR.  
SIMBA A. CHIGWIDA  
COLE M. CLEMENTS  
JEREMY M. CLEVINGER  
MICHAEL F. CLEVINGER  
ADAM C. COKER  
ALEXANDER G. COLE  
AMBER G. COLEMAN  
RYAN C. COLLINS  
RYAN D. COLTON  
JOSE I. COLUNGA  
JEREMY J. COLWELL  
HARRY P. CONSAUL IV  
DUSTY L. COOK  
STEPHEN M. COOK  
BRANDON E. COOLEY  
JASON C. COPELAND  
AARON J. CORONNA  
JEREMY A. COTHERN  
STEPHANIE L. COTHERN  
DEREK M. COTTA  
GABRIEL R. CRANE  
JACK M. CRONAN  
TROY J. CRONBAUGH  
NICHOLAS J. CRUZ  
JAMES N. CUNNINGHAM III  
KENNETH H. CURTIS  
THOMAS W. DAGGETT  
ANTHONY R. DAMICO  
DAVID V. DAMIN  
CRAIG O. DAVIS  
CHRISTOPHER M. DELL  
SUZANNE M. DEMPSEY  
CHRISTOPHER A. DENVER  
BLIAN C. DERAKHSHAN  
MICHAEL A. DEREDITA  
JOHN B. DICKENS  
SEAN P. DILLON  
AMANDA N. DONNELLY  
CASEY W. DOYLE  
CHARLES R. DRENNAN



THOMAS J. DUFF  
DOUGLAS I. DUFFIN  
CHRISTOPHER S. DUNCAN  
THOMAS J. DUNN  
DANIEL B. EAGAN  
PAUL D. ECKERT  
JONATHAN R. ELLIOTT  
THOMAS A. EYBL  
ROSS A. FEARON  
ROBERT W. FEATHERSTONE  
TERRY A. FELLOWS, JR.  
RYAN A. FERRELL  
JASON M. FIDUCCIA  
DANIEL M. FLETCHER  
JOHN G. FLETCHER III  
CARLOS R. FLORES  
RICARDO S. FLORES, JR.  
KATHARINE E. FOLZ  
ERIC FONG  
SCOT A. FOSTER  
AARON M. FREY  
JASON E. FRIDAY  
CHRISTOPHER M. GAITENS  
ANTHONY T. GAROFANO  
JOSE B. GARZA, JR.  
BRADLEY P. GAUTREAUX  
CLINTON P. GEBKE  
JAMES M. GEIGER, JR.  
JAMES M. GEIGER III  
JONATHAN M. GEISLER  
CHARLES E. GEORGE  
DEREK R. GEORGE  
TIMOTHY J. GILLETTE, JR.  
JAMIE M. GLINES  
NATHANIEL C. GODDARD  
PASCAL J. GONZALEZ  
DANIEL E. GRAINGER  
TAD A. GREER  
WILLIAM P. GRIMES  
ANTHONY J. GUDRY  
MARK A. GUTHRIE  
ROBERT F. GUYETTE II  
PAUL D. HAAGENSON  
MICHAEL S. HAGER  
KYLE P. HAHN  
KALEB J. HARKEMA  
CLAYTON T. HARLIN, JR.  
MICHAEL B. HARMON  
RICHARD D. HARPER  
AARON J. HARRELL  
KEATON H. HARRELL  
ADAM M. HARRINGTON  
TODD E. HARRISON  
CHRISTOPHER R. HART  
NATHAN M. HARVEY  
ANGELA B. HATCH  
CHARLES A. HATTON  
JESSICA M. HAWKINS  
MATTHEW M. HEMPHILL  
MICHAEL S. HENSON  
PAUL C. HERRERA  
MATTHEW W. HOHL  
CORY L. HOLIDAY  
KRIKET S. HOLLEY  
TYLER J. HOLT  
CHRISTOPHER K. HUCKABY  
JEREMIAH W. HUGHES  
BERNARD W. HUND III  
CHARLES P. HUNT  
TREVOR L. HUNT  
CHRISTOPHER J. JAMISON  
JOHN F. JEDRA  
BYRON R. JOHNSON  
MICHAEL E. JOHNSON  
ANDRE M. JONCKHEERE  
JUSTIN A. JONES  
LAWRENCE O. JONES  
SCOTT L. JONES  
PATRICK W. JUNICK  
JASON D. KAISER  
VERONICA L. KALTRIDER  
RUTH E. KEHOE  
STEVEN M. KEISLING  
BRADLEY B. KELLER  
CHRISTOPHER J. KELLY  
ROBERT S. KEMPER  
DUSTIN A. KERLIN  
JOHN S. KIM  
ASHLYN E. KING  
MATTHEW F. KLOBY  
ERIC J. KNECHT  
NATHAN K. KNOWLES  
ANTHONY M. KOEHL  
ERIK B. KOLLE  
STEVEN L. KOSNIK  
JASON A. KOZAK  
DAVID A. KRIEGBAUM  
ETHAN C. KRUMNOW  
LOWELL D. KRUSINGER  
JENNIFER A. KUKLA  
VALERIE N. KYZAR  
JASON R. LAIRD

JASON A. LAMBERT  
JONATHAN W. LANDERS  
JARRIEL L. LANG  
JARROD P. LARSON  
JASON E. LATTA  
RALPH E. LEMASTER  
JASON R. LESHKAR  
JOHN M. LEWIS  
RAYMOND F. LHEUREUX, JR.  
JAMES J. LILLEY  
ASHLEY E. LISH  
JUSTIN D. LOKKESMOE  
EDWARD A. LORD  
JEFFREY L. LUDWIG  
FRANK A. MACHNIAK, JR.  
ADAM J. MALLO  
MICHAEL F. MANNING  
ERICA K. MANTZ  
EFREN S. MANZANET  
JONATHAN E. MARANG  
PAUL M. MARCY  
AHMAD J. MARTIN  
THEODORE P. MARTIN  
TRACY A. MARTIN  
FREDDIE F. MARTINEZ  
LINDSAY E. MATHWICK  
MATTHEW S. MAYO  
MATTHEW J. MCLANE  
MICHAEL D. MCMAHON  
SHAWN A. MEIER  
JOHN T. MEIXNER  
CHARLES E. MILLER II  
JOHN C. MILLER  
JOSHUA D. MILLER  
YATES F. MINNER  
JOSE N. MIRELES  
JOSEPH D. MONTAGNA  
BRIAN M. MONTALVO  
JOSHUA E. MONTERO  
MICHAEL W. MOORE  
MITCHELL A. MOORE  
FREDDY A. MORALES  
PATRICK R. MORAN  
MIGUEL MORENO  
TRAVIS M. MORRIS  
THOMAS C. MORSE  
BRANDON W. MOTT  
MARCUS D. MOYER  
LINDSAY K. MURPHY  
JAMES O. MYUNG  
REID B. NANNEN  
ANTHONY M. NAVARRETTE  
MATTHEW J. NEELY  
JEREMY M. NELSON  
GEOFFREY T. NEWTON  
KAHO NG  
AARON C. NORWOOD  
COURTNEY D. OBRIEN  
KEVIN J. O'DONNELL  
WILBUR S. OLES IV  
KYLE B. OPEL  
WILLIAM C. OREN  
PEDRO ORTIZ  
BRIAN M. OSHEA  
KRISTOPHER W. OTTEN  
BENJAMIN M. PARENTE  
FRANK N. PARISI  
KIRA L. PARRISH  
MARIO S. PARZINO  
WILLIAM J. PATRICK  
RAMON E. PATTUGALAN  
MATTHEW A. PEDERSON  
WILLIAM P. PENDLEY  
LAURA J. PERAZZOLA  
NICHOLAS B. PERKINS  
ADAM F. PERLIN  
BUCK A. PERRY  
RYAN E. PETERSEN  
JON T. PETERSON  
TODD A. PETERSON  
JOSEPH R. PETKUS  
PHUONG H. PHAN  
STEVEN M. PIACENTE  
STEPHEN M. PIANATANIDA  
STACIE M. PICCINICH  
DANIEL D. PINKERTON  
JUAN R. PLASCENCIA  
JOSHUA R. PLUMMER  
ERIC D. PORTER  
LEVI G. PORTER  
JUSTIN M. POTHEEN  
JEFFREY B. POTTER  
WILLIAM M. POWELL  
ADAM E. POWERS  
JONATHAN S. PRATHER  
AARON W. PRIDGEN  
DAVID S. RAINEY  
NATHAN T. RASMUSSEN  
JOHNATHAN D. REED  
JONATHAN P. REED  
STEVAN D. REICHERT  
STACI L. REIDINGER

HARRY REIFSCHEIDER III  
JASON R. REUKEMA  
THEODORE C. RHODES  
MATHEW J. RICE  
OWEN Q. RIEMER  
JONATHAN M. RINGLEIN  
ANDREW C. ROBBINS  
LUKE T. ROBERTS  
ERIC C. ROBINSON  
JEFFREY M. ROHMAN  
CHRISTOPHER J. ROSS  
STEPHEN R. RUBEO  
JAMES P. RUBOCKI  
EDWARD P. RUSHING  
JOSEPH M. SALUCCI  
MATTHEW J. SAMSON  
JOSEPH C. SANDS  
BRYAN P. SARGENT  
LUKE A. SAUBER  
ERIC A. SCHERRER  
ANDREW P. SCHILLING  
JOHN W. SCHINDEL  
ERIK M. SCHMIDT  
ERIK N. SCHNEIDER  
TED W. SCHROEDER  
ROBERT M. SCOTT  
JONATHAN M. SECOR  
ANDREW J. SEGAL  
ANTON T. SEMELROTH  
JOSEPH T. SEYKORA  
RICHARD L. SHINN  
GORDON M. SILLIKER  
JAMES C. SMITH  
JOSHUA E. SMITH  
NICHOLAS A. SMITH  
WILLIAM M. SMYTH  
WALTER P. SNODGRASS  
CHRISTOPHER A. SOUTHARD  
TIMOTHY A. SPARKS  
KATHERINE L. SPIES  
JEREMY J. SPRIGGS  
JON D. STIEBNER  
ADAM C. STILES  
BRANDON M. STOCKWELL  
DANIEL J. STRUZIK  
JAMES A. SUMLER  
ERIC D. SWANSON  
AUTUMN D. SWINFORD  
STEPHEN G. TAUTE  
ALEXANDER M. TAYLOR  
BRETT V. TAYLOR  
CHRISTOPHER A. TCHINSKI  
JACK C. TEMPLETON II  
CURTIS L. THOMAS  
DANIELLE E. THOMAS  
MATTHEW A. THOMPSON  
CHRISTOPHER T. TIERNEY  
JON C. TILLMAN  
JARED L. TOWLES  
CHANCE D. TROMBETTI  
ADAM W. TROUT  
EMMA C. TUCKER  
WILLIAM D. TURNER III  
KYLE A. UGONE  
DAVID D. VANDAM  
SAMUEL A. VERPLANCK  
ESTEBAN T. VICKERS  
BENJAMIN Y. VICTOR  
NICHOLAS L. VOGEL  
ALEXIS F. VOGELGESANG  
NATALIE N. WALKER  
TOBIN J. WALKER  
SHANNON M. WALLER  
JEREMY R. WALTER  
JASON R. WAREHAM  
MILES G. WARREN  
WILLIAM D. WHALEY II  
WILLIAM G. WHEATLEY, JR.  
JOSEPH L. WHITE  
LEE A. WHITE  
MICHAEL W. WHITE  
RANDALL C. WHITE  
JOE A. WHITEFIELD, JR.  
NICKOLAS D. WHITEFIELD  
KIRK A. WHITTENBERG  
ROBERT E. WICKER  
ERIC A. WIENER  
BRIAN S. WILLIAMS  
THEODORE L. WILLIAMS II  
JONATHAN M. WILLIAMSON  
BRIAN J. WILSON  
NICHOLAS R. WITTMAN  
ANTHONY J. WLOTKO  
ALLEN D. WOLD  
ROBERT W. WOODARD  
ALI I. YAKUB  
ADRIAN E. YBARRA  
JUSTIN A. YOUNG  
JASON C. YURISIC  
CHRISTOPHER L. ZACHARY  
BRYAN L. ZUPPINGER  
DAVID D. ZYGA