United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, AUGUST 1, 2013 No. 113

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable BRIAN SCHATZ, a Senator from the State of Hawaii.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal Lord God, the source of our life, You are high above all, yet in all. Keep us from becoming weary in doing what is right, as You use us for Your instruments in these challenging times. Empower our Senators to bring Your freedom to those shackled by fear. Help them to lift the burdens that are too heavy for people to carry. Lengthen their vision that they may see beyond today and make decisions that will have an impact for eternity.

And, Lord, in a special way, bless Dave Schiappa, as he prepares to transition to new vocational opportunities. Thank You for his decades of faithful service for You and country on Capitol Hill. Be gracious to him and his family. We pray in Your loving Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, August 1, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable BRIAN SCHATZ, a Senator from the State of Hawaii, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

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

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following leader remarks the Senate will be in morning business until 11 o'clock this morning. The time until then will be equally divided and controlled between the majority leader and the Republican leader.

At 11 the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the Chen nomination to be a U.S. circuit judge for the Federal circuit. Also, at 11 there will be a filing deadline for all second-degree amendments to the Transportation bill.

At noon there will be two rollcall votes on confirmation of Chen and cloture on the THUD bill. Following those votes, the Senate will recess until 2 p.m. for a bipartisan caucus meeting.

This afternoon there will be a rollcall vote on the confirmation of the Power nomination to be Ambassador to the United Nations.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

COMMENDING DAVID J. SCHIAPPA

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, this morning I wish to say a few words about somebody who will not be around when we get back after the recess. After nearly 30 years of service, Dave Schiappa is hanging up his cleats. Dave is not exactly a household name. I think he likes it that way, but there is no question to those who work here day in and day out that nobody is more essential to the running of this place than Dave. To the extent we get anything done around here, it is largely because of Dave. To the extent we are not getting into shouting matches and food fights the rest of the time, well, that is largely thanks to Dave too. He has been the glue and he has been the grease that keeps this place functioning and we are really going to miss him.

As Secretary for the Republican majority and minority under three different leadership offices, Dave has been the eyes and ears on the floor for Republican leaders going back more than a decade. He has also been our chief diplomat to the other side. He has answered a million questions from all of us at all hours, always with the same tact, wicked sense of humor, and sharp mind that has made him not just an indispensable help to our conference but also the kind of guy we just like having around this place. I know I am speaking for everybody when I say that.

When I announced Dave's departure to the leadership team earlier this week, the entire room, Senators and staff, erupted in applause. I assure you it was not because folks were glad to see him go. There is just nobody you would rather be with, in a foxhole or just killing time on the Senate floor, than Dave.

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

Dave had a pretty illustrious career before he got the big office up on the third floor. Prior to joining the Senate as a cloakroom assistant at the tender age of 21, legend has it he did stints as a bartender—that was while he was in college—and as a hot dog vendor out on the National Mall during summers in high school. As far as I know, these are the only two jobs outside the Senate Dave has ever had. Somehow they turned out to be great preparation for this place. I am not exactly sure why that is, but I am sure we could all come up with some interesting theories about that.

So Dave came here right out of college, back when there were no cameras on the floor, just a radio. His job back then was basically to perform the role of play-by-play announcer, telling offices what was happening out here on the floor, matching the voices with names, and just letting everybody know where things stood at all times. I wanted to have a poster out here with a photo of Dave from those days, but all the photos have mysteriously somehow disappeared. Someone suggested it might have something to do with the fact that Dave sported a pretty serious eighties mustache back then. Maybe Cheryl can dig up that good photo from the family collection.

In 1994, Dave moved out of the cloakroom and onto the floor as Republican floor assistant. Two years after that, he was named Assistant Secretary for the majority and 2 weeks before 9/11, in August 2001, Senator Lott named him Secretary for the majority. Since then, the two parties have swung back and forth a couple of times, but Dave has been one of the constants—smoothing out all the rough edges during a thousand legislative fights, providing indispensable strategic advice to me and to the rest of our conference, and just generally keeping everybody on both sides informed of everything that is going on out here.

It is not easy. It is not easy telling Senators they will not get an amendment they have been fighting for or that they have to wait. But Dave has always had the perfect temperament for that job.

Nobody on Earth—nobody—knows more about Senate precedent and procedure than Dave Schiappa, and nobody wears their knowledge and skill more lightly.

So we are going to miss him a lot. We will all miss his ''Davisms,'' whether he is reporting that some Senator just showed up in the cloakroom ''in a three-point stance'' or that the week is shaping up to be a ''nothing burger.'' Those are Davisms.

He will take some secrets, hopefully, with him. It will forever remain a mystery, for example, how Dave stuffs all of those cards into his suit coat pocket. Ask Dave a question about anything and he will have the answer written on some card inside his coat. The secrets of the Senate are contained on those cards.

They say there are no indispensable men, though many of us have long suspected that Dave is the exception. I guess we will soon find out.

Dave, thanks for all you have done for all of us and for your devotion to the institution. I know how much the Senate means to you personally and we all appreciate how much you have given to it over the years. Some folks complain about the hours and the unpredictable schedule around here, but Dave has us all beat. He is not only here whenever we are, he is here after the lights go out, finishing up the business of the day, sending out e-mails, tying up loose ends or ''loose tarps,'' as he might put it. We are all glad you will finally have a little predictability in your life.

Which brings me to my last point which is almost, actually, the most important. Nobody who has a family can handle this place without an understanding spouse. So I want to thank Cheryl for putting up with this place over the last 23 years. Dave tells the story that early on in their marriage, Cheryl got Dave tickets to a show at the Kennedy Center for his birthday. When he called to tell her something had come up and he couldn't make it, she didn't know what he was talking about. Dave explained that he was stuck and there just wasn't anything he could do about it; it is just how the Senate works. It was the last time she questioned his job or his schedule.

So as much as I am here to thank Dave today, I want to thank Cheryl. I want Cheryl to know we are grateful to her for all the sacrifices she has made over the years for Dave and their family.

Ask Dave why he has been here so long and he will tell you it is the people, but the truth is Dave is one of the best this place has ever seen. I have no doubt about it.

Dave, on behalf of the entire Senate family, thanks for everything. You will be missed.

I see my friend the majority leader. Let me call up a resolution before his comments and then we will move on.

COMMENDING DAVID J. SCHIAPPA

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 212 and for the clerk to read the resolution.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 212) commending David J. Schiappa:

S. RES. 212

Whereas, David Schiappa has loyally served the Senate for 29 years, his entire professional career, starting in the Senate in December 1984;

Whereas, David Schiappa grew up in Maryland and graduated from DaMatha Catholic High School, the University of Maryland, and Johns Hopkins University;

Whereas, David Schiappa rose through all the positions in the Republican Cloakroom finally serving as either Secretary for the Majority or Secretary for the Minority for the last three Republican Leaders;

Whereas, David Schiappa has at all times discharged the duties of his office with great dedication, diligence, and sense of service, thus earning the respect of Republican and Democratic Senators alike, as well as their staffs; and

Whereas, his good humor, storytelling ability, and easy-going manner have made him an invaluable member of the Senate family: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate expresses its appreciation to David Schiappa and his family and commends him for his outstanding and faithful service to the Senate.

The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit a copy of this resolution to David J. Schiappa.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid on the table with no intervening action or debate.

Mr. REID. I object.

(Laughter.)

I will withdraw my objection.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 212) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

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

Mr. President, when I learned David Schiappa was going to leave, I had a brief conversation with him at the back of the Chamber. I am not very much for being emotional, but if ever there was a time I felt like shedding a tear, it was when I said goodbye to Dave Schiappa.

''Parting is such sweet sorrow,'' and it really is. It is from Shakespeare:

''Good night, good night! Parting is such sweet sorrow.''

And it really is.

If you are looking for someone who is a true Washington insider, you need look no further than Dave. He was actually born in Washington, DC, and for a quarter of a century he has made the trains run on time in the Republican cloakroom. For 13 of those years he served as the Republican secretary. He has been the secretary, as the Republican leader mentioned, when the Republicans held the majority and the minority.

Regardless of who controlled this Chamber, my observation was that he has always managed the floor with integrity and an even temper. He has been a real pleasure to work with. When Gary, his counterpart, wasn't around, I would go to Dave and ask him questions. I never had any concern about the answer because he would always tell me the truth. Sometimes I didn't like to hear the truth, but he was always very forthright and candid.

No matter how bad things got on the floor between Members, Dave and his Democratic counterpart Gary Myrick were always looking for a path forward. Gary Myrick has been so important to this body, along with Dave.

How these staff members love their jobs. I try to tell people about my staff,

and about the Senate staff in general. They do this because it is public service. He has put in 20 years—longer than 20 years. He is 50 years old and moving on to another career. I understand his doing that for himself and his family.

Gary Myrick has been my chief of staff. He ran my office. He loved this floor very much. This was always his dream job even though on paper he was a big shot by being the Democratic leader's chief of staff, but that is not what he wanted to do. He wanted to come to the Senate floor where he was raised in his employment. He knew this was the job that he wanted, and he told me that. I arranged things so he would come and be the secretary to the majority here.

Gary Myrick and David Schiappa were literally always looking for a way forward. They sorted through what I wanted, what the Republican leader wanted, and what Members wanted. They didn't always arrive at the conclusion the Republican leader or I wanted because sometimes that wasn't possible, but they worked through long hard days—and even longer nights—as well as holidays and birthdays. He has a friendly demeanor—Gary is not nearly as friendly as Dave but is just as effective.

They worked so well together. They are a team. Some day, when the history of this institution is written, they will have to talk about these two good men who made this place work through some of the most difficult times this body has ever seen.

He will be missed by Democrats and Republicans alike, and that is the truth.

In all of the times we talked—and we talked about important things most of the time. I understand he and Gary have been working together since the 1980s, and they are supposedly great storytellers—one and all. They have been known to talk for hours on end. They would disappear, and when Gary came back, we would ask: What did you talk about? And Gary would say—and I want to make sure I get this right—''I have no idea.'' But that was only a way of covering for both of them because they were so candid and forthright with each other. They always have been, and they would never ever divulge anything I was doing or going to do or anything Leader MCCONNELL was going to do or had done. They were absolutely confidential in their communications with each other. That is how they trusted each other. So when Gary said, ''I have no idea,'' he knew every idea, but he wasn't going to tell me what they talked about.

They are two such fine men. Even though there were difficult situations where they found themselves forced to talk, I am sure time passed quickly because they are such good people.

I know David will be successful at whatever he does. I congratulate him and thank him for three decades of valued service to the United States Senate and to our country.

I wish him, his wife Cheryl, and his children Aly and Mason—by the way, that is my middle name—happiness. I mean it when I say: Parting is such sweet sorrow.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am both saddened and heartened by the departure of Dave Schiappa from the Senate family.

I share the sadness felt on both sides of the aisle that the Senate is going to lose a valuable, dedicated, and inspiring resource.

I am heartened to know, without doubt, that Dave will move on to pursuits in which everyone around him will benefit from his productive presence. I am heartened to think, also, that his family might be able to see him a bit more often.

Dave's work in the Senate involves a challenging schedule, often involving brutal hours. He is often here morning, noon, and night—and sometimes overnight—helping to ensure that the Senate operates. With Dave at the helm, the operations are smooth, predictable, and disciplined. When things go smooth, as they normally do with Dave around, rest assured that much of that is the direct cause of Dave's tireless work and devotion.

Amazingly, with all of his tireless devotion, Dave always has a positive and uplifting disposition, and is always a pleasure to be around. Whether it is idle friendly chat, or discussions of Senate-rule intricacies, discourse with Dave always leaves you in a better place.

As Leaders MCCONNELL and REID and many others have attested, Dave always tells you the truth and is a straight-shooter, whether you like it or not. He tells the truth to any Senator on the floor, no matter what side of the aisle. That is what has helped the Senate work smoothly for the many years Dave has been at the steering wheel on our side.

Dave's tenure in the Senate began almost 30 years ago when he began working in the cloakroom. Since those earlier days, he has moved up the ranks to be one of the few people around here who understands all of the intricacies of the Senate, and he uses that understanding to help all of us and to make this place work. Dave is ending his illustrious Senate career with more Senate years under his belt than most Senators he works with on the floor.

Dave Schiappa has been a true treasure for me, for the Senate, and for the American people. The Senate is losing a valuable resource, and I am sad to see him go. I, and I am sure all of my colleagues, wish Dave and his family all the very best, and I am confident that in whatever Dave chooses in his future endeavors, we will continue to see nothing but the very best from him.

When people talk about America's best and brightest, they refer to folks like Dave who is truly one of our best and brightest.

In addition to thanking Dave for his counsel, camaraderie, guidance, and hard work, I also would like to give sincere thanks to Dave's wife and family. They have endured the often-grueling schedule demanded by Senate hours, which for Dave often stretches well before and well after when the Senate is actually in session. We owe Dave's family an enormous amount of gratitude for the time demands that the Senate has placed on them.

I am going to miss Dave Schiappa, as will the entire Senate as a collection of people and as an institution which Dave has nurtured and preserved.

COMMENDING ROHIT KUMAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, in addition to David leaving, Rohit Kumar is also leaving. I don't know what he did for Senator MCCONNELL, but most of the time I didn't like it. But I learned in our conversations, most of them in the back room, what a fine man he is and how smart he is. He is incredibly intelligent, he is good at his job and, as I have just indicated, a little too good sometimes.

Even though we at times knew what was happening was happening because he was behind it, I am really sorry to see him leave the Senate. He is a good person. I admire him and have such great respect for him. I wish him success and happiness in his next endeavor.

He has a beautiful young daughter that he boasts about all the time, and rightly so. He and his wife Hillary, I am confident, will have a very pleasant life outside the Senate, even though we will all miss him.

MORNING BUSINESS

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 11 a.m. with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

TRIBUTE TO DAVID SCHIAPPA

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader and the Republican leader for what they expressed about David Schiappa. We rank-and-file Senators feel the same way on both sides of the aisle.

I was reminded that the late Alex Haley, the author of ''Roots,'' once said: ''When an old person dies, it's like a library burning down.'' Dave is neither old nor dying, but there is some similarity in what is happening. With his leaving after 30 years, a number of volumes from the Senate library are going out the door. We won't have that wisdom, that experience, or that knowledge that has been so valuable to

us, and that has been especially important to the Senate where nearly half the Members are in their first term. This is an institution that depends on precedent, understanding, and respect of its strengths over a long period of time.

I had a chance to work with Dave at the request of Senator MCCONNELL at the beginning of the last two Congresses to work on the Senate rules. In working with Dave and with Gary, what I found was they were representing our point of view, but they also had such a love of the institution, they wanted to make sure whatever we came up with enhanced it, strengthened it, and didn't destroy it.

We wish Dave the best. We have admired his service and his friendship, and we hope that over the next few years he will allow us to bring those volumes of wisdom, knowledge, and experience back because occasionally we may need to read them.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I am very pleased to be able to join my colleagues in wishing Dave Schiappa well in his next adventure in life, and I know he will be successful and also build upon his knowledge and experience here in the Senate. I know his contributions will continue, and it will be a pleasure to continue to follow Dave in his career, noncareer, or long vacation. Whatever he chooses to do will be happy and rewarding as has his tenure here in the Senate.

No one is more respected or more appreciated than David Schiappa. So is it a sad day, in many ways, to see him leave, but a happy one to know he is going to begin a new era. We will watch him closely and stay in touch with him and continue to appreciate him throughout his career.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to add to the comments. In Wyoming we have what is called the code of the West. While Dave Schiappa may be the man of Washington, he abides by the code of the West. There are 10 points, and I won't name them all, but it is to live each day with courage, take pride in your work—and we see that year after year—do what needs to be done, if you make a promise, keep it. We also say ride for the brand.

Finally, we say—and this really applies to David—it is: Speak less and say more. When he speaks, we all listen, just like the old EF Hutton commercial. But he does epitomize what we look to in terms of leadership, and his guidance has been so wonderful for all of us. So I wanted to rise from the West to say that David Schiappa has done a remarkable job for all of us, both parties, and a wonderful job for this country.

I yield the floor.

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

OBAMACARE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, many of us will be leaving in the next day or so and heading to States across the country. As we travel across our States, we will be listening to our constituents and hearing what is on their minds.

One of the things I hear about every weekend in Wyoming is that people are concerned about the President's health care law, and specifically how the law affects their lives, their families, and their jobs. People all across Wyoming—and I believe all across the country—are angry. They are angry that the White House is unfairly giving employers a 1-year delay in the mandate to offer insurance but did not delay the individual mandate that says every American must buy or hold Washington-approved insurance. For many of these people this is very expensive insurance.

Instead of granting a permanent delay or helping all Americans, President Obama and his supporters are trying to convince the American people that this health care law is working fine. Once again, the Obama administration is lecturing the American people instead of listening to the American people. They think if they give more speeches and deliver more sales pitches the American people will finally like this law. It is not going to happen.

Look at how far the Obama administration is willing to go with its latest sales pitch. Last week CNN reported the administration called together a bunch of Hollywood celebrities to help convince young Americans to buy expensive health coverage. The youth of America are not going to fall for it. Even though many of these Hollywood stars are great actors who always remember their lines, young Americans understand that ObamaCare is the wrong script for America. Even though some of these stars deliver funny jokes on ''Saturday Night Live,'' they are about to find out that this health care law is no laughing matter.

In fact, Americans of all ages believe the law is unworkable, unaffordable, and deeply unpopular. They are also finding out it is unfair, and that is what CBS found out last week. They did a poll. They found that 54 percent of Americans disapprove of the law. They also found that only 13 percent of the people say the law will actually help them personally. Three times as many Americans in the poll believe the law will hurt them personally. Three times as many people believe the law will hurt them personally than the people it will help. So over the next couple of months the American people can expect a barrage of advertising.

There was a big story about it today in the New York Times. Musicians are playing songs on the west coast and trying to get people to sign up for the exchanges. It was all aimed at trying to distract the American people from the health care train wreck that is coming.

According to the Associated Press, at least $684 million will be spent nationally on publicity, marketing, and advertising for the law. The Washington Post found that the States will be running ads not just on TV and radio—and you are not going to believe this—they are also putting slogans on coffee cups, on airplanes flying banners across beaches, and even, believe it or not, on portable toilets at a cost of nearly $700 million. It is a windfall for advertising agencies and a hard sell for hard-working taxpayers.

The administration is picking the pockets of the American people for advertising while the health care law is shrinking the paychecks of the people who can only find part-time work.

Speaking of part-time workers, I wish to talk about a new story that is out that demonstrates the height of hypocrisy surrounding the President's health care law. Frankly, the story is so outrageous that it is one of those things a person can't make up. The headline of the article reads ''Half of Affordable Care Act call center jobs will be part-time.'' Here are the details.

The article is about a new call center in Contra Costa County, CA. This is part of the effort to have so-called navigators who will answer Americans' questions about the health care law. The call center ran ads for more than 200 jobs that said all of these jobs would be full time. That is what people are looking for in America—full-time jobs, full-time work. But once the new workers started training, some of them got a different story. They found out that they would actually be part-time employees with no health benefits.

Let me emphasize that point. Even the ObamaCare navigators are not going to be covered by the health care law and are not going to be provided health care. Even some of the navigators will not know how they can get affordable health care coverage even though they are the ones who are supposed to be giving advice to Americans. Some navigators are being forced to work part time because the company cannot afford to provide the expensive government-mandated, government-approved insurance they are supposed to teach others how to get. It turns out the ObamaCare navigators need their own ObamaCare navigators.

The article even quotes one worker saying, ''What's really ironic is working for a call center and trying to help people get health care, but we can't afford it ourselves.'' That is what this

administration has done to this country. I don't call that ironic; I call it outrageous.

So the question is, Who are the navigators going to call for help and how are they going to answer Americans' questions when many of them don't know how they are personally going to be able to afford the health care coverage the government and the President of the United States mandate they have?

The bad news is this story is only one of many new examples of hypocrisy recently surrounding the President's health care law. Week after week we have seen labor unions—one after another—that originally supported the law now express concerns about how the health care law will impact their members' access to care. Late last week we even heard from something called the National Treasury Employees Union. It is important to know that this union represents most of the IRS workers—the 100,000 IRS workers—who are going to be enforcing the health care law. What about these IRS workers? What are they saying? Well, it turns out the IRS employee union said they are very concerned they might actually have to buy their own health insurance in the exchanges, just as other Americans will. These are the exact same IRS agents who will collect massive amounts of data—personal data—on people's individual lives and their health care choices. They will investigate whether people have the right coverage. They will apply the tax penalties to anyone who doesn't. These are the agents who now say they want no part of the health care law's exchanges for themselves. They actually have sample letters the union has sent to the IRS agents to send to Members of Congress to say: I am one of your constituents, and we don't want it to apply to us, and we want to hear back.

This health care law is bad for all Americans. Each of those stories demonstrates again that the President's health care law is fundamentally broken. Instead of spending the rest of the summer trying to sell an expensive failing product, the President should simply listen. He should listen to young people who are about to see their premiums soar. He should listen to ObamaCare navigators who can't find affordable health care. He should listen to the IRS agents who enforce the law and who don't want to live under the law. He should listen to the American people and what they have to say about the high costs of their health insurance coverage. He should listen to what Americans have to say about how hard it is to find a doctor who will take care of them.

Front-page story: So many people on Medicare cannot get a doctor to take care of them. Why? Because of the health care law. Twenty percent of family physicians in this country—this story was reported in the Wall Street Journal—20 percent of family physicians are not taking new Medicare patients. Thirty-three percent are not taking new Medicaid patients. But a big part of the President's health care law was to force people onto Medicaid—a program that is not working already.

The President should listen to what Americans have to say about how hard it is to keep their current coverage. And the President should listen to what the American people have to say about trying to make ends meet on a part-time salary—a part-time salary because of the health care law, because of the incentives of the health care law to knock down employees' work hours to less than 30.

Then the President should come back to Washington after he actually listens, not lectures, and sit down with Congress—Republicans and Democrats working together—and work on real solutions that will give Americans what they wanted in the first place with health care. Americans want the care they need from a doctor they choose at lower cost. These are the things that have not been provided under the health care law.

Remember what NANCY PELOSI said: First we have to pass it to find out what is in it. The American people now know more and more what is in this health care law, which is why it is even less popular today than it was the day it passed and why; for every American who thinks they will be helped by the health care law, three Americans believe their lives will be made worse by the law forced through this body.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

TRIBUTE TO DAVID LYLES

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, if you come to my office in the Russell Building, you will usually be greeted by one of the young and eager staffers who welcome visitors and answer the phones at the front desk. Every once in a while, you will find, instead, someone with a little more experience—my chief of staff, who has now about 30 years of Senate service in fact.

David Lyles often takes time to sit at the front desk and to answer phone calls—not during the slower, easier days of a summer recess, but always, instead, when the constituent calls are the hottest and the heaviest. It is his way of staying connected to the flow of feedback coming into the office and of letting the staff know that everybody, from the most experienced staffer to the most recent college graduate, is responsible for responding to the people we all serve. But it is also his way of providing some relief to the pressure these young new staffers are under—particularly when answering the phone calls at various times when issues are very contentious. That hands-on approach is emblematic of David's leadership—leadership that has meant so much to my work in the Senate and to me personally.

At the end of this week, when David Lyles retires from the Senate, we are going to miss his passion, his dedication, his South Carolina maxims, his encyclopedic knowledge of the Senate, Civil War history, and also his vast knowledge of the best bicycling routes in Northern Virginia.

Nearly all of David's professional life has been in public service, and nearly all of that service has been spent with the aim of strengthening our Nation's security and honoring our commitments to the men and women of our military. Of more than 30 years of Senate service, most has been spent with the Armed Services Committee, first as a professional staff member, then as deputy staff director, and from 1997 to 2003 as director of the Democratic staff, before agreeing to serve as my chief of staff in my personal office.

He also served earlier with the Senate Appropriations Committee, as a civilian member of the Pentagon staff. and as staff director of the 1995 Base Realignment and Closure Commission—a difficult and at times thankless job that was nonetheless of major importance to our Nation.

His Armed Services Committee career even encompassed some of the most significant national security challenges of our time: the end of the Cold War, the Persian Gulf war, the 2001 terrorist attacks, the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, as well as the immense technological changes and major budget challenges we have faced during his years here.

I have asked David twice to change jobs: first in 1997 when I asked him to leave a brief stint in the private sector to serve as Democratic staff director on the Armed Services Committee and, second, when I asked him to give up that position to join my personal office as the chief of staff.

I made these requests because I value his judgment, his knowledge, and his integrity, because I know of his love and his respect for this institution. When new staffers join our office, David will usually walk them down to the Senate floor, bring them to the staff benches behind me along the walls, give them a chance to see in person what most have only seen on C–SPAN and to share some of the mix of excitement and responsibility that David still feels when he comes to this floor.

David once told a reporter for the Washington Post, ''I've always felt that anonymity was the key to job security.'' Well, I am sorry to blow his cover, but David's outstanding career is worthy of public praise. He has served the American people and the

Senate with great distinction. He has helped protect the men and women in uniform and their families. He has led the men and women in his charge with patience and loyalty and modesty at times of great challenge for the Senate and the Nation.

I am and I always will be deeply grateful to David Lyles for his wise counsel, for his loyalty, for his friendship, and above all for his integrity. I wish David and his wife Annie a long and happy retirement full of visits with laughing grandchildren, untroubled waters to paddle, and smooth roads to ride.

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

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. CHAMBLISS. I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to speak as in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

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

TRIBUTE TO DAVE SCHIAPPA

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I rise this morning to speak about my good friend and a great friend of this great institution who will be leaving us this week, Dave Schiappa.

I remember after I was elected in 2002 there was a transition in the leadership on the Republican side from Trent Lott to Senator Bill Frist. Trent told me one day that the first thing he told Bill Frist was make sure that Dave Schiappa is going to be your floor leader, and that is exactly what Bill did.

I was new to the Senate, did not know my way around at all, much less know the rules. I simply don't know how I would have functioned over the last 10 years without Dave Schiappa being here. He has been that valuable to all of us as Members of the Senate. He is available, frankly, to both sides of the aisle. I have heard a number of my Democratic friends over the last 24 hours, since we have been aware of Dave's departure, who have said: Gee, I don't know what I am going to do without Dave Schiappa being here.

Our floor leaders are all so vitally important. We do reach out to those Members on the other side who inform us from time to time of what is going on. They are always straight with us. This institution couldn't operate without them.

Dave has certainly been our leader. He is very smart, very knowledgeable, and he is very hard-working. All of these folks work such long hours. They are here long after we are here, and they are here well before we get here the next morning. We owe a deep debt of gratitude to all of them, and particularly when someone such as Dave Schiappa, who has been here for 28 years, makes a move on to another life. It is imperative that we say: Dave, thanks for your great work. Thanks for your inspiration to all of us.

Dave probably knows this institution better than any Member on the Republican side, certainly. The one thing I will always remember about is Dave, No. 1, keeps his word. If you tell him you have an issue with the bill, an issue with a nominee, or you have an amendment you wish to call up, Dave takes care of you.

He has been so valuable to all Members of the Senate during his tenure. We are truly going to miss him. I know his next life will hold great things for him. He will be very successful there, and we certainly wish him the best.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. We are in morning business?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. We are.

OBAMACARE

Mr. RUBIO. I wish to speak briefly about ObamaCare once again. This is an issue that is now coming to the forefront over the next few weeks.

As we get ready to start to implement portions of it across the country, we are starting to see the implications of it.

There is so much coverage given to this as a partisan fight between Republicans and Democrats or liberals and conservatives, but I actually think this issue goes much farther than that because it is impacting all Americans.

I understand the President was here yesterday and individuals from the White House as well. According to the press reports, they were here to reassure nervous Democrats about the implementation of ObamaCare and what it could mean.

I understand why people are nervous about this bill. They have the right to be. For example, the exchanges, health care exchanges which, if you can't get insurance, you are supposed to be able to go to them and buy health insurance, are not going as planned. Only yesterday there was a news report that in Georgia they have asked for an emergency extension because they won't be up and running by October 1.

There are more news reports of more people being pushed from full-time work to part-time work. The reason why is because ObamaCare says if a company has more than 50 employees at full-time status, there are certain rules to follow that are going to cost money. We are starting to see evidence that people are being moved from full time to part time. Some major companies are announcing that they are moving more people to part time. There are reports of impending rate increases.

In my home State of Florida 2 days ago, the insurance commissioner announced that the individual market rates, if you are buying as an individual, are going to go up 30 or 40 percent.

We know there are many people in the middle class, hard-working Americans who are happy with the health insurance coverage they have now. They are probably going to lose that coverage. They are going to have to go to an exchange or another company their company is now offering. This doesn't mean you lose only the insurance with which you are happy, it means you lose the doctor, potentially, because you can only go to a doctor that is in the network on your insurance plan. If your new insurance doesn't have that doctor, you can't keep going to that doctor. There are a lot of reasons to be nervous.

Add to this a lot of the original supporters of this; for example, the labor unions. The Teamsters came out 2 weeks ago saying they want this suspended or repealed because it is breaking the promises it made in terms of the 40-hour workweek and the whole argument I made about full time to part time.

Here is the irony. The labor union that represents the IRS workers is asking to be exempted from ObamaCare. This is ironic, because they are the very workers who are in charge of enforcing the law. The people who are going to be in charge of enforcing ObamaCare have asked to be exempted from ObamaCare. There are a lot of reasons to be nervous about it if you are a supporter.

One more reason is the impact it is going to have on our insurers. We haven't heard a lot of talk about this yet, but I will focus on one group of seniors in particular, and that is seniors who are on something called Medicare Advantage. Medicare Advantage is the Medicare Program where basically you contract with a private company to administer your benefits under Medicare. How these companies compete for your business is they add all sorts of value-added services.

One example is transportation. My mom is on Medicare Advantage. One of the reasons they get her business is that in addition to good doctors, they actually will pick her up from home, because she can't and doesn't drive. They take her to her doctors' appointments. These are the kinds of benefits Medicare Advantage offers.

The problem is ObamaCare cuts about $156 billion out of Medicare Advantage—not to save Medicare; it throws it into the overall budget on ObamaCare.

Who uses Medicare Advantage? This is an interesting statistic: Forty percent of African Americans on Medicaid use Medicare Advantage, 53 percent of Hispanic beneficiaries who are on Medicare use Medicare Advantage, and 38 percent of people on Medicare Advantage make less than $30,000 a year.

What is the impact of taking $156 billion out of Medicare Advantage? It is

about $11 billion this year alone being taken out of the Medicare Advantage Program.

This means—and the President would say we are going to pay less money to these insurance companies. Fine. What is the impact of that? Let me describe to you the impact of what it is going to be.

First, you are going to see reductions in benefits, meaning a lot of these companies are going to have to save that money somewhere. Where they are going to save it is by reducing the benefits they offer you on Medicare Advantage.

For example, maybe there won't be anymore transportation in my mom's Medicare Advantage plan. We don't know.

There will be increases in copays, the amount of money seniors are going to have to pay every time they go to the doctor or hospital. They are going to have to tighten physician networks, which means the number of doctors available is going to shrink. If you have a doctor now who has been seeing you, and he or she gets kicked out of the network because they are tightening the network, you may not be able to keep going to the same doctor. That is the disruption it has.

One study found that by 2017, seniors on Medicare Advantage could lose on an average about $1,841 a year. This is the impact.

I will say why this is pernicious, why this hurts. Medicare Advantage has some things about it that need to be fixed, but it is a good program. It has good outcomes. The fact is these companies want you to go to your doctors' appointments. They want you to be getting your flu shots and your vaccine against pneumonia and other things. Why? Because they want to you stay healthy. They need you to stay healthy in order for the plan to work. We see it in the results.

Medicare Advantage patients have 39 percent fewer hospital readmissions. When people leave the hospital, there is a 39-percent reduction in people who go back because something went wrong. There are 24 percent fewer emergency room visits and 20 percent fewer hospital days.

Medicare Advantage is the program that works. I say this firsthand because I see it in my mom's life, and I see it in the lives of thousands of seniors in Florida who are on Medicare Advantage.

You may ask yourself: Well, if this is so bad why haven't we heard any of this before? The reason is the insurance companies, because of a gag order, are prohibited from talking about any of this until you start getting your benefits letter, and they are coming. If you are a senior on Medicare Advantage, the chances are that soon you will open your mail to the bad news that the Medicare Advantage you have and are happy with has been changed in a negative way for you because of ObamaCare. They don't know that yet, because the companies have not been allowed to tell them yet, but they will have to tell them soon. When they do, this will add one more concern that people should rightfully have about ObamaCare and the impact it is going to have on our people, particularly on seniors. This is why, my colleagues, I have become so passionate about this issue, one more reason why it is so important that we stop ObamaCare.

One may say what can we do to stop it? It is already the law. It is already in place. A lot of people have told me this. The answer is there is something we can do and it comes as soon as September. In September, in order for this government to continue to function, we have to pass a short-term budget. I wish it were a long-term budget that was balanced, but it looks as though it is going to be a short-term budget.

We should pass the budget. We have to. We can't shut down the government. I am not for shutting down the government. When we do this short-term budget, let's fund the government. Let's make sure Social Security checks go out. Let's make sure we are funding defense to keep our Nation safe. Let's make sure we fund the government, but let's not keep funding ObamaCare. Let's not keep pouring money into a program that even the unions are now against. Let's not keep pouring money into a program that not even the IRS workers, who are going to enforce this, want for themselves. Let's not keep funding this program that is going to hurt seniors on Medicare Advantage. Let's not keep funding it.

I will say what the blowback is: Oh, you are threatening to shut down the government. No, I am not. I don't want to shut down the government. In fact, the only people who are talking about shutting down the government are the people who go around saying: We will not support a short-term budget unless it funds ObamaCare. Those are the people who are threatening to shut down the government. Their position, basically, is that ObamaCare is so important we can't possibly fund government without funding it.

So if the government is shut down—and I hope that doesn't happen—because of ObamaCare, that is an unreasonable position, especially in light of all the problems we know this program has. And this idea that unless we fund ObamaCare we must shut down the government is a false choice. That is not true.

Let me just say every single Republican opposes ObamaCare. And I must share with you that there are a growing number of Democrats who are at least nervous about ObamaCare and would love for it to go away in some way, shape, or form. In fact, one of them is the President. The President has actually delayed a major portion of ObamaCare because he knows it is going to be a disaster.

I would just suggest to those who oppose ObamaCare to ask themselves this question: How can I possibly go back to the people who sent me here—to the people who are going to be hurt by this, to the people being moved from full-time to part-time employment, to the businesses that can't grow, to the individuals who are going to lose the coverage they are happy with and the doctor they have gotten to know, to the seniors on Medicare Advantage who are going to see their benefits reduced and their out-of-pocket costs go up—and say to them I did everything I could to prevent these things from happening? How can I possibly say that to them if I vote for a budget that pays for this?

This September gives us the last best chance to slow this down or to stop it. Once this law starts kicking in and starts hurting our economy, we will start crossing some points of no return.

To my colleagues on the Republican side, I would just say: Look, if we are not willing to draw a line in the sand on this issue, what issue are we willing to draw a line in the sand on? If we are not willing to fight on this issue, what issue are we willing to do it on?

Right now I can think of nothing that is hurting our economy and nothing that is hurting job creation more than the uncertainty and the fear this law is imposing on our small businesses, on our middle class, on our working class, and on our seniors. I hope we will not let this last best chance go by. I hope we will take this opportunity to stop this law from hurting Americans, especially the millions of seniors who rely on Medicare Advantage for their health care.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF RAYMOND T. CHEN TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Raymond T. Chen, of Maryland, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Federal Circuit.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will be 1 hour for debate equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Vermont

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, 3 months ago, I noted in my statement on April 18 that it had taken the Senate almost 1 year longer to confirm 150 of President Obama's district court nominees than it took the Senate to confirm the same number of President Bush's district court nominees. Unfortunately,

we have not picked up the pace, and we remain almost 1 year behind the record we set from 2001 to 2005. Today, the Senate confirms the 200th of President Obama's circuit and district nominees. Thanks to Senate Republicans' concerted effort to filibuster, obstruct and delay his moderate judicial nominees, it took almost 1 year longer to reach this milestone than it did when his Republican predecessor was serving as President—over 10 months, in fact. I have repeatedly asked Senate Republicans to abandon their destructive tactics. Their continued unwillingness to do so shows that Senate Republicans are still focused on obstructing this President rather than helping meet the needs of the American people and our judiciary.

Earlier this month, the senior Senator from Tennessee observed that at the time there were only three circuit and district nominees on the Executive Calendar. He said, correctly, that we could clear those three nominees in just one afternoon. Weeks later, we are now being permitted to vote on just one of those nominees. As Senator ALEXANDER said, we could very easily be voting on several others as well. There are now 12 circuit and district nominees pending before the Senate. The only reason we are not voting on all 12 is the refusal of Senate Republicans to give consent. This refusal means that by the time the Senate returns in September, our district courts will once again be facing a period of what the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service calls ''historically high'' vacancy levels, which they last experienced 2 years ago. So the Republicans' effort to obstruct and delay the confirmations of President Obama's nominees means that we have essentially not been permitted to make any net progress in filling vacancies. We have barely kept up with attrition.

Over the past month, some Senate Republicans have been claiming that ''at this same point in their presidenc[ies]'' President Obama has had more circuit and district nominees confirmed than President Bush did. Of course, these Senators fail to mention that they are referring only to the fifth year of those presidencies, and ignoring both presidents' first terms. Such comparisons are misleading—the reason President Bush had so few confirmations in his fifth year is that we had made such good progress already in his first term—but I appreciate the Ranking Member of the Judiciary Committee for at least being honest when he makes this comparison by saying that it is between fifth years, and not entire Presidencies.

The assertion by some Senate Republicans that ''there is no difference in how this President's nominees are being treated versus how President Bush's nominees were treated'' is simply not supported by the facts. Compared to the same point in the Bush administration, there have been more nominees filibustered, fewer confirmations, and longer wait times for nominees, even though President Obama has nominated more people and there are more vacancies. Anyone can point to this example or that example, but when one looks at the whole picture, it is clear that President Obama's nominees have faced unprecedented delays on the Senate floor and that his nominees have been less likely to be confirmed than President Bush's at the same point.

But if Senators wish to claim that there is no obstruction of the Senate's consideration of judicial nominees, or that we are matching or even exceeding the pace of confirmations from the Bush administration, let us make it a reality. According to the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service, it would require 27 additional circuit and district confirmations this year to reach the same number of confirmations as President Bush had achieved by the end of his fifth year in office. That means we must pick up the pace, since we have had only 26 circuit and district confirmations so far this year, and just two confirmations in the past month.

Fortunately, the Senate had already received more than enough judicial nominees to make this happen. There are eight circuit and district nominees pending on the calendar today, and another four were reported this morning. One of the nominees reported today is Patricia Millett, one of three well-qualified nominees for the vacancies on the D.C. Circuit. I hope Senate Republicans will end their misguided attempt to strip the D.C. Circuit of three seats and that we will be allowed to consider her nomination on the merits of the nominee. Five more nominees had a hearing last week, as the Judiciary Committee continues to do its job. If we do confirm 27 more nominees this year, we might even bring the number of vacancies below 70 for the first time in more than 4 years.

However, even if we do bring the number of vacancies down to 70, that number is still far too high. These vacancies impact millions of people all across America who depend on our Federal courts for justice. In addition to the 87 current vacancies, the Judicial Conference has identified the need for 91 new judgeships, so that the people who live in the busiest districts can nonetheless have access to speedy justice. Earlier this week, Senator COONS and I introduced a bill to create those judgeships, and I hope we can pass this long-overdue legislation into law. The Nation's growing demands on our courts also shows how important it is that we reverse the senseless cuts to our legal system from sequestration. I continue to hear from judges and other legal professionals about the serious problems sequestration either has caused, or will cause, if we do not fix it. Last week the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and the Courts held a hearing on the impact of sequestration and highlighted how it is devastating our public defender service. This was an important and timely hearing, and I commend Chairman COONS for chairing it.

Today the Senate will vote on the nomination of Raymond Chen, who is nominated for the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. Mr. Chen currently serves as Deputy General Counsel for Intellectual Property Law and Solicitor in the Office of the Solicitor at the United States Patent and Trademark Office, a position he has held since 2008. Prior to 2008, he was an Associate Solicitor in the Office of the Solicitor at the USPTO, a Technical Assistant for the Federal Circuit, and an Associate at Knobbe, Martens, Olson & Bear. Before practicing law, Mr. Chen was a scientist at Hecker & Harriman. The ABA Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary unanimously gave him its highest rating of ''well qualified.'' Mr. Chen was reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee over 3 months ago by voice vote.

We must work to reduce the number of judicial vacancies so that Americans seeking justice are not faced with delays and empty courtrooms. So let us act quickly on consensus nominees. And if Senate Republicans have concerns about a nominee, let us debate that nominee, for however long is necessary, and then have an up-or-down vote. Eleven of the twelve circuit and district nominees currently pending before the Senate were reported by voice vote. There is no reason we cannot consider all 12 today. If Senators are willing to work together to focus on meeting the needs of the Federal judiciary, then I am confident that we will be able to make real progress for the millions of Americans who depend on our courts for justice.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia.

POWER NOMINATION

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, let me express my thanks to Senator SANDERS for his willingness to yield to me and give me this time.

I am here very briefly to commend Samantha Power to the entire Senate as President Obama's nominee to be the U.N. ambassador representing the United States.

I do so proudly because of the great work she has done against genocide and atrocities around the world, because she has been an outspoken leader in terms of doing what is right, and I think she has the courage to represent our country on the Security Council better than anyone I know.

I got to know Samantha Power by reading her book, ''A Problem from Hell: America and the Age of Genocide.'' It is the story about Rwanda and the genocide where 1 million people died while the rest of the world turned and looked away, and her calling on all people of democracies and freedom around the world to not let that happen again.

When she came to the White House, she created the Commission on Atrocities for President Obama to focus on that and see to it that it didn't happen again. It was through her leadership that she forced President Obama and the administration to engage in Libya and end what would have been a genocide in Libya by Muammar Qadhafi.

She is smart, she is intelligent, she is tough, and she has a Georgia tie of which I am very proud. She graduated from a high school in DeKalb County, GA, in the 1980s called Lakeside High School. She did an internship between her first and second year at Yale University in Atlanta, GA, for a sports broadcaster on a sports station in the city. He was asked a few days after she left to give some description of what kind of person Samantha Power was, and I want to read that quote because it reflects the kind of person we want representing us as an ambassador at the U.N. He said:

Oh, my God, was she bright. Acerbic, lightening-witted, and the depth of the Mariana Trench.

That is a quote from Jeff Hullinger, the first person she worked for in 1988.

Samantha Power is the right person, at the right time, to represent the right country in the U.N. on the Security Council. I commend her to the Senate and hope she receives a unanimous vote.

I yield back the remainder of my time and thank the Senator from Vermont.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont.

THE MINIMUM WAGE

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate hundreds and hundreds of young people throughout the country who are standing up for justice, who are putting a spotlight on one of the major economic crises facing this country.

Today—this week and in recent weeks—we have had young people in New York City, in Chicago, in Washington, DC, in St. Louis, in Kansas City, in Detroit, in Flint, MI, and other areas around this country who are fast-food workers—the people who work at Burger King and McDonald's and Popeye's; the ones who give us the hamburgers and the french fries—saying that workers all over this country cannot make it on $7.25 an hour, $7.50 an hour. Often they are unable even to get 40 hours of work and, in most cases, they get no or very limited benefits.

So all over the country these workers, often young people, are walking out of their establishments, their fast-food places, and are educating consumers about the economic injustice taking place in these fast-food establishments. What they are saying is that we need to raise the minimum wage in this country; that American workers cannot exist on $7.25 an hour, which is the national minimum wage now, or $8 an hour or $9 an hour.

My own view is, at the very least, we should be raising the minimum wage to $10 an hour. Just do the arithmetic, with somebody making $7.25 an hour, and if they are lucky enough to be getting 40 hours a week—and many workers are not.

I was in Detroit a couple of months ago talking to fast-food workers, and what they are saying is they get 20 hours a week in one place to make a living and then they have to work at another place. One young man I talked to is working at three separate locations, having to travel, in order to cobble together what, in fact, is by far less than a livable income. So just do the arithmetic. If you make $7.25 an hour, and if you are lucky enough to be working 40 hours a week, you are making about $15,000 a year. Then, of course, your Social Security taxes are coming out of that and your Medicare taxes are coming out of that, and maybe some local taxes. You can't survive on $14,000 or $15,000 a year.

The point is these fast-food workers are educating the Nation about the fact that hundreds and hundreds of thousands of people are working hard every single day and are falling further and further behind economically. We have to stand with them and we have to raise the minimum wage in this country.

While workers at fast-food establishments and other places such as Walmart are earning the minimum wage, I should mention that the CEOs of these large corporations are, in many cases, making exorbitant compensation packages. The CEO of Burger King, a corporation with over 191,000 mostly low-wage workers gave its CEO Bernardo Hees a 61-percent pay raise last year, boosting his total compensation to $6.5 million in 2012.

Well, if a millionaire can get a 65-percent pay raise, maybe it is time to get a pay raise for the workers who are making $7.25 an hour.

Last year, McDonald's, a corporation with over 850,000 mostly low-wage employees, more than tripled the compensation of its CEO Don Thompson. In 2011, Mr. Thompson received a mere, paltry $4.1 million. But last year, because of his significant raise, the CEO of McDonald's received $13.8 million.

Well, if Mr. Thompson can make $13.8 million as the head of McDonald's, surely the workers at McDonald's can make at least $10 an hour, not $7.25 an hour, not $8 an hour.

David Novak, the CEO of Yum! Brands—the owners of Taco Bell, Pizza Hut, Kentucky Fried Chicken, and Long John Silvers—was paid $11.3 million last year and received over $44 million in stock options.

Well, if this company has enough money to give this gentleman $44 million in stock options, maybe we can end starvation wages at Yum! foods.

In terms of the minimum wage, since 1968, the real value of the Federal minimum wage has fallen by close to 30 percent. The purchasing power of the minimum wage has gone down by some 30 percent since 1968. If the minimum wage had kept up with inflation since 1968, it would be worth approximately $10.56 per hour today.

The issue our young people working at these fast-food places are highlighting goes beyond the fast-food industry. The reality is that many of the new jobs being created in America today are low-wage jobs.

I think we all recognize, even some of my Republican colleagues understand, we have made significant economic gains since the collapse of the economy at the end of President Bush's tenure in 2008 when we were losing 700,000 jobs a month—an unsustainable reality, 700,000 jobs a month. Now we are gaining jobs, and that is a good thing, but not enough jobs. Unemployment remains much too high. Real unemployment today is close to 14 percent. But in the midst of understanding the job creation process in this country, we need to know that nearly two-thirds of the jobs gained since 2009 are low-wage jobs that pay less than $13.80 an hour.

So the good news is we are now creating some jobs—not enough jobs; unemployment remains much too high—but we cannot lose track of the fact that most of the new jobs being created are not paying working people a living wage. While most of the new jobs being created are low-wage jobs, we should remember that nearly two-thirds of the jobs lost during the Wall Street recession were middle-class jobs that paid up to $21 an hour. So the economic trend is not good. The Wall Street crash resulted in mass unemployment, and though we are gaining new jobs, many of the jobs we are gaining are low-wage jobs. Yet the jobs we have lost are higher wage jobs.

Also, while we discuss the state of the economy, let us never ever forget that middle-class families have seen their incomes go down by nearly $5,000 since 1999, after adjusting for inflation.

Opponents, and there are many—the entire fast-food industry and all the big-money interests, the guys who make millions and millions of dollars a year, the people who have unbelievable pensions, who have all kinds of benefits, the CEOs—are working very hard to tell us in Congress not to raise the minimum wage, which is $7.25. Among many other arguments they say: Well, if you raise the minimum wage, it is going to be a job killer. It will kill jobs.

Let me say this on a personal basis. I represent the State of Vermont. The State of Vermont has the third highest minimum wage in the country; it is $8.60 an hour. Meanwhile, with an $8.60-an-hour minimum wage, I am happy to say that the State of Vermont has the fourth lowest unemployment rate in the United States at 4.4 percent. And to be very honest, I have not bumped into many employers who tell me: I would be hiring more people if we lowered the minimum wage in Vermont. It does not happen. I think that is a bogus argument.

The State of Washington, if my memory is correct, has the highest minimum wage in the country. Their unemployment rate is lower than the national average.

There is another point I would like to make that needs to be made over and over. We talk a lot in this country about welfare reform. I think that in general, when people use that expression, what they are talking about is lower income people who may be breaking the law and taking advantage of programs for which they are not quite eligible.

Let me say a word about the need for welfare reform but in a somewhat different tone, and let me say that the biggest welfare recipient in this country happens to be the wealthiest family in the United States of America; that is, the Walton family, who owns Walmart, a family that is worth $100 billion—more wealth, by the way, than the bottom 40 percent of the American people. The wealthiest family in America is the largest welfare recipient in America. How is that? Well, the reason they are so wealthy, the reason that family is worth $100 billion is they make huge profits because they pay their workers starvation wages. But in order to keep their workers going, the taxpayers of this country—through Medicaid, through nutrition programs, through affordable housing—give assistance to Walmart so that their workers can keep coming to work. So somebody who works at Walmart for $7.25 or $8 an hour, more often than not their children are on Medicaid paid for by the taxpayers of this country. They and their kids are on food stamps paid for by the taxpayers of this country. Many of their employees live in affordable housing subsidized by the taxpayers of this country.

So the Walton family becomes the wealthiest family in this country while working-class and middle-class taxpayers provide assistance to their workers so they can continue going to work. Let me make the very radical suggestion that maybe the wealthiest family in America might want to pay their employees a living wage so that the taxpayers of this country do not have to subsidize them.

I would conclude by telling those young people in major cities around this country that many of us respect and appreciate the courage they are showing. It is not easy to walk out of a job when you don't have any money, because your employer may say: You are out of here; you are fired. But these young people have the courage to stand and say: No. We are human beings. We live in the greatest country on Earth. We have to earn a living wage. We can't make it on starvation wages.

So I thank those young people for standing for justice not only for themselves but for all Americans, and I hope that Members of Congress listen carefully to what they are saying and that we go forward as soon as possible in passing a minimum wage that will provide dignity for millions of workers.

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

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

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we know what is ahead of us the next hour or so. I ask unanimous consent that we change that.

In between the vote on Chen, the judge, and the next vote, I ask that there be 10 minutes, and 2 minutes of that would be 1 minute on each side, and 8 minutes would be given to the comanager of that bill, SUSAN COLLINS. That would be for debate only.

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

THUD APPROPRIATIONS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, we have spent the last 2 weeks here on the Senate floor talking about our bipartisan transportation and housing bill. This is a bill that is all about creating jobs, investing in our families and in our communities, and laying down a strong foundation for a long-term and broad-based economic growth. This bill is not exactly a bill I would have written on my own. I know it is not exactly a bill Senator COLLINS would have written on her own. But it is a compromise bill that reflects the deep cuts we made when we set spending levels in the Budget Control Act as well as the best ideas from both sides of the aisle of ways we can improve and reform our transportation and housing investment.

The transportation and housing investments in this bill have a direct impact on the families and communities we represent, from improving our roads, to reducing traffic and helping Main Street businesses, to making sure our bridges are safe so we do not see more collapses like the one back home in my State of Washington, to supporting our most vulnerable families, seniors, and veterans with a roof over their heads when they need it the most and making investments in our communities that mayors across our country use to create local jobs in their hometowns and so much more.

Senator COLLINS and I worked very hard together to write a bipartisan bill to invest in programs that should not be partisan. I think we succeeded. Six Republicans voted for this bill in committee; 73 Senators voted to bring this bill to the floor for a debate. That debate was a full and open one, with amendments and votes from Democrats and Republicans.

I wish to personally thank Senator COLLINS for her hard work on this bill, and I also thank all of our staff on the appropriations subcommittee: Alex Keenan, Dabney Hegg, Meaghan McCarthy, Rachel Milberg, and Dan Broder; as well as the staff of Senator COLLINS, who spent endless hours: Heideh Shahmoradi, Kenneth Altman, Jason Woolwine, and Rajat Mathur—all of whom worked so hard and put in so many hours and late nights on this strong bipartisan bill.

After 2 weeks of debate and discussion and a bipartisan bill before us, we are now going to move very shortly to a final vote. I want to be clear. This bill has the support of the majority of the caucus. In the House of Representatives, what did we see happen yesterday? They pulled their transportation and housing bill off the floor. The Republican leadership would not even allow a vote on their bill because they did not have a majority in their caucus. The chairman of the House Appropriations Committee said that showed that sequestration is unworkable and needs to be replaced. That is the House Republican chairman. But here in the Senate we have a majority, and we should move to pass this bill.

The only thing that can block the passage of this bill, the only way a bipartisan bill with the support of the majority could be stopped is if Republican leaders whip their own Members into filibustering a jobs and infrastructure bill that many of those Republicans actually support. That is the only way.

The choice before us is clear, and I urge my colleagues to make the right one. This vote is not about whether you support this exact bill or agree with the exact spending level. As Senator COLLINS has made clear again and again, you can think the spending level is too high and still support this process in which we pass a bill in the Senate and work with the House bill on a compromise. You can certainly disagree with the bill and not think it should be subjected to a filibuster.

The bottom line is that a vote to wrap up and vote on this bill is a vote for jobs and the economy and for bipartisan solutions to the problems facing our Nation. A vote to filibuster this bill is a vote for more gridlock, more obstruction, more partisanship, and more political games.

I know when I go home to Washington State I want to be able to tell my constituents that Democrats and Republicans worked together to solve some problems, help them, and grow the economy. I know there are many Democrats and Republicans here today who want to be able to say the same to their constituents, and I hope they will stand with me and Senator COLLINS and vote against a filibuster of our bipartisan bill.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 101

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I stand today to discuss and strongly support my bill, S. 101, the State and Local Government Bailout Prevention Act. I urge all of us to unite to pass this bill

expeditiously. Let me briefly explain what it is about.

I first introduced this bill in early 2011, February 2011, because two things were happening. First of all, several significant State and local entities were teetering on the verge of bankruptcy. At the same time, the Federal Government—things in Washington—was in a horrible state fiscally, such that we could clearly not afford to take on more spending, more debt, more responsibility. I wanted to pass legislation that would make it crystal clear that neither we, the Congress, nor the Treasury Department, nor the Federal Reserve, nor any other Federal entity was going to bail out State or local governments that had acted irresponsibly and tipped into bankruptcy.

Things have not gotten better since then. In fact, in many ways things have gotten worse, and very recently, just in the last few weeks, the city of Detroit filed for bankruptcy—the largest municipal bankruptcy in U.S. history. Other large States and local communities are teetering on the verge of bankruptcy. Many States are in a horrible fiscal situation, such as California and Illinois.

Meanwhile, we are not in a fundamentally more sound place here in Washington at the Federal level. Even if we stick to the Budget Control Act numbers—and that is very much up in the air, but even if we stick to those numbers, Congress will spend $967 billion in discretionary money this year, and that will result in a $810 billion deficit—almost a $1 trillion deficit this year.

This Nation, total, is almost $17 trillion in debt. The balance sheet of the Federal Reserve has swollen from $800 billion in August of 2007 to over $3.5 trillion today.

Now more than ever, S. 101, the State and Local Government Bailout Prevention Act, is appropriate, is needed. That is why I come to the floor today to urge expeditious passage of S. 101. This bill is very simple, basic, straightforward, but important. It would simply do four things: First, it would prohibit the use of Federal funds to bail out State and local government budgets. Second, it would prevent the Federal Reserve from providing assistance to or creating a facility to help, again, State and local governments in a bailout situation. Third, it would prevent Congress and the Treasury Department from bailing out State and local governments. Fourth, there is specific language so we do not create any confusion that this is not intended to stop or deter or interfere with appropriate assistance in declared disaster areas.

That is the sum and substance of S. 101, the State and Local Government Bailout Prevention Act. When you look at situations such as Detroit—the largest ever municipal bankruptcy—and when you look at our fiscal situation in Washington at the Federal level, this clear bar of the Fed bailing out State and local governments is very much needed.

I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Development be discharged from further consideration of S. 101 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration and that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I will be very clear. First, I say to my colleague from Louisiana, he and I have worked together often on a whole host of issues. He is on Environment and Public Works; I chair Energy. I want him to know I am happy to continue working with him on this and other issues. The reason I have to object at this time is that the language as it is written would deal a huge body blow to more than 700 rural and heavily forested counties across the country in more than 40 of our States. It, in effect, could prohibit payments under the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act.

This legislation, which was a bipartisan bill—Senator Larry Craig and I authored this legislation—is a lifeline for these hard-hit rural communities that are walking on a tightrope. They are trying to balance, for example, how they are going to keep the schools open and how they are going to have law enforcement in their communities. Declining revenues from Federal forests spurred the creation of this program to compensate for the loss of receipts from the Federal forests. Suffice it to say that without this legislation we could have school perhaps 3 days a week in a big chunk of rural America. I mentioned law enforcement. The question of how you maintain 24-hour law enforcement in a lot of these areas has been drawn into question. I think that without this assistance we might have some counties facing bankruptcy.

Given the fact that this language does not clarify the status of the Secure Rural Schools Program, I have to object. I am going to continue to object until the legislation does clarify that it will not prohibit payments under that legislation, which is a lifeline for rural America.

We have had a number of recorded votes on that particular legislation here in the Senate. It has received overwhelming bipartisan support. It was authorized on a bipartisan basis.

I am going to yield the floor. I know colleagues want to speak on this issue. I want it understood how concerned I am about the legislation in its present form. That is why I have to object at this time.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I too join with our colleague from Oregon in raising great concern about what this proposal would do. This is a proposal—we have seen, actually, three of them now—that would cut all Federal funding for any community that has either defaulted or, more important, is at risk, has problems financially. What does that mean? It means that any city, any county, any local unit of government that is struggling with a tight budget could potentially lose all Federal funding. We are not talking about a bailout here. We are talking about the same Federal funds that go to every community—no funding for emergency services such as police departments and fire departments; no funding for transportation, for roads and bridges; cutting off funding for special education and for our schools; no funding for economic development to help these communities that are challenged because of, possibly, economic circumstances such as a shifting manufacturing base or other economic issues beyond their control.

This is extremely broad. According to some legal definitions, ''default'' could mean anything—late payments on any kind of an obligation. It makes absolutely no sense.

Let me also indicate that one of the real concerning problems here is that it would exempt emergency spending for a natural disaster. I appreciate that the Senator from Louisiana would want to do that given the fact that we had Hurricane Katrina hit in New Orleans and our whole country came together. People in Detroit raised money to help with Hurricane Katrina. But I suggest that for the 41 cities and counties that filed bankruptcy over the last 20 years or the hundreds from Texas, to Kentucky, to Alabama, and beyond who now have troubled bond ratings and are considered at risk—this is really a slap in the face to every city and community across our country.

This is not about stopping a bailout for Detroit. We are working hard. People are coming together. This is a community that is coming back thanks to a tremendous amount of grit, hard work, and leadership from the business community, religious community, community leaders, and so on. This is about whether we are going to support communities that need some help.

Think about this: If a city is doing well and has a wealthy tax base and an upper middle-income community with high-powered lobbyists, then they should get Federal money—taxpayer money? Children with disabilities can get special education. We are going to help build roads and bridges in communities. But if a community is having some financial difficulty, then, unfortunately, we would say we would not allow the same ordinary Federal funding every community gets to be available for that community. That is not the right values for America.

That is why the International City/County Management Association, the National Association of Counties, the National League of Cities, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the Government

Finance Officers Association strongly oppose this effort.

I have one final statement to make before turning to our distinguished senior Senator from Michigan.

When we are looking at what is happening right now in Detroit and around the country, once again we are seeing workers and retirees on the frontline who have lost their pensions and their wages. In the auto rescue, we saw Delphi retiree pensions were not protected. Now in the city of Detroit, police, fire, and city workers are not protected. So when we talk about the middle class of this country—people working hard every day—we need to put them first. We need to make sure nobody loses their pension. We need to make sure we stand as a country with cities that are in distress and working hard to become vibrant and strong again.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I too object to the unanimous consent request. While the sponsor says it is aimed at bailouts, no one I know of is seeking a bailout from the communities that would be impacted. Despite the stated intention, the effect of this bill is to endanger the financial health of hundreds of cities and counties in every corner of this country. It would weaken the safety and security of countless Americans who call those communities home. I don't know of anyone seeking a bailout. Yet bailout is the word that is used frequently here by the sponsor of this legislation.

What is the definition? Communities at risk of defaulting. Hundreds and hundreds of communities are ''at risk of defaulting.'' It is unclear what that means. But the strains on local governments in the last few years—particularly following the financial crisis we had—are real. To say that any community, city, or State, for that matter, that is at risk of defaulting is to be challenged in terms of getting regular support from the Federal Government.

This is not limited to loans. This bill affects grants as well as loans. In the words of the bill, ''grants and aid'' would be prevented. All sorts of Federal funding, in other words, besides those kind of actions of the Federal Government involving credit or reliance on credit of the donor or for repayment.

The Congressional Research Service says this, again, applies not just to loans but to grants as well. Why in Heaven's name would struggling communities—whether it is my hometown of Detroit or any other community in this country—be denied the ability to seek grants is beyond me. It is not limited to loans but grants as well. This bill goes way beyond the bailouts that no one is seeking and would have a severe impact on cities and towns across the country.

Standard & Poor's lists more than 250 securities offered by Louisiana municipalities that are below investment grade. One State has 250 communities with securities below investment grade, which presumably means there is a significant credit risk in those communities. Under this bill, are those communities not eligible to seek regular grants? I am afraid so, and that is not just me saying that. Again, that is from the CRS.

Finally, Senator STABENOW has made reference to a letter that we received from the National League of Cities, National Association of Counties, the United States Conference of Mayors, and others, opposing this legislation because it goes way beyond its stated purpose of preventing bailouts.

Again, my town—and I don't know of any town that has—has not asked for a bailout. I am proud to have been living in Detroit all of my life. It doesn't need this kind of legislation poking at it to stop something from going to Detroit, which it has not applied for.

I know this legislation was introduced before this recent bankruptcy application on the part of the city of Detroit, but nonetheless to seek a unanimous consent in this context and in this moment to pass legislation—apparently without even a hearing—seems to me to be beyond the pale.

As a lifelong resident of Detroit, I oppose this proposal. I oppose it because thousands of municipalities that have suffered in the aftermath of the recent recession would be negatively affected. Our residents, their residents, our employees, their employees, and retirees around the country deserve better.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I appreciate the two Senators from Michigan being the only ones on the floor right now objecting and saying this has nothing to do with Detroit, but, of course, it does.

I am very sorry to hear this objection. There is no objection on the Republican side. Of course there would be an objection if, in fact, this legislation would bar normal Federal grants and normal Federal loans unrelated to a bailout of a State or a municipality in bankruptcy mode, but it doesn't do that.

The legislation is very specific and very targeted. It is about a bailout of a State or locality in bankruptcy mode, and that is what it is about. It is not about normal routine Federal funding, and that is why there is no Republican objection.

One of the distinguished Senators from Michigan makes the point that Detroit has not formally asked for a bailout. That is true so far. But when the mayor talked to the Wall Street Journal about this, he ''left the door open for a Federal bailout after the city's bankruptcy filing.'' When asked directly whether Detroit would seek a Federal bailout, Mayor Bing said, ''Not yet.''

Similarly, the Governor of Michigan Rick Snyder didn't support a bailout but said on CBS's ''Face the Nation:'' ''If the Federal Government wants to do that, that's their option.'' That is not exactly not opening the door and considering that opportunity.

Again, I didn't file this bill in the last 2 weeks. I originally filed this bill in February of 2011. Unfortunately, Detroit isn't the only municipal or State bankruptcy on the maps. States can't formally file bankruptcy, but in laymen's terms they can essentially go bankrupt. Detroit is not the only issue on the map. Many States face a horrible fiscal situation as well, such as California and Illinois. There is a real danger of these States and localities seeking a Federal bailout. This bill is about that. It is not about normal Federal funding. It is not about the safe and secure rural schools program. It is not about any of that routine stuff. It is about a bailout of a State. It is about a bailout of the municipality or other local jurisdiction. Of course, Detroit, unfortunately, is the most obvious example after its historic bankruptcy filing very recently.

Again, I am sorry to hear their objection. I am sorry the two Senators from Michigan are here on the floor about this. I don't think that is a coincidence because this is a bill about bailouts. I think we should pass it, and be very crystal clear at the Federal level that we are not going to take on that bailout role and responsibility.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. On line 7, page 1: ''Notwithstanding any other provision of law''—and then after talking about Federal funds not being used to purchase or guarantee obligations, it then says:

> no Federal funds may be used . . . or provide direct or indirect grants-and-aid, to any State government, municipal government, local government, or county government which, on or after January 26, 2011, has defaulted on its obligations.

It is very clear. It is line 7, page 1, and lines 1 and 2 on page 2: ''direct or indirect grants-and-aid to'' may not be provided to any city which has defaulted on its obligations. This is the language of the bill.

It also says on line 12 of page 2 that the funds of the United States may not be used ''to assist such government entity.'' ''Assist any such government entity.''

Hundreds of governments would be covered by this legislation. It is no coincidence that the Senators from Michigan are here on the floor because we are the most current victims of this language if it were ever passed. There are hundreds of others who would be victimized by this language because of its breadth, and that is what the Senator from Oregon was very dramatically pointing out.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the language from the bill be printed in the RECORD at this time.

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

S. 101

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. PROHIBITION ON THE USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS TO PAY STATE AND LOCAL OBLIGATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no Federal funds may be used to purchase or guarantee obligations of, issue lines of credit to, or provide direct or indirect grants-and-aid to, any State government, municipal government, local government, or county government which, on or after January 26, 2011, has defaulted on its obligations, is at risk of defaulting, or is likely to default, absent such assistance from the United States Government.

(b) LIMIT ON USE OF BORROWED FUNDS.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall not, directly or indirectly, use general fund revenues or funds borrowed pursuant to title 31, United States Code, to purchase or guarantee any asset or obligation of any State government, municipal government, local government, or county government, or otherwise to assist such government entity, if, on or after January 26, 2011, that State government, municipal government, or county government has defaulted on its obligations, is at risk of defaulting, or is likely to default, absent such assistance from the United States Government.

(c) PROHIBITION ON FEDERAL RESERVE ASSISTANCE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall not provide or extend to, or authorize with respect to, any State government, municipal government, local government, county government, or other entity that has taxing authority or bonding authority, any funds, loan guarantees, credits, or any other financial instrument or other authority, including the purchasing of the bonds of such State, municipality, locality, county, or other bonding authority, or to otherwise assist such government entity under any authority of the Board of Governors.

(d) LIMITATION.—Subsections (a) through (c) shall not apply to Federal assistance provided in response to a natural disaster.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I support the nomination of Raymond T. Chen, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Federal circuit. This is the 29th judicial confirmation this year. With today's confirmation, the Senate will have confirmed 200 lower court nominees; we have defeated two. That's 200 to 2. That is an outstanding record. That's a success rate of 99 percent.

We have been doing that at a fast pace. During the last Congress, we confirmed more judges than any Congress since the 103rd Congress, which was 1993 to 1994.

So far this year, the first of President Obama's second term, we've already confirmed more judges than were confirmed in the entire first year of President Bush's second term. At a similar stage in President Bush's second term, only 10 judicial nominees had been confirmed. We are now at a 29-to-10 comparison with President Obama clearly ahead of where President Bush was. And, as I said, we have already confirmed more nominees this year—29—than we did during the entirety of 2005, the first year of President Bush's second term, when 21 lower court judges were confirmed.

With regard to hearings, the record shows that President Obama is being treated much better than President Bush during his second term.

Last week we held the 11th judicial nominations hearing this year. In those hearings we we have considered a total of 33 judicial nominees. Compare this favorable treatment of President Obama during the beginning of his second term versus the first year of President Bush's second term. At this stage in President Bush's second term, the Committee had held not 11 hearings with 33 judicial nominees, but only 3 hearings for 5 nominees, and all of those were hold-overs from the previous Congress.

In fact, for the entire year of 2005, Senate Democrats only allowed 7 hearings for a grand total of 18 judicial nominees.

It is hard to believe, but no nomination hearings on judicial nominees were held during April, May, June, or July. Four months with no judicial nomination hearings. Yet, we recently rushed through hearings on nominees to the DC Circuit Court of Appeals, plus a number of District nominations. In fact, in just the last few weeks, we have held hearings for 14 judicial nominees. That's not very far behind the entire output of 2005—7 hearings, 18 nominees.

Again, we have already exceeded that number—11 hearings and 33 judicial nominees. The bottom line is that the Senate is processing the President's nominees exceptionally fairly.

President Obama certainly is being treated more fairly in the first year of his second term than Senate Democrats treated President Bush in 2005. It is not clear to me how allowing more votes and more hearings than President Bush got in an entire year amounts to ''unprecedented delays and obstruction.'' Yet, that is the complaint we hear over and over from the other side. So I just wanted to set the record straight—again—before we vote on this nomination.

Raymond T. Chen is nominated to be United States Circuit Judge for the Federal circuit. He received his B.S. from the University of California, Los Angeles, in 1990 and his J.D. from New York University School of Law in 1994. Upon graduation, Mr. Chen worked at Knobbe, Martens, Olson & Bear in California from 1994 to 1996. As an associate, he drafted district court briefs and legal memoranda on specific patent and trademark issues as well as several patent applications spanning various technologies.

In 1996, Mr. Chen joined the senior technical assistant's office at the Federal circuit in Washington as one of three technical assistants. There, he researched and wrote memoranda, commenting on drafts of court opinions for both legal and technical accuracy as well as identification of conflicting legal precedent, occasionally writing for individual judges.

From 1998 to 2008, Mr. Chen served as an associate solicitor in the Office of the Solicitor at the United States Patent and Trademark Office. During that time, he was first or second chair on several dozen Federal Circuit briefs defending the agency's patent and trademark decisions, and he presented approximately 20 arguments in the Federal Circuit.

He regularly appeared in district court defending the agency against lawsuits brought under the Administrative Procedure Act. He was also a legal advisor on several patent policy and legal issues within the agency, occasionally prosecuting patent attorneys in administrative proceedings for violating the agency's code of professional responsibility.

In 2008, Mr. Chen became the Deputy General Counsel of Intellectual Property Law and Solicitor. There he supervises other lawyers in the Solicitor's Office and has presented oral arguments in some of the seminal patent cases before the Federal circuit.

In addition, Mr. Chen deals with higher-level patent and trademark policy issues within the agency. He also coordinates the determination of what positions the United States should take as an amicus in intellectual property cases before both the Supreme Court and the Federal circuit.

Lastly, Mr. Chen is responsible for the review and clearance of all new regulations and amendments to existing regulations for the Office of the Solicitor.

The ABA Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary gave him a unanimous ''well qualified'' rating.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). All time has expired.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I ask my colleagues to vote for this nomination.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent for 30 additional seconds.

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

Mr. LEAHY. I believe we should act quickly on a number of judicial vacancies. Eleven of the twelve circuit and district nominees currently pending before the Senate were reported by voice vote. All Democrats, all Republicans on the Judiciary Committee voted together. There is no reason why we couldn't consider all 12 today, along with Mr. Chen. If we work together, then we can fulfill the needs of the Federal judiciary.

Madam President, have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have not.

Mr. LEAHY. I request the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

There is a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of

Raymond T. Chen, of Maryland, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Federal Circuit?

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

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

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

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

The result was announced—yeas 97, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 198 Ex.]

YEAS—97

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

NOT VOTING—3

Inhofe	Landrieu	McCain

The nomination was confirmed.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 10 minutes for debate only, with the Senator from Maine Ms. COLLINS controlling 8 minutes and with 2 minutes equally divided in the usual form prior to a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on S. 1243.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, the Senate is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is not in order.

The Senate will be in order.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, have Senators sit down and shut up. OK. It is unfair. Senator MURRAY has something to say. Senator COLLINS has something to say. It is just not polite.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. Senators will take their conversations from the well. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, the Senate will shortly decide whether to invoke cloture on the fiscal year 2014 Transportation, Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill. We have spent nearly 2 weeks debating this bill and working through approximately 85 amendments.

We were making progress. We even had a vote on a nongermane amendment, which clearly would have fallen to a point of order had one been raised. So no one has been shut out of this process.

Chairman MURRAY and I have repeatedly encouraged Senators to come to the floor, file, and debate their amendments to improve the bill we reported.

It has been an open and transparent debate thus far, a return to regular order—something I have heard virtually everyone here urge us to do.

Nevertheless, some Senators are intent on preventing this legislation from moving forward, despite the fact that this bill is not the final version of the transportation and housing appropriations bill. It is only one step in the process but an essential step—one that will allow the Senate to move forward and eventually negotiate with the House of Representatives to decide on a top line and to further improve the bill.

A considerable number of my colleagues have advocated for the House funding level of $44 billion and have opposed the Senate bill. But I would like to point out that not one of my colleagues has offered a specific amendment, account by account, to reduce the funding levels, program by program, in this bill to meet the $44 billion level in the House bill.

I personally offered an amendment that said that in October, if we find we have breached the top line of the Budget Control Act, we would go back to the appropriations process and redo the bill to meet that top line.

I would also point out that yesterday the House leadership was forced to pull its THUD bill from the floor due to lack of support. Some Republican Members thought the spending levels were too high. But it is surely significant that a substantial number of Republicans felt the bill, as written, was far too low and would hurt our homeless veterans, would delay repair of our crumbling infrastructure, and would slash the Community Development Block Grant Program to the lowest level in history, to below the 1975 level when it was first created by President Ford.

Let me point out that the numbers in the House bill were not realistic. That is one of the reasons it failed. The numbers in our bill are not unrealistic. They are too high. They would come down in conference. The President's request was artificially low due to several budget gimmicks and scoring differences. We took care of those gimmicks. We have an honest bill that is before our Members. Let me give you just one example of a gimmick that was in the President's budget. His request for the section 8 project-based rental assistance is insufficient to fully fund the 12-month renewal contracts with private owners.

We are not going to be throwing people out of those subsidized apartments after 10 months in the year. So Senator MURRAY and I added funding to more accurately reflect what was needed. That was over $1 billion of the difference. There was the difference in the scoring by CBO and OMB. We have to go by CBO. That accounted for $1.8 billion.

It is disappointing to me that we have not gone to conference on the budget because we would not be in this dilemma. We would have agreed-upon allocations that would guide the appropriations process. But in the absence of that, what is wrong with proceeding with this bill with cutting spending in it? If Members have amendments they wish to offer to cut spending—and there are a few that have been offered, but as I said, none that bring it down to the House's level in an account-by-account manner.

I am still hopeful we will be able to pass this bill and start bringing other appropriations bills to the floor before the end of the fiscal year because forcing the government to operate under continuing resolutions is irresponsible. It ends up costing more money in the long run. It is wasteful because we continue to fund programs that are no longer needed because we are just continuing current law.

So I urge my colleagues to think very carefully about this vote. It would be so unfortunate if we go home to our constituents in August and are forced to tell them we are unable to do our job. We should continue working on this bill. We should invoke cloture. This bill undoubtedly would have been reduced in conference had we been allowed to go forward.

I do wish to thank many of my colleagues for working with us as we tried so hard to advance this important legislation. I am particularly grateful to Chairman MURRAY for her bipartisan approach and collaboration and for working so closely with me throughout the process.

Finally, I would be remiss if I did not thank our staffs on both sides of the aisle for their hard work. They have worked night and day on this bill. I will put all of their names in the RECORD. I know my time is expiring.

Let's do the right thing. Let's proceed to end the debate on this bill, take

care of the rest of the germane amendments and proceed to final passage and ultimately to conference with the House. Let's show that we mean it when we say we are committed to full and open debate and returning to the process that used to serve us well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I wish to echo what my good friend and partner on this bill Senator COLLINS just said. Similar to all of us, when I go home to my State of Washington, I do not hear a lot from my constituents about partisan politics. They do not ask me which party is up or which party is down. They do not care about the political games and certainly not who is winning or losing them.

The vast majority of people I talk to when I go home ask me what we are doing in Congress to create jobs and get this economy going again. They ask me what we are doing to break through this gridlock and the constant manufactured crises and make sure this country, this economy, is working for them and their families.

They tell me they want Democrats and Republicans working together. They want us to get into a room and put politics aside and put our country first and find some common ground and get something done. That kind of work is far too rare these days, though many of us are fighting to change that. I am very proud the Transportation bill we are about to vote on does just that.

The bill is not exactly what I would have written had I done it on our own or what Senator COLLINS would have done on her own.

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent for 30 additional seconds.

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

Mrs. MURRAY. This is a bill that is a compromise that reflect the deep cuts we have set in the spending levels of the Budget Control Act. It reflects the best ideas of both sides. So I urge my colleagues to move past the obstruction, get over the gridlock. Let's show the American people we can work for them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I wish to commend the Senior Senator from Maine for the extraordinary amount of work she and her staff have put into this bill. But regretfully, where we are is cloture on this Transportation bill will be viewed as a question of whether we intend to keep the commitment we made to the American people 2 years ago this month to reduce $2.1 trillion in spending over the next 10 years.

The House of Representatives is marking to a $91 billion-a-year lower figure which reflects the law. I believe that if we invoke cloture on this bill and move forward, it will be widely viewed throughout the country that we are walking away from the commitment we made, on a bipartisan basis, that the President signed just 2 years ago, that we would reduce spending by this amount of money, $2.1 trillion over the next 10 years.

Regretfully, I would strongly urge my colleagues to keep the bipartisan commitment we made 2 years ago and to vote no on cloture on this bill.

I yield the floor.

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

The bill 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 S. 1243, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

Harry Reid, Patty Murray, Barbara A. Mikulski, Jon Tester, Tom Harkin, Jack Reed, Dianne Feinstein, Tim Johnson, Tom Udall, Mark Begich, Christopher Murphy, Patrick J. Leahy, Richard J. Durbin, Bill Nelson, Christopher A. Coons, Amy Klobuchar, Mazie K. Hirono, Richard Blumenthal.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on S. 1243, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, 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 bill clerk called the roll.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 54, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 199 Leg.]

YEAS—54

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

NAYS—43

Alexander	Enzi	Murkowski
Ayotte	Fischer	Paul
Barrasso	Flake	Portman
Blunt	Graham	Risch
Boozman	Grassley	Roberts
Burr	Hatch	Rubio
Chambliss	Heller	Scott
Chiesa	Hoeven	Sessions
Coats	Isakson	Shelby
Coburn	Johanns	Thune
Cochran	Johnson (WI)	Toomey
Corker	Kirk	Vitter
Cornyn	Lee	Wicker
Crapo	McConnell	
Cruz	Moran	

NOT VOTING—3

Inhofe	Landrieu	McCain

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 54, the nays 43. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

HIGH SPEED RAIL PERMITTING

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, Chairman MURRAY, and Senator BOXER, I rise to discuss with you the importance of funding for the Surface Transportation Board in this legislation, as well as the funding that Chairman MURRAY has provided to the Federal Railroad Administration to continue to administer its grant awards.

As you know, opponents of California's high-speed rail project are attempting to use the Federal permitting process in order to prevent the Nation's first high-speed rail project from moving forward and succeeding.

The Surface Transportation Board funding will provide the resources necessary to continue the Board's efforts to permit the growth of passenger rail projects in the United States. The funding in the bill for the Federal Railroad Administration will ensure that this agency is able to monitor and administer the grants it already awarded.

Mrs. MURRAY. I am pleased to fund the Surface Transportation Board. I agree with my colleague from California that this agency needs funding in order to comply with its governing statute, which directs the Board to support the growth of rail in the United States.

I share your concern that some opponents of a single project in California are trying to limit the ability of the Surface Transportation Board to operate under its statute. The appropriations bill before us provides the Surface Transportation Board with the resources necessary to facilitate California high-speed rail, not stand in its way.

This bill in no way limits the ability of the Board to oversee projects under its jurisdiction and facilitate their construction.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I agree that this bill in no way limits the ability of the Board to oversee projects under its jurisdiction and facilitate their construction.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you, Chairman MURRAY and Chairman MIKULSKI, for explaining that this legislation will

allow California high-speed rail to move forward.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I also would like to thank Chairman MURRAY and Chairman MIKULSKI for your explanation.

I am deeply alarmed by attempts in the other body of Congress to prohibit the Department of Transportation and the Surface Transportation Board from completing their permitting and oversight responsibly.

These attempts violate the spirit of federalism. The California high-speed rail project was approved by California's voters on the ballot, the legislature has enacted enabling legislation, and the Governor supports it.

While some may not like this type of transportation investment, it is the choice that my State has made for their future, and the Federal Government should respect those decisions.

Furthermore, I strongly believe the Federal permitting process should not be used as a tool to obstruct and delay major infrastructure investments of our States.

Permitting infrastructure in California is a notoriously thorough, long, and comprehensive process. In the years California has analyzed this one project, China has built thousands of miles of high-speed rail.

But this year, in an attempt to stymie the project, opponents of California's plan forced the Surface Transportation Board—an agency dedicated to protecting fair competition in freight rail—to assert Federal jurisdiction over California's high-speed rail project.

This new layer of Federal permitting is duplicative of the thorough 5-year-long review performed by the Federal Railroad Administration. Nonetheless, State and Federal entities complied with this extraneous requirement. However, now opponents are working vigorously to stall the actions at the Surface Transportation Board that will allow construction to finally begin in earnest.

Fortunately, the Surface Transportation Board exists to facilitate the growth of rail in the United States—not to impede it. As long as the Board acts quickly within its statutory authority, it will not impede California's decisions.

Mrs. BOXER. I also share the concerns expressed by Senator FEINSTEIN, and I would also like to reiterate that the people of California voted to fund this project. The California State Legislature voted to fund this project, and the Department of Transportation, after weighing a number of applications for high-speed rail across the Nation, decided to fund this project. I find it troubling that opponents have attempted to hinder the advancement of this project by curtailing an independent agency's mission and responsibilities, as well as trying to prohibit the transmission of appropriated funds to its rightful destination.

I am pleased that this legislation will allow the Surface Transportation Board to act within its statutory authority. I also see that the legislation will allow the Federal Railroad Administration to administer its previously awarded grants to California, and I thank Chairman MURRAY for advancing this legislation.

I would also like to note that this project is incredibly important to the future of California. California's 170,000 miles of roadway are the busiest in the Nation, with automobile congestion draining $18.7 billion in lost time and wasted fuel from the State's economy every year.

Additionally, flights between Los Angeles and the Bay area, which is the busiest short-haul market in the United States with 5 million passengers annually, are the most delayed in the country, with approximately one in every four flights late by an hour or more.

California's high-speed rail system will not only increase mobility and save lost time and money over the coming decades, it will also create near-and long-term employment opportunities, enhance environmental and energy goals, and spur economic development.

Mrs. MURRAY. As my colleagues know, California has a grant agreement with the Department of Transportation, and California has spent funds consistent with that agreement. I was extremely careful to draft the Senate bill to ensure that California will be able to be reimbursed for their expenses.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Thank you, Chairman MURRAY, for ensuring that California will not be left holding the bag, which is not a fair way for the Federal Government to treat the States. Were an appropriations bill to prevent the Federal Government from honoring its grant commitments, it would set a dangerous precedent. I am concerned that it would undermine the competitive process.

RECESS

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

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:57 p.m., recessed until 2 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. COONS).

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF SAMANTHA POWER TO BE THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED NATIONS

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

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Samantha Power, of Massachusetts, to be the Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 hours of debate equally divided between the proponents and the opponents.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am pleased to strongly support the nomination of Samantha Power to be the next United States Ambassador to the United Nations, and I commend President Obama for selecting her for this extremely important position.

Born of Irish parents and raised in Ireland until she was 9, Samantha and her parents emigrated to Pennsylvania and Georgia, and she attended Yale and Harvard.

She is well known for her accomplishments as a journalist during the conflicts in the former Yugoslavia, her Pulitzer Prize-winning book, ''A Problem from Hell,'' her leadership of the Carr Center for Human Rights, and her work as the senior director for Multilateral Affairs and Human Rights at the National Security Council.

Samantha is a person of extraordinary intellect, exceptional integrity, and a strong moral compass. She is willing to challenge conventional wisdom and fight for things she feels passionately about, irrespective of the forces aligned against her.

Samantha is an internationalist. She believes in the indispensable role that multilateral organizations play in addressing global problems no country can solve alone—from genocide to global warming to international terrorism.

At the National Security Council she also brought much-needed attention to human trafficking, protection for refugees, gay rights, and gender-based violence. But what some people may be less aware of is the depth of Samantha's devotion to the principles on which this country was founded, and which I believe is one of the key reasons the President nominated her.

Samantha is an American patriot. She will not only strive to ensure that the United States leads by example at the United Nations, but that we do so in a manner that honors the Constitution and the idealism of those who wrote it, which continue to inspire people around the world. That is what people expect of the United States, and I know of no one better suited to turn that expectation into reality.

At a time when the United States faces emerging threats and intensifying competition for natural resources, human rights are under assault in many countries, and millions of people live in squalor or have fled their homes due to armed conflict, natural disasters, or the effects of overpopulation and climate change on the availability of land, water and food, how effectively we use our influence globally will determine the kind of world our children and grandchildren inherit.

Now is the time for the United States to embrace these challenges, and I am confident that Samantha Power will do so with every bit of conviction and energy that she has.

To those Senators of either party who have at times differed with this administration over foreign policy or who may doubt the importance of U.S. support for the United Nations, I encourage those Senators to speak to Samantha directly. There is no one better informed, no one more willing to listen to other points of view, and no one more persuasive, than Samantha Power.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho is recognized.

Mr. RISCH. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. RISCH pertaining to the introduction of S. 1430 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. I rise to promote and suggest to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that we support the nomination of Samantha Power to be the next Ambassador to the United Nations.

This is a very complex world we live in today. Certainly the forum of the United Nations, in spite of some issues that all of us had with that body over the years, remains the one forum where the United States, No. 1, gets to exhibit strong leadership with our friends, our allies, our adversaries, and a strong voice in the United Nations is imperative.

Samantha Power is an individual who possesses the type of character, the type of strong background, and the person who possesses the intellect and the right kind of ability to communicate to represent us today in this complex world at the United Nations.

Samantha was born in Ireland but moved to the United States shortly thereafter. She was educated in the public schools in Atlanta, Yale, and Harvard. Obviously, she has the intellect, from a background standpoint, to represent our country at the U.N.

Between her stints at Harvard and Yale, she did reporting as a journalist on the ground, reporting on the Yugoslav wars. She was hands-on dodging bullets and being involved from the standpoint of making reports to various journals and other publications about what was happening in those Yugoslav wars.

Samantha is an individual who developed a passion for human rights. She is not bashful about sharing that passion. It is a commendable passion that she has for human rights.

From 2005 forward, Samantha has been involved almost exclusively in the arena of foreign policy, first as a staffer for then-Senator Obama, later involved in his campaign, and most recently as a member of the National Security staff.

Samantha is not only knowledgeable, she is knowledgeable in the right way when it comes to foreign policy. She is not only smart, but she is worldly. She has the charisma, in her own way, No. 1, to express herself in a way that right now the United States needs to be expressing itself.

This is why I am so excited about the opportunity to see her on the ground at the United Nations representing our great country. She can be tough when she needs to be tough. She can be charismatic, and she can also be sharp-tongued.

With the adversaries she is going to have to be dealing with at the United Nations, all of those assets are going to come into play. Samantha is going to do a great job as our next U.N. Ambassador. I applaud her for her willingness to engage in public service. I would encourage all of my colleagues to support her nomination to be the next Ambassador to the United Nations.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I understand we have 1 hour available in opposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I wish to speak in opposition to the pending nomination. I would like to take a few minutes to discuss the nomination of Ms. Samantha Power to be the next U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations.

Let me begin by saying that Ms. Power is an impressive person. She has an inspiring personal story, she is clearly very intelligent, and she has already accomplished much in her career. However, I do have three concerns I want to take a moment to highlight today.

The first has to do with a concern I have about her unwillingness to directly answer questions I personally posed to her during her confirmation hearing before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I asked her about statements attributed to her in the past alleging that the United States had committed ''crimes'' that it needed to reckon with. I raised the question not to embarrass her but to give her the opportunity to clarify by either pointing out examples of these crimes or to clarify what she meant by those comments. Instead, she kept avoiding directly addressing my question. She kept saying that America was the greatest country in the world and that she wouldn't apologize for America.

I don't think it is unreasonable to be concerned about those statements, and I do not think it is unfair to be concerned about the fact that we are sending someone to represent us at the most important international forum in the world who thinks the United States has committed crimes that it needs to reckon with.

I believe I and members of the committee deserved an answer to the question. Instead, what we got in response was a rehearsed line. I believe it was a missed opportunity for her and for all of us. To me, these statements she made in the past and her inability to answer or address them raise questions about her judgment, although—let me be clear—I certainly do not question her patriotism.

Secondly, I have an even greater concern that she is being appointed by a President whose foreign policy is fast becoming an utter and absolute failure. From crises in the Middle East, to strategic uncertainty in Asia, to a country we were told was a partner but is now harboring a fugitive and traitor who has done great damage to U.S. national security, I believe the world is now more dangerous and more uncertain than when President Obama took office. It is increasingly apparent that our foes are more willing than ever to challenge us. Even more troubling is that those who seek to emulate us, who desire the freedom we all, as Americans, enjoy, are often left to fend for themselves with little American support.

A strong, engaged America has been good for the world and for the American people. When America fails to lead, the result, as we see in Syria today, is chaos—a chaos that allows others with goals other than our own to fill the void we leave behind.

History taught us twice in the last century that even if we put our heads in the sand and try to ignore the world's problems, those problems will not ignore us. I realize the American people are weary of war. We have paid a tremendous price in lives and money in the war on radical Islamic terrorism. But to follow the advice of those—including some in the Republican Party—who advocate disengagement from the world would be a terrible mistake. If we follow their advice, we will only pay a higher price in the long term.

Let me be clear. That does not mean America can solve every problem or get engaged in every civil war on the planet. I would confess that we also have voices here that are too eager to engage America in every conflict on the planet. We need to be careful about when, where, and how we engage American forces overseas. But isolationism on the one hand and hyperintervention on the other are not our only two options. Between these two choices we have a third option, and it is this—one based on the idea that while the United States cannot solve every problem in the world, there are very few problems in the world that can be solved without the United States.

If a problem can be solved by using an international forum such as the United Nations, that is fine, but more often than not the United Nations can not and will not confront the problem. In the end, the truth is that America is still the only Nation in the world able to form and lead coalitions to confront evil and solve problems. It is still the

only Nation on Earth able to keep the seas open for trade. It is still the only Nation capable of maintaining the safe balance of power in Asia and Europe and around the world. It is still the only Nation on Earth capable of preventing rogue nations from becoming nuclear powers. And it is still the only Nation on Earth capable of targeting and diminishing radical terrorist organizations that plot to attack and kill Americans here at home and around the world.

We should be careful when we get involved. Foreign aid is not a one-way street and should always be conditioned and based on our national interests. Military power should be employed judiciously and only where it can make a difference in defending our long-term goals. But we cannot pretend that if we ignore our enemies, they will ignore us. We must be involved, and when we get involved we must make sure not just that we are doing it the right way, we must make sure we are doing it at the right time because sometimes acting too late is worse than not acting at all. When we do get involved, it is OK to be motivated by humanitarian concerns, but the primary objective of our foreign policy must always be to protect our people from those who do or may one day want to harm us.

This is the kind of clear strategic view of America's role and of our interests that should guide our foreign policy. It is the kind of clear strategic thinking this President has failed to lay out. As a result, what we see all around us is failure.

The President dithered on Syria. We should have tried to identify secular rebels early in the conflict, and we should have made sure they were the best armed and the best trained group on the ground. Instead, the President decided to lead from behind and allow others to decide whom to arm, and the result is that today it is rebel groups linked to Al Qaeda—foreign fighters, not even Syrians—who are the best armed and best equipped groups within Syria. Now I fear Syria may be headed toward becoming another Afghanistan before 9/11, toward becoming the premier operational area in the world for global jihadists.

The President entered office with the naive belief that we could convince Iran to become a responsible nation by, quite frankly, being nicer to them. He wasted valuable early years in his Presidency not giving the Iranian threat priority, and now the Ayatollahs continue the march toward acquiring both nuclear weapons and long-range missiles that can one day threaten the United States.

I would be remiss if I did not point out that in 2009 he missed an opportunity to clearly stand on the side of those protesting a stolen election and instead chose not to because he didn't want to interfere in the ''sovereignty'' of another nation.

The President also wasted time thinking the cause of radical Islamic terrorism was partially because George W. Bush was hated in the Muslim world. But despite his speech in Cairo, despite his efforts to close Guantanamo, despite his elimination of the use of the term ''war on terror,'' Al Qaeda continues to hate America, and even as I speak here today they continue to plan attacks against America here and around the world.

The President is not alone in failing to confront these threats. I am afraid that because of the success we have had in preventing another attack on the scale of 9/11, some of our leaders in both parties have been lulled into a sense of false security. I certainly support the privacy rights and expectations of all Americans, but, my colleagues, I also know for a fact that the surveillance programs our government uses have prevented attacks and saved American lives.

I think it is a mistake to dismiss privacy concerns as crazy. After all, we have a government whose tax-collecting agency has targeted Americans because of their political views. But it is also a mistake to exaggerate them. After all, if a known terrorist is emailing or calling someone in the United States, we had better be able to know who and where that person is.

If Osama bin Laden had been calling someone in the United States on their cell phone, I promise you it wasn't a stockbroker. We had better know because these people are still plotting against us, and not if but when they strike again the American people are going to turn to us and ask: What has the Federal Government been doing to prevent this, we had better have a good answer.

We live in a very dangerous world, one, by the way, where our enemies aren't just other countries anymore. Our enemies are also rogue states, well-armed militias, and radical clerics. This kind of danger calls for a clear strategic vision on foreign policy, and this President, sadly, does not have one, which brings me to my third and primary concern about Ms. Power's nomination, and it is one that is related to the United Nations itself.

We need an advocate in New York who makes it their primary focus to ensure that the United Nations is more accountable, that it is more effective, and that it serves U.S. interests and is not just some multilateral ideal in which we invest all of our hopes.

If she is confirmed today, I hope Ms. Power does indeed become that type of Ambassador. But I have not been satisfied by the evidence thus far of this administration's willingness to be serious about tackling these issues over the last 4½ years that ensure that every American dollar going to the United Nations actually advances America's interests. I think Congress needs to play a more active role in forcing this very much needed change to occur.

What I would like to do in closing is spend a few minutes highlighting legislation that I recently introduced to this effect. I am pleased to have as cosponsors Senators CORNYN, RISCH, and FLAKE, and I hope more of my colleagues will join this effort.

I am not the first person to raise concerns about the effectiveness and utility of the United Nations. Former Senator John Danforth, who was serving as our Ambassador to the United Nations in 2004, when the U.N. General Assembly couldn't even pass a resolution condemning human rights violations in Sudan, said at the time:

> One wonders about the utility of the General Assembly on days like this. One wonders if there can't be a clear and direct statement on matters of basic principle, why have this building? What is it all about?

Anyone who has followed the United Nations closely, especially in recent years as the Security Council has failed to respond to the crisis in Syria as more than 100,000 Syrians have died and hundreds of thousands more have been forced out of their homes, across borders, straining all of Syria's neighbors, leaving behind a failing state that is becoming a safe haven for global jihadists—all of the people who have shared these concerns and have seen this happen should be rightly asking the same question Senator Danforth asked back then.

In the midst of this horrific crisis, the United Nations has even been unable to achieve consensus on the issue of whether to allow international humanitarian organizations to provide cross-border support to tens of thousands of Syrians stuck in camps facing frequent shelling and attacks from the Assad regime.

Just as we are troubled by this inability to tackle the world's toughest problems, we should also be angry about the fact that for decades more human rights criticism at the United Nations has been directed against Israel than against actual human rights violators and that U.N. agencies and organizations have employed blatant anti-Semites; or that for decades recipients of U.S. foreign aid have only voted with the United States at the United Nations less than one-third of the time and such support, by the way, doesn't even currently factor into U.S. decisions about who receives our foreign aid; or the fact that the world's most notorious tyrants and human rights violators are allowed to serve on the Human Rights Council rather than being condemned by it; or by the fraud and the mismanagement that has pervaded the U.N.'s peacekeeping operations, including abuses and exploitation of the very people that those peacekeepers were sent to protect; or by the Security Council resolutions on Iran and North Korea that members of the U.N. willfully violate, as we recently saw with the Panamanian capture of a ship transferring weapons from Cuba, one rogue state, to North Korea, another one; or by the proliferation of mandates that have clouded the organization's mission and effectiveness.

The list goes on and on. But let me be clear. I am not here to argue that we don't need the United Nations. Ideally, we would have a United Nations where the nations of the world would come together and seriously deal with North Korea, Iran, radical Islam, and human rights. But the United Nations we have right now isn't capable of any of this. It has basically become a forum for nations whose interests are directly opposed to ours, to block our efforts using the United Nations as cover.

That is how North Korea and Iran continue to evade sanctions. That is how Israel's enemies continue their efforts to delegitimize the Jewish State. That is how Assad continues to massacre his own people with weapons built in and supplied by the Russians.

More than six decades after its creation, we still hope for a United Nations with resolve, a United Nations that acts with effectiveness and purpose. Sadly, the United Nations' persistent ethics and accountability problems are limiting its role. Until the organization addresses these important issues, it will continue to be ineffective and often irrelevant.

Americans should care about this more than any other people because we shoulder the primary fiscal burden of the United Nations' budget, and our patience is not limitless. We don't believe in continuing to throw money at programs and projects that fail to accomplish their objectives.

So my hope with the legislation I filed is to provide an incentive for the United Nations and the President and our Ambassador in New York to modernize that international body along a spirit of transparency, respect for basic human freedoms, and effective nonproliferation. This legislation would also attempt to address the anti-Semitic attitudes that have become so prevalent in certain corners of the United Nations and seriously diminish the effectiveness and credibility of the entire U.N. system.

At the core of these reforms that I proposed is an effort to instill a sense of transparency and competition at the United Nations by its adoption of a budgetary model that relies mostly on voluntary contributions. This legislation would also strengthen the international standing of human rights by reforming the U.N. Human Rights Council in a way that would deny membership to nations under U.N. sanctions, designated by our Department of State as state sponsors of terrorism or failing to take measures to combat and end the despicable practice of human trafficking. Other provisions of the bill seek meaningful reforms at the U.N. Relief and Work Agency that provides assistance to Palestinian refugees of the 1948 Arab-Israli conflict.

This legislation is needed because the structure and bureaucratic culture of the organization often makes it impossible or, at best, downright difficult to achieve meaningful reforms.

In closing, for more than six decades now the United Nations has served as an important multilateral forum to address peace and security issues throughout the world. But it has never been, and it is not now, a substitute for strong American leadership. When America fails to lead, the world becomes more dangerous.

The United Nations is badly broken. I hope we will work to force meaningful transparency and accountability reforms for the United Nations. But so far this administration does not seem very interested in doing so and, unfortunately, at least based on our conversations, neither does the nominee before us. Therefore, until we begin to take some positive steps in that direction, I will not be able to support Obama administration nominees who have not committed to significant reform of the United Nations.

Ms. Power has failed to make such a commitment. Therefore, that is why I am voting against her nomination to be our next Ambassador to the United Nations.

● Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I wish to express my opposition to the nomination of Samantha Power to be U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations.

As you know, I am very interested in the ability of our American oil and gas industry to compete for business in the country of Myanmar as soon as possible. By virtually every international standard, the U.S. oil and gas industry is the world leader in technical innovation. It is my understanding, however, that Ms. Power, as one of the Obama administration's point persons in pursuing a liberal international agenda attempted to 'carve out' the American petroleum industry from doing business in Myanmar when the United States suspended economic sanctions against this country last year. Fortunately, wiser powers within the executive branch prevented such a carve out from occurring, and now the American petroleum industry can compete with those companies from the European Union, China and Russia, which are already there. Clearly, this carve out strategy would have been a strategic mistake, and it has led me to question seriously Samantha Power's ability to represent adequately U.S. national interests and security needs at the United Nations. I believe that American companies, and especially our oil and gas companies, can play positive roles in the democratic transition in Myanmar by demonstrating high standards of responsible business conduct and transparency, including respect for labor and human rights. Ms. Power's inability to recognize this fact is very troubling.

In addition, I find her position on Israeli-Palestinian relations of great concern. Israel is our friend and the sole democracy in the Middle East. It is a nation that we should support and promote in a region that is torn by violence and conflict. Samantha Power does not see it this way. Rather, she believes that Israel should give up its historical right to its land, and that the U.S. should impose a peace plan upon Israel with the Palestinian Authority. She has also repeatedly accused our friend Israel of human rights abuses. This certainly does not represent the views of the people or that of the leadership of the United States.

Lastly, in addition to her lack of diplomatic skills, Ms. Power has no management experience, causing me to question her ability to lead at the United Nations. The U.S. Mission to the U.N. is constantly facing management issues, and I had hoped that President Obama would have nominated someone who could effectively promote U.S. initiatives there. Unfortunately, Ms. Power is not such a nominee.

It is for these reasons that I oppose Samantha Power's nomination as the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations.●

Mr. RUBIO. I yield back the balance of the time available to the opposition.

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

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise to speak on behalf of Samantha Power's nomination to be the Ambassador to the United Nations.

As I said in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which I chaired, on Ms. Power, her appointment as Ambassador to the United Nations has come with much fanfare and with some criticism—which, at the end of the day, means she must be doing something right. In that regard, as I listen to my colleague member of the committee express his reservations and his opposition to Ms. Power, I think we have to have some context.

When she responded: The United States is the greatest country in the world and I will not apologize for it, it was her way of rejecting any characterization of statements that she made in the past. It was very clear to me. I want a U.N. ambassador sitting in front of the world who considers the United States the greatest country in the world and who will not apologize for the United States before that world body. She made it very clear that is exactly what she intends to do.

On accountability, we cannot achieve accountability at the United Nations if we do not have a U.N. Ambassador there to lead the effort on accountability. On those questions where she was asked by several members: Are you committed to making the United Nations a more accountable organization, not only did she say yes several times, in the affirmative, but she gave examples of how that accountability can be achieved. We need an Ambassador to pursue accountability at the United Nations.

Finally, I agree with my colleague that when America fails to lead in some critical times, we leave a void in the world. But we cannot lead if we do not have a U.N. Ambassador raising

their voice and their vote on our behalf on some of the critical issues of the day.

So this nomination is critical to pursuing the national interests and security of the United States. Whatever my colleagues might think about her nomination, I don't believe anyone can question her considerable credentials or her years of service. Certainly, no one can question her willingness to speak her mind, especially her willingness to speak out on human rights issues around the world.

As a war correspondent in Bosnia, in the former Yugoslavia, Rwanda, and Sudan, she has, as she said in her Pulitzer Prize-winning book, seen ''evil at its worst.''

Ms. Power has built a career and a reputation as one of the Nation's most principled voices against all human rights violations and crimes against humanity. I know that voice will be heard around the world should we confirm her.

While some of us may not agree with everything she has written and said during her extensive career as a journalist and foreign policy professional, she has been a tireless defender of human rights, and she has seen the tragedy of human suffering from the frontlines firsthand, and it has given her a unique perspective.

In her role at the National Security Council, she was clearly involved with U.S. policy toward the United Nations. She knows the United Nation's strengths, its weaknesses, and how it operates. At the end of the day the United States needs a representative at the United Nations who will uphold American values, promote human rights, secure our interests and the interests of our national security. I have every confidence in Samantha Power's ability to do exactly that, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting her nomination.

Personally, I am incredibly appreciative of the principled positions she has taken on the Armenian genocide, her belief that we should use the lessons of what clearly was an atrocity of historic proportions to prevent future crimes against humanity is a view consistent with my own and which is supported by her role in the President's Atrocities Prevention Board. I agree we must acknowledge the past, study how and why atrocities happen, if we are ever to give true meaning to the phrase ''Never again.''

As the son of immigrants from Cuba, I personally appreciate her commitment to exposing Cuba's total disregard for human and civil rights, and I respect her for not idealizing the harsh realities of communism in Cuba. I know from the conversation we had in my office, she appreciates the suffering of the Cuban people—the torture, abuse, detention, and abridgement of the civil and human rights of those who voice their dissent under the Castro regime. I welcome her commitment to reach out to Rosa Maria Paya, daughter of the longtime dissident and Cuban activist, Oswaldo Paya who died under mysterious circumstances last year in Cuba as his car was bumped off the road, and I look forward to her fulfillment of that commitment.

At the end of day, it is fitting that someone with Ms. Power's background represent American interests and American values at the United Nations. In the words of the U.N. Preamble, it was created ''to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small. . . .''

Who better than Samantha Power, a recognized advocate for the fundamental rights of every human being, to be our ambassador to the United Nations? If confirmed, her focus will, of course, be on the crisis du jour: the Middle East, Syria, Iran, North Korea, Afghanistan, Pakistan, and others, and the nature of nations that emerge from the Arab spring. But I know while she is meeting those challenges, she will also be engaged on human rights around the world: on freedom of expression in Latin America; on fighting HIV-AIDS, malaria, and polio in Africa; on the status of talks to resolve the 66-year-old question of Cyprus; on women's rights in Pakistan and labor rights in Bangladesh and human rights in Sri Lanka.

Ms. Power, during her nomination process, has repeatedly expressed steadfast support for the State of Israel during her hearing, in her testimony, and individually to several members of the committee, including myself as chair. She has promised to stand up for Israel at the United Nations, and I know she will.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter to the committee in support of Ms. Power from six bipartisan former Ambassadors to the United Nations be printed in the RECORD, calling on the Senate to confirm her as soon as possible in this time of opportunity, to have a U.S. representative in New York advocating for American interests. I urge my colleagues to support this qualified, experienced nominee. I know she will serve the Nation well.

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

Hon. ROBERT MENENDEZ,

Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As former U.S. ambassadors to the United Nations in New York, we are writing in support of Samantha Power's nomination as U.S. ambassador and representative to the United Nations. We believe she is eminently qualified for the role and if confirmed she will effectively promote U.S. values and interests.

She has long been a champion of human rights and an advocate for American leadership around the world. As a Pulitzer Prize winner, university teacher, senior member of the National Security staff at the White House, and journalist, she has the knowledge base effectively and efficiently to promote U.S. interests at the U.N.

She has a record of support for Israel and she will continue her advocacy as U.N. ambassador for our important ally in the Middle East while bringing to the task the balance and judgment required to advise the President and the Secretary of State on the perspective from the United Nations on the important issues of Arab-Israeli peace as well as the host of other issues which are constantly part of United State's policy in dealing with the world community through and with the United Nations.

The administration will benefit from her perspective; if confirmed, her experience will allow her to be an effective leader beginning on her first day.

We believe that the Senate should confirm Samantha Power as soon as possible because in this time of opportunity and challenge we need to have the position of US representative at the UN in New York filled and operating—advocating for US interests—at the earliest possible time.

We would be most grateful if you would ask your staff to insure that this letter is made available to all the members of the Committee of Foreign Relations.

With warm regards and respect,

MADELEINE ALBRIGHT.
JOHN DANFORTH.
DONALD MCHENRY.
EDWARD PERKINS.
THOMAS R. PICKERING.
BILL RICHARDSON.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I also rise to support the nomination of Samantha Power to be our Ambassador at the United Nations. Within the last month I had a unique opportunity as the junior member of the committee that my friend Chairman MENENDEZ chairs, as the head of Foreign Relations, to spend the day at the United Nations and learn about it from then-Ambassador Rice. I left that day with a couple of reactions: first, very proud to be an American, and, second, concerned about the challenges the institution faces.

First, on the proud to be American, I think it is important for us to realize, for whatever its flaws, the United Nations would not exist if it were not for this country. It is a quintessential American idea to pull together an institution that tries to build peace, that tries to solve hunger, that tries to solve global health needs. The idea first gained force through the efforts of American President and Virginian Woodrow Wilson who won the Nobel prize for trying to get the League of Nations going at the end of World War 1. That league lasted for 20 years and collapsed, for many reasons, including the lack of participation in the United States in the global effort. But the idea did not die. The American idea stayed alive, and in 1939 the State Department, within 2 years after the collapse of the league, started to work on the next version. FDR worked on it during his entire Presidency and was scheduled to have the first conference on the United Nations 2 weeks after his untimely death in 1945.

The second decision made by President Truman in 1945—the first was to keep FDR's Cabinet—was he was posed with this: After FDR's death, we can

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield the floor.

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

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

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

Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

There is a sufficient second.

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

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

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

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

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

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

[Rollcall Vote No. 200 Ex.]

YEAS—87

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

NAYS—10

Barrasso	Lee	Shelby
Cruz	Paul	Vitter
Enzi	Rubio	
Heller	Scott	

NOT VOTING—3

Inhofe	Landrieu	McCain

The nomination was confirmed.

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

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

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

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

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

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

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 22) was agreed to, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 22

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

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

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

EXPRESSING GRATITUDE FOR COOPERATION

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

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

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

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

THE FARM BILL

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

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

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

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

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

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

I ask the distinguished chairwoman, was the unsustainable cost and the pattern of waste, fraud, and abuse associated with direct payments the impetus for the chairwoman to ensure that this subsidy was fully and immediately eliminated in the most recent Senate-passed farm bill?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I would also say to my friend from Arizona that if we do not get the farm bill signed into law by September 30, then direct payments are scheduled to continue. So I hope we can count on the Senator's support to make sure we can pass the farm bill in time and eliminate direct payments.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the chairwoman for her commitment. To be frank, I believe the Senate farm bill leaves much to be desired. In fact, to gain my support, the farm bill will need to undergo dramatic changes to reduce the taxpayer cost of Federal crop insurance, remove market-distorting price supports, and limit the scope of the Federal Government in U.S. agriculture.

That said, the chairwoman is right to point out that as uncertainty continues to surround the farm bill, Congress appears poised to pass yet another extension of the 2008 farm bill and, in turn, continue direct payments.

With regard to direct payments, such an outcome would be a costly regression in light of the Senate's bipartisan efforts to eliminate this multibillion-dollar subsidy.

After 17 years, three extensions, and more than $92 billion paid out, it is time for direct payments to come to a full and immediate end. On this point, the chairwoman and I are in full agreement.

To that end, the chairwoman has my commitment to do everything I can to ensure that any legislation that should come before the Senate containing an extension of direct payments will be met with my fierce opposition.

I thank the chairwoman again for her commitment and for her attention to these concerns.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues who have been patiently waiting. I know there are many Members who wish to speak.

I thank my colleague from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank my colleague as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H. CON. RES. 25

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 33, H. Con. Res. 25; that the amendment which is at the desk, the text of S. Con. Res. 8, the budget resolution passed by the Senate, be inserted in lieu thereof; that H. Con. Res. 25, as amended, be agreed to; the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses; and the chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate; that following the authorization, two motions to instruct conferees be in order from each side: motion to instruct relative to the debt limit and motion to instruct relative to taxes/revenue; that there be 2 hours of debate equally divided between the two leaders or their designees prior to votes in relation to the motions; further, that no amendments be in order to either of the motions prior to the votes; all of the above occurring with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I would ask the Senator from Illinois if he would consent to a modification of his request that it not be in order for the Senate to consider a conference report that includes reconciliation instructions to raise the debt limit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator so modify his request?

Mr. DURBIN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection to the modification has been heard.

Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. RUBIO. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I am sorry we are ending this session and going home for August with this. This is an attempt to go to a conference committee with the House of Representatives to agree on how much money we as a government will spend next year.

Each Chamber has passed a budget resolution. The Senate passed one. The House passed one. The basic constitutional approach to this is to bring the two together, work out our differences. This is, in fact, the 18th time we have asked the Republicans for their consent to go to this conference committee to resolve the differences between the House and the Senate and the 18th time that a Republican Senator has stood and objected.

We have heard speech after speech about how bad it was that the Senate never passed a budget resolution. I bet you heard it too. So we passed one. We did not get any help from the Republicans in passing it, but we passed it. Then, when it came time to try to work out our differences with the House of Representatives, Republican Senator after Republican Senator stood and said: No, we do not want to meet with the House of Representatives, even though it has a Republican majority.

Well, what difference does it make if we agree on this number? Can life go on? It makes a big difference. You see, earlier this afternoon we had this bill on the floor, S. 1243. It is a bill for the Departments of Transportation and Housing and Urban Development. Senator PATTY MURRAY of Washington chairs that appropriations subcommittee. Senator SUSAN COLLINS of Maine is her vice chairman on the Republican side. They worked long and hard on this bill.

It is a $54 billion bill. It pays for the basics when it comes to transportation in America; TIGER grants so that communities can build the roads they need; money to rebuild bridges that are falling down; airports in Massachusetts, Illinois, and Florida. It has the Housing and Urban Development Program in it as well, housing for poor people, housing for veterans.

Well, it came to a procedural vote today on the floor. It was a dramatic moment. The Senator from Maine, the Republican Senator who has worked on this for so long, stood and begged her colleagues on the Republican side to join her in moving this bill forward. She put in a lot of work, and she went through this long list of 85 different amendments that have been considered on this bill, how everybody has had their chance if they wanted to change it. Senator MURRAY of Washington said the same thing.

Then the Republican leader Senator MCCONNELL came to the floor and said: I am asking all the Republicans to vote no. Vote no because we have not reached an agreement on the budget resolution; we have not reached an agreement on the total amount of money we will spend next year.

So they all voted no—all except Senator COLLINS. Every one of them voted no because we did not have an agreement on the budget resolution.

So I just came to the floor and said: Why don't we sit down and try to reach an agreement on the budget resolution? And a Republican Senator said: No, I object to that.

Where does that leave us? They will not pass the bills—appropriations bills—for something as basic as transportation and infrastructure because we do not have an agreement on a budget resolution, and they will not give their consent for us to sit down and agree on a budget resolution.

The games politicians play. When we had this press conference outside, there were people from the construction industry—iron workers, transportation workers, some of them in hard hats—and one of them got up to the microphone and said: I don't know what is going on inside those rooms with all that wrestling, but we need more jobs in America. Why can't you pass a bill to create more jobs in America?

I think most Americans, wherever they live, would agree with that ironworker. Most of them would not understand what just happened today—how the Republicans, except for one, all voted against that bill for transportation, saying we had not reached an agreement on how much we were going to spend, and then they turned around and objected when we came forward and said: Then let's try to reach an agreement. They objected. You just heard it on the floor.

I respect my colleague from Florida. And do you know the reason for the objection? He is afraid we may resolve the issue about our debt ceiling. Do you know what the debt ceiling is? The debt ceiling is America's mortgage. When we vote for spending bills, we

have to borrow some money to cover what we are voting for.

Many on the Republican side say: We want to vote for spending bills, but we do not want to be held responsible for the money you have to borrow to pay for it.

If we fail to enact a debt ceiling at the end of this year, America will default on its debt for the first time in history. The economic recovery we are seeing now will disappear. Jobs will be lost. Businesses are going to contract, some will fail. It is totally irresponsible to say: I just hope we never extend that debt ceiling.

We need to do that. We did it 16 times under President Ronald Reagan—16 different times under President Reagan. This is not a Democratic or Republican issue. It is an issue of responsibility and fiscal responsibility.

I am saddened that we had such a good run for 2 weeks where we were working together and we end on such a sour note. I am saddened we could not pass this good, basic bill—a bill which had bipartisan support coming out of the committee. I am saddened that the Senator from Maine was the only Republican Senator who would vote for this bill today. And I am saddened that we will end this session with an objection to the House and Senate trying to sit down together and work out their differences.

If you wonder why the approval rating of Congress is at rock bottom, I am afraid we have seen today in the proceedings of the Senate exactly why that is the case.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I rise this afternoon to discuss the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act, which is also known as Shaheen-Portman. I am very pleased to be here with my cosponsor Senator ROB PORTMAN. He has been a partner in developing this legislation. I thank him for being such a great partner and because he has to go catch a flight, I am going to defer, yield to him for his remarks, if I could. I will yield to him for a question so he can speak to this bill and get to his flight on time.

Mr. PORTMAN. I thank the Senator for yielding. I appreciate that and I will yield back to her in a moment.

First, I want to say that I appreciate her working with me over the last couple years on this legislation. This is the kind of legislation we ought to be doing around here because it has a lot of benefits. It reduces our trade deficit. It helps encourage job creation. It actually makes our environment cleaner. I think it can be helpful in a renaissance to our manufacturing in America. It is called the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act.

I also want to thank the ranking member and chair of the Senate Energy Committee—that is Senator WYDEN and Senator MURKOWSKI—for their consistent support of this legislation. We got it through the committee with a strong vote, and we need to get it to the floor when we come back in September with a strong vote.

I am told this is going to be the first substantive Energy bill on the floor since 2007. It is about time. I hope it will have support from both sides of the aisle, and I know it has support on both sides of the Capitol. It is going to help job creators all over the country. It is the right thing to do.

On this side of the aisle, we focused a lot on an ''all of the above'' energy strategy. We believe we ought to be producing more energy, particularly domestic sources of energy in the ground in America, and I support that strongly. We also, though, talk about embracing smart, economically viable policies that let us use less energy. So it is producing more and using less. There is a lot of focus on producing more but less on this part about using less, and that is what this bill does.

It is supported by more than 250 businesses, trade associations, advocacy groups—the National Association of Manufacturers, the Sierra Club, the Alliance to Save Energy, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce—so it is a group that does not normally come together to support legislation. They like this bill because, again, it has these benefits for the environment, but also benefits for the economy and for our energy policy in this country.

It passed the Energy Committee with a strong bipartisan vote of 19 to 3. Simply put, Senator SHAHEEN and I have a bill that I think makes good environmental sense. It makes good economic sense, and it makes good energy sense.

I have visited with businesses and job creators all over Ohio, and they tell me pretty much the same thing. They are competing in a global marketplace. They are competing with companies in Indiana but also in India, and their ability to compete depends on their costs. They go up against companies and countries where the cost to produce goods tends to be lower. We are never going to compete on wages in developing countries, nor should we. We are not going to be able to reduce the quality of our goods, nor should we. We want to be sure we are not cutting corners.

One thing we can do is reduce the costs to our manufacturers on energy because it is a big input, particularly with heavy manufacturing. This enables us to do that through energy efficiency technologies.

What we can do as the Federal Government—through research, through disseminating best practices, through supporting skills training—is help the private sector develop the energy efficiency techniques of the future. We can make it easier for them to use efficiency tools to reduce their costs, which enables them to put those savings toward expanding their companies and hiring more people.

The proposals contained in the bill are commonsense reforms we have needed for a long time. The bill has no mandates on anyone in the private sector. In fact, many of our proposals come as a direct result of our conversations we have had with people in the private sector about how the Federal Government can best help them to become more energy efficient, save money, and create more jobs by reinvesting in their businesses and communities.

Here is a brief overview of what the legislation does.

First, it helps manufacturers by reforming what is called the Advanced Manufacturing Office. This is an office at the Department of Energy. We need to provide clear guidance to this office that its responsibilities ought to include and ought to be prioritized to help manufacturers develop energy-saving technology for their businesses. Frankly, they have gotten a little bit off track and have focused more on helping manufacturers of clean energy, which other Departments and agencies do, including at DOE. This office ought to be focused on energy-saving technology.

It also requires the Department of Energy to assist with on-site efficiency assessments for manufacturers. It facilitates the already existing efforts of companies around the country to implement cost-saving energy efficiency policies by streamlining the way the government agencies in this area work together.

It increases partnerships with National Labs—the National Laboratories, which are a great source of research and technology—and energy service and technology providers together to leverage private sector expertise toward energy efficiency goals.

The legislation also strengthens model building codes, so that builders in States that choose to adopt them will have the most up-to-date energy-efficient building codes that are available—again, no mandates, but best practices.

It also establishes university-based building training and assessment centers, building on existing industrial assessment centers located around the country. We have one in Dayton, OH, that does a great job. We want to make sure they can also do energy efficiency work.

These centers will help train the next generation of workers in energy-efficient commercial design and operations through this legislation. Not only will these programs save energy but they also help provide our students and unemployed workers with the skills they need to compete in what can be a growing field, which is the energy efficiency field.

Again, this bill is not about forcing companies to become more energy efficient or imposing mandates, it is about giving these companies the help they are asking for. We can do that at no additional expense to the taxpayer because the cost of this legislation under our bill is fully offset.

In fact, I believe this bill will save the American people a bunch of money. Why? Because the legislation takes on the largest user of energy in the world. That is the U.S. Government. The Federal Government needs to practice what it preaches. By requiring it in this bill to adopt energy-saving techniques that make its operations more efficient and less wasteful, we are doing just that.

The bill directs DOE to issue recommendations that employ energy efficiency on everything from computer hardware to operation and maintenance processes, energy efficiency software, power management tools. It also takes commonsense steps toward allowing the General Services Administration to update building designs that are out. Some of them have been out there for years. They have developed these designs over time. They are going to be permitted finally to update these efficiency standards, again with the latest energy efficiency technology. The government has been looking for places to tighten its belt. This is certainly one. Energy efficiency is a darn good place to start.

All this adds up to a piece of legislation that Americans across the spectrum can support. It is fully offset, contains no mandates on the private sector, and requires the Federal Government to become more efficient.

According to a recent study of our legislation and its impact, by 2020, using the tools of Shaheen-Portman, the private sector can create 80,000 new jobs, lower CO_2 emissions by the equivalent of taking 5 million cars off the road, and save consumers $4 billion a year in reduced energy costs. A vote on the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act is one more step toward achieving the goal of a true ''all of the above'' energy policy that produces more energy at home while using less. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Again, I commend my colleague from New Hampshire for working with us. I yield to her after having answered her.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I assume the question is, will this bill pass the Senate?

Mr. PORTMAN. Will this bill pass the Senate is a question that I pose to my colleague from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I would say absolutely it will pass the Senate. It will do that because it represents almost 3 years of meetings, negotiations, and broad stakeholder outreach in an effort to craft the most effective piece of legislation with the greatest chance of passing not only the Senate but the House as well so it can be signed into law.

This bill, as has been explained so well, is a bipartisan effort that is designed to boost the use of energy efficienct technologies. It will help create private sector jobs. It will save businesses and consumers money. It will reduce pollution. It will make our country more energy independent.

This legislation will have a swift and measurable benefit to our economy and our environment. As Senator PORTMAN said, a study by experts at the American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy found that last year's version would have saved consumers $4 billion. This may be a little hard to read on the chart, but you can see it reduces energy costs. In doing so, it saves consumers $4 billion a year. It would create about 80,000 jobs, if it were passed, by 2020. It would also be the equivalent of taking 5 million cars off the road.

The United States needs a comprehensive national energy policy. We are too dependent on foreign oil. We are overly reliant on an outdated energy infrastructure. We need to utilize a wide range of energy sources, including natural gas, oil, nuclear, and renewable such as wind, biomass, and solar.

But we cannot just focus on the supply side. We also need to think about how we consume the energy once we have it. Efficiency is the cheapest, fastest way to reduce our energy use. Energy-saving techniques and technologies lower costs, they free up capital that allows businesses to expand and create jobs and allows our economy to grow. We can start by improving our efficiency now by installing ready and proven technologies, things such as modern heating and cooling systems, smart meters, computer-controlled thermostats, and lower energy lighting, to name a few.

There are substantial opportunities that exist across all sectors of our economy to conserve energy, to create good-paying private sector jobs. In fact, there are countless examples of energy efficiency success stories in the private sector that I have had the good fortune to see as I have traveled around New Hampshire.

I visited small retail businesses, manufacturing companies, ski areas, apartment complexes, and municipal buildings throughout New Hampshire. They are all using energy-efficient technologies to lower costs, to improve working conditions and, most important, to stay competitive.

Not long ago I had the opportunity to visit a company on the seacoast in New Hampshire called High Liner Foods. It is a seafood processing plant. It requires a lot of energy to operate. In fact, at one point the 180,000-square-foot facility consumed roughly 2 megawatts of power at any given time during normal operations. So next to the core costs of personnel and fish, because it is a fish processing plant, energy was their biggest expense. But by installing efficient lighting, new boilers, various demand-response techniques such as adjusting its lighting to dim when no employees are in the area, establishing HVAC setpoints, High Liner Foods is making great strides in reducing energy consumption. It has allowed them to expand their footprint in the State and to be more cost-effective in their production.

This week I had the opportunity to visit the first LEED-certified auto dealership in New Hampshire. It is the first Toyota auto dealership that is LEED certified in New England, which I know the Presiding Officer will appreciate, being from the neighboring State of Massachusetts. They have implemented a number of effective energy-efficient initiatives to cut their energy cost, including the installation of solar panels, efficient lighting, and an impressive energy dashboard to monitor energy use throughout their entire service. Their customers can come in, they can touch this interactive dashboard, they can see what is going on throughout the physical plant.

I have also visited some great New Hampshire companies that also are producing energy-efficient technology. We have a company in New Hampshire called Warner Power, which has made the first breakthrough in transformers in over 100 years. Studies show that inefficiency in transformers results in a loss of about 5 percent of all electricity generated in the United States. With the wide-scale use of Warner Power's innovation, the Hexaformer, and their control system technology, the company estimates that 1.5 percent of all transformer energy losses could be eliminated. This would save the country 60 terawatts of electricity a year. That is equal to about five times New Hampshire's entire annual electricity consumption. So energy efficiency is an excellent example of a bipartisan and affordable approach that can immediately grow our economy and improve our energy security.

In addition to being affordable, efficiency is widely supported because its benefits are not confined to a certain fuel source or a particular region of the country. It is clearly one of those areas where we can all come to some common agreement, whether we support fossil fuels or whether we support alternatives such as wind and solar. So it is no wonder, as Senator PORTMAN said, that this legislation enjoys such a broad, diverse coalition of support. It has received more than 250 endorsements from businesses, environmental groups, think tanks, and trade associations, from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers to the National Resources Defense Council and the Painters Union. These are the types of nontraditional alliances that have helped us to get this bill to the floor.

The legislation provides a roadmap to create and implement a national strategy to increase the use of energy efficiency technologies in the residential, commercial, and industrial sectors of our economy.

It provides incentives and support, not mandates, for residential and commercial buildings in order to cut energy use. This is very important because buildings consume about 40 percent of all energy in the United States. The bill strengthens voluntary national model building codes—I would emphasize that these are voluntary—to make new homes and commercial

buildings more energy efficient, while working with States and private industry to make the code-writing process more transparent.

It also trains the next generation of workers in energy-efficient commercial building design and operation. The legislation also assists our industrial manufacturing sector, which consumes more energy than any other sector of the U.S. economy. It directs the Department of Energy to work closely with the private sector industrial partners to encourage research, development, and commercialization of innovative energy-efficient technology and processes for industrial applications.

It helps businesses reduce energy costs and become more competitive by incentivizing the use of more energy-efficient electric motors and transformers. It establishes a voluntary program called SupplySTAR, which is modeled on the successful ENERGY STAR Program, to help make company supply chains more efficient.

Finally, the legislation requires the Federal Government, the single largest user of energy in the country, to adopt more efficient building standards and smart metering technology. It requires the Federal Government to adopt energy-saving technologies and operations for computers. It allows Federal agencies to use existing funds to update plans for new Federal buildings using the most current building efficiency standards.

The best part, as Senator PORTMAN said, is the cost of this legislation is fully offset. It reallocates funding that has not been used from existing programs.

I thank Chairman RON WYDEN and his ranking member LISA MURKOWSKI from the Energy and Natural Resources Committee for their great support in getting this bill to the floor. This is a bipartisan, affordable, and widely supported piece of legislation. Most importantly, it is an effective step in addressing our Nation's very real energy needs. I thank Senator PORTMAN, Senator WYDEN, and Senator MURKOWSKI for all of their help with this bill. I look forward to debating the bill on the floor of the Senate, to listening to amendments, and to passing this bill out to the House and finally having it signed into law. I hope my colleagues will join me in this debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

IRS INVESTIGATION

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to talk about the status of the ongoing Finance Committee investigation into the targeting scandal at the Internal Revenue Service.

As you can tell, my voice is a bit hoarse this afternoon. I am feeling a little bit under the weather. With the Senate about to go into recess, I thought it was important that I say a few words about this investigation, particularly with some of the statements we have heard coming from the administration this week.

In May, when the news broke that the IRS had been targeting conservative organizations applying for tax-exempt status with additional scrutiny, President Obama promised his administration would fully cooperate with Congress in its investigations. He also stated he directed Treasury Secretary Lew to follow up on the IRS inspector general audit to get more information as to how this happened, who was responsible, to make sure the public understood all of the facts.

I was encouraged by this initial response. As you recall, I worked to clear the way for Secretary Lew's confirmation in this Senate, even though many of my colleagues had expressed legitimate concerns about his nomination. I did so, in large part, because I believed him when he promised to be fully transparent and cooperative with Congress. When the President said he had ordered the Secretary to get to the bottom of this, I expected him to live up to his promises to do so and to work with us as we tried to do the same.

Imagine my surprise then to hear both the President and Secretary Lew state over the past week, with our investigations into the IRS targeting, Congress was creating a ''phony scandal.''

It started with the President who said:

> With this endless parade of distractions and political posturing and phony scandals, Washington is taking its eye off the ball. And I'm here to say, this needs to stop.

That is what the President said.

That was followed by Secretary Lew stating on last Sunday's shows this past weekend that ''there is no evidence that this went to any political official'' and that congressional investigators' efforts to find evidence is ''creating the kind of sense of a phony scandal.''

In essence, they are saying our efforts to look into this mess are illegitimate and that the American people should simply ignore them. That is a far cry from the position the President and his administration took when this scandal was made public. As I said at that time, they were contrite. Officials were even apologizing for what went on at the IRS.

Today, however, it is a ''phony scandal.'' It is not worthy of the public's attention, they say. I have to wonder what they are basing their dismissal on, certainly not a thorough review of all the relevant documents, that is for sure.

In a letter to congressional leaders on June 4, Danny Werfel, the Acting IRS Commissioner, stated that the IRS had collected some 646 gigabytes of raw, electronically stored information, which is equal to 65 million pages' worth of documents relevant to this investigation.

Let me repeat that. The man in charge, Danny Werfel, stated that the IRS had collected some 646 gigabytes of raw, electronically stored information, which is equal to 65 million pages' worth of documents relevant to this administration. However, to date, only about 21,500 pages have been given to us—21,500 pages of documents. Those are the only documents produced to the Finance Committee to fulfill our comprehensive document request from May 20 of this year. The pace at which documents have been provided to our committee has been slow and often with long delays in between document productions.

Despite their initial pledges to be cooperative and responsive, the Obama administration has been slow-walking the Senate Finance Committee. We aren't the only ones being slow-walked.

Only last week, my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee, chairman DAVE CAMP and ranking member SANDER LEVIN, wrote to Danny Werfel, who is currently the principal Deputy IRS Commissioner, that at the rate the IRS is producing documents, a full and responsive production will take months. It is actually much worse than that.

Let me refer to this pie chart. Look at the documents we received from the IRS, 6,000 pages of, guess what, training materials. Come on, give me a break. There were 500 pages of Steven Miller, Douglas Shulman, and William Wilkins, and 15,000 pages of nonpriority custodians. That is what we have gotten from them since May. It is pathetic.

As that chart illustrates, given the intermittent document production and the very small number of priority documents we have received thus far, it could be 2016 before we ever would be able to draw any conclusions about what happened at the IRS. That is pathetic. I have a feeling that is exactly what this administration wants, and that is what I call slow-walking.

Since the initial report confirming the inappropriate targeting released by the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration, or TIGTA, on May 14, this ''phony scandal'' has evolved from what the IRS first claimed was a couple of rogue employees in Cincinnati to direct IRS involvement from high-level officials in Washington, DC, including, at the very least, individuals in the IRS's Office of Chief Counsel.

I should note that the IRS Chief Counsel is also an Assistant General Counsel in the Treasury Department, and he reports to the Treasury's General Counsel. Clearly, much more needs to be learned about who was involved, why decisions were made, and what motivated these decisions.

This is why the Senate Finance Committee has been conducting a thorough, balanced, and fact-based bipartisan investigation that carefully examines every aspect of this in order to get to the truth.

We are not interested——

Mr. ROBERTS. Would the distinguished ranking member yield for one quick question? I know the Senator has prepared remarks, and I know he is not feeling well, but I am stunned by this. I am a member of the committee, as the Senator well knows.

Mr. HATCH. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTS. You have been promised full cooperation by the Deputy Commissioner, Mr. Werfel. I have been present when he has tried to inform the committee of full cooperation. Now we find out what full cooperation is, more especially as the President has indicated these scandals are so-called phony scandals and repeated by Mr. Lew.

The Senator stated there are 65 million pages that should be available to the committee, which is stunning—stunning—in the job we would have to do. But out of those requested, only 21,500 documents have been presented. Of the 21,500, only 15,000—well, 15,000 pages, but those are nonpriority documents.

Thereby, if you try to figure out when this would be done, it would be in 2016; is that correct?

Mr. HATCH. That is right.

Mr. ROBERTS. I am stunned by this.

Mr. HATCH. It may be beyond that. It may actually go beyond that.

Mr. ROBERTS. I would imagine, if you do the math—and if you know how much time we have to actually do this—but I am stunned. This isn't what we were promised. This wasn't the understanding of the full committee and the bipartisan effort.

I don't know what we are going to have to do. We are going to have to do some drastic action if this is any indication of what we are taking.

The Senator pointed out that we have been thorough, we have been bipartisan, and we have kept absolute integrity with this. The key word was ''painstaking.'' If we have this information, there is a lot of pain, but there is no take.

Mr. HATCH. You got that right.

Mr. ROBERTS. I am extremely upset about it. I thank my colleague for bringing this to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. HATCH. I thank my colleague from Kansas. All I can say is: Look, we were promised full cooperation, and we are not getting it.

I don't blame Mr. Werfel for this, although he is a very close friend of Mr. Lew's. I think he has wanted to be more cooperative. When I chatted with him today again, he indicated the attorneys are going over everything. Let me just say, are we going to get the right papers? Are we going to get the truth?

We are not interested in some perceptions of the truth based on limited documents and limited facts. We wish to know precisely what happened, and we are going to find out.

Today, in addition to the small number of documents we have been able to review, the Finance Committee investigators have interviewed 14 individuals from IRS offices in both Cincinnati and Washington, DC. So far those interviews have yielded more questions than answers. In fact, the list of additional questions keeps growing as the investigation wears on.

After more than 2 months of investigation, here are just a few of the questions I have. I will not take too much of the Senate's time tonight, but I have a lot more questions than this, and I am going to ask these in a bipartisan manner.

Why did IRS Commissioner Shulman visit the White House 157 times? That is the number we have been given. That is unheard of. It has never happened before.

I admit ObamaCare has taken some time, but you can't justify 157 times. It sounds to me as if there is something fishy going on.

Why is it that the unions get tax-exempt status under 501(c)(5)? There was a surge in the 501(c)(5) applications in recent years. Why weren't they subject to some of the scrutiny?

Did the IRS give extra scrutiny to union applications for tax-exempt status? The answer to that is, no, they didn't.

I am not suggesting they should, but they certainly shouldn't have traded preelection of so-called conservative groups the way they treated them.

Everybody knows that is a scandal. Yet they call this not a scandal?

Once Deputy Treasury Secretary Neal Wolin learned from Inspector General Russell George of the TIGTA audit regarding IRS targeting of conservative groups on June 4, 2012, did he tell anyone else at the Treasury Department or the White House about his findings, including then-Treasury Secretary Geithner? Not that I can understand, because we don't know. They are not answering these questions.

When did Assistant General Counsel for Treasury William Wilkins, who also holds the title of IRS Chief Counsel, first find out that the IRS was targeting conservative groups? When did he find that out? Why can't we get a simple answer on that?

Whom did Mr. Wilkins inform about this targeting when he found out about it? What was the extent of the Treasury Department's role regarding Lois Lerner revealing, in response to a planted question, that the IRS had targeted conservative groups applying for tax-exempt status at an American Bar Association conference? When did any employee of the Treasury Department first have involvement regarding the IRS targeting of conservative groups' applications for tax-exempt status?

What was first date that any White House official was informed about the IRS targeting of conservative applicants for tax-exempt status?

It has been reported that ProPublica obtained private information from the IRS about conservative groups that had applied for tax-exempt status. In addition, it has been reported that the National Organization for Marriage alleges that the IRS illegally leaked information about its donors.

What action, if any, has been taken by the IRS and the Department of Justice with respect to any IRS employee who may have illegally disclosed private taxpayer information in either of these cases? These are important questions.

Are there other cases where a conservative group or its members have had their private taxpayer information unlawfully disclosed?

It has been reported that the IRS attempted to impose gift taxes on donors to the conservative group Freedom's Watch. Did the IRS attempt to impose gift taxes on the donors of other tax-exempt groups? Has the IRS targeted individuals for an audit of their personal tax returns based on their membership in or donations to a conservative tax-exempt group?

It has been reported that Lois Lerner communicated with an attorney at the Federal Election Commission regarding a case before the FEC.

Did Lois Lerner violate section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code dealing with the protection of taxpayer privacy in her communications with the Federal Election Commission? She had a right to take the Fifth Amendment, but was that why she took it if she violated section 6103?

These are questions that have to be answered. Why did Sarah Hall-Ingram, who was in charge of the IRS's efforts in implementing ObamaCare, attend a meeting with then-IRS Commissioner Steve Miller in May 2012 regarding the IRS's targeting of conservative groups' applications for tax-exempt status?

It has been reported in the media that Christine O'Donnell had a tax lien put on her property the day she declared her candidacy for the Senate.

There is something wrong here. Anybody who is fair ought to be concerned about what is wrong here—not just this but in all these questions.

As part of the IRS internal investigation the President charged Secretary Lew with conducting, has the IRS examined whether any political candidates were inappropriately targeted?

Much has been made of the employees who have been ''relieved of duty'' and had ''administrative actions'' taken against them, allegedly in direct response to the inappropriate targeting. Once again, the facts do not add up, as the administrative actions discovered thus far were against low-level employees for actions that were not directly tied to the allegations of inappropriate targeting.

So my question is, Who was relieved of duty? Lois Lerner supposedly was after she took the Fifth Amendment and refused to testify. But even she was able to log in to her computer after being allegedly relieved, and she is still being paid her full salary.

Who else has been relieved of duty? What does Lois Lerner know that prompted her to invoke her Fifth Amendment right against self-incrimination?

Former IRS Commissioner Steve Miller and Doug Shulman were both aware of the targeting of conservative groups seeking tax-exempt status and the systematic practice of subjecting those

conservative groups to intrusive and unwarranted scrutiny about their activities. Why did they both deceive the Senate by failing to inform us that these practices were going on? Why? I was disappointed in Commissioner Shulman because he came to my office long before this all came up and I was quite impressed. But I think he had an obligation to come clean.

Why did the tea party cases sit for months at the IRS, through the 2010 election cycle without activity? Why? Why did Lois Lerner direct the IRS Chief Counsel's Office—an office that was purportedly slow in its response to requests for assistance from other IRS components—to get involved in reviewing tea party cases? Why did the IRS demand that tea party organizations seeking tax-exempt status provide a list of their donors to the IRS when that was not required? Why?

These types of inappropriate actions, as I said, are just some of the many questions we have about the IRS targeting scam. These questions will simply not go away, and our investigation will not stop until all of them are answered. And we are doing this in a bipartisan way.

Just today we learned President Obama has selected a new nominee to serve as the next Commissioner of the IRS. I have to say I was a bit surprised, although perhaps I really shouldn't be. Given the dark cloud that currently hangs over the IRS, I would have thought the President would have taken the time to consult Congress before choosing the agency's next leader. Yet I am the ranking member of the appropriate committee with sole jurisdiction over the IRS, and today's announcement is the first I have heard of this decision, and it was only after the decision was made. I like the President. I think we are friends. But that was improper, and it was a slight that should not have happened.

I asked Senator BAUCUS if he was informed by the President, and he said: About 3 hours ago. And he sounded a little disgusted himself.

I won't go into the merits of John Koskinen's nomination today. I have no intention of prejudging him. He will be fairly considered by the Finance Committee, and I have the reputation that he will be fairly considered. His record and qualifications will be thoroughly examined. But I want to assure my colleagues that I will demand significant answers from Mr. Koskinen when he comes before the committee, and I think other Republicans will as well.

My purpose will be twofold. First, we need to get to the truth about what happened at the IRS and, perhaps just as important, we need to make sure the Obama administration is fully cooperating with our efforts rather than using phony statements about phony scandals.

So today I want to call on President Obama and Secretary Lew to stop closing the door on this investigation that has just started and hasn't even been given a chance. If this is indeed a phony scandal, the burden is on them to prove it is. And just saying that it is isn't good enough. They should have the IRS produce all the requested documents and let the documents speak for themselves. There is no reason to hide these things, nor is there a reason to have a whole bunch of attorneys determining what can be released and what can't be released. Let them show how their partisan targeting began and why it continued for years. Let them show who was or was not involved and to what level within the IRS or elsewhere in government these activities were discussed and directed. Until then, this is certainly not a phony scandal. It is a legitimate bipartisan investigation being conducted in a fair and balanced way that seeks to let the facts dictate the outcome.

I have a reputation around here for being fair and honest, and I resent the way the Finance Committee is being treated. I can't speak for the chairman, but I believe he feels pretty much the same way because we are being mistreated with regard to our requests for information. This isn't some itty-bitty phony scandal. This is big-time stuff that should get into why the IRS was doing this to begin with.

People in this country are scared to death of the IRS, and with good reason. If they can do this to you, can you imagine what else they can do? And I have listed just a few things here today. I have a lot more I could say. This is an important investigation, and Senator BAUCUS and I intend to do it in a bipartisan way. But when we ask for documents, we want documents, and we don't want some bunch of partisan lawyers in the department stopping us from getting the documents they must provide. It sure looks as though they are deliberately trying to delay this as long as they can so they can say: Well, nobody cares about it. Well, I have to tell you, everybody in this country must care about it. If they can do this to these small, conservative tax-exempt organizations, then they can do it to every other organization when the time comes.

This is an important investigation, and this administration ought to be at the forefront of trying to get to the bottom of it instead of pulling from behind, saying there is nothing here when they know there is a lot here. I would like these questions answered. They are important questions. This is an important investigation. We should not allow the IRS to run rampant like this. That is the beginning of tyranny—except it began before 2010—and we should get to the bottom of it so it never, ever happens again.

I think there are a lot of people at the IRS who would like to see us get to the bottom of it because they are being besmirched by the bad things that have happened. There are a lot of decent, honorable people working at the IRS, and they have to be as concerned as I am about the mistreatment that occurred prior to the last election and after.

Is it going to happen again? Are these agencies of government going to be used by partisan people in the way they has been used up until now? It is enough to scare the daylights out of anybody, and it is enough to think, are we moving toward a totalitarian system where the people in government can get away with anything they want to and especially an agency as powerful and scary as the IRS? I hope we can get the answers to these questions. If we can't, this isn't going to stop until we do. And these are just preliminary questions; I will come back with some more in the coming weeks.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SHAHEEN). The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam President, I would like to again thank the distinguished ranking member of the Finance Committee for his presentation and asking very pertinent questions with what I thought was going to be not an easy task but at least a task where we would receive cooperation from the IRS and, for that matter, the administration.

Nobody likes to be audited, and surely nobody likes to say they have been audited, as the distinguished ranking member pointed out about all the conservative groups. But let me point out that this has gone on not only with regard to them but to individuals as well. We are getting reports from the senatorial campaign committee indicating that people are hesitant to give, that people who have given in the past significantly to the Republican cause have been audited, and audited for the first time in their lives, to pro-Israel groups—and I can go on and on with a list of the organizations.

This is a very serious situation. This really surprises me, that having said we were going to do this in a painstaking, bipartisan way, that this is simply not the case.

I am going to be joining the distinguished ranking member. I am very interested in the further questions we feel we can boil down that simply have to be answered first, and then obviously there are many more.

AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE ACT

This really goes to the subject I want to talk about. The American people now, as a result of this, do not trust the IRS, and they sure as heck do not trust the IRS to be in charge of their health care. That is the subject I want to touch on, and I will try to make it very brief.

It has been more than 3 years since the Affordable Care Act—referred to by some or most in the press as ''ObamaCare''—was signed into law. At the time, I can recall, after months of markup in both the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions and Finance Committees, I had many concerns. I remember I was very frustrated with my amendments being defeated on partisan votes, most of them having dealt

with rationing. I remember distinctly comparing this rush to government health care to a western or Kansas analogy of riding hell for leather into a box canyon to eventually finding the only alternative would be to turn around and ride back out to a more realistic market-oriented health care reform trade.

As it turned out, we never even saw the bill before we voted on it. I voted no, and so did every other Republican Senator and Member of Congress. And I regret to say to my colleagues that I told you so. Premiums are going up. Taxes are going up. Overall health care costs continue to rise. Burdensome, costly, and, I might add, difficult-to-understand regulations are confusing and confounding health care providers. Many of these folks will not even know about a particular regulation until they are fined by outside contractors. The results have been terribly counterproductive to any economic recovery. Regulations such as these this have a way of dampening anything we are trying to do.

The current and growing problems are so large and complicated with this government takeover of health care that it has been difficult, if not impossible, for the administration to get ObamaCare off the ground. I mentioned what happened 3 years ago at the beginning of my remarks. Let's now talk about what is coming down the pike in just a matter of weeks.

October 1 is the deadline when, according to the Affordable Care Act, according to the law, according to promise, millions of Americans who do not receive insurance through an employer will be forced to purchase health insurance in an exchange overseen by the States and the Federal Government—except for Georgia. Yesterday, Georgia was the first to announce that they will not be ready by the October 1 deadline and have asked for a delay.

I am going to make a prediction that what Georgia did, others will do, including the Federal Government. In fact, as we all know, the administration—in a weekend blog, no less—announced they would delay the employer mandate due to take place January 1, 2014, by a year, to January of 2015. I might add, that just happens to be after the midterm elections. This just means another delay for businesses that complained about the red-tape and costly burdens the mandate placed on their operations. Many are already laying off employees or moving them to part-time status to avoid the costly mandate. And all of this follows the thousands of waivers granted to corporations, unions, and other groups.

Again, my question is, Where is the waiver for the average family in Kansas and around the Nation? Where is the permanent delay for the taxes that will affect individuals?

As we warned, things are starting to crumble and get worse, which is why we need to sunset the exchanges and the individual mandate—literally, a tax on families.

This evening or tomorrow those of us privileged to serve in the Senate will leave Washington for the month of August, and we are going to get an earful regarding all of the problems associated with ObamaCare and the impending deadline. Will exchanges be ready? If they say they are ready, will they really be ready? Many Kansans who will be forced into a Federal exchange or see another last-minute delay—a Federal exchange, by the way, that doesn't exist as of my remarks—will ask how much the new plan will cost. They will say: What will it cover? Will they be able to see their family doctor? Will their personal health information remain private and safe or end up in a six-agency database? Some people call it seven agencies. Will they be losing the health insurance they like? Will the high costs force their employer to make them a part-time employee, change their plan, or just drop their coverage altogether?

Right now Kansans and everyone else in the country cannot answer these questions—and neither can the administration. And when we get back, we will have only 4 weeks until the October 1 deadline. That means, really, if we are going to do something about this, we are only going to have 3 weeks in which something can be done to sunset, delay, defund, or repeal the law and replace it with real health care reform that works and to restore the all-important relationship between patients and doctors.

Well, I do have an answer. Some time ago, when the ObamaCare storm clouds were first forming, I introduced legislation to sunset the exchanges and the individual mandate if they are not, as promised, up and running and ready to enroll by October 1 so that the exchanges can meet the requirements prescribed by law. Simply named the ''Exchange Sunset Act of 2013,'' S. 1272, my bill aims to make sure that if the exchanges are not ready, they go away and so does the mandate.

I realize, as we travel down this road to the October 1 deadline at ever-increasing speed, there will be those who support continued advertising and encouraging thousands to sign up in the exchanges. The question is, Sign up for what? The chances of the exchanges, State and Federal, being ready—and I mean ready and accessible to all that the advertising is trying to bring in—are remote at best. Obviously, there will be some kind of a delay, and once again we will have the administration rewriting laws which they had a direct hand in writing and which were passed exclusively by the Democratic majority. I submit, changing the law by the Executive—the Office of the President—without approval by the Congress is unconstitutional.

Three weeks, three weeks before the ObamaCare train wreck. When this body comes back, let's talk about it, and I urge immediate consideration and hopefully passage of S. 1272, the Exchange Sunset Act of 2013. It is a train wreck, folks, and we have to get America off the track.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

MANIPULATING TAX REFORM

Mr. FLAKE. Madam President, I rise today to discuss the so-called grand bargain referenced yesterday by the President.

On Tuesday President Obama recycled a number of policy ideas that have lingered for months, if not years, and repackaged them as what he called ''a grand bargain.'' This proposal seems to be an attempt by the President to extend an olive branch to the Republican side of the aisle by offering corporate tax reform. In exchange, he is asking for additional stimulus spending.

I am in favor of a grand bargain, but this is not even close to a grand bargain. It is not even a bargain. A grand bargain would involve reform to entitlement programs to make them sustainable over time. A grand bargain would involve a farsighted look at the outyears, not just a shortsighted attempt to score political points for the next election cycle.

The administration has taken the taxpayer down the road of stimulus spending before, with the idea that we can stimulate job growth with so-called shovel-ready projects. Sadly, we have all seen what throwing taxpayer money at supposed shovel-readiness gets you and just how lackluster this economic recovery has been. Wasting hard-earned dollars on so-called investments doesn't create jobs. Businesses and the people who build them is what creates jobs.

I think both sides of the aisle agree that our Tax Code is already far too complicated. In fact, a recent bipartisan letter from the chairman and ranking minority member of the Senate Finance Committee discussed the complexity, inefficiency, and unfairness of our Tax Code, which acts as a brake on our economy. But if we can't bring ourselves to do entitlement reform—or the so-called grand bargain—at least at this stage what we can do is perhaps a small bargain for businesses and the taxpayers just by simplifying both the individual and corporate codes to foster an environment that is hospitable to business expansion, to hiring, and to international competitiveness.

Last week I shared publicly with the leadership of our tax-writing committee my goals and principles for tax reform. Chief among them is lowering the business income taxation for corporations and those businesses that file as individuals.

With 95 percent of U.S. businesses structured as subchapter S corporations, limited partnerships, limited liability corporations, and other pass-through businesses, we can't ignore the fact that many of them pay a top rate of 39.6 percent in addition to several other layers of taxation. In my view,

any substantive tax reform should include a reformed tax system that allows all U.S. businesses, including passthrough businesses, to thrive. Unfortunately, the proposed corporate taxation reforms the President included in his recent announcement will once again have the government picking winners and losers in the Tax Code.

Here in the Senate, there are efforts to work in a bipartisan fashion to reform the Tax Code. This is a good-faith effort that should be encouraged. As I mentioned, it would be a bargain for taxpayers and businesses alike.

If we can make progress on the small bargain, then perhaps some day we can return our attention to the grand bargain—a bargain that would include and involve entitlement reform and substantive tax reform in the same package.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 2668

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 145, H.R. 2668. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, without intervening action or debate, and the motion to reconsider be made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Madam President, very briefly, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. It comes as no surprise that the Republicans are once again trying to repeal the health care act. By one count, the House and Senate Republicans have tried to fight the same fight more than 70 times.

Albert Einstein was not insane. He was very smart. But he described insanity pretty clearly as doing the same thing over and over and expecting different results. That is where we are here. This is insane. It is clear Republicans liked it better when insurance companies could deny coverage when you had a preexisting condition; when insurance companies could cut off your health insurance when you got sick; when insurance companies could raise insurance rates without any review. They would say—I guess when they say what they are saying now, that they want to prevent enforcement of the health care reform, what they are really saying is they want to repeal free mammograms and preventive care, repeal the law that lets kids stay on their parents' health care until they are 26.

Let's not fight the same fight over and over. It is time to stop fighting. It is time to work together.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Texas.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 2009

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate receives from the House H.R. 2009, the Keep the IRS Off Your Health Care Act, the Senate proceed to its consideration; that the bill be read a third time and passed, without intervening action or debate, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Republican leader.

DELAY THE INDIVIDUAL MANDATE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, let me address the first consent I offered, which was objected to. Last month the administration announced it would delay ObamaCare's employer mandate on business. It is not hard to see why they wanted to do that. We keep reading about why businesses large and small will have little option but to cut employee hours and paychecks as ObamaCare comes on line, about how restaurants such as White Castle, for example, are considering hiring only part-time workers moving forward, about how small businesses are citing ObamaCare as a top worry.

I think there are a lot of Members on this side who would question the legality of what the President did. But with midterm elections on the horizon, it is no mystery why the administration would want to delay the law for businesses, considering how many jobs it is likely to kill, how many paychecks it is likely to slash. Here is the thing, though: Don't families and individuals deserve the same kind of relief? I believe they do. I do not believe it is fair to give a break to business and leave Americans out in the cold.

Recently we learned that Ohioans buying health insurance next year can expect about a 40-percent premium increase. Next door, in Indiana, costs could rise by more than 70 percent. Some Georgians could face a nearly 200-percent premium spike. In my home State of Kentucky, actuaries are predicting cost increases that could exceed 30 percent. Remember, the President said costs would go down, that ObamaCare was the Affordable Care Act.

Millions face the prospect of losing the insurance they like and want to keep, which again is not what the President promised. That is why I have asked the Senate to pass H.R. 2668. This legislation passed the House on a strong bipartisan vote with nearly 2 dozen Democrats supporting it and it would delay some of ObamaCare's most burdensome mandates for everyone.

Shortly after its passage in the House my colleagues and I called on the majority leader to bring it to the floor for a vote. Those calls were unheeded. So I am disappointed to hear that some of our friends on the other side have objected to this vote as well. I do not understand, frankly, why they would want to leave Americans out in the cold. I note that Members on this side are united in our belief that at the very least Americans deserve the same relief as businesses do. So we will all be supporting this commonsense bipartisan bill if we have a chance to vote on it.

You would think this is a principle Members of the body would support unanimously. If it is OK for businesses, why not for individuals? Unfortunately, objection has been heard and we will not get an opportunity to have the same break for the average American citizen as the administration is giving through executive action to businesses. It is a shame, but that is where we are going into the August recess.

I yield the floor.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES PRIVATE FIRST CLASS DUSTIN P. NAPIER

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, it is with sorrow that I rise to pay tribute to a young man from Kentucky who gave his life in service to our country. PFC Dustin P. Napier of London, KY, died on January 8, 2012, in Zabul Province, Afghanistan while in support of Operation Enduring Freedom. The cause of death was injuries sustained from small-arms fire. PFC Napier was 20 years old.

For his service in uniform, PFC Napier received several awards, medals, and decorations, including the Bronze Star Medal, the Army Achievement Medal, the Army Good Conduct Medal, the National Defense Service Medal, the Afghanistan Campaign Medal with Bronze Service Star, the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, the Army Service Ribbon, the Overseas Service Ribbon, the NATO Medal, the Combat Infantryman Badge, and the Overseas Service Bar.

Dustin's father Darrell Napier says of his son, ''He was born in an Army hospital, and I'm sure he ended up dying in an Army hospital. He was my hero. Please pray for us.''

Dustin was born in an Army hospital because he followed his father's example of military service. Darrell Napier served in the U.S. Army from 1989 to 1994, and was stationed in Germany and Fort Polk, LA. Dustin, the youngest of Darrell's three sons, knew from an early age he wanted a military career.

''He'd been wanting to do that since he was a little boy, about when he was six years old,'' Darrell recalls. ''I encouraged him to do so. And he was a leader. He'd take the initiative to get things done. I've always raised my boys to do the right thing, no matter if the cause was popular or unpopular.''

By the time he reached high school, Dustin was a top cadet in his Junior ROTC program. ''I remember him as a model student, very quiet and serious. You always knew where he stood,'' says Colonel Mark Jones of the Air Force Junior ROTC program at South Laurel High School, Dustin's alma mater.

Dustin rose to be his Junior ROTC unit's corps commander and the most decorated cadet.

News of PFC Napier's loss shook many who remembered him at South

Laurel High, where Dustin graduated in 2010 and had many friends. ''When I . . . heard he died, my legs almost collapsed. It was unbelievable. He was a good friend, a good mentor, and truly a good person,'' says Devan Burkhart, a South Laurel student.

''I learned from him. He was the one who would tell me, 'Stick with it,' when I got frustrated with the program, and I did stick with it.''

Steven Cheek, one of Dustin's best friends and a high-school classmate, recalls the fun he and Dustin had shooting rifles, going to ball games, watching movies, and listening to music. Dustin's favorite group was the Doors. Other friends remember Dustin loved to play the air guitar.

After graduating from South Laurel High in May 2010, Dustin joined the U.S. Army in July and completed basic training at Fort Benning, GA. In April 2011, he was deployed to Afghanistan with C Company, 1st Battalion, 24th Infantry Regiment, 25th Infantry Division, based out of Fort Wainwright, AK.

Darrell Napier recalls that Dustin would call home from Afghanistan every now and then. ''He did miss home a lot,'' Darrell says. ''He loved to hang out with his friends very much. He missed his friends at Save-A-Lot, where he worked for almost four years. And if there was one meal Dustin really loved from his mother, it was her chicken and dumplings.''

Dustin also found happiness thousands of feet in the air, while on R&R. It was in an airplane that he met Tabitha Sturgill Napier, who he married in October 2011.

Remembering her husband, Tabitha says, ''You are my very best friend and I love you very, very, very much. You are an amazing husband.''

A few days after his death, friends and classmates held a memorial service for Dustin at South Laurel High School. His friends from his old Junior ROTC unit thought it only fitting to hold the service where Dustin had served as such a fine example to past, present, and future cadets. Outside the school, the American flag stood at half-mast.

''Cadet Napier came here with a purpose from start to finish, from the first fall-in to the last fall-out,'' says CMSgt Randy Creech of Junior ROTC.

We are thinking of PFC Napier's loved ones today, including his wife, Tabitha Sturgill Napier; his parents, Darrell and Marianne Napier; his brother, Darrell Dean Napier; his stepbrother, Christopher Bittner; his stepson, Lane Robison; his grandmother, Monika Paul; his grandfather, James Napier; and many other beloved friends and family members.

I know that no words spoken in this chamber can take away the sadness and loss that Dustin's family must feel. But I do want them to know that this Nation, and this United States Senate, are deeply grateful for Private First Class Dustin P. Napier's service and sacrifice. And we are humbled to pay tribute to his life and legacy.

BURMA

Madam President, today I rise to discuss U.S. policy toward the Southeast Asian nation of Burma.

In a little over 2½ half years, the world has witnessed dramatic change in Burma; change that would have been thought unimaginable not long ago. Nobel Peace Prize Laureate Daw Aung San Suu Kyi has been released from house arrest and now sits in parliament. Hundreds of political prisoners have been released from prison. A largely free and fair by-election was held in April 2012. Ceasefires have been signed between the central government and several ethnic minority groups.

Yet, despite these welcome reforms, much work remains to be done. At the heart of Burma's existing problems is the need for constitutional reform. The current flawed constitution is not up to the task of supporting the country's democratic ambitions. Simply put, if Burma is to take the next big step toward economic and political reform and toward fully normalizing its relations with the United States, it needs to revise its constitution.

And there has been some encouraging news on that front. Just last week the Burmese parliament announced it would establish a committee to examine amending the constitution. This provides a great opportunity for the Burmese leadership to follow through on its commitment to full democratization.

As this parliamentary panel begins its efforts, I would highlight four areas of the constitution that are, in my view, in particular need of reform.

The first area of reform is the need to bring the Burmese military, called the Tatmadaw, under civilian control. Civilian control of the military is a fundamental condition of a stable, modern democratic country. Many of the stubborn problems Burma still needs to address stem from the continued outsized role of the military in Burmese political life. For example, Burma continues to maintain military ties with North Korea. Indications are that elements within the Burmese military want to continue enjoying the financial benefits of continued relations with North Korea.

The unfortunate result is that Burma's pro-reform president Thein Sein cannot formally rein in the Tatmadaw since, under the Constitution, the president is not head of the armed forces. A separate military Commander in Chief leads the armed forces and he is independent of the president.

Another example of the problems stemming from the lack of civilian control of the military is the tense state of relations between the armed forces and the Kachin ethnic group. The Kachin in northern Burma share a proud history with the United States stemming from our close cooperation during World War II. Ending the conflict in Kachin state—and all other ethnic conflicts for that matter—is essential to achieving lasting peace, reconciliation and security in Burma after 60 years of civil war.

In Europe recently, President Thein Sein predicted that a national ceasefire was right around the corner. And a peace process led by one of his close ministers has been ongoing. However, military clashes continue in northern Shan state as well as in Kachin state. The Tatmadaw has every right to protect itself, but, without transparency and civilian oversight, questions remain about the extent to which military operations have conformed with the President's guidance and intentions.

Without ending its relationship with Pyongyang and without building peace with the Kachin and other ethnic nationalities, U.S.-Burmese relations will not become fully normalized. Without the military accepting civilian oversight and demonstrating a commitment to peace, our military relationship will likewise be limited. Such a result would be to the detriment of both countries.

Having U.S. diplomats continue to urge Burma to amend its Constitution to bring the military under civilian control is important. But there are other policy tools that I believe can help reform the Tatmadaw. I believe that beginning a modest military-to-military relationship would serve this purpose. Just to be clear. I am not advocating rushing into lethal training of the Burmese military or arms sales. What I am talking about is the U.S. armed forces engaging with the Tatmadaw on compliance with the law of armed conflict, and other issues related to international standards of military professionalism.

What better way is there to show the virtues of civilian control of the military than to have the most highly regarded armed forces in the world—the U.S. military—engaged with the Tatmadaw about respect for human rights, accountability and rule of law? I believe that a modest, targeted military-to-military relationship would work hand in glove with diplomatic efforts to convince the Burmese military that placing themselves under civilian control is good for the nation.

Beginning a military-to-military relationship is common sense. Since before independence, the Burmese military has been a significant political institution in the country. And no lasting reform in Burma can take place without convincing the Tatmadaw that such a step is a positive development for the country.

A second area of needed constitutional reform involves amending the constitution to permit the Burmese people to choose freely whom they want to serve as their leader. This is a fundamental democratic principle. Current restrictions include a requirement that no one in the President's immediate family can be a citizen born to parents who were not born in Burma.

Just think about that. That's a remarkably narrow requirement. Why does the Burmese government have so little faith in the ability of its citizens to freely and responsibly choose their own leaders?

These provisions, if left unamended, would cast a pall over the upcoming 2015 elections. And, those elections are viewed by many observers as the next high-profile step in Burma's reform efforts. If the 2015 elections are viewed as illegitimate, it will lead many to conclude that reform efforts have stalled in Burma and the country's stated commitment to democracy is hollow.

I think having the 2015 elections turn out to be flawed would cloud the reformist legacy of the current national leadership.

A third area of needed reform in this regard is judicial independence. Currently, the Burmese judiciary is not independent of the executive. As we ourselves have learned from experience in America, having judges who are not under the thumb of the other branches is not only a vital check on the other organs of government, but also a bulwark against violations of individual rights.

Finally, there need to be constitutional assurances for ethnic minorities. Burma faces no greater challenge than peacefully integrating its various ethnic groups. These groups have long harbored misstrust of the central government and the Tatmadaw. Building protections for ethnic minorities into the Constitution would, I suspect, go a long way toward making the ethnic groups more receptive to the new government. Such provisions would also be underscored by an independent judiciary to help enforce these protections.

As we know as Americans, amending a Constitution is not easy, nor should it be. But over the years, we in this country have amended our Constitution to make it more democratic and to provide greater protection of individual liberties.

Reforming the Burmese Constitution in areas such as the four I just raised is a necessary next step in Burma's own journey toward democracy and peaceful, national reconciliation.

There is still time for Burma to act ahead of the 2015 election and correct these problems. I urge the country's leadership to seize the moment, to take this vital step and to cement its reformist legacy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

KEEP THE IRS OFF YOUR HEALTH CARE ACT

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, turning to the matter upon which I asked unanimous consent and to which the majority leader objected, and that is to take up legislation that I have sponsored here in the Senate, which has been passed in the House, which is the Keep the IRS Off Your Health Care Act, with each passing day it seems as though more and more supporters of ObamaCare are having second thoughts. As I mentioned last week, three of America's most powerful labor leaders have declared the President's health care law is ''creating nightmare scenarios'' and threatening to ''hurt millions of Americans.'' Those are some pretty remarkable words from people who were some of the foremost advocates for the Affordable Care Act, otherwise known as ObamaCare.

Meanwhile, the union that represents IRS employees has announced it does not want its members to receive health insurance through ObamaCare exchanges. In fact, earlier today the IRS Commissioner himself said he wants to keep his current health care policy and does not want to sign up for ObamaCare, as millions of other Americans will be required to do.

Speaking of the Internal Revenue Service, the agency's political targeting scandal continues to grow. I listened in my office to Senator HATCH, the ranking Republican on the Senate Finance Committee, the one primarily responsible for Internal Revenue oversight in the Senate, and I hope the questions he posed will be answered by the bipartisan investigation we are conducting. We recently learned the Internal Revenue Service's Chief Counsel's Office, headed by an Obama administration appointee, was aware of the abuses. So much for a couple of rogue agents in Cincinnati, as was originally reported. We have also learned that IRS officials have been improperly targeted, not only conservative organizations but political candidates and donors as well.

To make things worse, the same person who ran the IRS division that targeted conservative groups is now running the agency's ObamaCare office. I can't make this stuff up. Truth is stranger than fiction. Americans might be asking: What does the IRS have to do with ObamaCare?

America's tax collection agency will be responsible for administering several of the law's most important provisions, including the individual and employer mandates, which we have heard so much about, and all of the subsidies. In other words, all of the tax dollars will go to fund the exchanges under ObamaCare. Those will be administered by the Internal Revenue Service under the current law.

It is remarkable that at a time when public trust and the Internal Revenue Service has plummeted and IRS officials are complaining their staffers are overworked and overburdened, the Obama administration wants to use this tax agency to administer a massive new entitlement program affecting one-sixth of our national economy. To me, that sounds like another recipe for disaster.

Back in May I sponsored legislation that would prevent the Internal Revenue Service from a role in implementing ObamaCare. Last week, I introduced it as an amendment to the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill that was pending before this Chamber.

Congressman TOM PRICE of Georgia has introduced a similar bill in the House of Representatives. Unfortunately—and this is pretty amazing—even before the House passed the House bill and before the Senate had a chance to take up the Senate bill, President Obama has already issued a veto threat were we to pass it. It sounds a little defensive to me. I understand ObamaCare is a deeply decisive issue in Washington, and I understand that while many have been compelled to defend the law previously, they are now feeling a little skittish about it 3 years later.

I ask my colleagues: Given all we have learned about corruption and institutional abuse at the Internal Revenue Service, does anyone truly believe we should dramatically expand the agency's power to implement ObamaCare? Does anyone truly believe IRS agents should have access to even more personal financial information—not to mention medical information—about American citizens? If IRS officials conducted a systematic campaign of political targeting against conservative organizations, why should we have any more confidence that the agency will fairly and objectively implement the President's health care law?

Remember, the IRS has already announced it will violate the text of the law and issue health care subsidies through Federal exchanges. Let's recall what happened. Many States said: We will pass on State-based insurance exchanges upon which ObamaCare depends to be implemented in the States. So what the IRS has said is: We are going to paper over the fact that Congress never explicitly authorized tax dollars to subsidize the Federal exchanges, even though the law clearly states that those subsidies can be issued only through State exchanges. That is another example of lawlessness when it comes to ObamaCare.

In other words, the agency has already shown utter contempt for the rule of law when it comes to implementing the President's most cherished legislative accomplishment. They have already shown that contempt, and they don't deserve, nor have they shown themselves worthy of, our confidence when it comes to implementing this health care law.

In my view, the IRS has absolutely no business playing such a huge role in the American health care system. For that matter, I ask my friends on the other side of the aisle one final question: Do you still believe ObamaCare will reduce health care costs? After all, it is estimated that the law will cause a dramatic spike in individual insurance premiums across the country—from Maryland to Florida, to Indiana and Ohio, to Kentucky and Missouri, to Idaho and California.

Earlier this week, for example, the Florida insurance commissioner predicted that because of ObamaCare, the

cost of health insurance in the individual market and Florida will increase by 30 to 40 percent. The reason for that is because the provisions in ObamaCare mandate the guaranteed issuance of health insurance even after a person is sick. Someone compared it to waiting until your house is on fire to buy insurance. It is not insurance anymore, and it drives up the cost, not to mention the fact that young people—such as those sitting in front of me—are going to have to pay the price of subsidizing health care for older Americans. The so-called age-banding requirements don't allow older citizens to pay any more than three times what young people pay for health insurance, even though the cost of their health care, given their age, will be higher.

So this is what distorts the insurance markets, which is causing health insurance premiums to skyrocket across the States because of ObamaCare.

Rather than make our individual health insurance markets even more distorted and more dysfunctional than they are today, we should dismantle ObamaCare and replace it with patient-centered reforms that create a genuine national marketplace for health insurance.

I was just reading a story about an Oklahoma surgical center which publishes the price of common procedures for the public to read and which now has created—what markets always do—greater consumer awareness of what exactly these procedures cost. As we have seen in Medicare Part D, the prescription drug plan Congress passed a few years ago, when a market is created and vendors compete for consumers' business, prices go down and the quality of service goes up. That is what markets do. Ultimately, it benefits the consumer, and it would benefit taxpayers and patients as well.

What do I mean by patient-centered reforms? I am talking about reforms that empower individual Americans by giving them more choices and flexibility in the health care markets—such as the example of the Oklahoma surgical care center—by giving people more transparent information about pricing and quality and by directly assisting people with preexisting conditions.

I heard the majority leader earlier when Senator MCCONNELL offered a unanimous consent to extend the moratorium on the individual mandate just as the President has unilaterally on the employer mandate. He said something to the effect of: Republicans want people to be subjected to preexisting condition exclusions that are not covered. That is simply false. We don't have to embrace 2,700 pages of ObamaCare just to take care of that problem or other problems we have agreement on. We should also work to protect the doctor-patient relationship.

The last thing we ought to do on my list of things to do to reform the health care system is to save Medicare from bankruptcy. It is on an unsustainable path. Yet any time we try to suggest reforms that will strengthen and stabilize Medicare and make sure it is there for future generations, they are met with a ''stiff-arm.''

If we want to reduce health care costs, if we want to expand quality insurance coverage and give Americans more choices and options, we should equalize the tax treatment for health insurance so it is treated the same whether it is provided by your employer or whether an individual buys it. We should let individuals and businesses form risk pools in the individual market, and we should let folks buy health insurance across State lines.

Why shouldn't I be able to buy health insurance in New Hampshire or Alabama or somewhere else if it fits my needs? Right now that is not possible. It would create a market which would create competition, bring down costs, and make it more affordable. We should expand tax-free health savings accounts so people can save their own money and spend it as they see fit on their health care. If they don't spend it there, it is available for their retirement, much like any other individual retirement account.

We should curb frivolous medical malpractice lawsuits. According to one study, the annual cost of defensive medicine is a staggering $210 billion. In my State, we have had a lot of success with medical malpractice reform. It stabilized the cost of medical malpractice insurance that physicians have to buy, and it created a huge surplus of physicians who want to move to Texas and practice their profession. They realize they will not lose everything they have in the litigation lottery. They can buy affordable coverage that will protect their family and their patients should they make mistakes.

We should give each State much more flexibility to design a Medicaid Program that works best for their neediest residents. Medicaid is a wonderful program, but it is broken. This is designed to protect the most vulnerable people in our society and provide for their health care needs. But because of the broken Medicaid Program, only one out of every three doctors in my State will actually see a new Medicaid patient. Medicaid reimburses at about half of what private insurance reimburses, and as a result many doctors can't afford to see a new Medicaid patient. What we have is the appearance of coverage, but there is no real access to the doctor of their choice. So we need to fix Medicaid.

Finally, we should establish greater provider competition in Medicare so the competition I mentioned a moment ago in the Medicare prescription drug program could also apply in other aspects of Medicare and help make it more affordable, shore it up, and guarantee its availability to generations yet to come.

There is no reason why Americans have to accept an unworkable health care law administered by an agency such as the Internal Revenue Service that has grossly abused its power and demonstrated that its current job is way beyond its capacity to perform.

I realize we will not be able to dismantle ObamaCare overnight—not with President Obama still in the White House and with a Democratic majority in the Senate. I realize many of these issues need to be debated further, but I hope we can all agree that the Internal Revenue Service, the IRS, should not be administering a law that affects one-sixth of our national economy and which so dramatically affects the quality of life for 320 million Americans.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SHELBY. Madam President, last week in Illinois President Obama attempted to blame opponents of the ObamaCare for the law's broken promises. He lashed out at what he called ''folks out there who are actively working to make this law fail.'' Those were his words. He further said: ''[A] politically motivated misinformation campaign'' is afoot. He strongly implied that fault rests not with those who conceived the law but those who have not, in his estimation, ''committed themselves to making [it] work.''

Think about it a minute. This flailing, of course, was nothing more than an effort by President Obama to dodge and deflect accountability for the law that bears his name. Let's be real. ObamaCare is not a failure because so many Americans reject it, rather so many Americans reject ObamaCare because it is a failure. I believe we should focus on what truly matters.

Americans are growing increasingly anxious about how the law will affect them and their families. They wonder what it will mean for health insurance and tax bills. They wonder whether they will be able to get the care they need when they need it. They wonder whether the quality of American health care will remain the best in the world and, yes, they wonder how a government reorganization of one-sixth of the economy will impact a weak jobs market. Unfortunately, neither the outset nor the outlook provides consolation.

President Obama has frequently sought to downplay the debacle surrounding the rollout of his health care law. He says ''that glitches and bumps'' are to be expected. But as the Wall Street Journal columnist Kimberly Strassel notes, the Democrats didn't ''count on the hiccups turning into cardiac arrest,'' and that is what happened.

Since the enactment of ObamaCare, a laundry list of unworkable provisions has been repealed or delayed. But recently the administration announced two particularly notable delays.

First, the administration will delay implementation of the law's employer mandate until 2015 because workable

reporting requirements are not yet in place. This provision requires all employers in this country with more than 50 employees to provide adequate health care coverage for full-time employees, defined as those employed at least 30 hours per week or pay a penalty. In anticipation of this mandate many employers are cutting back hours for current workers and holding off on hiring new ones.

I welcome any relief from ObamaCare for anyone in this country, but why should such relief not apply to individuals and families as well as businesses? If the administration hasn't gotten its act together by now, what leads us to believe it ever will? Instead of temporarily delaying part of ObamaCare for some, I believe the best course would be to permanently delay all of it for everyone.

The administration also recently announced postponement of a critical taxpayer protection under ObamaCare. Taxpayers were previously told the government would verify that applicants actually qualify for subsidies before receiving them. Now the administration says it is not ready to do that until 2015, although it will still go ahead with enrollment in the program in 2014. So for the coming year, the Obama administration will trust but not verify anything. The honor system, I believe, is no taxpayer protection.

These are not run-of-the-mill glitches and bumps, as the President would say. These provisions are central to the legislation and may foreshadow major problems to come, as we find out every day. These provisions are unworkable or problematic not because people don't like them but because they were poorly designed. This isn't about a lack of commitment on behalf of those forced to comply with these mandates. Rather, it is about a lack of confidence on behalf of those who conceived and crafted these provisions.

In light of the disastrous rollout of ObamaCare, Americans are also apprehensive about the cost—yes, the cost. How will all of this impact their health insurance premiums? What will be the tax burden? What will a new entitlement program do to our $17 trillion debt, which is growing?

With respect to premiums, President Obama told the American people his health care overhaul ''could save families $2,500 in the coming years.'' Those were his words. But despite this bold claim, health insurance premiums for the average American family have increased over $3,000 since 2008, and this is according to the Kaiser Family Foundation Employer Health Benefit Survey, which is very well respected.

Moreover, a recent Wall Street Journal analysis finds that premiums for healthy consumers could double or even triple under ObamaCare. Can we imagine that?

Although ObamaCare has not decreased premiums, it has certainly increased taxes. According to the Congressional Budget Office—CBO—and the Joint Committee on Taxation, ObamaCare imposes a $1 trillion tax hike on the American economy over just the first 10 years—a $1 trillion tax hike. Their analysis finds 21 tax hikes in ObamaCare due to the law's various mandates and restrictions. Among these, several affect individuals making less than $200,000 and married couples making less than $250,000—a clear violation of President Obama's often repeated campaign promise not to do so.

Despite this massive tax hike, ObamaCare will still add $6.2 trillion—yes, $6.2 trillion—to the debt in the years ahead. This is based on the Government Accountability Office projections. This clearly violates yet another promise by the President that he would ''not sign a plan that adds one dime to our deficit—either now or in the future.'' Goodness.

I believe ObamaCare will not only fail to control costs but will also destroy the best quality health care in the world—ours. Why do I say this? In 2009, Dr. Martin Feldstein, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers under President Reagan and a Harvard professor, wrote an op-ed in the Wall Street Journal entitled ''ObamaCare Is All About Rationing.'' He backed up his statement by citing a report issued by President Obama's own Council of Economic Advisers which explained how the President would propose to reduce health spending by eliminating certain treatments—by rationing.

Dr. Feldstein went on to compare the Obama strategy to that of the British national health service. He concluded the existence of such a program in the United States would not only deny lifesaving care but would also cast a pall over medical researchers who would fear that government experts might project their discoveries as ''too expensive.''

Think of the implications of rationing health care. What does it mean for a patient sitting in the doctor's office when they get a life-changing diagnosis? I know that feeling. I have been there. It reassured me to know we have the best health care in the world and that everything possible would be done to save my life. I want others who encounter that situation to have the same reassurance. But will they?

Despite what President Obama may say, it is not just Republicans who have deep concerns about health care. This week, on the same Wall Street Journal opinion pages, Howard Dean, a former Democratic National Committee chairman and Governor, as well as a physician, concurred with Dr. Feldstein. Mr. Dean wrote that ObamaCare's independent payment advisory board—IPAB—''is essentially a health care rationing body.'' By setting doctor reimbursement rates for Medicare and determining which procedures and drugs will be covered and at what price, the IPAB will be able to stop certain treatments its members do not favor by simply setting rates to levels where no doctor or hospital will perform them. That was the plan.

Mr. Dean went on to say, ''These kinds of schemes do not control costs. The medical system simply becomes more bureaucratic.''

We all know now ObamaCare is a bureaucratic nightmare. With more than 20,000 pages of new rules and regulations, the law expands government to an unprecedented level, creating 159 new boards, commissions, and government offices. Think of it.

Adding to these concerns, Deloitte's 2013 Survey of U.S. Physicians finds that due to recent developments in health care, ''the future of the medical profession as we know it may be in jeopardy as it loses clinical autonomy and compensation.'' The survey by Deloitte also found that ''6 in 10 physicians''—6 in 10—''say it is likely that many physicians will retire earlier than planned in the next 1 to 3 years.''

Again, sitting in that doctor's office, I remember breathing a little easier to know we have not only the most advanced treatments but also the most skilled and experienced physicians in the world. We don't want to jeopardize that, do we?

In addition to concerns about the quality of care, the Obama administration has backtracked on still another of the President's promises. In 2009, he stated unambiguously: ''If you like your doctor, you will be able to keep your doctor. Period.'' The President's words.

Despite this pledge, the Department of Health and Human Services, under the Obama administration, recently posted the following on healthcare.gov: ''Depending on the plan you choose in the marketplace, you may be able to keep your current doctor.'' It says ''may'' be able to keep your doctor. That is not what the President told the American people.

A University of Chicago study underscores this finding that more than half of current individual insurance plans do not meet ObamaCare's standard to be sold on the exchanges. So much for that ironclad promise.

But there is another area: ObamaCare is a job killer. How will ObamaCare affect jobs? In President Obama's recent Illinois speech I mentioned earlier, he made the following curious statement about Republicans and job creation: ''They'll bring up ObamaCare despite the fact that our businesses have created nearly twice as many jobs in this recovery as they had at the same point in the last recovery when there was no ObamaCare.''

This is a non sequitur. At a minimum, President Obama implied that ObamaCare has not hurt job creation. At worst, he implied it has helped.

In stark contrast, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce's second quarter 2013 Small Business Survey in America finds that ''71 percent of small businesses—and that is the job creation machine in this country—say the health care law makes it harder to

hire.'' The same survey finds that ''one-half of small businesses say that they will either cut hours to reduce full-time employees or replace full-time employees with part-time workers to avoid the mandate.''

In addition, Gallup finds that ''41 percent of small business owners say they have held off on hiring new employees'' in response to ObamaCare.

The 1-year delay on ObamaCare's employer mandate provides momentary relief. But in light of sustained high unemployment in this country, I find it deeply troubling that perhaps the best thing President Obama has done for American business during his time in office is to provide only a brief reprieve from his own signature achievement.

Notably, labor unions agree with businesses now, that ObamaCare will hurt the economy. Recently, in a scathing letter to Democratic leaders in Congress, the president of the Teamsters Union, the UFCW, and UNITE-HERE, wrote that ''ObamaCare will shatter not only our hard-earned health benefits, but destroy the foundation of the 40-hour workweek that is the backbone of the American middle class.''

This brings me full circle to where I began my remarks. President Obama conveniently blames Republican opposition for the stumbles and failures of ObamaCare, despite the fact that Americans across the political spectrum have spoken up about its many flaws.

President Obama rammed his health care legislation through Congress without a single Republican vote. Why? Because he knew he did not need our votes to put the entire Nation under his health care plan. Yet now he claims that ObamaCare works for those who are ''committed to it.'' Committed to it?

Republicans are committed to finding solutions that actually lower health costs, that do not tax and spend us into oblivion, that preserve the world's highest quality health care, and that foster economic growth. We have said all along that ObamaCare would fail on each of these counts.

I believe opposition to ObamaCare is not responsible for its failures, and commitment to it will not negate its deep flaws. The only way to achieve the goals we all share is to begin by repealing this failed law so we can replace it with a plan that works. I hope we can.

I yield the floor.

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

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

THE ECONOMY AND IMMIGRATION

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I would like to share some remarks about the economic condition of American workers, the immigration bill that passed here recently, and in general about where we are as a Nation and the difficulties we are facing.

I think there is a growing acceptance by most experts that we have, indeed, seen a decline in the wages of the middle-class and working Americans relative to inflation since maybe as long ago as 1999—a steady erosion of their income relative to the price of products they buy. That is not a healthy trend.

President Obama talked about it, our Democratic colleagues talked about it a lot when President Bush was President. But it has continued. I thought maybe it was an aberration, but I do not think so anymore. I think a lot of things are happening with robotics, ObamaCare, other things that are happening, that are making it more difficult for workers to find jobs—unemployment remains exceedingly high—and to have wage increases.

One of the things I noticed this week from the Republican side of the aisle is that Congress received two letters—one from Republican donors, according to some, and another from CEOs—urging that Congress act on immigration. This is primarily to the House Members.

Nearly 100 top Republican donors, they called themselves, and Bush administration officials sent a letter to the House Republicans on Tuesday urging lawmakers to pass a bill that legalizes illegal immigrants. The donor letter came the same day the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and 400 other businesses and umbrella groups fired off another letter to the House leaders of both parties urging them to pass something.

One word was not mentioned in either one of those letters: Wages. Nor was any discussion of jobs and unemployment raised in those letters.

Mr. Karl Rove—a man I know and like and a long-time friend—and these groups would have us believe this legislation is about the providing of amnesty to people who have been here a long time. That certainly is a large part of it. Businesses know that legalizing illegal workers will, indeed, expand the available labor pool for industries with the effect, I suggest, of bringing down wages, particularly in the areas where illegal workers might have previously not had access. So of the 11 million people, perhaps half, we understand, do not have fake documents, are not able to work in the labor force, effectively, and they take marginal jobs. If this bill were to pass, all would immediately be given Social Security Numbers, and they could apply to any job in America.

That is both a good thing and a difficult thing. It is good that they would be able to work. It is not so good if you wanted one of the jobs that would be taken.

But there is a phrase in the letter which has gotten too little attention and which explains what this is all about. Mr. Rove and the donors say, the legislation must ''provide a legal way for U.S.-based companies to hire the workers they need.''

So we are supposed to pass a law that guarantees American companies the right to hire whoever they need, whoever they say they need, whoever they believe is best for them. That means the best worker at the lowest price. That is what free markets are all about. That is what the law of supply and demand is all about. It has not been repealed, by the way, the law of supply and demand.

First and foremost, that cannot be the goal of an immigration policy of the United States of America. It cannot be the overriding policy of our system to provide and to make sure that whatever workers our companies want at whatever price, apparently, they are willing to pay or want to pay—that we allow workers to come in from abroad and take those jobs, regardless of the unemployment rate in America, regardless of the number of people who are on welfare, on unemployment compensation, who have not had a good paycheck in a number of years, perhaps.

Our responsibility and our goal is to serve the people of this country and to try to create a climate, an economic agenda that allows them to prosper and to actually find jobs and actually get pay raises, not pay reductions.

Of course, there is already a legal way for U.S.-based companies to hire workers they need. They can hire the people living here today who are unemployed. Or they can hire some of the million-plus immigrants whom we lawfully admit each year. We have a very generous immigration policy. No one is talking about ending that and not allowing immigration to continue. We allow about 1.1 million immigrants a year come to America lawfully, plus guest workers who come specifically to work. That is very generous. But this bill would double the number of guest workers and increase substantially the number of people who come through immigration to become permanent residents in our country, at a time of high unemployment—much higher unemployment than we had in 2007. That bill would have allowed much fewer people to come into the country, and it was rejected by the American people.

No one is saying these programs cannot and should not exist, and that they should not be improved. But I am afraid the businesses want the choicest pick of labor at the lowest cost they can get it. That is what businesses do. That is what businesses want every day. When they go out and interview people, they want the best person they can get at the least cost. That is what their stockholders demand. So they believe the immigration policy for the entire Nation should exist to create an abundance of low-cost labor. I do not agree with that.

They, in their bubble they live in, think lower wages are good. You hear

about it: There are concerns over rising wages. It might drive up prices, you hear the Wall Street Journal say.

Well, maybe some politicians think that way too. They are not concerned with how the plan impacts workers, the immigrants themselves, public resources, the education system, or taxpayer dollars. They are not focused on the broader economic and social concerns that happen when someone is not able to get a job for years at a decent wage. The focus tends to be on the reduction of the cost of labor.

But America has a larger concern. That concern is unemployment. It is workplace participation. It is wages. And it is the cost of social services to those in need. We all agree we must make America more competitive globally. Workers must be productive and competitive. But how do we close the income gap? How do we deal with that?

The best way to do that is not to reduce our wages and workers' quality of life. The way to do that is with a less burdensome Tax Code, a less intrusive regulatory system, and a tougher, smarter, fair trade policy. These policies would make us more competitive and help wages and working conditions improve.

So when these business voices and establishment figures say the GOP needs to support a comprehensive immigration bill, what they are really saying is the GOP and the Congress of both parties—which in the Senate, of course, a minority of Republicans voted for the bill, and every single Democrat voted for the bill. They would have done the things I am concerned about.

Now they are worried about the Republican House and they are trying to put the pressure on them. What they are saying is, we need to increase low-skill immigration, when we do not have enough jobs now. The Senate bill, based on CBO analysis, would provide legal status to 46 million people—mostly lower skilled immigrants—by 2033—46 million. Here is what the National Review editorialized on the subject:

> By more than doubling the number of so-called guest workers admitted each year, the bill would help create a permanent underclass of foreign workers. The 2007 Bush-Kennedy proposal was rejected in part because it would have added 125,000 new guest workers. The Gang of Eight bill—The one we just passed in the Senate—would add 1.6 million in the first year, and about 600,000 a year after that and that is on top of a 50 percent or more increase in the total level of legal immigration. The creation of a large population of second-class workers is undesirable from the point of view of the American national interest, which should be our guiding force in this matter. The United States is a nation with an economy, not an economy with a nation.

This Nation owes certain things to its citizens, the people who are here now. We have a lot—300 million—and many of them are hurting. We owe them the best opportunity—owe them the best opportunity—to be successful and have a decent job with increasing wages, not declining.

Here is what conservative writer Yuval Levin wrote in a recent op-ed. I am saying this because these are conservative writers.

> The Left's economic policies (and the legacy of decades of right-wing confusion about the difference between being pro-market and being pro-business too) are making the American economy less and less like the vision of capitalism that conservatives should want to defend. They should consider what now would be best for the cause of growth and prosperity—the cause of free markets and free people.
>
> Capitalism is fundamentally democratic, after all—we today might say fundamentally populist and recovering this understanding of conservative economics would help today's Republicans see an enormous public need, and an enormous political opportunity, they tend to miss, and to which conservatism could be very usefully applied. It would point to a conservative agenda to help working families better afford life in the middle class, and to give more Americans a chance to rise.

So this is, I guess, directed—too late now to deal with the Senate. It passed the Senate, but not too late to deal with in the House, which does have a Republican majority. If Members of Congress want to broaden their appeal, the answer lies in speaking to the real and legitimate concerns of millions of hurting Americans whose wages have declined and whose job prospects have diminished.

The New York Times talked about this in 2000. They forgot about all of this now. But in 2000, they editorialized against an amnesty bill, what they called a ''hasty call for amnesty'' and warned that ''between about 1980 and 1995 the gap between wages of high school dropouts and all other workers widened substantially.'' That is what the New York Times said then. It remains true.

Professor George Borjas, himself an immigrant to America as a young man from Cuba, now at Harvard, perhaps the most effective and knowledgeable and respected scholar of wages and immigration in the world, certainly in the United States, estimates—get this—that 40 percent, almost half, of the trend downward in wages today can be traced to immigration from unskilled workers. Businesses do not have to bid up salaries to get good workers if you constantly have a flow of people come in.

That data he reported has been updated. High levels of low-skilled immigration between 1980 and 2000—and those levels would be greatly increased if this bill that passed the Senate were to become law—have already reduced wages of native workers without a high school diploma by 8 percent, according to Professor Borjas. He has analyzed Labor Department statistics, census data, and all kinds of data, according to the highest academic standards.

Professor Borjas said their wages have fallen from 1980 to 2000 by 8 percent in real dollars as a result of the current flow of immigration. So that is about $250 a month. You think that does not make a difference to working Americans and their families, to lose $250 a month?

Oh, we do not want to talk about that. That is not a problem. The immigration bill will increase wages, we are told. Professor Borjas said it has already reduced wages enough to be very painful to people who are trying to take care of their families today. Wages continue to fall.

This is not only an economic problem, but it is a social problem. The idea that dramatically increasing the number of foreign workers to take a limited number of American jobs will reduce unemployment and raise wages is so ridiculous it is hard to think it worth discussing. The very idea of this is beyond my comprehension. Yet we have the President out there today sending out documents claiming just the opposite—the President of the United States. The law of supply and demand has not been eliminated. Wages today are lower than in 1999. Median household income has declined 8 percent in that time. Some 47 million of our residents are on food stamps today, including 1 in 3 households in Detroit. According to the Associated Press, four out of five U.S. adults struggle with joblessness, near poverty, or reliance on welfare.

There is no shortage of labor in the United States. There is a shortage of jobs in the United States. Our goal must be to help our struggling Americans move from dependency to being independent, to help them find steady jobs and rising pay, not declining pay. Our policy cannot be to simply relegate more and more of our citizens to dependence on the government while importing a steady stream of foreign workers to take the available jobs. That is not in the interest of our country or the people of this country.

Some contend our unemployed do not have the needed skills. Well, let's train them. We now spend over $750 billion a year on means-tested welfare-assistance type programs. That is the largest item in the budget, bigger than Social Security, bigger than defense, bigger than Medicare. Of that amount, for every $100 we spend on those programs, we only spend $1 on job training. So we need to wake up here. We need to quit paying people not to work, quit delivering money that creates dependence, and shift our policies in a way that puts people to work and gets them trained to take the jobs that are here today.

As we leave for recess, my message to my colleagues in the House is this: Do the right thing. Make your priority restoring the rule of law, defending working Americans, and helping those struggling, immigrant and native born.

People who immigrate here lawfully want to go to work here and see their wages rise too. Their wages are being pulled down if the flow of immigration is too large. It is amazing to me how the coalition has been put together. Some of the comments about it kind of take my breath away.

Here is what the President said today in his paper, claiming that everything

is going to be great with this huge increase of immigration that was in the bill he wants to see passed in the House. This is their report. The broader leisure and hospitality industry, one of the fastest growing sectors in the U.S. economy, also stands to benefit significantly from commonsense immigration reform.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the leisure and hospitality industry has consistently added jobs over the last 3 years. These sectors remain a source of robust economic activity and continue to exceed expectations. Leaders of these industries have been long-time proponents of legislation that would legalize workers in the United States and facilitate the lawful employment of future foreign-born workers.

The head of the American Hotel and Lodging Association this year applauded the Senate—I bet he did—on behalf of the lodging industry for its bipartisan commitment to immigration reform that ''creates jobs, boosts travel and tourism, preserves hoteliers' access to a strong seasonal workforce, and stimulates economic growth.''

Well, sure. He would rather be able to have a large flow of workers from abroad take the jobs. What happens to the Americans who are not getting jobs? Are they on the food stamp rolls, the assistance rolls? Are they on unemployment compensation? Are they otherwise struggling to get by with government assistance? Would it not be better for our Americans to have those jobs?

I mean, think about it, the President of the United States out here celebrating special interests, hotel magnates, casino magnates who want cheap foreign labor so they do not have to hire American workers who are unemployed. That is what we are talking about. I think it is time for the Republicans to stand up to the Republican 100 donors writing that letter. Give me a break. We need to reject their advice and the premise of their letter that the public policy of the United States should be based on giving U.S. companies a legal basis for hiring all the low-cost foreign workers they say they need.

They are not entitled to demand that. We are supposed to set national policy here. We are supposed to set policy that serves the national interest. We do not work for those donors and special interests. So the national interest is to reduce unemployment, certainly, and to create rising wages. That is our responsibility in this body. Let's get on with it.

I want to say how great it is to see my friend Senator ENZI. I am taking up his time. I hope I have not kept him too late. He works late anyway. But he has been a great principled supporter of immigration reform and is opposed to the bill that came before us. I thank the Senator for his work on so many of these issues but immigration reform is on my mind today. It is great to see the Senator.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

HEALTH CARE REFORM

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, a lot of Americans are worried right now about their health insurance. They know what is coming. Seniors have been turned down by their doctors for Medicare treatment because the doctors are not adequately compensated. If they have not been turned down, they know someone who has been turned down.

Medicaid is uncertain and a stigma. On the one hand, advances in medical technology and the capabilities and knowledge of our health care providers mean we are living longer and have more tools at hand than ever before to address diseases and illnesses.

However, on the other hand, this increasing life expectancy, coupled with the aging of our population and the steady increases in health care costs, means our health care system is on the verge of becoming completely unsustainable financially.

All across the country health insurance rates are skyrocketing. Families are struggling to cope with the higher costs and less choice. Employees are losing coverage and they are losing working hours. Businesses are not hiring. At the center of this uncertainty is the President's health care law. A number of provisions have already gone into effect, but we will not experience the full force of the law until 2014; that is, January.

The Democrats' ''go it alone'' health care reform plan in 2009 was the first major piece of legislation to pass Congress without a bipartisan vote. Let me repeat that again. The Democratic ''go it alone'' health care reform plan in 2009 was the first major piece of legislation to pass Congress without a bipartisan vote. When you have a partisan bill you get partisan results.

After 20,000 pages of regulations and still a lot more to come, they are a little behind on those, and after over 150 new bureaucratic boards, agencies, and programs, the Federal Government still cannot figure out how to make the law work and has had to delay it, in part.

What I have seen to date is enough to convince me that we need a different path. I opposed the health care law initially and I support full repeal of the law. Fixing our health care system does not have to be divisive or partisan. There are clear differences in the approach to fixing health care from all across the political ideological spectrum. However, the least we have to do is to dismantle the worst parts of the law and replace them with reforms that actually work, reforms that lower cost and expand choice, reforms that do not bankrupt the country and every taxpayer.

The Federal Government needs to support viable solutions when needed and refrain from handcuffing innovative private designs with the excessive regulations for narrowed political interests. We need more competition, not less.

Unless we take concrete steps now, we will soon be unable to switch off the track toward government-run health care. When I first got here, I was warned that there were people who did not care who ran the train of health as long as it wrecked. Then we could have universal single-pay, government-run health care. I am not sure that is not still the goal.

One clear example of how convoluted this law is comes from the definition of who an employee is. I used to work in the shoe business, so I understand the difference between full-time work, which was 40 hours a week, and part-time work, which was under 40 hours a week.

However, under the health care law, there are now full-time employees and full-time equivalents. What this means is the law requires employers, and particularly small businesses, to determine how many of their part-time employees it takes to equal a full-time employee. They don't come under the full force of the law until they hit 50 employees. There are businesses that understand that, and they are trying to avoid getting to the 50th employee. But there are some catches in this law.

First of all, the health care law sets full time at 30 hours, not 40 hours per week but 30 hours. It was news to me. It always was 40 hours.

Second, the law requires these employers to take everyone working 29 hours a week or less, combine all of their time for a week, and then divide by the number 30 to establish how many full-time equivalents these part-time workers represent. I don't think a lot of people planned on that.

If you are still following along at this point, congratulations. You can see how costly the taxes imposed by this law will be.

What if the rule forces you to add all of your employees' hours and divide by 30 hours to determine your full-time employees? What if you have 10 employees who are working 40 hours? That would be 400 hours. If you divided that by 30 and find out that you are paying 10 people, but you actually have 13⅓ employees at the full-time requirement, that could put you over the 50 and put you into a whole different category of costs and penalties.

If you have 10 employees and you watched it so that there are only 29 hours, that comes to 290 hours. If you divided that by 30, you would find out that even though none of these people are full-time employees, you have 9⅔ full-time employees. You can see how they could do a little miscalculation, suddenly be at the 50, and be into a whole new series of penalties.

The Obama administration also had to admit recently that the employer mandate, one of the key pieces of the law, isn't ready.

One of the most economically crushing and burdensome regulations will not be implemented until past 2014, past the 2014 election in 2015. I don't think that was a mistake on their part. I think it was intentional—to come after the election.

There is another little complication that gets thrown in here though. If those employers are not providing the health insurance and not being fined for not providing the health insurance, then the people who work for them have to go on the exchange to get their health insurance. If they go on the exchange to get their health insurance, they can't be subsidized by the businesses they worked for. That is going to be a surprise to a lot of employees too.

The delay will force more people to enroll in health care exchanges or face the tax penalty if they don't. A lot of people don't realize if they do go on the exchange, there is also a surcharge on the cost of their health insurance. They are going to be paying a 3.5 percent tax for buying the insurance. Of course, if they don't buy the insurance, then they get a penalty.

The delay was also made for the businesses without congressional approval, done administratively. The Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation informed Senator HATCH this week that this delay will increase the cost of the new insurance program established by law by $12 billion. It is not as if we had an extra $12 billion laying around here.

In particular, the Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation estimated that the Federal Government will be required to pay an additional $3 billion in subsidies for people on the exchanges. A lot of extra costs were just kicked in there. This delay not only increases the costs on hard-working Americans, but it fails the original intent of health care reform, and that is to provide Americans with high quality, affordable health care.

In addition, the law requires the administration to set up health insurance exchanges in a number of States, including Wyoming. We are sparsely populated, low numbers. The numbers wouldn't work out to do our own exchange.

One problem is the administration has yet to tell anyone exactly how they are going to do those exchanges or what even a basic plan is. If you are going to have a range of plans that insurance companies can bid on, that you can look up on the computer, doesn't it seem, before you can even start, that you would have to know what the basic plan is?

How the President can argue that everyone will love the health care law once it goes into effect is beyond me. This administration can't even tell anyone where they can buy their insurance, what plan options will be available, and, most importantly, what the costs will be.

Remember what NANCY PELOSI said before they passed the law? They will have to pass the bill before we get to know what is in it. The administration is shopping its own version of that statement.

As the Senate Finance Committee chairman put it recently: this law is a train wreck waiting to happen. That is the Democratic Senate Finance Committee chairman.

Of course, on top of all of this, the law relies in part on new taxes and tax subsidies to support the coverage expansion.

This means the IRS will be involved in implementation. I have significant concerns with the ability of the IRS, particularly in the wake of the current scandal. The fact that this organization, the IRS—tainted by such political behavior—is involved in implementing the new health care law has increased my belief that the health care law is not something the country wants or needs. Of course, the IRS employees don't want to come under this law either. I don't know of anybody who really wants to come under it.

I will take a close look at proposals to remove the IRS from any implementation activities, but I do think they should be subject to the law too. At the same time, I will continue to work to provide folks with relief from the health care law as a whole.

One of the things they have said if you are going on the exchange is, if you are in certain income categories, then you get a subsidy from the government to help you purchase your insurance. We are told now that will be self-reporting and will not be subject to audit. Doesn't that sound like something that could be fraught with a lot of fraud, where you say you just make enough to get into the biggest subsidies? Everybody wouldn't do that, of course, but I think there are some who would.

How is the government doing on some of the things that they already put into effect? I saw a little article on high-risk pools. When the bill went in, a lot of the States already had high-risk pools, and we worked with States to make those viable, but the Federal Government said we could do it for less. They put in a high-risk pool.

To keep people from jumping from the State ones, which, yes, are more expensive, over into the Federal one, which is less expensive, they said you couldn't make the jump unless you were without insurance for 6 months. People who are in the high-risk pool can't afford to be without insurance for 6 months.

There wasn't a big jump to the high-risk pool. But in spite of the fact that there wasn't a jump to the high-risk pool, the Federal high-risk pool went broke. It ran out of money.

Here is the disturbing part of that article. They said, well, they would just shift that cost over to the States. The States are already doing it, and they are doing the right thing. Now they are going to be asked to pick up the additional costs. How many parts of ObamaCare are going to get shifted over to the States? The States have had a lot of promises. Can any of those promises be met? Will they be met? A lot of decisions are being based on what the Federal Government promised.

Of course, in truth, we are out of money. The new law also tried to address the problem of rising health care costs. I believe the Federal fiscal situation is untenable, and we need to implement significant and far-reaching spending cuts to get our fiscal house in order. We cannot continue on our current path.

The President and his administration will argue that the new law will expand access and lower costs. While the law certainly increases access to insurance, it also moved billions of dollars from the Medicare Program to pay for this new insurance program. That is not exactly saving the government money.

The projections for lower costs also don't add up for the average American either. Insurance premiums and rates are increasing. Small businesses are unable to continue to provide health insurance for their workers.

Businesses in general have delayed hiring or are only hiring people part time—although I hope they listen to the part that I gave about the little part-time catch that is built into the law.

All of these decisions are directly driven by the economic impact of the health care law. My Senate Republican colleagues and I are focused on developing proposals that address the worst aspects of the health care law. The law increases premiums and health care costs, forces employers to stop offering insurance to their employees, and slashes benefits for millions of Medicare beneficiaries.

I support repealing both the cap on health savings accounts, flexible spending accounts, and the prohibition on over-the-counter purchases included in the health care law.

Flexible spending accounts help make consumers more aware and engage in their health care spending.

Health savings accounts are something that young, healthy staffers of the Senate like to do. They can do the math real easy. They can look at the regular program and see how much that would cost or they could take a look at health savings accounts. The difference in the price, in only 3 years they could cover the whole deductible part as long as they were healthy for 3 years. They would be covered for that part until something major happened—and they were covered for catastrophic—so they found that to be a real bargain. But not anymore.

Additionally, a number of other Senators and I have put forward bills to repeal the taxes imposed by the President's health care law. That would be

relief from new taxes on prescription drugs, relief from new taxes on medical devices, and relief from new taxes on health insurance plans. I wish to provide relief to employers from new regulations imposed on them by the law.

These ideas preserve competition in a private market for health care coverage and lower the cost of care for the consumer. All of these steps are commonsense reforms to the health care law that take us off the path toward a national, Federal health care system.

One of the most effective ways Congress can address the rising costs of health care is to focus on the way it is delivered as part of the Nation's current cost-driven and ineffective patient care system. America's broken fee-for-service structure is driving our Nation's health care system further downward.

Today's method of payment encourages providers to see as many patients and prescribe as many treatments as possible, but it does nothing to reward providers who keep patients healthy. Maligned incentives created by the fee-for-service system drive up costs and hurt patient care.

Tackling this issue is a good start to reining in rising health care costs. The health care law championed by President Obama and the majority party in the Senate did little to address these problems because the vast majority of the legislation involved a massive expansion of the government price controls found in the fee-for-service Medicare and Medicaid Programs.

If we wish to address the threat posed by out-of-control entitlement spending, we need to restructure Medicare to better align incentives for providers and beneficiaries. This will not only lower health care costs, it will also improve the quality of care for millions of Americans. It is very important that we protect access to rural health care services too.

There is more that can be done to better align Federal programs to meet the needs of rural and frontier States. The criteria that determine eligibility for Federal funds to support rural health care programs are based on factors that make it difficult to prove the needs of the underserved, rural, and frontier areas.

For example, one provider for 3,500 people in New York City is entirely different than the 3,500 people living in Fremont, Campbell County or, perhaps more so, Niobrara County. I use Niobrara County quite a bit, for example, because Niobrara County is the size of Delaware and has 2,500 people living in it. It is 90 miles tall, 75 miles wide, and near the bottom of the center is a town called Lusk. This is where almost all of the people live. They do have a hospital there.

When they have a doctor or a physician's assistant, the hospital is open. When they do not, they are 104 miles from a trauma center.

You can't apply the same rules to that hospital that you apply to New York City hospitals. In addition, we need to think more creatively about how to use technology services, to improve telemedicine capabilities, particularly for the rural areas so that where a person lives has less impact on the level of care they are able to receive.

The advancement of more powerful, wireless technologies has substantial potential to remotely link individuals across the country to deliver health care in more accessible settings. Our Nation has made great strides in improving the quality of life for all Americans. We need to remember that every major legislative initiative that has helped transform our country has been forged in the spirit of cooperation. These qualities are essential to the success and longevity of crucial programs such as Medicare and Medicaid.

When it comes to health care decisions being made in Washington lately, the only thing the government is doing well is increasing partisanship and legislative gridlock. The President and Democrats need to listen. It is time to admit that this partisan experiment in government-run health care is failing. In order for this to get better, they must acknowledge the problem. Some of the law's authors and biggest supporters admit this law is a mess, and it will only get worse.

However, those in the Democratic leadership continue to support flawed health care laws out of pride, politics, or a belief that the government knows best. It makes no sense to stubbornly cling to a law that is so massive, burdensome, bureaucratic, and confusing that it is collapsing under its own weight.

By focusing on positive changes, Congress can give the failed law's proponents a way out. The key is finding common ground. More often than not, the country hears about what divides Congress instead of what unifies us. We could come together and focus on commonsense solutions with the kinds of step-by-step reforms that would protect Americans. I believe Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle can agree on 80 percent of an issue 100 percent of the time.

I want to be clear that this isn't compromise. When you compromise, each side gives up something they believe in, and in the end they get something no one believes in. I am about agreeing on common ground without compromise, without sacrificing each party's principles, by leaving out parts of the issue to look for a solution later.

Congress also needs to stop dealmaking and start legislating. We need to stop developing comprehensive bills and then marketing them as the only option. To me, comprehensive means incomprehensible. The larger a bill is, the harder it is to agree. And, of course, you can tuck some things in there that people never see. This is especially true when we pass a bill that no one has fully read and then afterwards we find out what is in it.

No party has all the good ideas. By working together, the end result should be something that not only works but moves the country forward in a responsible way.

We still need health care reform, but it has to be the right way, with strong bipartisan support on individual health care issues. What happened to individual choice on a policy? What happened to liability reform? What about the sale of insurance across State lines or pooling through an association so they have leverage against the insurance companies? What happened to adequate compensation for providers? All of these have been left out. Providing Americans with access to affordable health care at a high quality is something Republicans and Democrats should be able to agree upon.

The challenges of the American health care system are not going away. If we improve health care in a practical instead of a political way, we can make its better. Good policy is good politics. Why do I have some hope this is going to happen? Congress is more interested now than they have ever been, and the reason is there was a Republican—yes, there was one Republican provision in the bill that forced Congress to go into the exchanges too. We and our staffs have to live under the law we passed. That is how it should be. But the result is hitting everyone in their offices right now. Every Senator and every Representative is looking at what may happen to their staff on January 1, and their staffs are concerned. It has changed the tenor of some of the hearings we are having. It is pretty hard-hitting on both sides. So with that, I do have hope.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

POSTAL SERVICE REFORM

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, most of our colleagues have finished, a lot of them packed up and are heading back to their home States to begin the August recess. I wish them all well, especially the one who just preceded me on the floor tonight.

I stand between the staff here and the pages who are wrapping up their summer with us—at least a month with us. They will be heading back to their home States across America. We had one of our pages—a page, actually, in the last group, at the beginning of the summer—from Delaware, and we are very proud of her and all the ones who have been here. I have told them they are among the best group we have ever had—even that guy from Arkansas, whose mom used to sit right down here in the row next to MARK PRYOR and me.

I thank the staff for their hard work throughout the course of this year. I think we are in a good place, and the Senate is starting to act more like the Senate of old. We are beginning to govern a little more from the center, and Democrats and Republicans are looking to find new ways to work together on a wide range of issues.

I am especially pleased with the progress we made on the Federal student loan program, again trying to make sure the program is available and at a reasonable interest rate cost to help make sure a lot of students, young and old, if they need help, can sign up for student loans late this summer and fall and then go back to school and complete their education.

Senator ENZI used the numbers 80–20. In the time I have known him, he has talked about the 80–20 rule, of which he may be the architect. The 80–20 rule is something like this: Around here, we agree on about 80 percent of the stuff and may disagree on about 20 percent of the stuff. But in the end, why don't we just focus on the 80 percent we agree on and set aside the 20 percent we don't agree on and then take that up another day?

That is the spirit Senator TOM COBURN, who is the ranking Republican on the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, and I have taken to an issue that needs to be addressed, and that is a path forward in making sure we have a strong postal system in this country, as we have had for over 200 years. We need to have a strong, vibrant, financially strong, and sustainable postal system for a long time, for as long as we are going to be a country.

The nature of our needs and the way we communicate has changed dramatically. I remember finding in my parents' home, oh gosh, about 5 or 6 years ago, when, after my dad had died, my mom was going to move out of her home in Florida up close to my sister in Kentucky, this treasure trove of love letters my parents exchanged during World War II. For others of you whose parents have been in similar situations and whose folks were part of the ''greatest generation,'' you may have uncovered a treasure trove of letters like that as well. They wrote literally every day—just about every day through the war.

I remember that the happiest days I spent in Southeast Asia, in the several tours I served there in the early 1970s, the happiest days for us each week were the days we got the mail. Those were the best days—letters from home, cards, postcards, newspapers, magazines. Those were great days.

Our troops in Afghanistan still get mail. They still get letters and postcards and birthday cards, Father's Day and Mother's Day cards, but it is different because they have Skype and cell phones and a lot of other ways to communicate.

I asked my staff recently to go back 12 years ago to when I first came here and tell me how many e-mails we got for every letter we sent—tell me how many e-mails we got for every letter we sent and received. It turns out for every 1 e-mail we received, we received 10 or 12 letters. That was just like 10 or 12 years ago. Then I asked them to tell me what it is today, and it has flipped. It is just the opposite. For every letter we get, we receive roughly 10 or 12 e-mails. So the way we communicate in this country has changed, and that is just one clear example of it for us here on Capitol Hill.

The Postal Service has struggled much like the U.S. auto industry did in the last decade or two to try to make a go of it. The auto industry found themselves in a situation where they had more plants than they needed, more suppliers than they needed, they had really in some ways more different models than they needed, and they had, sadly, more employees than they needed given their market share, which was about 85 percent when I was in Southeast Asia, and it dropped to about 45 percent 3 or 4 years ago. Fortunately, the auto industry in this country has revived, is vibrant, and is coming back. They are hiring and building cars—award-winning, highly energy efficient cars.

The auto industry was an industry that had to retool itself and right size itself for the 21st century, and they have done that and done it well. The big three in the United States are back and building some of the best cars in the world. We are proud of the work they do, and they are not only hiring people but are paying bonuses to their people, and it has turned out to be a really great success story. These were companies that were literally going into bankruptcy—GM, Chrysler—not that many years ago. They are back, and we are a better country. Thank God we helped them get back. And Ford builds great vehicles.

What do we do about the Postal Service? The Postal Service has about 7 million people working for it or who have jobs that are related or are connected directly or indirectly to the Postal Service—7 million jobs. What do we do about them?

I think what we need to do and are trying to do is contained in the legislation Dr. COBURN and I are introducing tonight, which we have worked on for the last 6 months. I really thank him and his staff, especially Chris Barkley, who is here on the floor with us, who has worked very closely and hard with John Kilvington, who is a member of the majority staff at the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee.

We want to thank a lot of people, Democratic and Republican staff, majority and minority staff, for the terrific work they have done to try to find the middle, to focus on that 80 percent we can agree on, and the 20 percent we can't agree on, we will put off until another day.

The legislation we have written, put simply, addresses how we make possible and ensure that this Postal Service—which was literally spelled out and called for in our Constitution all those years ago—is still relevant today; that it is able to be financially viable today and help meet our communication needs today in a different age, in a digital age. They can do this. They can do this. There is a lot in the legislation that will help make that possible.

We have not written a perfect bill. The ones I have ever written or coauthored or authored, believe it or not, are not perfect. We do our best, and then we introduce the legislation and ask other people who have similar or different views to tell us what they like about our legislation and what they do not like.

In introducing this legislation, we would invite folks from around the country, whether they happen to be residents, consumers, people living in homes, families who rely on the mail, whether they happen to be businesses that use the mail broadly or whether they happen to be folks who send out magazines or catalogs or other nonprofit groups or other folks who work for the Postal Service, the employees, those who are retired, the customers of the Postal Service—we welcome their input as they have a chance to look over what we have written. We ask them to see if they can help us make it better.

Over in the House of Representatives, Congressmen ISSA and CUMMINGS have been working, along with their colleagues, on legislation. It has been reported out of committee over there, I think on a party-line vote.

One of the things that was important to me was to write a bipartisan bill. Dr. COBURN wanted us to write a bipartisan bill. Neither one of us got everything we wanted. The nature of compromise is there are some things that, frankly, you are not all that enamored with, and that is the case here. Our pledge going forward is to continue to work together, to ask Democrats and Republicans to help us improve on this legislation.

The challenge for us is this: In a digital age where people use Skype and Internet and Twitter and all, how do we enable the Postal Service to use what is truly unique—and it is a unique company, if you will; it is a public-private company, although a big company, the second largest employer in the country, and it is a business that goes to every mailbox in this country 5 to 6 days a week—to make a profit, to be financially sustainable, and to meet our communication needs without a huge ongoing reliance from the taxpayer, from the Treasury, to do that? I think they can do it. I think they can do it. I think the legislation we have written will help make that possible.

I want to say a special thanks to a number of folks. I want to thank the Postal Service, led by Pat Donahoe, the Postmaster General; the Board of Governors there, which is part of the Postal Service: the folks who represent hundreds of thousands of postal workers through the union; the businesses across the country that use and rely on the Postal Service; and a lot of customers—regular people who have given us their ideas and shared their ideas with us from towns large and small, cities and States large and small. We

look forward to their input and their criticism—constructive, we hope—to make this legislation even better.

I would again say to our staffs who worked so hard to get us to this point a very special thank you.

To our colleagues on both sides of the aisle, we look forward to working with you to make what we think is a good bill even better. I like to say that everything I do, I know I can do better. If it isn't perfect, make it better. And my last thought on this is that the road to improvement is always under construction.

So we have some more work to do, and we will take what is a good bipartisan bill and hopefully make it a lot better.

Madam President, with that, I will say good night to you. I look forward to seeing you in about 5 or 6 weeks. My best to you and the people you so ably represent in New Hampshire. God bless.

With that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

THANKING STAFF

Mr. REID. Madam President, I appreciate the Presiding Officer's patience in waiting for us to wrap up things.

Let me say a word very quickly about the staff. I wish everyone a good August. It has been an extremely difficult first 7 months of this congressional period. We got a lot done, and I appreciate very much all the hard work of everyone.

I have said before, but not recently, that we get a lot of things done around here—not nearly as much as we should—but it is the result of all the work that is done by those here and the scores of other people we don't see that are back there doing all kinds of things to make this place work, all the committee staff, the police officers but especially the floor staff.

As we talked earlier today about some departures we have here, one of the good things we have is that in all the time I have been here, as far I am aware—there could have been instances, but I am unaware of any, where there was bitterness expressed publicly and, as far as I know, privately between each other. I haven't seen that. I appreciate very much the good work we do for the Senate. The staff is not partisan in the work for their bosses that they try to get done, and we can only do that through them.

I am so grateful for all they do for the Senate leadership, all the Senators, and the country. Words are not adequate for me to express that, but I truly do appreciate all they do.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S.1392

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that at 11 a.m. on Tuesday, September, 10, 2013, the motion to proceed to S. 1392 be agreed to and the Senate proceed to consideration of the legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

INTERCHANGE FEE RULEMAKING

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I rise to speak about a Federal court ruling handed down yesterday that represents a tremendous victory for consumers and Main Street businesses across America.

This ruling has to do with debit card swipe fees. Yesterday, a Federal judge in D.C. called for the Federal Reserve to lower the approximately 24 cent cap it set on debit swipe fees to a level that more closely reflects the actual cost of a debit transaction.

This decision is a major win for Main Street merchants and their customers.

It was urgently needed, because this decision corrects flaws in the Fed's rulemaking that had allowed Visa and MasterCard to triple the swipe fees they impose on many coffeeshops, convenience stores, restaurants and other merchants.

I had filed an amicus brief in this court case, since the case involved a rulemaking based on a law that I had authored. I am very pleased that the court ruled the way it did, and I will take a minute to explain why.

For years, I have been sounding the alarm about swipe fees, also known as interchange fees.

The swipe fee is a hidden fee that is charged on every debit or credit card transaction. It is a fee that a merchant has to pay to a bank when the merchant accepts a credit or debit card that the bank issued. The fee is taken as a cut out of the transaction amount.

These swipe fees are harmful to consumers and to our economy. They are hidden, they are anti-competitive, and they end up raising the price of everything we buy at retail.

It is important to understand how these fees work.

The vast majority of bank fees are set in a transparent and competitive market environment, with each bank setting its own fee rate and competing over them. But that is not the case with swipe fees.

With swipe fees, the big banks decided they would designate the two giant card companies, Visa and MasterCard, to set fees for all of them. That way each bank could get the same high fee on a card transaction without having to worry about competition.

Swipe fees have no transparency. Most customers and most merchants have no idea what kind of swipe fee is being charged when they use a debit or credit card.

The swipe fee system became an enormous money-maker for Visa, MasterCard and the banks. They were collecting an estimated $16 billion in debit swipe fees and $30 billion in credit fees each year.

Those billions are paid by every merchant, charity, school, and government agency that accepts payment by card—and the costs are passed on to American consumers in the form of higher prices.

By 2010, the U.S. swipe fee system was growing out of control with no end in sight. U.S. swipe fee rates had become the highest in the world—far exceeding the actual costs of conducting a debit or credit transaction.

There were no market forces serving to keep fees at a reasonable level. There was no competition and no choice. Merchants and their customers were being forced to subsidize billions in windfall fees to the big banks.

I knew we had to change this situation.

This is an issue of fundamental importance to our economy. Our nation is moving from a currency based on paper cash and checks to a system where American dollars are mostly exchanged through electronic transactions.

We cannot allow Visa, MasterCard and the big banks to dominate the electronic payments system and use it to enrich themselves at consumers' expense. Remember, this is America's currency we are talking about. We have to ensure transparency, competition and fairness when it comes to electronic payments involving U.S. dollars.

So I stepped in and introduced an amendment to the 2010 Wall Street Reform bill that for the first time placed reasonable regulation over debit swipe fees.

My amendment said that if the Nation's biggest banks are going to let Visa and MasterCard fix swipe fee rates for them, then the rates must be reasonable and proportional to the cost of processing a transaction. No more unreasonably high debit swipe fees for big banks.

My amendment passed the Senate with 64 votes and it was signed into law with the rest of Wall Street reform.

The swipe fee reform law that I wrote directed the Federal Reserve to issue regulations to bring down debit swipe fee rates.

In December 2010, the Fed issued a proposed rulemaking that called for debit swipe fees to be capped at 7 to 12 cents per transaction.

This was a significant reduction from what had been a 44 cent average debit swipe fee, though it still allowed banks

to easily cover their debit transaction costs, which the Fed pegged at just a few cents.

However, after the Fed issued the draft rule, the big banks and card network giants turned their lobbyists loose on them. It was a lobbying stampede.

They pressured the Fed to raise the debit swipe fee cap to a level far higher than 12 cents, because they claimed that there were all sorts of additional costs that the Fed forgot to include in its analysis.

The Fed gave in, and in June 2011 issued a final rule that raised the cap level to about 24 cents—much higher than the actual cost of a debit transaction.

Predictably, Visa, MasterCard and the big banks took advantage of this watered-down regulation that they had lobbied for. Visa and MasterCard promptly jacked up any swipe fee rates that were below 24 cents so that this 24 cent ceiling became a floor.

With Visa and MasterCard's rate increases, stores that mainly handle small dollar purchases like coffeeshops, convenience stores, and fast food restaurants are now paying far more in swipe fees than they did before.

These merchants used to be charged debit fees that were a percentage of the purchase amount, and now they are charged around 24 cents no matter how small the purchase. Their customers ultimately pay the price.

This was not a flaw in the law, which required a ''reasonable and proportional'' fee. Instead, it showed the danger of watering down the regulations that implement these laws. The banks and card companies lobbied the Fed for a loophole and when they got one, they ran through it.

After the Fed issued its final rule and Visa and MasterCard promptly raised their swipe fee rates to the cap level wherever they could, a coalition of merchants led by the convenience stores filed a lawsuit in federal court.

They argued that the Fed failed to follow the law in issuing its final regulation. They urged the court to order the Fed to rewrite its regulation in compliance with the statute.

I filed an amicus brief in this case in support of the merchants' position. In my brief, I pointed out that when the Fed doubled its swipe fee cap between the initial rulemaking and the final rulemaking, the Fed cited the need to cover certain costs that the statute explicitly prohibited the Fed from including.

The bottom line, I argued, was that the Fed came far closer to following the statute in its draft rulemaking than after it had bent toward the banks in its final rulemaking.

The court agreed, and yesterday it ordered the Fed to rewrite its rules in compliance with what the law provides.

Here's a key quote from the court's opinion: ''The court concludes that the Board has clearly disregarded Congress's statutory intent by inappropriately inflating all debit card transaction fees by billions of dollars.''

The court also pointed out the problem with Visa and MasterCard's swipe fee increases on small dollar transactions. The Court said:

> By including in the interchange fee standard costs that are expressly prohibited by the statute, the final regulation represents a significant price increase over pre-Durbin Amendment rates for small-ticket debit transactions under the $12 threshold. Congress did not empower the Board to make policy judgments that would result in significantly higher interchange rates.

The court concluded that the Fed must rewrite its regulation to lower the debit fee cap and to halt Visa and MasterCard's fee increases on merchants for small dollar transactions.

Now, this process of rewriting the regulations will take some time, and I suspect there may be more litigation before this issue is over.

But this court ruling marks a tremendous win for Main Street merchants and their customers who deserve the swipe fee relief that the law provided for.

Fortunately for the Fed, there are some clear roadmaps for how it can fix its regulation. I pointed out in my amicus brief that the Fed's initial rulemaking, with its 7 to 12 cent cap, came far closer to reflecting the actual costs that Congress instructed the Fed to look at.

The Fed should look again to its initial rulemaking as it works to rewrite its final rule.

And just last week, the European Commission announced that it would seek to cap debit swipe fee rates throughout the European Union at 0.2 percent of the transaction.

Given that the average debit transaction is about $38, that works out to an average cap of about 7 cents- right where the Fed was in its initial rule.

Congressman PETER WELCH and I sent a letter last week urging the Fed to closely review the European Commission's debit fee cap and to incorporate it in the Fed's debit fee regulation. I believe the Fed will find the Commission's analysis and conclusions to be very helpful in rewriting its final rule.

As we move forward on the path of reasonable swipe fee reform, I should note that Visa, MasterCard and the banking industry are probably not too pleased with this court decision.

I suspect they will be up here on Capitol Hill very soon, screaming bloody murder and arguing that this court decision means the end of the world.

I just want to point out that the banks and card companies have been spreading myths and using scare tactics about swipe fee reform for years. None of them have come true.

They argued that swipe fee reform would devastate small banks. Yet separate studies by the Fed, GAO and the FTC have all found that the exemption I wrote in the law for small banks has worked as intended.

As it turns out, small banks and credit unions have thrived since this law took effect. Why? Because under my amendment, small banks and credit unions can continue to receive the same high interchange rates from Visa and MasterCard they got before far higher than the rates that their big bank competitors now receive.

Also, the big banks argued that they would have to jack up fees on consumers to make up for the lost revenue from swipe fees.

But we haven't seen that happen either, because there is transparency and competition when it comes to bank fees on consumers. In fact, we've gotten more transparency on these fees in the past few years as many banks have adopted a fee disclosure form developed by the Pew Charitable Trusts that I have strongly supported.

As the banks' other scare tactics have faded away, they have resorted to arguing that the problem with swipe reform is that merchants haven't passed along enough swipe fee savings to consumers.

This was a pretty hypocritical argument for them to make, because they knew that Visa and MasterCard had raised many swipe fee rates after reform took effect—a direct result of the higher cap that they had lobbied for.

But even though many merchants have suffered under those swipe fee increases, we have still seen aggressive price competition and discounting by retailers since swipe fee reform took effect. Consumers have benefitted from this price competition, and they will benefit even more from this court ruling.

In closing, I note that yesterday's court decision marks another important step in the effort to make sure the electronic payments system is reasonable and fair for American consumers and businesses. Our work is not over yet, but we are making great progress.

I want to thank my colleagues and all the consumers, merchants and advocates across America who have joined me in this effort. This marks a big win for Main Street over Wall Street, and it wouldn't have been possible without this excellent coalition.

TRIBUTE TO GLENN POSHARD

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I would like to thank Dr. Glenn Poshard for all he has done for Southern Illinois University and for his 40 years of public service to Illinois.

After more than 7 years as president of Southern Illinois University, Dr. Poshard will be retiring next year. Under Dr. Poshard's leadership, Southern Illinois University has been able to keep tuition costs low and the university's finances sound, despite the financial problems that have plagued the State.

Throughout his career, Dr. Poshard worked for the people of southern Illinois. He was born in Herald, IL, and graduated from Carmi Township High School. He left Illinois to serve his country in the U.S. Army in Korea,

where he received a commendation for outstanding service.

Following his military service, Dr. Poshard returned to Illinois and used the G.I. bill to earn a bachelor's degree in secondary education, a master's degree in health education, and a Ph.D. in higher education administration. He received all three degrees from Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.

Appointed to the Illinois State Senate in 1984, Dr. Poshard held the seat until the people of the 22nd Congressional District sent him to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1989. During his 10 years in Congress, Dr. Poshard was a strong proponent of campaign finance reform. When he ran for Governor in 1998, he limited individual donations to his campaign and refused to accept contributions from political action committees.

Following his tenure in Congress, Dr. Poshard and his wife Jo founded the Poshard Foundation for Abused Children. For the last 14 years, the Poshard Foundation has helped children who have been victims of abuse, abandonment, or neglect in southern Illinois.

After a 40-year affiliation with the university, Dr. Poshard is leaving his beloved SIU in good shape. At SIU, Dr. Poshard has been a student, a student worker, a civil service worker, an adjunct professor, vice chancellor for administration, and now as he retires—the second longest serving president in the history of the Southern Illinois University system, an experience he calls ''the greatest honor of my life.''

I congratulate Glenn on his distinguished career and thank him for dedicating his life to public service. I wish him and his family all the best.

POLITICAL PRISONERS AND POLITICAL REPRESSION IN RUSSIA

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, over the years I have come to the floor to raise the plight of political prisoners being held around the globe. These have included journalists, activists, bloggers, musicians, and opposition candidates who all had the misfortune of landing in an autocrat's jail for exercising or advocating for basic freedoms that most of the world takes for granted.

Many of these cases are ones that have received little attention or are not in the world's media spotlight, including: Gambian journalist Ebrima Manneh, who has been held incommunicado since 2006 and probably has died in detention; Vietnamese blogger Dieu Cay, who was jailed for 12 years for anti-state propaganda and is in poor health due to a hunger strike amid his president's recent visit to Washington; Saudi blogger Hamza Kashgari, who was grabbed off a plane in Malaysia while fleeing for his safety and returned to Saudi Arabia to face charges of blasphemy; Turkmen political dissident and human rights activist Gulgeldy Annaniyazov, who has been in jail since 2008; and Belarusian opposition candidate Mikalai, who was thrown in jail for having the temerity to run against his country's strongman, President Lukashenko.

Many of my colleagues here have helped with these efforts, including 11 other Senators who recently joined in a letter to Uzbek President Karimov asking for the release of activist Akzam Turgunov and journalists Dilmurod Saidov and Salijon Abdurakhmanov.

Others have also championed the cause of political freedom around the world, including Senators MCCAIN and CARDIN, who have been leaders in trying to hold our Russian friends to a higher standard of political and human rights freedom.

In fact, Senator CARDIN was tireless in his effort to pass the Magnitsky law—a law that I supported—that tried to bring about some measure of accountability regarding the death of Russian lawyer Sergei Magnitsky, who was jailed after exposing official corruption and later died from mistreatment while in custody.

I have also watched with great dismay the deterioration of democracy and human rights in Russia.

A few years ago I had the chance to speak to the Lithuanian Parliament on that country's—the country of my mother's birth—20th anniversary of independence from the Soviet Union. One of the other speakers on that memorable occasion was Russian democrat small ''d'' democrat—Yuriy Afanasyev.

Many probably did not realize or have forgotten that during those heady days in the early 1990s a number of countries—such as Lithuania—were early in declaring independence and, as a result, helped change history in Eastern Europe.

And who helped support many such efforts?

Russian democrats in the streets of Moscow—the same ones who were also instrumental in bringing a transition to democracy in their own country.

Afanasyev was just such a Russian. He helped lead large public protests in Moscow during the January 1991 crackdown against Lithuania's independence movement.

That is why I find myself so saddened by what is happening in Russia today—the systematic state-sponsored harassment and dismantling of those Russian citizens and organizations that are still hoping for a democratic and free Russia so many years later.

Just 2 weeks ago, the Russian government tried and convicted popular opposition leader and candidate for mayor of Moscow Alesksei Navalny on charges that had already been thrown out as baseless after a local investigation.

If his conviction is upheld, he will be banned from public office for life.

Navalny's case is just one of a long list of politically motivated charges and actions in recent years used to squash any criticism of the Russian government or those who might want to run for political office:

A few weeks ago, hundreds of protesters were detained by Russian Interior Ministry personnel when protesting Navalny's dubious conviction—a fate met by scores of nonviolent protesters in recent years;

As of March of this year, the Russian Federal Security Service accompanied by tax enforcement and other government personnel has raided thousands of NGOs across Russia, seizing documents and interrogating staff—all in an orchestrated intimidation campaign;

Opposition leader Boris Nemtsov has been arrested multiple times for peacefully protesting government policies;

Deputy editor-in-chief of Russian newspaper Novaya Gazeta Sergei Sokolov fled Russia after the chief federal investigator took him into the forest and threatened to decapitate him;

Doctor of Political Sciences at Kuban State University Mikhail Savva, who was a member of the that region's Public Oversight Committee and an outspoken voice against corruption was arrested in April and has been held without bail on flimsy charges;

Leader of For Human Rights, Lev Ponomaryov, a prominent human rights advocacy group in Moscow, was kicked and beaten during a forceful eviction of his organization from their headquarters. The assault was carried out by men dressed in civilian clothing, but was observed by riot police officers;

Lastly—and very symbolic of the hundreds arrested at recent protests—human rights activist Nikolay Kavkazsky was arrested last year at his home for allegedly hitting a policeman during a protest although an independent investigation implies he was in fact dodging blows from a policeman.

Let me take a moment to pause and mention an extraordinary story and photo from the Washington Post of Russian schoolteacher Marina Rozumovskaya, standing alone in front of Moscow City Hall in the freezing Russian winter in January of 2011.

In the photo she is holding an 8 by 11 inch sign that said ''Freedom to political prisoners'' in response to the arrest and jailing of a prominent opposition leader who had criticized the Russian government.

Watching and waiting for her to break the law across the street in the 10 degree weather were a dozen or so Russian police officers.

This brave schoolteacher told the Washington Post, ''If you don't exercise your rights as a citizen, nothing will ever change.''

The Russian government has also used almost paranoid legislation to restrict Russian human rights and election monitoring organizations from doing their work.

For example, in March of 2013, Russian officials raided the offices of hundreds of non-governmental organizations, including Amnesty International.

Equally troubling, Russia's largest elections watchdog GOLOS, and its executive director Lilia Shibanova, were

fined for failing to register as a ''foreign agent,'' even after receiving the prestigious Sakharov Prize by the Norwegian Helsinki Committee and rejecting the monetary portion of the award.

Russia has also passed draconian laws that include fines equivalent to an average annual salary for taking part in unsanctioned protests, stiffer libel penalties, a broader definition of treason, and restrictions on websites—laws that former Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev has denounced as an ''attack on the rights of citizens.''

Earlier this year Gorbachev also warned Russian President Putin ''not to be afraid of his own people.''

Remember Sergei Magnitsky, the Russian who tried to draw attention to massive police and tax fraud who died in Russian custody? He was convicted a few weeks ago of perpetrating fraud himself—4 years after he died.

After what many brave Russian democrats did for countries such as Lithuania and others breaking free from the Soviet Union, we owe it to speak up for those who are fighting for basic political freedoms today in Russia.

These endless show trials are not for criminals or foreign agent organizations. They are not worthy of a great nation.

These are petty attacks on patriotic Russians who want the freedom to peacefully criticize and improve their government, to run for office, to have clean elections, and to have an independent judiciary that is not used to quash political opponents.

The Russian people—our friends—deserve better than to have such aspirations so brazenly and so shortsightedly repressed.

SMARTER SENTENCING ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, yesterday, I introduced the Smarter Sentencing Act, bipartisan legislation that would reform our drug sentencing laws to make Federal sentencing policy smarter, fairer, and more fiscally responsible.

This bill, which is cosponsored by Republican Senator MIKE LEE and Judiciary Committee chairman PATRICK LEAHY, would reduce certain mandatory minimum sentences for nonviolent drug offenses and give Federal judges more ability to impose individualized sentences for certain offenders. These modest changes will allow Federal law enforcement to focus limited government resources on the most serious offenders and public safety risks.

Why is this legislation needed? Let's look at where we are as a country. We incarcerate more individuals, including per capita, than any other nation in the world. Our rivals, with far lower incarceration rates, include countries like Rwanda, Cuba, China, and the Russian Federation.

And our incarceration rates are only growing over time. We have 500 percent more inmates in our Federal prisons than we did 30 years ago. For example, in 1980 we had fewer than 25,000 in Federal custody, and today there are more than 219,000.

Our Federal prison system is at nearly 40 percent over capacity—with more than 50 percent overcrowding at high-security facilities. As the Government Accountability Office has explained, this overcrowding is not only creating financial strain, but it is jeopardizing the safety of both inmates and prison guards.

And who are we incarcerating with our limited resources? Nearly 50 percent of Federal inmates are serving sentences for drug offenses.

Let's be clear: The price tag for this system is unsustainably high in terms of both financial and human costs. What we spend on Federal incarceration has increased more than 1100 percent in the last 30 years. The number was less than $330 million in 1980 and had skyrocketed to more than $6.6 billion by last year.

Our current incarceration policies are swallowing our limited law enforcement budget and forcing choices that many lawmakers and taxpayers would not agree with. Incarceration and detention costs account for nearly a third of the Department of Justice's discretionary budget. This threatens funding for Federal prosecutions, Federal law enforcement, funding and grant money for State and local law enforcement, and support for treatment, intervention, and reentry programs.

In the era of sequestration, we are faced with a choice: We can either change our sentencing policies or potentially suffer an erosion in public safety. We need to take steps to control Federal prison spending now or we will face significant cuts in the resources available for other pressing criminal justice priorities like making sure there are police on the streets, crime prevention programs in place, and an ability for offenders to reintegrate into their communities rather than become safety risks.

Many States across the country recognize that we are at a crossroads and they are pursuing important reforms with a high degree of success. A New York Times article published this week explains the ''new approach to crime'' many States are taking and the resulting decline in State prison populations. The Federal Government should follow suit.

And let's never forget the human costs. We hear every day about heartbreaking cases of mothers, fathers, uncles, aunts, and children who are behind bars for far too long sometimes decades—for nonviolent offenses. This harms communities and families.

One such case is a woman I came to know well, Eugenia Jennings. Because of unjust sentencing laws, she was incarcerated in Federal prison at the age of 23 for more than two decades for a nonviolent drug offense involving the exchange of a small amount of drugs for clothing. Eugenia had three children who were forced to grow up without their mother.

Even the sentencing judge acknowledged the injustice of Eugenia's sentence, lamenting ''there is nothing this court could do'' because of the laws that existed. Eugenia was a model prisoner winning awards, completing substance abuse programs, and serving as a model employee who worked at a call center and sewed thousands of pairs of shorts for the military. Eugenia suffered from a serious and rare form of cancer while in Federal custody. Eugenia would still be serving a sentence today—a sentence that would be costing taxpayers hundreds of thousands of dollars and depriving children of a mother—had it not been for the highly unusual grant of a Presidential commutation. Who benefited from the many years Eugenia spent in prison?

How do we fix this problem or at least take an important step toward solving it? We have learned that our exploding prison population is in large part due to ineffective sentencing laws and the increasing number and length of Federal mandatory minimum sentences. Mandatory sentences, particularly drug sentences, can take individualized review out of a judge's hands by requiring a one-size-fits-all sentence imposed by Congress. And the number of Federal mandatory sentences has doubled during the last 20 years.

More than 60 percent of Federal district court judges agree that existing mandatory minimums for all offenses are too high. Many think they are just bad policy. Justice Anthony Kennedy said: ''I am in agreement with most judges in the federal system that mandatory minimums are an imprudent, unwise and often unjust mechanism for sentencing.''

The Judicial Conference of the United States, which represents all Federal judges, has ''consistently opposed mandatory minimum sentences for more than 50 years.'' The bipartisan U.S. Sentencing Commission recently said, after studying this issue in a 369-page report, ''[T]he Commission unanimously believes that certain mandatory minimum penalties apply too broadly, are excessively severe, and are applied inconsistently. . . .''

We subject our Federal judges to a rigorous confirmation process. Congress should allow these judges to use their legal and law enforcement expertise to do their jobs and not micromanage their sentencing decisions. It is important in achieving both justice and public safety to have sentences tailored to the individual facts, background, and circumstances of each case and defendant. Only the judge who hears a case has the ability to set such a sentence.

We are at a crucial moment in history. We can no longer afford sentencing policies that are not working, are draining limited Federal funds, are leading to unjust sentences, and are failing to make our families and communities safer.

As a result of these problems, some of the country's leading sentencing experts have called for the repeal of all Federal mandatory minimums. The Smarter Sentencing Act takes more modest but important steps in modernizing drug sentencing policy.

First, it modestly expands the existing Federal safety valve, which allows Federal judges to sentence certain nonviolent drug offenders below existing mandatory minimum sentences. This change will only apply to certain nonviolent drug offenses that do not involve weapons. It is supported by nearly 70 percent of Federal district court judges.

Second, the bill will permit those serving sentences that Congress has determined are unjust and racially disparate to petition for a reduction in their sentence. I authored the bipartisan Fair Sentencing Act in 2009 to help reduce the sentencing disparity between crack and powder cocaine offenses and to eliminate the mandatory minimum sentence for simple possession of crack cocaine. While African Americans were approximately 30 percent of crack users, they comprised more than 80 percent of those convicted of Federal crack offenses.

The bill passed the Senate unanimously. As one Judiciary Committee Republican stated, ''[W]e are not able to defend'' the unfair sentences that existed before the Fair Sentencing Act—sentences that disproportionately affected African Americans. Another stated that these changes were ''long overdue'' and that ''Congress should act without any more delay to start to reduce the sentencing disparity.'' A third Republican member of the Judiciary Committee stated, ''The law created inequities. . . . We are working and will continue to work to roll back the injustice that was done.''

Because of the timing of their sentences, some individuals are still in jail serving lengthy, pre-Fair Sentencing Act sentences that Congress has determined are unfair. To be clear, the Smarter Sentencing Act does not automatically reduce a single sentence in this respect. But it allows individuals sentenced under the old crack-powder sentencing disparity to petition courts and prosecutors for a review of their case, consistent with changes in the law made by the Fair Sentencing Act. Considering all of the circumstances, including public safety and the nature of the offense, a judge can grant or deny any petition. Federal courts successfully and efficiently conducted similar crack-related sentence reviews after 2007 and 2011 changes to the Sentencing Guidelines. Based on recent U.S. Sentencing Commission data, this change in the law alone could significantly reduce prison overcrowding and save taxpayers more than $1 billion.

Third, the bill lowers mandatory penalties for certain nonviolent drug offenses. These modifications do not apply to, for example, statutory penalties involving firearms or bodily injury. And this bill does not repeal any mandatory minimum sentences. Rather, it reduces certain nonviolent drug mandatory sentences so that judges can determine, based on individual circumstances, when the harshest penalties should apply. Let's allow these judges to do their jobs.

This bill crosses party lines it is a bipartisan compromise from a Republican from Utah and a Democrat from Illinois. This bill is the right thing to do, which is why it is endorsed by faith leaders from the National Association of Evangelicals to the United Methodist Church. This bill would improve public safety, which is why it is endorsed by the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives. And this bill is good policy, which is why it is endorsed by groups on the right and left, ranging from Heritage Action to the ACLU. It is endorsed by Justice Fellowship of Prison Fellowship Ministries, Grover Norquist, the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, the NAACP, the Sentencing Project, Open Society Policy Center, the ABA, the Constitution Project, the National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers, NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Families Against Mandatory Minimums, the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, Drug Policy Alliance, and Brennan Center for Justice, among others.

I thank my partner in this effort, Senator LEE. We have taken many months to study this problem and work together on a bipartisan solution.

I am grateful to Senator LEAHY, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, for joining this effort and, as always, for his leadership on criminal justice reform.

I urge my colleagues to support the Smarter Sentencing Act.

REMEMBERING EDDY SIZEMORE, HERMAN 'LEE' DOBBS, AND JESSE JONES

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I rise today to commemorate the victims of a tragic accident that occurred recently in Clay County, KY. Three heroes were lost when a medical helicopter came down in the parking lot of Paces Creek Elementary School outside the town of Manchester on June 6 of this year. Crewmembers Eddy Sizemore, the pilot, Herman ''Lee'' Dobbs, the flight paramedic, and Jesse Jones, the flight nurse, sadly died in this crash.

The crew of this medical helicopter was returning back to their Manchester base after transporting a patient in urgent need of care to a hospital in London, KY. Medical helicopters help transport patients in remote areas to hospitals where they can receive all necessary medical attention. Sadly, these three crewmembers who worked to save others' lives lost their own.

Pilot Eddy Sizemore was 61 years old and a native of Laurel County, KY. He was a former chief deputy in the Laurel County Sheriff's Office. He worked most of his life in law enforcement, and was a veteran of the U.S. Army; he served his country in Vietnam and was awarded the Bronze Star Medal and the Purple Heart. He is remembered by his three daughters, Stacey Johnson, Kacey Bolton, and Jessica Sizemore; his son, Justin Sizemore; his father, Frank Sizemore; his brother, Jerry Sizemore; the mother and stepmother of his children, Pam Brock Sizemore; 10 grandchildren; and many other family members and friends.

Flight paramedic Herman ''Lee'' Dobbs, of London, KY, was 40 years old. He had worked for Knox County EMS and had a love of horses that led to his being put in charge of a horseback search unit for the Knox County Special Operations Response Team. He is remembered by his wife, Emilee Dobbs; his parents, Herman Dobbs and Patsy Light Dobbs; his children, Jordan, Hayden, and Walker Dobbs; his sister, Lori Crawford; his brother, Chad Dobbs; his aunt, Sherri Blakely; his uncle, Dale Light; his mother-in-law, Candace Hutton; and many other family members and friends.

Flight nurse Jesse Jones was 28 and from Bell County, KY. He graduated from Southeast Kentucky Community and Technical College as a registered nurse in 2007 and then pursued his dream of becoming a flight nurse. He is remembered by his grandparents, Mac and Ruby Jones; his son, Tyson Lee Jones; his father, Eddie Gene Jones; his stepmother, Patricia Maye Jones; his brother, Wiley Gene Jones; and many other family members and friends.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that an article that was published recently in a southeastern Kentucky publication describing the very moving memorial service held for the three crewmembers of the tragic Air Evac 109 flight be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Whitley County Times-Tribune, June 17, 2013]

''GOD SPEED AND BLUE SKIES''

AIR EVAC 109 CREW REMEMBERED

(By Jeff Noble)

CORBIN.—After the funerals of three of their crew members last week, it was time for Air Evac Lifeteam to remember Eddy Sizemore, Jesse Jones and Lee Dobbs.

On Saturday morning the company did just that, during an emotional and moving memorial service in London.

Outside the North Laurel High School Gymnasium, the weather was sunny and the skies blue, when an estimated 300 persons—including the families of the three who died, as well as Air Evac crews and first responders from Kentucky and other states as far away as Missouri, Illinois, Minnesota and North Carolina—came to say goodbye to their brothers who paid the ultimate price while doing their duty.

For all of them, the memory of what happened on that late Thursday night, June 6, will forever be seared in their hearts and minds.

Sizemore was the pilot. Jones was the flight nurse. Dobbs was the flight paramedic. All three died when their medical helicopter crashed in the parking lot of Paces Creek Elementary School in Clay County, just about 150 yards from the helipad where the crew is based in Manchester.

For the crews, it was their time to mourn. To persevere. And to have closure.

It was Pastor Donald Sims, of the City of Hope Community Fellowship in Manchester, whose opening prayer began the memorial service.

''Lord, be with the families, their friends, and bring hope, healing and comfort to all who are here,'' he prayed.

From the St. Louis suburb of O'Fallon, Missouri, came Air Evac Lifeteam's president, Seth Myers. He was the first speaker at the service, and told the audience and his employees, ''It with a heavy heart that I stand here. To honor the life of Eddy Sizemore, Lee Dobbs and Jesse Jones.''

He spoke of the three who perished, and spoke of the many first responders who came to pay their respects.

''I see uniforms of all colors. They all represent one thing. That's the dedication to serve others. The attendance today is a testament of these three people who served. They loved doing what they did, and the crews working with them. They helped to save lives and make a difference in peoples' lives. They're gone from us today, but they'll never be forgotten,'' Myers said.

He then read a letter from a woman, thanking the crews for their service.

''I can't imagine the emotions at this time, but you will work as a team and persevere . . . For Eddy, Lee and Jesse, their impact lives on in the life of every person they saved . . . I challenge you to move forward. A Japanese proverb said, 'Fall down seven times, stand up eight.' Signed, Mandy Curley,'' the letter said.

Eulogies were given for all three members of the helicopter crew by friends and family. Eddy Sizemore was remembered first.

''My definition of a hero is someone laying down their life helping someone they don't know. All three of those men did. I'm alive and able to stand on this stage today, because of Eddy's experience as a helicopter pilot. Eddy saved my life,'' said Officer Chuck Johnson of the Laurel County Sheriff's Department.

Johnson recalled riding with Sizemore as a spotter during a marijuana search in 2005 when both worked together with the sheriff's office. They were in the air when the chopper hit guy wires, then plunged to earth, hit the ground and skidded 96 feet on the blacktop. Johnson said it was Sizemore's skills, and cool in the hot seat, that brought the chopper down safely.

''I believe that God has a plan of a mission of all of us here on Earth. On that day, our mission wasn't finished. On June 6th, Eddy's mission was complete, and he was called home,'' he pointed out.

There was another side to Sizemore. A lighter side that permeated the workplace, and gave Johnson and his co-workers a wealth of what he affectionately called ''Eddy Stories.''

''He loved to sit and laugh and loved to cut up with us. Eddy loved to keep people entertained. He also liked to cheat at playing Rook during our times we worked the night shift years ago with the Sheriff's Office . . . Eddy always had our back. All of us who worked with him will continue to mourn. There was only one Eddy Sizemore,'' Johnson said.

Kathy Guyn spoke next. She remembered when Jesse Jones was in her nursing classes at the Pineville campus of Southeast Community and Technical College.

''He was the type of student everyone liked. Fun-loving, and had a good time. Jesse was very intelligent. He wanted to be a nurse. He made his patients feel very important, and that they were the most important person in the hospital. He loved to hunt. On more than one occasion he would remind me and the other teachers that it was the beginning of deer season. And he loved his family, especially his grandparents. When he graduated, he told me he wanted to be a flight nurse. He was meant to be in the skies. If I needed a flight nurse, I would want Jesse Jones, because I know he was the best,'' she stated.

Eliza Brooks started her nursing career with Jones at Pineville Community Hospital. She also spoke on behalf of Jesse's family.

''He had an eagerness to learn more. My husband also worked at the hospital, and he and Jesse became friends . . . We would serve lasagna for Jesse every deer season, and on Christmas, our family had a camouflage stocking for Jesse. To the family, we want to thank you for sharing Jesse with us. He loved all of you. He lived life every day to the fullest. He was always loving, kind and compassionate. He knew what to do, and never looked back. The sky was not the limit for Jesse,'' she said, holding back tears.

Letch Day, of Air Methods Corporation, gave the first of two eulogies for Lee Dobbs, the last of the crew of three that Day called ''Our fallen heroes, our fallen brothers.''

''To know Lee was an honor. He was a strong-willed person. EMS was his job. It was his life. It was his passion. The one letter to describe Lee was 'C' character, caring, compassion, commitment, companion, and childhood hero. His character was what propelled him to excellence. He loved and cared for his family. And he cared for his family and others with compassion and commitment. He was to others a companion, and to his children, a childhood hero to them,'' he said.

Day then looked at Dobbs's three sons and told them, ''Your Dad. He is a hero. Don't ever forget that.''

Lee's own father, Herman Dobbs, took the stage next. His voice cracked as he began to weep, while talking about the son he lost almost two weeks ago.

''Knowing Lee as my son, he would have said, Dad, did you tell the Jones family, and the Sizemore family, I'm sorry for their loss? They were my partners.' That's what he'd want me to say. He was my son. We tried to bring him up that way. I'm just so thankful the Lord gave me a son like that,'' Dobbs said, his voice choked with emotion.

In the place where the North Laurel High Jaguars held court, there were three wreaths on the stage—one each for the three fallen crew members. In the middle of each wreath was a picture of each of them. On each side of the stage was a large video screen, which showed pictures and moments of the lives of Lee, Eddy and Jesse. The seats on the gym floor were reserved for family members and Air Evac employees. When the doors opened at 10 a.m. for the service, the seats quickly filled, with other Air Evac crews and first responders joining the general public on the home side of the bleacher seats.

Two Air Methods Corporation employees from Missouri—Ray Haven and his wife, Veronica—sang the inspirational song ''I Will Rise.'' Ray played acoustic guitar, while he and Veronica sang the duet.

Towards the end of the service, three recorded songs were played over the speakers while the audience watched the visual montage of the three men they called ''their family.''

One was the song ''You Never Let Go,'' followed by ''Shine Your Light,'' a tribute to first responders by Robbie Robertson, a former member of The Band. The set ended with an encore of ''You Never Let Go.''

When that ended, Brian Jackson, the program director of Air Evac 109 in Manchester, came to the stage, accompanied by nine crew members. Some of the crew shared stories and lighthearted moments about their work with Lee, Jesse and Eddy.

Several in the audience got some good laughs from the stories, which a nearby person in the bleacher seats said they needed.

Jackson told the crews and first responders, ''Thank you for your prayers and your support during this time. It really means a lot. We agree. They were brothers to us. They would want me to tell you, Crawl back on that ambulance. Crawl back on that truck. Crawl back on that airplane. Do what you do best.'''

When the Manchester crew finished their final thoughts, they pinned the wings on the wreaths of Dobbs, Sizemore and Jones.

Letch Day returned, and presented a framed print in memory of the three crewmen to the Air Evac 109 base in Manchester.

''We're asking them to be our 'Guardian Angels' in memory of the job they did so well,'' he said.

Jackson and the base crew proudly accepted the print.

Kentucky state flags were presented to the families of the three crewmen by Mike Poynter, the state EMS director. Air Evac Lifeteam flags were also given to the three families, as were three fire helmets brought to them in memory of their fathers, by the Manchester Fire Department.

The tones were heard over the speakers, and the Last Call was given by a dispatcher. When that ended, a piper played ''Amazing Grace'' on the bagpipes as the color guard left the gymnasium. And the service ended.

Nearly everyone who attended went outside to wait for an aircraft flyover. Six helicopters and one airplane hovered overhead for the next five minutes, each one's pilot and crew showing in their own way their own respect and honor for their fallen comrades.

For those up in the air, and on the ground, this past Saturday was their time to remember.

It's a good bet that many of them will forever remember those final words when they heard the crew's last call inside the gymnasium.

''November One-One-Nine Alpha Echo is out of service. God speed and blue skies.''

IMMIGRATION REFORM

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I would like to speak briefly about how the immigration reform bill affects access to health insurance coverage. In particular, I am pleased that the Senate-passed legislation preserves the ability for States to cover lawfully residing pregnant women and children under Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program CHIP. Importantly, States may extend full benefits under these programs to individuals who gain legal status as a result of the bill, including those granted Registered Provisional Immigrant RPI, Blue Card, and V-visa status.

My home State of Washington is one of 27 that have decided to exercise the option to extend these health care benefits to children or pregnant women. We do this because we know that when women have access to prenatal care, children are born healthier. We all benefit when children receive the immunizations they need and are able to see a doctor when they are sick.

During the debate on S. 744, two of my colleagues, Chairman LEAHY and Senator ROCKEFELLER, came to the floor to discuss this issue. I join them in support of preserving States' rights to extend Medicaid and CHIP benefits to lawfully residing noncitizen children and pregnant women. I thank my colleagues for addressing an issue that is critical to my home State and I echo their comments on the intention of the Senate with regard to this issue.

Madam President, I would also like to speak today about the need for comprehensive immigration reform by highlighting the work of one of my constituents.

I was touched when I read a poem written by 10-year-old Erin Stark of Bellevue, WA. I met Erin last month at a welcoming ceremony for new immigrants in my home State of Washington. She told me about her passion for writing and explained that she won a national writing contest with the submission of her poem on immigration. I think her words exemplify the diversity and extraordinary contributions made by immigrants to this country.

''WHAT WOULD YOU MISS ABOUT IMMIGRANTS, IF THEY DIDN'T COME TO AMERICA?''

Would you miss the food?
The pot stickers, sushi, and dumplings,
Pizza, spaghetti, curry, or crepes?
Just think about it for a minute or two,
Could you survive eating fish at every meal?
Could you?
Immigrants are coming every day,
Variety is what they bring with them in every way.
Would you miss the holidays?
Day of the Dead, and Chinese New Year,
Hanukkah, Kwanzaa, and Ramadan too?
Why did the Christians travel the distance,
Was it to share their beliefs and Christmas?
Immigrants are coming every day,
Variety is what they bring with them in every way.
Would you miss their art,
Painting, literature, and music,
Plays, sculpture, and design?
Life would be dull without art,
People might become sad and would get broken hearts.
Immigrants are coming every day,
Variety is what they bring with them in every way.
Would you miss the things they made?
Railroads, canals, communities, and skyscrapers,
Schoolhouses, highways, churches, and businesses?
What would kids do without schools?
We might turn into fools!
Immigrants are coming every day,
Variety is what they bring with them in every way.
Immigrants are coming every day.
They bring recipes, celebrations, talents, and skills.
Variety is what they bring with them in every way.
USA would be bland without immigrants,
Now our nation is colorful and the joy is infinite.

—*Erin Stark*

Mr. President, I would like to extend a special welcome to Erin Stark. I look forward to seeing all that she will accomplish in the years to come.

TRIBUTE TO ROHIT KUMAR

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I wish to pay tribute to my colleague Rohit Kumar, who will soon, unfortunately, be leaving Senate service for other pursuits.

Rohit stood by me and others here in the Senate as we navigated through deep challenges faced by our Nation, and he has consistently and vigilantly worked for the American people to promote a lot of good, and to prevent a lot of bad from happening.

Rohit is a consummate Senate professional whose skills and accomplishments have provided a long strand of service to this body and to the country. He is a rarity, combining a razor-sharp intellect, logical patterns of thought, and an ability to obtain fair and balanced assessments of challenges that typically involve tradeoffs across a host of competing interests. He adds to that an uplifting disposition and a keen wit.

Rohit possesses mastery of policy, politics, rules of the Congress, and more. While most of us would be content having mastery of any one of those realms, Rohit has managed to master them all. He is a complete package.

Rohit has been an asset to me, to my caucus, to Senate Leadership, and to the country, and his presence will be missed by all of us.

All of us here in the Senate are also indebted to Rohit's beautiful family, which has endured the often-rigorous demands that his Senate service has placed on them. I can think of more than a few occasions where Rohit was negotiating issues that are deeply important for the future of our Nation in stressful, around-the-clock marathon sessions.

If you were to ask me to construct a template for an ideal person to have by your side to navigate through the tough decisions, tradeoffs, and negotiations we face in Congress, I would simply point to Rohit Kumar.

We are all very sad to see Rohit leave. We trust that he will be able to take a bit more time with his family, and will pursue future endeavors with more of the same rigor and industriousness he has consistently shown in his service to the country while working in the Senate. Wherever he goes, without doubt, those around him will benefit tremendously.

I wish to thank Rohit for the many years of outstanding assistance he has provided to me, to my colleagues in the Senate, and to the country. I also thank his family for sharing Rohit with us, and for persevering as we often tapped his talents around the clock. I am proud to have worked with Rohit.

REMEMBERING HARRY BYRD JR.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I rise today to pay special tribute to a man I admired for many years, former U.S. Senator Harry Byrd Jr. Sadly, Harry passed away July 30, 2013, leaving behind a lasting legacy that garnered the respect of many throughout our State and Nation.

Senator Byrd made history in 1970 when he became the first person to win election to the U.S. Senate as an independent candidate. He used that independence to be a voice for good and was someone people respected for his deliberative manner.

Senator Byrd was not one to introduce unnecessary legislation and in fact believed legislation was not always the answer. However one of his proudest moments as a legislator was his work on a bill that mandated a balanced Federal budget in 1978. He set the tone for my own commitment to this principle that I have continued to fight for throughout my service in the Senate.

I had the pleasure of getting to know Harry during my early years as a Senator. In fact, after the important and difficult Labor Law Reform battle I waged 2-years into office, I received a note from Harry that I treasure to this day. This Independent Senator praised my work and declared that ''. . . the American people are indebted to you.'' Strong words from a strong man that I looked up to and admired as a very junior Senator just learning the ropes.

Senator Byrd not only conquered the political world—he was a highly respected voice in the newspaper business—two entities not always known for cohesive relationships. He spent many decades in publishing and served as editor and publisher for two newspapers; as well as the vice president of the Associated Press.

His service in the Senate was matched by his service to his country in the U.S. Navy as a Lieutenant Commander during World War II. His love for America and the ideals it represents could be found throughout the good works he performed throughout his life.

Our nation lost a truly wonderful man. I know that many people will truly miss his strength, leadership, and wisdom.

Elaine and I convey our deepest sympathies to his three children and their families. May our Heavenly Father bless them with peace and comfort at this time. The contributions and impact Senator Byrd made on his family, his community, and our Nation will be felt and appreciated for generations to come.

UNITED STATES-ISRAEL STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP ACT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, the United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act of 2013 reaffirms the strong relationship the United States has with Israel. As the legislation states, our countries share a deep and unbreakable bond, forged by over 60 years of shared interests and shared values.

S. 462 includes provisions that will enhance cooperation between our countries in the areas of energy, defense, homeland security, and agriculture.

While I support the end goal of the bill, I do have reservations about a section dealing with the visa waiver program. The visa waiver program was created by Congress but is largely overseen and maintained by the executive branch. The Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of State, may designate any country as a participant if certain qualifications are met. Congress laid out the criteria, which include low nonimmigrant visa refusal rate; machine readable passport program; law enforcement and security interests; reporting lost and stolen passports; repatriation of aliens; and passenger information exchange.

Once a country meets these requirements, the Secretary of Homeland Security allows the country to participate in the visa waiver program. Yet, S. 462 would amend the statute and allow Israel in the program even if all the criteria are not met. Specifically, under the legislation, Israel would not have to abide by the low nonimmigrant visa refusal rate. Currently, 37 countries participate in the visa waiver program without needing a special exception.

I am concerned about section 9 of the bill because it sets a precedent for other countries not to have to abide by all the terms of the program. Participating in the visa waiver program is a great benefit. Congress should not be making exceptions.

So, while I support the bill and am cosponsoring it today, I will advocate that section 9 be amended before it is passed by this body. The Senate should accept the House language, which simply includes a statement of policy and requires the Secretary of State to report on the extent to which Israel satisfies the requirements specified in law.

I hope my colleagues will work with me on this section, and I look forward to helping pass this bill in the Senate to reaffirm the partnership of United States with Israel.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

STAFF SERGEANT KIRK A. OWEN

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I pay tribute today to a true American hero, Army SSG Kirk A. Owen of Sapulpa, OK who died on August 2nd, 2011, serving our Nation in Paktya Province, Afghanistan. Staff Sergeant Owen was assigned as a scout to Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 1st Battalion, 179th Infantry Regiment, 45th Infantry Brigade Combat Team, Oklahoma Army National Guard.

Staff Sergeant Owen died of injuries sustained when the vehicle in which he was riding was attacked with an improvised explosive device in the Lajah District, Paktya Province while conducting combat operations. He was 37 years old.

Kirk enlisted in the Oklahoma National Guard at the age of 31 as a Chaplain's Assistant after seeing a recruiting commercial on television and deployed in support of disaster relief operations following Hurricane Katrina. Kirk then deployed again to Iraq in 2007 as an infantryman and rose through the ranks to Staff Sergeant. He served as a full time Army National Guard Soldier. He strived to be the best in everything he did and was repeatedly recognized for his excellence as the Hero of the Battlefield and the outstanding soldier in the 45th Infantry Brigade Combat Team for his performance at the Joint Readiness Training Center, and presented the Unsung Hero Award when he attended the Ranger Reconnaissance and Surveillance Leader Course for his scout training. He also was Soldier of the Cycle for basic training and given Distinguished Honors at Advanced Individual Training.

A true warrior and leader, Kirk died while escorting an Explosive Ordnance Disposal team to disarm dangerous explosive devices in Paktya Province. Kirk was a loving husband, endearing father, and faithful friend. His loving presence, strong faith, incredible sense of duty and honor, and his wonderful sense of humor left a lasting impression on every heart he touched.

First Baptist Church Pastor Doyle Pryor said, ''Kirk is one of those guys who had a natural sense of duty and honor. He really believed his military service was a calling from God.''

Major General Myles Deering, the Oklahoma National Guard Adjutant General, said, ''He was an outstanding non-commissioned officer, dedicated to loyally serving his country and fellow Soldiers. His loss is being felt across the state and he will be greatly missed.''

His daughter Kylie wrote:

My dad was a fantastic leader. All of his guys looked up to him. My nickname for him was Ironman. There was nothing to me that he couldn't do. He loved Jesus with all his heart and that's where my peace is coming from. I can just see him up in heaven following Jesus around wanting to know everything. A few weeks before he left we were at the grocery store and my dad and little sister were walking down the marshmallow aisle and he turned to her and said 'Kayci, I think heaven will smell like marshmallows.' I hope it does. The memory of my dad will live on forever and his good looks will too.

In July 2012, the town of Sapulpa dedicated a neighborhood park where the Owen family still lives as a tribute to Kirk and his service to our Nation. There is a lasting monument in his honor.

Kirk lived a life of love for God, his wife and daughters, family, friends, and country. He leaves behind a wonderful and loving family: his wife, Tiffany and daughters, Kylie and Kayci. He will be remembered for his commitment to and belief in the greatness of our nation. I am honored to pay tribute to this true American hero who volunteered to go into the fight and made the ultimate sacrifice for our protection and freedom. We will keep them in our thoughts and prayers, always.

HYDROPOWER REGULATORY EFFICIENCY ACT

Mr. SESSIONS. I rise today to express my support for the Hydropower Regulatory Efficiency Act of 2013, H.R. 267. This important legislation will encourage and facilitate the development of clean and renewable hydropower capacity in the United States.

Hydropower has played a key role in the economic and industrial development of the State of Alabama over the last 100 years. In fact, according to the National Hydropower Association, Alabama ranks among the top ten States in hydropower generation, with over 8,700,000 megawatt-hours of conventional hydrogeneration. I believe hydropower will continue to make important contributions to meet Alabama's energy needs well into the future. For that reason, I believe the Hydropower Regulatory Efficiency Act of 2013 is an important piece of legislation that merits this body's full support. I would like to recognize the excellent work of the Senate Energy Committee, including the chairman and ranking member, on this legislation. At this time, I wish to ask the ranking member for permission to engage her in a brief colloquy concerning her understanding of Section 6 of this legislation.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I welcome an exchange for the record.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank my colleague for her willingness to discuss this legislation. Section 6 of the Hydropower Regulatory Efficiency Act of 2013 promotes hydropower development by directing the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, FERC, to investigate the feasibility of a more streamlined licensing process for certain hydro projects that should not be subjected to the lengthy and expensive licensing process that was designed for projects with many more complicated issues and stakeholder interests.

Under H.R. 267, two types of projects would be eligible for the 2-year licensing process: new hydro developments at existing nonpowered dams and closed-loop pumped storage hydro. It is my understanding that adding generation capacity at existing nonpowered dams would tap into an important and substantial renewable energy resource at projects where the impacts of dam construction have already been realized.

For hydropower developers to take full advantage of any streamlined licensing process that FERC may develop as contemplated in Section 6 of the act, I believe there needs to be a good understanding of what types of pumped storage projects would be considered ''closed-loop pumped storage projects.'' This term is not defined in the act, and I am not aware of any generally accepted engineering or industry definition for that term.

In order that I might have a better understanding of the types of hydropower projects that would be eligible

for a streamlined licensing process that FERC may develop in accordance with Section 6 of the act, would the ranking member kindly provide a description of the types of pumped storage projects that she would consider to be ''closed-loop pumped storage''?

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Senator for his support of this legislation and for his inquiry about Section 6 of the Act. Streamlining the licensing process for ''closed-loop pumped storage'' projects will encourage development of new and important sources of renewable energy that will help balance the country's energy resources and provide critical support to the Nation's power grid.

Section 6 of the bill directs FERC to develop criteria for identifying projects featuring ''closed loop pumped storage'' that would be appropriate for licensing within a 2-year process. This term was used in the bill to generally describe pumped storage projects that have a low impact on the various resources considered by FERC during the licensing process such as environmental, recreational, and navigation interests.

For example, pumped storage projects that are removed from major streams are likely to have fewer significant resource impacts and issues to be addressed and resolved, which makes them appropriate for the 2-year licensing process. Accordingly, the types of pumped storage projects considered ''closed loop'' and, therefore, eligible for FERC's expedited licensing process under this bill, would include projects where the upper and lower reservoirs do not impound or directly withdraw water from a navigable stream and projects that are not continuously connected to a naturally-flowing water feature.

These types of ''closed loop pumped storage'' designs are candidates for a 2-year licensing process because the resource impacts associated with such projects can be minimal as compared to more traditional pumped storage hydro designs and other conventional hydro projects for which the existing FERC licensing process was designed.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank Ranking Member MURKOWSKI for her explanation. Again, I applaud her for her work on the Hydropower Regulatory Efficiency Act of 2013 and for her leadership in this body.

VOTE EXPLANATIONS

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, I regret having missed the July 31, 2013 vote on the confirmation of Byron Jones, of Minnesota, to be Director, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives. Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of the confirmation of Mr. JONES.

I also regret having missed three votes on August 1, 2013. The three votes that I missed are as follows: the nomination of Raymond Chen to be a United States Circuit Judge for the Federal Circuit; cloture on S. 1243, Transportation, Housing, and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations; and the nomination of Samantha Power to serve as the United States Ambassador to the United Nations. Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of all three votes.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Madam President, I was unable to cast my vote earlier this week on the nomination of James Comey to be the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, FBI, and the nominees for the National Labor Relations Board.

Had I been present, I would have voted to confirm Mr. Comey as FBI Director and would have voted in support of the motions to invoke cloture and confirmation of the nominations of Kent Hirozawa, Nancy Schiffer, and Mark Pearce to be members of the National Labor Relations Board.

REMEMBERING LINDY BOGGS

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I wish to pay tribute to an incredible woman—former Congresswoman and Ambassador Lindy Boggs—who was a trailblazer for women and a passionate advocate for the people of Louisiana and people across the country who too often don't have a voice in Washington.

When I first became a Member of Congress in 1983, Lindy was one of only 21 women serving in the House of Representatives. I will always be grateful for the kindness and generosity she showed in taking me under her wing—and it was the same for so many other women who followed her in Congress and found in her a role model of such dignity and strength.

No one will ever forget her courage in the face of unspeakable tragedy—the loss of her husband, Congressman Hale Boggs, whose plane disappeared during a campaign trip to Alaska in 1972. Louisianans, including her husband's closest friends, urged her to run for the seat in a special election the next year, and she became the first woman elected to Congress from the State where she was beloved.

I remember visiting Lindy's home State of Louisiana years later and being overwhelmed at the outpouring of love and respect the people she represented had for her—and with good reason. Throughout her time in Congress, she was a champion for civil rights, women's equality, and social justice.

During her first term in Congress, Lindy was assigned to the House Banking Committee. At one point, the committee was considering an amendment to a lending bill banning discrimination on the basis of race, age or veteran status.

Seizing the opportunity, Lindy quickly added the words ''sex or marital status'' to the amendment and ran to a copy machine to make copies for each Member. She told her colleagues:

> Knowing the Members composing this committee as well as I do, I'm sure it was just an oversight that we didn't have 'sex' or 'marital status' included. I've taken care of that, and I trust it meets with the committee's approval.

That is how sex discrimination was made illegal in the Equal Credit Opportunity Act of 1974.

She was a skilled lawmaker who used her immense personal charm, political savvy and intellect to win over colleagues on issues that were critical to her State and the country. One of her Republican House colleagues remarked:

> It was impossible not to like Lindy. She liked everybody. She was nice to everybody. She achieved more with less huff and puff and bluster than any of the rest of us did.

Lindy stood up for equality and racial justice, even when her views were not popular with some voters in her own district. When she left Congress in 1991 after serving nine terms, she was the only White Member to represent a Black-majority district.

She led the fight for equal pay for women in government jobs and for greater access to government contracts for women business owners. She worked to protect women from domestic violence, and inspired so many young people—women and men—to follow her into public service.

Lindy was a pioneer in so many ways—the first woman to chair a major political party's nominating convention, the first woman to serve as U.S. Ambassador to the Vatican, and the first woman to have a room in the Capitol named in her honor. But because of her leadership and mentorship, Lindy made sure that she would not be the last and that generations of other women would be able to follow in her extraordinary footsteps.

My heart goes out to her family, her friends and all of those whose lives she touched. She will be dearly missed.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, today I honor and celebrate the life of an extraordinary American: Marie Corinne Morrison Claiborne Boggs, who we all knew as ''Lindy.'' She was a remarkable national leader, trailblazer for women everywhere, wife, mother, and a friend. Lindy taught me—and an entire generation of Louisianians, both men and women, through her example—to answer the call of public service.

With her death last Saturday, July 28, 2013, our entire State is in mourning but we are also celebrating a life well lived.

Throughout her life, she shaped the world to become a better and more just place. When she was born in 1916, women could not vote and segregation reigned supreme. But she refused to accept the world as it was and set about to change it. She lived through both World Wars and the Great Depression. Despite all of these daunting obstacles, Lindy—a graceful woman with a strong, passionate calling to serve others—was not deterred.

Like many women of her time, she married a man of great promise—and ultimately great power—Hale Boggs. But

when he was lost in a tragic plane accident in Alaska, she—unlike many—stepped up and into his shoes, trusting God to lead her forward.

She was elected to succeed her husband in Congress on March 20, 1973, and became the first woman elected to the House of Representatives from our State. At the time, there were only 15 women in the U.S. House of Representatives and none in the U.S. Senate.

But Lindy never let the novelty of this, the pressure of work and family, or any other challenge she faced throughout her career stand in her way or deter her from serving her State and her country.

Her keen political mind, iron will and graceful Southern charm helped her become one of the most formidable forces Congress has ever known. She was known for bridging the gap between Republicans and Democrats and convincing her colleagues to do what was right with poise, kindness and reason.

As her colleague Bill Frenzel, a Republican from Minnesota said of her: ''It was impossible not to like Lindy. She liked everybody. She was nice to everybody. She achieved more with less huff and puff and bluster than any of the rest of us did.''

She used her formidable influence to help lead the fight for civil rights, pay equity for women and the right for women to hold a mortgage on her own home without the necessity of a husband's signature.

As a member of the Banking Committee she inserted a provision barring discrimination over sex or marital status into the Equal Credit Opportunity Act of 1974. She did not tell her colleagues before she did it and simply told them:

Knowing the members composing this committee as well as I do, I'm sure it was just an oversight that we didn't have 'sex' or 'marital status' included. I've taken care of that, and I trust it meets with the committee's approval.

There was no objection! And tens of millions of women were given access to credit, opportunity and a future of their own.

Lindy never tired in her fight to expand opportunities for women, whether it was helping women as candidates for public office at all levels of government, pressing Federal cabinet secretaries and agency heads to promote women to senior leadership and policy positions in government, supporting women that work two to three jobs to keep food on the table and a roof over their head or speaking out for victims of domestic violence.

In fact today, there is a place named ''Lindy's Place'' in New Orleans that carries on her work to support abused and battered women.

In 1976, she nominated a young woman from New Orleans to the U.S. Military Academy as soon as the Army dropped the gender bar, and then quickly nominated women to all four service academies. She applauded NASA when Sally Ride was the first female American astronaut to go into space. She knew women could really excel at anything whether it was on this planet or beyond.

Following her retirement from Congress in 1991, she once again answered the call to serve as the first female ambassador to the Holy See where she continued to exhibit the same strength, intelligence and respect that she was known for throughout her life. She was most certainly the only person to call the Pope ''darlin'!''

Lindy's decades of service to her family, community, Nation and church reminds us all to give of ourselves fully to a worthy cause, and is an example of what we can achieve when we do. She has certainly set the gold standard for public service.

But knowing Lindy as well as I did, I believe she was most proud of her 3 children, 8 grandchildren and 18 great-grandchildren.

As many of you know, the special cloakroom for the women of the House bears Lindy's name. A few months ago when we celebrated the 40th anniversary of Lindy's election, she said she was proud of that room, but that ''Maybe, someday, the women will have to relinquish the room when women are the majority in the House.''

I know that Lindy will be proud when women achieve this milestone. Even after that day comes, Lindy's legacy will continue to inspire us for many years to come.

REMEMBERING WILLIAM H. GRAY III

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, today I wish to honor and remember the full life of Congressman William H. Gray, III, and his exceptional service to his community, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and our country.

Bill was born in Baton Rouge, LA, the second child of Dr. William H. Gray, Jr., and Hazel Gray. Though he spent the first 8 years of his life in Florida, Bill moved to Philadelphia in 1949 and remained a distinguished resident of our Commonwealth until his recent passing.

Bill was a pastor and shepherd for his congregation, a respected member of the U.S. House of Representatives, and a powerful advocate for higher education. Today we honor his life, his good works, and his legacy.

As a pastor, Bill followed in the footsteps of his father and grandfather and led Philadelphia's Bright Hope Baptist Church for more than 33 years. Knowing that the ministry was not just something you did on Sunday morning, Bill always believed strongly in the principle of a ''whole ministry,'' that the church must tend to all the needs of its entire congregation. Under Bill's leadership, that congregation quickly grew to over 4,000 parishioners, but Bill remained committed to his ''whole ministry'' and made sure to continue his important advocacy work on issues ranging from housing, to economic justice, to excellent education for all. Bill often said that his position as pastor of Bright Hope was the most important job he had ever had, one that cultivated the skills and priorities that shaped his life's work.

As a member of the U.S. House of Representatives, Bill proudly represented the Second District of Pennsylvania from 1979 to 1991 and built a reputation as a thoughtful and effective leader. Bill quickly rose through the ranks of leadership during his 12 years in Congress and assumed the chairmanship of the Budget Committee, after only 6 years in office. Three years later, in 1988, he was elected to chair his party's House caucus, and then in 1989 he became the House majority whip, the third-ranking leadership position in the House.

As a lifelong advocate for higher education, Bill chose to leave Congress at the pinnacle of his career to accept the position of president and CEO of the United Negro College Fund. He said at the time that ''Woodrow Wilson used to say, 'My constituency is the next generation,' and you know, that's why I left Congress, because my constituency, really, is the next generation.'' Bill's 12-year tenure at UNCF brought unexpected growth in support for historically Black colleges, and he constantly sought innovative ways to both attract new investment and increase existing funding. By the time he left UNCF 12 years later, Bill and his team had raised more than $1.54 billion.

Bill never rested and was never satisfied with one job at a time. While leading the UNCF, he was asked by President Clinton in 1994 to lead the efforts to restore democracy in Haiti. His work there earned him the Medal of Honor from the President of Haiti. In 2004, Bill started Gary Global Strategies, Inc., and served as a director on multiple corporate boards, including at Dell, JPMorgan Chase, and Pfizer. He also served as vice chairman for the Pew Commission on Children in Foster Care and on the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council.

Bill often said that he had ''always been taught by my folk, parents, grandparents, that service is sort of the rent you pay for the space you occupy. And so, what I've tried to do is direct my life towards service based on faith and commitment, and social justice.'' As Bill's family and friends mourn his passing, I pray that they will be comforted by the knowledge that this great Nation will never forget the commitment Bill demonstrated to each of us, to his ''whole ministry.'' May he rest in peace.

TRIBUTE TO BLAISE MESSINGER

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, today I wish to recognize Blaise Messinger, Connecticut's 2013 Teacher of the Year.

Every year the Connecticut State Department of Education selects one teacher for this prestigious title who

then serves as an ambassador for education throughout the State and also represents Connecticut on a national scale, working on panels and advisory committees with other State teachers of the year, as well as with the National State Teacher of the Year Program and the U.S. Department of Education. This year's Connecticut Teacher of the Year, Blaise Messinger, was selected from 4 finalists, 15 semifinalists, and over 80 district teachers of the year for this tremendous distinction.

Mr. Messinger makes an extraordinary difference in the lives of his students and their families and at his school. He is an inspiration to his colleagues. At Woodside Intermediate School in Cromwell, CT, he is well known for his commitment to making fifth grade engaging and interesting. An actor in Los Angeles and New York City for many years, Mr. Messinger dedicates this thespian acumen and ability to his students' progress. By making school fun and relevant, his students remember what he teaches and come out of his classroom as enthusiastic learners. When addressing fellow educators as Connecticut Teacher of the Year, he advised his colleagues to ''think back to that teacher you can still hear in your head.'' I am grateful that Mr. Messinger came to Connecticut to apply his talents, high energy, and positive spirit as a community leader.

One personal inspiration for Mr. Messinger's incredible impact as a teacher is his own family—especially his two sons, Ethan and Caleb, who live with him and his wife Kimberley in Cromwell. Mr. Messinger has said that his love for them—and his witnessing how teachers impacted their lives, especially his son Ethan who has autism—drives his desire to change the lives of children.

I thank the Connecticut State Department of Education and the National Teacher of the Year Program for representing the voices of passionate, talented teachers and recognizing their heroic efforts. Mr. Messinger has already done great work on a national level, sparking important discussions about changing the way we educate our future generations. I am very proud that he represents Connecticut as 2013 Teacher of the Year and invite my colleagues to join me in applauding his invaluable contributions to our country.

SYRIA

Mr. BEGICH. Madam President, I wish to speak about the crisis in Syria and the role that one company in one nation is playing in perpetuating the strife.

Every day Syria descends deeper into chaos and civil war. Since March 2011, more than 100,000 Syrians have been killed, an estimated 5 million have been internally displaced, and at least 1.6 million have fled their war-torn land. By the end of 2013, half of Syria's population may have left their homes.

The pressure on neighboring countries, Turkey, Lebanon, Jordan and Iraq, is only increasing. Beyond the refugee crisis, the resulting chaos threatens unprecedented violence and instability for all of Syria's neighbors. As Syria's conflict grows increasingly radical, its borders are increasably insecure.

In August 2011, now nearly 2 years ago, President Obama declared that Syria's dictator, Bashar Asad, had lost all legitimacy and ''must go.'' At the time of that statement, the number of Syrians butchered by the Asad regime numbered a then-shocking 6,000. There were frequent grim comparisons to Bashar al-Asad's father Hafez, who shelled Hama for days in 1982, killing perhaps 20,000. Now, today we see a nation on a path to destruction and Hafez Asad's 20,000 dead is just a fraction of the number his son has killed.

America must take seriously its commitment to doing what it can to bring an end to the Asad regime. We must not tolerate the empowerment of forces antithetical to our interests. And we certainly must not be complicit in their behavior.

The triumph of the Asad regime would validate and encourage the murderous behavior of leaders who spurn democracy and the rule of law. It would empower the belligerent regime in Tehran and offer support to Iranian proxies who seek to annihilate Israel and ultimately threaten our own nation.

While we view the Asad regime with rebellion, some others have stepped up support for him, facilitating Asad's brutal success. Among these is the Government of Russia. Russia has demonstrated time and again its support for Bashar Asad and its opposition to our own humanitarian and democratic values.

Russia has consistently thwarted multilateral efforts to stem the violence in Syria, including vetoing a United Nations Security Council resolution that would have penalized Asad's failure to carry out a peace plan. It has made clear its unwavering support for Asad's brutality. Addressing the compounding challenges posed by Russian intransience has proven increasingly difficult. The Obama administration has made a serious effort to engage in a direct dialog over matters related to Syria, most recently along the sidelines of the G8.

But that effort has not been fruitful. Indeed, the Russian Government has demonstrated no genuine interest in achieving a resolution to the Syria conflict. Moscow appears to simply enjoy the political cover that U.S.-Russian talks provide. Russia remains unwavering in its support for an Asad regime that has hosted its bases, served Russian economic interests, and anchored what remains of Russia's influence in the region.

At the same time, Moscow continues to flout international norms. Russia is acting antagonistically toward our Nation. It perpetuates human rights abuses at home. It sacrifices the well-being of Russia's orphans for the sake of political gains. And it is sheltering the fugitive Edward Snowden.

Russia's state-owned arms export firm, Rosoboronexport, has exacerbated the crisis in Syria. Instead of promoting a path to peace, Rosoboronexport has provided the Syrian Government with the means to perpetrate widespread and systemic attacks on its own people. It has supplied Asad with guns, grenades, tank parts, attack aircraft, anti-ship cruise missiles, and air defense missiles, which his regime in turn uses to perpetuate its rule and murder innocent civilians. Rosoboronexport also has made a commitment to provide Syria with S–300 advanced anti-aircraft missiles that would protect Syrian air dominance and facilitate its continued attacks on its civilian population.

These weapons do not threaten the Syrian people alone. They challenge American interests in the region, including the safety and security of Israel.

Let's look at one particular example that has received a good deal of international attention. It is certainly possible that NATO or our own Nation may decide it is necessary to create a no-fly zone over Syria to stop the carnage. Russian-provided S–300s would present a major threat to U.S. or allied aircraft and pilots seeking to establish such a zone. They would also pose a direct threat to Israeli civil and military air traffic.

The Russian transfer of weapons to Syria is not just inhumane, but it is a violation of U.S. law. The Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 and the Iran, North Korea, and Syria Nonproliferation Accountability Act, as well as Executive Orders 13382 and 13582 all demand sanctions against ''those entities that materially assist, or provide support for, the Government of Syria.''

In addition, the fiscal year 2013 National Defense Authorization Act prohibits contracts with Rosoboronexport, and section 1233 of S. 1197, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, which was passed by the Senate Armed Services Committee, prohibits the use of funds to enter contracts with Rosoboronexport.

In light of the lack of progress of diplomatic efforts to end Russian support for the Asad regime and the direct nature of the threat these escalating arms sales pose, it is incumbent upon the U.S. Government to pursue more aggressive measures as mandated by U.S. law to create incentives for the Russians to change their behavior. Indeed, Senator KELLY AYOTTE and I have written to the President urging that he take this course.

With the exception of particular circumstances of true military necessity, the administration must end all financial dealings with Rosoboronexport and begin to impose sanctions against Rosoboronexport.

We must also impose sanctions against any Russian manufacturers that provide military equipment such as advanced anti-aircraft systems to Syria in contravention of U.S. law.

In my view, it is unconscionable for us to provide Russia with the recently announced $550 million contract for 30 additional Mi-17 helicopters, a purchase the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction has strongly advised against.

American taxpayer dollars should not be provided to a Russian state-owned corporation that is complicit in the murder of tens of thousands of innocent Syrian men, women, and children. The Department of Defense has the authority to end this contract with Rosoboronexport, which fails to meet the requirements of the Afghan military, and I have joined many of my colleagues in urging the administration to review this sale.

The United States must not be complicit in the arming of the Asad regime nor in the empowerment of countries like Iran, which will triumph if Asad succeeds. I urge the administration to impose sanctions on Rosoboronexport and to demonstrate to Russia that its behavior in Syria will not be cost-free in its relations with our Nation.

REMEMBERING PETER SORBO

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, today I wish to honor the service of Mr. Peter Sorbo, of Connecticut, whose family resides in Waterbury, CT. In January 1943, 18 year-old Peter Sorbo enlisted in the Army to serve his country during World War II. Deployed to the European theater and assigned to Bombardment Group 384, Squadron 545, he served as a waist gunner on a B–17 Flying Fortress and perished on August 12, 1943 after his plane was shot down above the Rhine.

I would like to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Waterbury Republican American that outlines this fascinating story about one of Connecticut's brave soldiers.

Many of Connecticut's sons, like Peter Sorbo, gave their lives defending our freedom and they deserve our perpetual gratitude. I ask that this body devote itself to remembering these courageous men and women by honoring their sacrifices and forever preserving their memories.

The following article written by Mike Patrick appeared in the July 29, 2013 edition of the Waterbury Republican-American. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE TRUTH . . . FINALLY

IT TOOK DECADES, BUT WATERBURY SISTERS LEARN ABOUT THEIR BROTHER'S DEATH IN WORLD WAR II

WATERBURY.—A family friend, some Internet research and the handwritten notes of prisoners of war have unearthed a story of tragic heroism that after seven decades has at last brought closure for two Waterbury sisters whose brother died in World War II.

''He was a good kid, a really good boy,'' Marie Debiase said through tears. ''After 70 years, we're finally finding out what happened to him.''

All she knew all these years, she said, was that her brother, Peter Sorbo, died when his plane was shot down over the Rhine in 1943.

But recently, her sister Joann Devino met Carmen Mancuso, one of their brother's old friends, at church. Mancuso said his son Richard was pretty handy at Internet research and may be able to learn a little more about the circumstances of Sorbo's death.

The sisters gave them some of their brother's letters and other documents, and Richard Mancuso, a sales manager from Madison and self-described history buff, got to work.

''I read a few of them it struck my interest,'' he said. ''I started Googling it.''

Mancuso discovered a treasure trove of information, including reports of Sorbo's death written by the men who served with him that day.

The following story was pieced together from those reports, and from family recollections.

Peter Sorbo was working in the United Cigar store late in 1942 when a woman came in and chided him with something like, ''What are you doing working here when my son is overseas?''

The tall, quiet 17-year-old took it to heart. He quit school, to the consternation of his parents, and enlisted in January 1943.

''I remember every bit of that day he went into the Army,'' Debiase said. ''It was a terrible blizzard that day.''

For the next several months, he wrote his family letters from the European Theater, mostly general, mundane greetings. Those letters would later prove helpful to Mancuso in learning how he died.

In August that same year, the waist gunner on a recently formed B–17 Flying Fortress squadron went AWOL. Sorbo, by then a staff sergeant, was assigned to take his place on a bombing mission over a synthetic fuel plant in Germany.

It was an extremely dangerous operation. B–17s were large, obvious and difficult for their gunners to defend. That was especially so for waist gunners, who endured sub-zero temperatures and thin oxygen while shooting Axis fighter planes through a very small window into a powerful airstream that made it hard to lock onto a target.

The plane was hit by a 20-mm shell that caught Sorbo in the neck.

The plane started to go down under continuous enemy fire. The crew prepared to bail out. One tried desperately to get a parachute onto Sorbo, who was already dying from his neck wound.

Then the plane exploded.

Six airmen parachuted out, including one who said the blast blew him out of the craft, and another who said he saw the plane go down as he drifted into the Rhine.

All six survivors were captured by the Nazis. Sorbo and three others were killed, including the crewman who tried to save him.

Devino said she often thinks of that heroic airman.

''I thought of the family,'' she said. ''If he didn't stop to try and get a parachute on Peter, he might have just been a POW.''

The family didn't know any of this for decades.

After the plane was shot down, the military sent a letter saying Sorbo was missing in action.

''All those years, we were hoping maybe he was a prisoner, maybe he would get back,'' Debiase said. ''My mother never stopped hoping.''

It wasn't until the war was over that the government acknowledged the plane and Sorbo's remains had been found, and asked the family if it would like them to be returned for burial.

Debiase said her family doubted from the beginning that the remains were his, but figured it was a service member who needed burial anyway, so they accepted them.

''Who we got, I don't know, but we respect it as my brother,'' Debiase said. ''We visit the cemetery and put the flags on when they need to be put on.''

Sorbo's loss devastated his family. His father was so distraught that he walked off a 20-year job as a tool setter at Chase Brass & Copper.

''He couldn't handle it,'' Devino said.

The parents doted on and spoiled their remaining son. He ended up drafted into the Korean War, returned an alcoholic, and died young.

Debiase and her husband, Michael, live in a lovely house with a dining room table long enough to accommodate their many family gatherings.

Her brother Peter, she said, wanted to go into radio. He was funny and kind and protective—all the things an eldest brother should be to his siblings.

''We at least know what really happened,'' she said. ''We never knew. I'm glad my parents never really knew.''

Her memories of Peter, she said, she has ''stored away in my heart'' since she was 9, the age she was when he died. She's 79 now and Devino is 83.

Debiase looked over at that dining room table, on this day strewn with Sorbo's sepia-toned service photographs.

''Every holiday you sit down and say, There should be another chair,''' she said. ''But there isn't.''

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

SANDWICH, NEW HAMPSHIRE

● Ms. AYOTTE. Madam President, today I wish to honor Sandwich, NH—a town in Carroll County that is celebrating the 250th anniversary of its founding. I am proud to join citizens across the Granite State in recognizing this historic event.

Sandwich is a picturesque community situated in the shadow of the Sandwich Dome, that has through the hard work and dedication of its citizens retained the look and feel of a traditional colonial New Hampshire village.

Sandwich was granted a charter by Governor Benning Wentworth on October 25, 1763, and derives its name from John Montague, the 4th Earl of Sandwich. Today, the population has grown to include over 1,300 residents.

Carpenters, wheelwrights, and blacksmiths formed the base of Sandwich's vibrant artisan history. The beauty of the region, and its rich history, has attracted a variety of artists to Sandwich.

In 1920, Sandwich Home Industries was founded. Today it is known statewide as the League of New Hampshire Craftsmen.

Sandwich is also home to one of New Hampshire's premier agricultural fairs. Held every year on Columbus Day weekend, the Sandwich Fair has been providing a venue for the celebration of

New Hampshire's agrarian history for the past 125 years.

Named for the owner of the nearby grist mill, the historic covered Durgin Bridge is listed on the National Register of Historic Places, and has been a part of the community since 1869. Before being washed away in 1865, a previous span served as a connection to North Conway for the Underground Railroad.

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

ROSHOLT, SOUTH DAKOTA

● Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Madam President, I wish to pay tribute to the 100th anniversary of the founding of Rosholt, SD. Rosholt is a thriving agricultural community in northeastern South Dakota.

Rosholt was named for Julius Rosholt, an entrepreneur whose efforts brought the railroad to the townsite. Lots were first sold in the newly platted town on August 11, 1913, and shortly thereafter residents began to start businesses that would serve the growing community. The visionary spirit of these early pioneers is evident 100 years later, as the town gathers for their centennial celebration.

Today, folks in Rosholt are as hardworking and determined as ever, exhibiting the small-town South Dakota values that make our State a great place to live. Numerous prosperous businesses line Main Street and the town is home to the region's largest grain elevator. Rosholt's educators and students set a high standard of academic excellence that serves as a model for the rest of our State. The Rosholt School has recently been recognized by the South Dakota Department of Education as a ''Distinguished School.''

Rosholt's history teaches us that when a community comes together it can do great things. The citizens of Rosholt have an undeniable pride in their community that will serve them well for many generations to come. I am proud to congratulate them on reaching this historic anniversary and wish them the best in the future.●

TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT COLONEL TIM SCHEPPER

● Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Madam President, today I wish to recognize LTC Tim Schepper, who on July 15, 2013, became the first pilot to log 5,000 hours in the B–1 aircraft.

Lieutenant Colonel Schepper is a senior evaluator for the 28th Operations Group and a B–1 pilot at Ellsworth Air Force Base in South Dakota. His impressive flying record on the B–1 highlights an Air Force career that spans 27 years, including two stints totaling over 14 years at Ellsworth. His record of 5,000 hours is well ahead of any other B–1 pilot in the Air Force. It is nearly 1,800 hours more than any pilot at Ellsworth and nearly 800 hours more than anyone Air Force-wide. Over one-quarter of his flying time, 1,300 hours, are combat hours.

He grew up on a ranch near Vargas, MN and joined the Air Force in 1986. In addition to his various duty assignments at Ellsworth, Lieutenant Colonel Schepper has also been stationed at bases in California, Texas, Mississippi and North Dakota and served 3 years as B–1 Functional Area Manager, B–1 Realistic Training Manager, Deputy Chief Flight Operations and Training Branch at Air Combat Command Headquarters in Langley, VA. From June 2010 to June 2011, he served as Deputy Commander, 379th Expeditionary Operations Group, in Southwest Asia.

His major awards and accomplishments include the Bronze Star Medal; Global War on Terrorism Service Medal; Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal; Iraq Campaign Medal; Afghanistan Campaign Medal; Air Force Commendation Medal with three oak leaf clusters; Air Force Combat Action Medal; Meritorious Unit Award with one oak leaf cluster; Combat Readiness Medal with five oak leaf clusters; National Defense Service Medal with bronze star; Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal; Meritorious Service Medal with four oak leaf clusters; Aerial Achievement Medal; and Air Medal with five oak leaf clusters.

Lt. Col. Schepper's feat underscores the great work of all B–1 personnel in the Air Force as well as civilian personnel from Boeing, who have been working on the B–1 program since it was introduced to the Air Force 30 years ago. According to Boeing's Dan Ruder, who was on hand for Lieutenant Colonel Schepper's record-setting flight arrival back at Ellsworth, the B–1 ''has nearly 10,000 combat missions logged and has been deployed for 8 consecutive years. This day solidifies how the B–1 is still a critical element to our national security.''

Like many Air Force personnel, Lieutenant Colonel Schepper and his wife are quick to credit family as well as the military and civilian communities for their support over the years. ''My family has always supported me significantly,'' said the Ellsworth pilot. ''I've had five deployments over the past 10 years, and obviously as everyone knows, when you're away from home there are a lot of things that still need to be done. My wife and my kids had to endure and do a lot of things to make up for when I wasn't around.''

Added his wife, Tania, ''We have been part of this community for so long. He didn't just accomplish this on his own. It takes maintenance, and it takes the help and support of other pilots, and community members.''

Lieutenant Colonel Schepper will be retiring in August, and I congratulate him on his impressive flying record, as well as his distinguished military service career, both of which serve as great standards of achievement for military personnel and the civilian community. I wish him all the best in his retirement.●

REMEMBERING KIP YOSHIO TOKUDA

● Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I would like to pay tribute to a dedicated community leader, compassionate public servant, and advocate from the State of Washington, Kip Tokuda.

I am proud to recognize Kip as the kind of civic champion who did so much for all of the communities he touched, especially for children and families in need.

Mr. Tokuda was born in Seattle in 1946 and eventually served his home district in the Washington State House of Representatives from 1994 to 2002. Through his work on behalf of his constituents and Washington State, he earned a reputation as a deeply principled legislator and respect from both sides of the aisle.

In addition to his service as an elected official, Kip also cofounded the Asian Pacific Islander Community Leadership Foundation, an organization that empowers young people from Asian Pacific Islander communities to seek leadership positions in government and nonprofit organizations. He helped start the Japanese Cultural & Community Center of Washington and last year was awarded the Order of the Rising Sun from the Emperor of Japan for his work to build and maintain strong ties between the United States and Japan. Most recently, he was appointed to the city of Seattle's Community Police Commission, where he worked to create a more diverse police force.

But most importantly, he was a dedicated father, husband, friend, and mentor to many.

People respected Kip because he respected them, and even though he accomplished so much in his life and earned a position of influence, you could always count on Kip to listen.

As a longtime Seattle resident, his kindness and passion inspired all who knew him.

Kip passed away on July 13, 2013 from a heart attack at the age of 66.

Kip is survived by his wife Barb and their two children, Molly and Pei-Ming.

He will be missed by many, but his legacy of service will live on through the organizations he founded and the lives he touched.

Mr. President, I would like to ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Kip Tokuda. He lived a full life and our thoughts are with his loved ones at this time of great and sudden loss.●

50TH ANNUAL ARKANSAS STATE CHAMPIONSHIP HORSE SHOW

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, it is with pleasure that I rise today to honor

the 50th Annual Arkansas State Championship Horse Show. In 1963, three horse show associations in Arkansas joined efforts to hold a State equestrian championship. This championship show originated when the Hillbilly Horse Show Association, the Central Arkansas Horse Show Association, and the Northeast Central Arkansas Horse Show Association joined together to host a championship competition. Over the years, this partnership has expanded to include 12 horse show associations from across the great State of Arkansas. For the past 50 years, the top 5 contenders from each association compete to earn the honor of being named the Champion Rider of Arkansas.

Arkansans have long enjoyed riding horses for sport and pleasure. Horse shows across the State attract fans seeking to witness the athleticism and agility of the sportsmen and the horses. While these riders make it look easy, horse riding requires a great deal of balance, coordination, and physical strength. Each rider must also exemplify self-discipline, responsibility, and patience with their horse. Horse riding is important to the people of my State, and I support keeping this heritage strong.

At the 50th Annual Arkansas State Championship Horse Show later this summer, competitors will again showcase their talent by riding different breeds in a variety of equestrian disciplines. They will compete with great sportsmanship and at the end of the show one rider will be named as the best in Arkansas. The competitive events will include the talents of Arkansans of all ages and hailing from each corner of the State.

I ask my colleagues to join me today in congratulating the Arkansas State Championship Horse Show on its 50th anniversary and in wishing its competitors and fans a wonderful day of celebration.

QUALE'S ELECTRONICS

● Mr. RISCH. Madam President, family-owned small businesses are a crucial part of America's landscape. They supply a demand in locations all across the United States, and are built on the sweat and dedication of their owners and employees. It is for this reason that today I wish to rise to honor Quale's Electronics, its founder Mel Quale, and all those who now manage and work for this longstanding family business.

In 1966, Mr. Quale opened Quale's Electronics, located in Twin Falls, ID. Quale's Electronics began humbly as a television repair shop, but after only a year in business Mr. Quale expanded his business to include retail television and home electronics sales. Small businesses often have trouble obtaining deals to outlet products from top brands, but Mr. Quale's persistence in the late 1960s through early 1970s paid off with several high-level brands in the electronics industry signing them on as a local dealer. Sales quickly took off. Quale's Electronics expanded to a new and larger location in 1976. Always striving to stay ahead of the curve, Mr. Quale sought out and procured deals to sell many of the exciting new electronics that debuted in the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s. Quale Electronics to this day remains a family business. Today, Helen Quale, and Mr. Quale's sons, Bruce and Steve, spearhead the ownership and management responsibilities.

In addition to running a successful small business, Mr. Quale also takes a keen interest in his community, offering his time and funding to important local causes and projects. Mr. Quale has previously served as a member of the Bureau of Land Management Resource Advisory Council for 9 years, public lands advisor for the Magic Valley Trail Machine, and 20 years as a precinct committeeman for the Twin Falls Republican Party. Additionally, Mr. Quale is an active member of the Twin Falls Rotary Club.

The success Mr. Quale has found in his business and the work he has done for his community is a testament to the important economic and civic good that is created by self-employed entrepreneurs all across the U.S. and a prime example of the spirit of Idaho's entrepreneurs. It is inspirational to see a family-owned business with decades-old roots spanning more than one generation continue to grow and succeed. Such businesses are vital not only to the local and national economy, but also to their home communities, and will always have a prominent place in the fabric of the United States.●

HAMPTON FIRST RESPONDERS

● Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I wish to recognize first responders from New Hampshire who heroically worked together to save two swimmers who were struggling to make their way back to shore at Hampton Beach in Hampton, NH, on July 25, 2013.

On the night of July 25, Hampton Fire & Rescue and the Hampton Police Department received notification that three individuals swimming in the water at Hampton Beach were unable to make their way back to shore. First responders from the departments immediately sprang into action and quickly arrived at Hampton Beach. While one of the three individuals was rescued by fellow beachgoers, two young men remained in the water not far from shore, struggling in riptide conditions and unable to swim back to land.

Hampton firefighters including Fire Chief Christopher Silver, Deputy Fire Chief Jameson Ayotte, Captain William Kennedy, Lieutenant Michael Brillard, Greg Smushkin, Jed Carpentier, Nate Denio, Jason Newman, Kyle Jameson, Kyle Averill, Buck Frost, Matthew Clement, Donald Thibeault and Hampton Police Officer James Deluca worked together to save the two 28-year old men who were caught in the water. The first responders worked in varying capacities, with some in the water, some aboard the Hampton Fire Department's rescue boat and others on shore, and acted as a unified team to successfully pull the swimmers to safety.

First responders are fundamental to the safety of individuals and communities in New Hampshire and throughout the country, as evidenced by the lives that were so recently rescued at Hampton Beach. These public servants came together from across different departments and divisions, as they often do, to perform their selfless work on behalf of people in need. The work of heroes like those in Hampton often goes unnoticed, but it is important that we do not take for granted the daily efforts made by all first responders to make our communities safer and improve the quality of life of all Americans.

I commend these gentlemen for their selfless actions on the night of July 25. The Hampton-area community and all New Hampshire residents applaud the work that dedicated first responders do every day. We specifically thank this group of public servants for saving lives on the night of July 25, 2013.●

ALSTEAD, NEW HAMPSHIRE

● Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I wish to to commemorate the 250th anniversary of the town of Alstead, NH.

Alstead was first chartered by Massachusetts Governor Jonathan Belcher as one of nine forts established in 1735 to protect southwestern New Hampshire from attack. Once New Hampshire was decreed its own province, New Hampshire Governor Benning Wentworth granted the land, then called Newton, in 1752. The area was finally incorporated in 1763 and renamed Alstead in honor of Johann Heinrich Alsted, a German professor and encyclopedist, whose works were popular at Harvard College. Alstead was a predominantly agricultural community, but its waterways also provided sufficient power to run a number of small mills, including New Hampshire's first paper mill, built in 1793.

Alstead boasts a quintessentially New Hampshire history with the exception of a small misstep in 1781 when the town voted to join the State of Vermont. Alstead was not alone in this wavering allegiance after the Revolutionary War, but I am very pleased to report that residents came to their senses the following year and rejoined the Granite State.

Two hundred and fifty years later, Alstead's views of Feuer State Park and Warren Pond serve as a beautiful backdrop to the community's rich history and small town charm. From August to October, Alstead will celebrate their sestercentennial with historical plays and tours, parades, lectures and exhibits.

I congratulate Alstead on this milestone in their history and thank this

community for its great contributions to our State.●

CANDIA, NEW HAMPSHIRE

● Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I wish to commemorate the 250th anniversary of the town of Candia, NH.

Candia was first settled in 1743 and was colloquially known as ''Charmingfare,'' perhaps due to its many bridle paths and lovely scenery. Gov. Benning Wentworth incorporated the town in 1763 and renamed it Candia, likely in honor of the principal city of the Greek island of Crete, which he had visited after his graduation from Harvard College.

With some of the earliest farmed land in New Hampshire, Candia grew into a strong industrial center with the help of the railroad and well-established mills which dominated its economy. Today, Candia has become a popular tourist destination for its quaint New England feel, family-friendly attractions, beautiful scenery and ease of travel.

I was pleased to welcome award-winning Candia Vineyards to Washington this past June for our annual Experience New Hampshire reception, where Granite Staters and Washingtonians alike could sample their wonderful wares.

Candia will honor this 250th milestone through a yearlong series of celebrations commemorating their long and rich history. I congratulate this wonderful community on their sestercentennial and wish them continued success for their next 250 years.●

CROYDON, NEW HAMPSHIRE

● Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I rise today to commemorate the 250th anniversary of the town of Croydon, NH.

The town of Croydon was incorporated and granted in 1763 by Gov. Benning Wentworth. Named for the London suburb of Croydon, England, our Croydon is situated on the highlands between the Connecticut and Merrimack Rivers. It is home to Corbin Park, one of the largest private game reserves in New England. Visitors may hunt a variety of animals including elk, European boar and bison on 24,000 acres of forested and mountainous terrain. Croydon also boasts the Croydon Village School, one of two remaining one-room schoolhouses still in use in the State of New Hampshire.

Today, Croydon's quaint, small-town feel and natural beauty continue to charm visitors and residents alike today. I congratulate this close-knit community on their sestercentennial anniversary and wish them continued success in their next 250 years.●

GILSUM, NEW HAMPSHIRE

● Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, today I wish to recognize an important milestone for the town of Gilsum, NH, upon the occasion of its semiquincentennial anniversary. Situated in scenic southwest New Hampshire, Gilsum actually received its first charter in 1752 under the name Boyle but was never settled. Governor Benning Wentworth re-chartered this land in 1763 to five proprietors, including Samuel Gilbert and his son-in-law Thomas Sumner. The name ''Gilsum'' was a compromise reached to resolve Gilbert and Sumner's ongoing dispute over the name of their new settlement.

Historically, Gilsum was a farming and manufacturing community, making use of the nearby Ashuelot River to power multiple factories by the 1850s. Gilsum also boasted a productive mine, which provided important economic stability for the town during its early years of development. Today, Gilsum is home to the W.S. Badger Company, a quintessential New Hampshire small business success story that now sells its wonderful skincare products, including its ''Badger Balm,'' across the country.

Gilsum will mark its 250th anniversary in August with a parade, talent show, community exhibits and music to commemorate its proud heritage. I rise today to wish Gilsum a joyful celebration of this important milestone and thank all its citizens for their contributions to New Hampshire.●

HAMPTON, NEW HAMPSHIRE

● Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I rise today to congratulate the town of Hampton, NH, on the occasion of its 375th anniversary.

Coastal Hampton is one of the 4 original New Hampshire townships chartered by the General Court of Massachusetts. It was first settled in 1638 under the name Winnacunnet, an Algonquian word meaning ''pleasant pines. '' One year later, Winnacunnet's Puritan settlers renamed the town ''Hampton'' to honor the birthplace of their leader Reverend Stephen Bachiler, a colorful figure whose descendants still populate Hampton today.

Hampton was a modest but bustling community whose early industry centered around farming and fishing. All that changed with the arrival of the railroad in 1840. Visitors from Boston and other cities soon discovered the charms of Hampton's stunning coastline, aided by the Exeter, Hampton and Amesbury Trolley line, which connected inland mill towns to the seacoast. Today, thousands of visitors flock to Hampton's beaches to surf, sunbathe, or take to the high seas on chartered fishing or whale watching expeditions.

The Hampton Historical Society will host a series of events throughout 2013 to commemorate this important milestone through a series of lectures and town-wide activities. I congratulate this beautiful town on 375 years of success and thank them for their contributions to our great State.●

HAVERHILL, NEW HAMPSHIRE

● Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I wish to celebrate and recognize the 250th anniversary of the town of Haverhill, NH.

Haverhill, first known as Lower Coos, was settled by citizens from Haverhill, MA and incorporated by Governor Benning Wentworth in 1763. Haverhill is situated on our State border, next to the mouth of the Ammonoosuc River, and shares much of its heritage with its sister city of Newbury in Vermont across the Connecticut River. Haverhill's location at the end of the Old Province Road was critical to its rapid development; this road, one of the earliest highways in New Hampshire, served as a supply route connecting the northern and western settlements with the seacoast. Haverhill's village of Woodsville hosted a railway supply enterprise that played an important role in the early years of the Boston, Concord and Montreal Railroad. Haverhill may have looked remote on a map, but it was clearly a town on the move.

Today, visitors to Haverhill may visit the oldest covered bridge still in use in New Hampshire, the Haverhill-Bath Bridge, built in 1829 and listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The Haverhill Historic Society has painstakingly curated many artifacts from the town's long and industrious history and hosts fascinating lectures throughout the year. Haverhill is also home to the Museum of American Weather, which offers an unusual and insightful view into New England history through its exhibits documenting weather events across our region.

The town of Haverhill will celebrate its semiquincentennial jointly with Newbury, VT through a series of events this year, culminating in an old-fashioned skating party in December. I congratulate Haverhill on 250 years of accomplishments, and thank its citizens for their many contributions to the Granite State.●

LISBON, NEW HAMPSHIRE

● Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I congratulate the residents of the town of Lisbon, NH as they celebrate its 250th anniversary.

Lisbon's roots date back to 1749, when Samuel Martin went on a hunting trip with his son in the wilderness along the Ammonoosuc River in the White Mountains. This beautiful region made a lasting impression on Martin, who returned to build a small cabin on Henry Pond with his family. This area would soon be settled and named the Gunthwaite settlement, which grew in size as soldiers returned from the Revolutionary War. In 1824, Gov. Levi Woodbury renamed the town Lisbon in honor of his friend Colonel William Jarvis, who had been appointed by President Thomas Jefferson to be the United States consul in Lisbon, Portugal.

The Ammonoosuc River provided a natural source of power for mills and factories that bolstered Lisbon's industry and helped it grow into a bustling town. At one time, Lisbon's Parker Young Company was the largest manufacturer of piano sounding boards in the world. Lisbon was also the first site in New Hampshire to have a ski rope tow.

Many of Lisbon's residents are descended from the town's original settlers and feel a strong commitment to preserving their town's history. Lisbon proudly honors New Hampshire's State flower during its annual Lilac Festival, held every Memorial Day weekend. Lisbon is also known for its public library, which houses nearly 10,000 volumes and serves neighboring towns Lyman and Landaff. On August 10, 2013, Lisbon residents and friends will come together to commemorate their 250th anniversary with music and community events to celebrate their past, present and future.

I wish the town of Lisbon a wonderful celebration and congratulate its citizens on this milestone in New Hampshire history.●

NEW BOSTON, NEW HAMPSHIRE

● Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I wish today to honor the town of New Boston, NH, which celebrates its 250th anniversary this year. As its name suggests, New Boston's long and admirable history bridges that of New Hampshire and our neighbor Massachusetts.

New Boston's first settlers came north in search of new opportunity. The land was originally granted in 1736 by the regional governor of Massachusetts and New Hampshire, Jonathan Belcher. Records show that locals had originally planned to christen the town ''Lanestown,'' but over time referred to the property as New Boston in honor of their former home. From 1736 until 1763, New Boston was legally part of Massachusetts; but during the course of those 30 years, the original grantees failed to establish a proper claim. In 1763, New Boston was formally incorporated and recognized as part of New Hampshire by Governor Benning Wentworth.

From its first census, we know that New Boston's residents quickly established a bustling community, building a lumber mill and clearing 200 acres of land. By the early 19th century, New Boston boasted 16 school houses, a bark mill, clothing mills, over 25 saw mills and even a tavern to host both travelers and townsfolk after a long day. Unfortunately, many documents depicting New Boston's origins were destroyed by the Great Village Fire of 1887, which ravaged the town and set over 40 of its buildings ablaze. New Boston's residents were undeterred by this tragedy, taking stock and quickly rebuilding their industrial center.

By 1893, New Boston had a railroad station, allowing merchants to move goods and services through their town into Massachusetts and further northeast. In the 1940s, New Boston became the proud home of two military institutions: the Gravity Research Foundation, which conducted research in hopes of creating a gravitational shielding system, and the New Boston Air Force Station, which tracks military satellites.

New Boston continues to inspire our State with its industrious and creative spirit. There is much to celebrate in New Boston's 250 years, and I am sure that the next 250 years will be equally or even more successful.●

PLYMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE

● Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I wish to congratulate the town of Plymouth, NH on their 250th anniversary.

Plymouth sits at the geographic center of New Hampshire on the west bank of the Pemigewasset River. Gov. Benning Wentworth granted this plot of land to returning soldiers from the French and Indian War and named it New Plymouth, after the original Plymouth Colony in Massachusetts. Plymouth's unparalleled views of mountains, fields and forests provide a stunning backdrop to a bustling town noted for its focus on industry and education, as well as its historical significance.

Plymouth's educational commitment began with its earliest settlers, whose children were predominantly literate. This devotion to education continues today through Plymouth State University, one of the area's oldest and finest institutions that counts Poet Laureate Robert Frost as a former faculty member. Every September, the Plymouth population doubles from 4,000 to 8,000 as students return to campus to take advantage of the rich opportunities offered at this university.

Plymouth was originally an industrial center known for its buck glove industry, its farming and its logging industry. It was also home to Draper and Maynard, a renowned sporting goods purveyor that supplied baseball gloves to Babe Ruth and his Boston Red Sox teammates.

Plymouth's strong tourism and skiing tradition dates back to the 1930s, when the once ubiquitous snow trains brought hundreds of skiers from Boston and other cities to the slopes of the White Mountains. Plymouth has taken great strides to preserve this history and heritage through the recently opened Museum of the White Mountains, which houses treasured art and artifacts from more than a century ago. The town continues to attract tourists hoping to see a quintessential New England town in action and remains a popular year-round destination for camping, hiking and winter sports.

I congratulate Plymouth on its 250th anniversary and wish all its citizens a joyous year of celebration of their proud history.●

SANDWISH, NEW HAMPSHIRE

● Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I wish to honor the town of Sandwich, NH, on the occasion of its 250th anniversary.

Sandwich is a quintessential New England village between the foothills of the White Mountains and breathtaking Squam Lake. Sandwich was chartered in 1763 by Governor Benning Wentworth and named for John Montagu, the 4th Earl of Sandwich. Lord Sandwich held various distinguished positions in British politics and its military, but is perhaps best known for his purported invention of a slice of meat between two slices of bread to sustain him while playing cards.

Sandwich's land would later double in size due to many concerns that the original grant was too inaccessible for a permanent settlement. In fact, from this expansion, Sandwich remains one of the largest towns in New Hampshire today. The first settlers arrived 4 years later, and by the early 19th Century the town of Sandwich had grown from uncharted wilderness into a bustling community of farms, schools, churches, traders, and artisans.

Sandwich's local fair is a wonderful New Hampshire tradition that celebrated its 100th anniversary last year. The Sandwich Fair has origins as far back as 1886, when local farmers gathered together to show off their livestock in hopes of drawing a crowd to trade and sell their goods. The event quickly grew to include community events such as band performances, beautiful baby contests, and, in the 21st Century, carnival rides. Sandwich's vibrant community, natural beauty, outdoor activities and historic and cultural events continue to draw visitors year-round.

I congratulate Sandwich on this important milestone and wish all citizens of Sandwich the best for their next 250 years.●

THORNTON, NEW HAMPSHIRE

● Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I wish to recognize of the 250th anniversary of Thornton, NH. Nestled in the beautiful Pemigewasset River Valley in the White Mountains, the land that became Thornton was originally granted to a small group of settlers on July 6, 1763 and subsequently incorporated in 1781. Thornton is named for one of those original settlers, Matthew Thornton, who would later become the first speaker of the New Hampshire House of Representatives and New Hampshire's delegate to the Continental Congress. Thornton, who signed Declaration of Independence, was an early and vocal advocate for compete independence from England.

Thornton was also the birthplace of Moses Cheney, an abolitionist and conductor on the Underground Railroad. Cheney founded and oversaw the printing of the Morning Star, an abolitionist Freewill Baptist newspaper distributed in New England from 1833 to

1874. Cheney's two sons added to their father's legacy through their own notable contributions to New England. Elder son Oren Cheney was the founder and first president of Bates College in Maine, and his younger brother Person Cheney served as a U.S. Senator and Governor of New Hampshire.

Thornton's original colonial meetinghouse, built in 1789, still stands in the center of town. Meetinghouses like this are considered the birthplace of small town democracy. This building hosted town meetings from 1790 to 1954. Today, it is being painstakingly restored by the Thornton Historical Society for future use as a museum to house the town's artifacts and documents from its long and proud history.

I honor this town's strong heritage and wish its citizens a wonderful sestercentennial celebration.●

WARREN, NEW HAMPSHIRE

● Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, today I wish to celebrate the 250th anniversary of Warren, NH. Situated in the White Mountain region just south of Franconia Notch, residents of Warren are surrounded by stunning wooded scenery that is quintessential North Country. Warren is a truly perfect example of small town New Hampshire.

In 1763, Gov. Benning Wentworth granted a tract of land to John Page, who settled on this land 4 years later. The area would be officially incorporated in 1770 by Benning Wentworth's nephew and successor, Gov. John Wentworth. Warren is one of two towns in New England that were named for Admiral Sir Peter Warren of County Meath, Ireland. Admiral Warren, a high ranking officer in the British Royal Navy, commanded a fleet that joined forces from Massachusetts to lay siege and capture the fort at Louisbourg, Nova Scotia in 1745. This victory united the colonies against Canada, as well as providing them with crucial fishing and fur trading rights.

For the better half of the 20th century, the Glencliff State Sanatorium operated in the village of Glencliff in Warren. Before the advent of antibiotics, it was thought that the thin, pure mountain air of the North Country could cure tuberculosis, and nearly 4,000 patients sought respite and cure in the White Mountains facility until its closing and conversion to Glencliff Home for the Elderly in 1970. While modern medicine has advanced by leaps and bounds, we certainly understand why a patient would seek the serene beauty of the North Country as a cure for any ill.

Warren's most famous landmark is a Redstone Ballistics Missile, which stands in the center of the village green today. These missiles were commissioned by the U.S. Army in West Germany during the Cold War as defense against the former Soviet Union and were the first to carry live nuclear warheads. This decommissioned missile was placed in the center of town to honor Senator Norris Cotton, a Warren native who served a long career in both the New Hampshire General Court and the United States Congress.

I honor Warren's sestercentennial and congratulate its residents on this important milestone.●

WOODSTOCK, NEW HAMPSHIRE

● Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, today I wish to congratulate the town of Woodstock, NH, on their sestercentennial anniversary.

Woodstock actually began as Peeling, NH, as decreed by Governor Benning Wentworth's 1763 charter. After a number of controversial name changes, the town eventually became known as Woodstock in 1840, possibly thanks to inspiration from the name of a novel by Sir Walter Scott. Appropriately, logging was thickly-forested Woodstock's primary industry, aided by the Pemigewasset River's power to run their saw mills and transport timber down to Lowell, MA. The arrival of the Gordon Pond Railroad helped the industry but also leveled thousands of acres of Woodstock forest.

These areas have long since recovered and 80 percent of Woodstock's land area is now protected under the White Mountain National Forest, which draws droves of tourists each year. In fact, Woodstock's and neighboring Thornton's forests make up Hubbard Brook Experimental Forest, one of the world's longest running ecosystem studies. For 50 years, Hubbard Brook has provided scientists and researchers with critical data and resources that identify and address environmental issues.

Woodstock is also home to local favorite Woodstock Inn Station and Brewery, a five time regional restaurant winner of New Hampshire Magazine's ''Best of New Hampshire'' feature. I was pleased to welcome this business to Washington in June for our annual Experience New Hampshire reception, where they shared their delicious craft beers and other products with Senators and their fellow Granite Staters.

I congratulate Woodstock on this important milestone and wish the community continuing success for their next 250 years.●

DELAWARE'S DREAM TEAM

● Mr. COONS. Madam President, Delaware is known as the First State, and I rise today to commemorate a first in my State. Forty years ago, the Howard High men's basketball team became the first boys' basketball team in the State-tournament era to complete an undefeated season. The 1973 Wildcats were honored for that achievement in Wilmington earlier this year, but today I would like to honor them on the Floor of the Senate.

You see, the story of the '73 Wildcats tells you something about my home State. They were never the tallest team out there—the tallest player was Lonnie Sparrow at 6 feet 3 inches—and they were never considered the team to beat. They were not even considered the best team at Howard High. The highly touted '72 squad had included John Irving who is still one of only two players in Hofstra University history to accumulate 1,000 points and 1,000 rebounds, and led them to their first two NCAA tournament appearances. They could only draw from a small student body of about 700 to 800 students, in contrast to some of the other local high schools.

But what Sparrow, Mike Miller, Eric Fuller, Kenny Hynson, Wayne Parson, Dave Roane, Istavan Norwood, Lemuel Glover, Rich Miles, Joe Robinson, Isaiah Reason, and Ernest Coleman had was better than height or the praise of outsiders. They had coaches that believed in them in Jay Thomas and Stan Hill, and they had a tight-knit group of supporters in the school and the community. Most of all, they had each other, and by playing ball together, they accomplished what no other team had done in Delaware history. Their amazing story includes last-minute buzzer shots to make it to the championships, and even a climactic showdown with long-time rivals Wilmington High, who had ended the school's dreams of a championship the previous year. It is a story made for Hollywood. In a fitting epilogue, they each continue their tradition of quality through teamwork as teachers, coaches, counselors, ministers, businessmen, members of the Armed Services, and civil servants.

But there is one more thing that must be noted. Named after the same Civil War general that Howard University honors and built around the same time, Howard was the first—and for many years only—African-American high school in Delaware. During the 1950's the shameful neglect towards the institution led to a court case challenging separate-but-equal laws that went on to become one of the five decided in the Brown v. Board Supreme Court decision. By the time of the '73 Wildcats, schools were desegregated but the poison of decades of racism persisted.

It was in this context that the all-black Howard team relied on each other, and did the impossible in Delaware. As such, they are an example to all of us—especially, I think, to those of us in the Senate faced with tough challenges for the future. You see, when everyone is betting against us, when it seems like we somehow lack the stature to get the job done, or when the world around us is tumultuous and seems more than any one of us alone can handle, we need to join together, find ways to trust each other, and get the job done. The 1973 Howard High Wildcats just wanted to play great basketball, and they did in storybook fashion. But in doing so, they became an inspiration to their friends, family, community, and at least one U.S. Senator.●

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 and a withdrawal which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:15 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 313. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to institute spending limits and transparency requirements for Federal conference and travel expenditures, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1660. An act to require the establishment of Federal customer service standards and to improve the service provided by Federal agencies.

H.R. 2768. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that a duty of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue is to ensure that Internal Revenue Service employees are familiar with and act in accord with certain taxpayer rights.

H.R. 2769. An act to impose a moratorium on conferences held by the Internal Revenue Service.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1911) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish interest rates for new loans made on or after July 1, 2013, to direct the Secretary of Education to convene the Advisory Committee on Improving Postsecondary Education Data to conduct a study on improvements to postsecondary education transparency at the Federal level, and for other purposes.

At 11:43 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 850. An act to impose additional human rights and economic and financial sanctions with respect to Iran, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2565. An act to provide for the termination of employment of employees of the Internal Revenue Service who take certain official actions for political purposes.

The message further announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 41. Concurrent resolution encouraging peace and reunification on the Korean Peninsula.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 8162 of Public Law 106–79, as amended, and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Speaker appoints the following Members on the part of the House of Representatives to the Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 1:00 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 2611. An act to designate the headquarters building of the Coast Guard on the campus located at 2701 Martin Luther King, Jr., Avenue Southeast in the District of Columbia as the ''Douglass A. Munro Coast Guard Headquarters Building'', and for other purposes.

H.R. 2167. An act to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to establish additional requirements to improve the fiscal safety and soundness of the home equity conversion mortgage insurance program.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 1:30 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 1911. An act to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish interest rates for new loans made on or after July 1, 2013, to direct the Secretary of Education to convene the Advisory Committee on Improving Postsecondary Education Data to conduct a study on improvements to postsecondary education transparency at the Federal level, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 313. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to institute spending limits and transparency requirements for Federal conference and travel expenditures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 850. An act to impose additional human rights and economic and financial sanctions with respect to Iran, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 1660. An act to require the establishment of Federal customer service standards and to improve the service provided by Federal agencies; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 2565. An act to provide for the termination of employment of employees of the Internal Revenue Service who take certain official actions for political purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 2768. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that a duty of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue is to ensure that Internal Revenue Service employees are familiar with and act in accord with certain taxpayer rights; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 2769. An act to impose a moratorium on conferences held by the Internal Revenue Service; to the Committee on Finance.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–2490. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulations; Dinghy Poker Run, Middle River; Baltimore County, Essex, MD'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0489)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2491. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulations; Revision of 2013 America's Cup Regulated Area, San Francisco Bay; San Francisco, CA'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2011–0551)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2492. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulation; Tall Ships Celebration Bay City, Bay City, MI'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0368)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2493. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulations; Red Bull Flugtag National Harbor Event, Potomac River; National Harbor Access Channel, MD'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0114)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2494. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Security Zone; Naval Exercise; Pacific Ocean, Coronado, CA'' ((RIN1625–AA87) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0482)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2495. A communication from the Deputy Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Connect America Fund'' ((RIN3060–AF85) (FCC 13–73)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2496. A communication from the Deputy Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Review of Wireline Competition Bureau Data Practices, Computer III Further Remand Proceedings: Bell Operating Company Provision of Enhanced Services; 1998 Biennial Regulatory Review—Review of Computer III and ONA Safeguards and Requirements'' ((RIN3060–AK03) (FCC 13–69)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2497. A communication from the Deputy Chief, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the

report of a rule entitled ''Facilitating the Deployment of Text-to-911 and Other Next Generation 911 Applications Framework for Next Generation 911 Deployment'' (FCC 13–64) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2498. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regulated Navigation Areas; Bars along the Coasts of Oregon and Washington'' ((RIN1625–AC01) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0216)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2499. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Navigation and Navigable Waters; Technical, Organizational, and Conforming Amendments'' ((RIN1625–AC06) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0397)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2500. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Outer Banks Bluegrass Festival; Shallowbag Bay, Manteo, NC'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0330)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2501. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Venetian Fireworks; Kalamazoo Lake, Saugatuck, MI'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0539)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2502. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Feast of Lanterns Fireworks Display, Pacific Grove, CA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0238)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2503. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; City of Menominee 4th of July Fireworks, Green Bay, Menominee, MI'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0540)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2504. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Summer in the City Water Ski Show; Fox River, Green Bay, WI'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0541)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2505. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Sugar House Casino Fireworks Display, Delaware River; Philadelphia, PA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0495)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2506. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Fifth Coast Guard District Fireworks Displays, Delaware River; Philadelphia, PA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0493)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2507. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Grand Haven 4th of July Fireworks; Grand River; Grand Haven, MI'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0547)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2508. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Margate Mother's Association Fireworks Display, Atlantic Ocean; Margate, NJ'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0494)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2509. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Fort Monroe Fireworks Display, Chesapeake Bay, Hampton, VA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0443)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2510. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Big Bay Boom, San Diego Bay; San Diego, CA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0059)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2511. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; National Cherry Festival Air Show and Fireworks Display, West Grand Traverse Bay, Traverse City, MI'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0189)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2512. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zones; Annual Independence Day Fireworks Displays, Skagway, Haines, and Wrangell, AK'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0078)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2513. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Execpro Services Fireworks Display, Lake Tahoe, Incline Village, NV'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0383)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2514. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; San Diego Symphony Summer POPS Fireworks 2013 Season, San Diego, CA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0388)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2515. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; City of Martinez Fourth of July Fireworks Display, Carquinez Strait, Martinez, CA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0345)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2516. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; City of Vallejo Fourth of July Fireworks Display, Mare Island Strait, Vallejo, CA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0355)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2517. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Fifth Coast Guard District Firework Display, Pagan River; Smithfield, VA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0473)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2518. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Tennessee River, Mile 625.5 to 626.5'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0408)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2519. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Northside Park Pier Fireworks Display, Assawoman Bay, Ocean City, MD'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0439)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2520. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; America's Cup Safety Zone and No Loitering Area, San Francisco, CA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0551)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2521. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; South Park Bridge Construction, Lower Duwamish Waterway, Seattle, WA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0452)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2013; to the

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2522. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Pilot Certification and Qualification Requirements for Air Carrier Operations'' ((RIN2120–AJ67) (Docket No. FAA–2010–0100)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2523. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Adoption of Statuary Prohibition on the Operation of Jets Weighing 75,000 Pounds or Less That Are Not Stage 3 Noise Compliant'' ((RIN2120–AK25) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0503)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2524. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Flight Data Recorder Airplane Parameter Specification Omissions and Corrections'' ((RIN2120–AK27) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0579)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2525. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Combined Drug and Alcohol Testing Programs'' ((RIN2120–AK01) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0688)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2526. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Modification of VOR Federal Airway V–345 in the Vicinity of Ashland, WI'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0236)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2527. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Restricted Area R–2504A and R–2504B; Camp Roberts, CA, and Restricted Area R–2530; Sierra Army Depot, CA'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0515)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2528. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Restricted Areas R–2907A and R–2907B, Lake George, FL; and R–2910, Pinecastle, FL'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2010–1146)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2529. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (53); Amdt. No. 3543'' (RIN2120–AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2530. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (78); Amdt. No. 3542'' (RIN2120–AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2531. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace; Presidio, TX'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0770)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2532. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace; Colt, AR'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1281)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2533. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace; Elbow Lake, MN'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1121)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2534. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace; Sanibel, FL'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1334)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2535. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace; Grand Canyon, AZ'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0163)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2536. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Worthington, MN'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1139)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2537. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Ogallala, NE'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1138)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2538. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Modification of Class D and E Airspace; Twin Falls, ID'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0258)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2539. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace; Parkston, SD'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1282)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2540. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0864)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2541. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0302)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2542. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Embraer S.A. Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1230)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2543. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2008–0620)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2544. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Learjet Inc. Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0214)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2545. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation,

transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; PILATUS Aircraft Ltd. Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0598)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2546. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0522)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2547. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0018)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2548. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation (Sikorsky) Model Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1206)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2549. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Piper Aircraft, Inc. Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0535)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2550. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Dowty Propellers Propellers'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2009–0776)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2551. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; DASSAULT AVIATION Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1067)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2552. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1039)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2553. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1035)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2554. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1305)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2555. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland (Eurocopter) Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0520)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2556. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1034)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2557. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Aircraft Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1330)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2558. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Various Restricted Category Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0553)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2559. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Pilatus Aircraft Ltd. Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0223)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2560. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc Turbofan Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1327)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2561. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Forchlorfenuron; Temporary Pesticide Tolerances'' (FRL No. 9391–9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2562. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Sorbitan monooleate ethylene oxide adduct; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance'' (FRL No. 9389–8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2563. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Complex Polymeric Polyhydroxy Acids; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance'' (FRL No. 9391–2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2564. A communication from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Releasing Information; General Provisions; Accounting and Reporting Requirements; Reports of Accounts and Exposures'' (RIN3052–AC76) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2565. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Handling of Animals; Contingency Plans; Stay of Regulations'' ((RIN0579–AC69) (Docket No. APHIS–2006–0159)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2566. A communication from the Assistant Director, Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting, (6) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of Defense, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2567. A communication from the Assistant Director, Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting, (2) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of the Navy, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2568. A communication from the Assistant Director, Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting, (2) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of the Air Force, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2013; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2569. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the review of internal records to verify employment of Iraqi nationals by the U.S. Government and request from each prime contractor or grantee that has performed work in Iraq information that can verify the employment of Iraqi nationals by such contractor or grantee; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2570. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Report to Congress on Department of Defense Fiscal Year

2012 Purchases from Foreign Entities''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2571. A communication from the Attorney, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendments to the 2013 Mortgage Rules Under the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act (Regulation X) and the Truth in Lending Act (Regulation Z)'' ((RIN3170–AA37) (Docket No. CFPB–2013–0010)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 25, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2572. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 12947 with respect to terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2573. A communication from the Attorney, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Electronic Fund Transfers (Regulation E)'' ((RIN3170–AA33) (Docket No. CFPB–2012–0050)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 25, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2574. A communication from the Secretary of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Broker-Dealer Reports'' (RIN3235–AK2574) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2575. A communication from the Secretary of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Financial Responsibility Rules for Broker-Dealers'' (RIN3235–AJ85) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2576. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Pyroxasulfone; Pesticide Tolerances'' (FRL No. 9393–6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2577. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Trifluralin; Pesticide Tolerance'' (FRL No. 9393–5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2578. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Modification of Significant New Uses of Ethaneperoxoic Acid, 1,1-Demethylpropyl Ester'' (FRL No. 9392–4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2579. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; State of Montana; Interstate Transport of Pollution for the 2006 PM2.5 NAAQS'' (FRL No. 9839–1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2580. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Quality Designations for the 2010 Sulfur Dioxide (SO2) Primary National Ambient Air Quality Standard'' (FRL No. 9841–4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2581. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Oregon: Infrastructure Requirements for the 1997 and 2006 Fine Particulate Matter and 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards'' (FRL No. 9841–1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2582. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Colorado; Second Ten-Year Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan for Greeley'' (FRL No. 9840–9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2583. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Colorado; Second 10-Year Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan for Colorado Springs'' (FRL No. 9840–7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2584. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans, State of California, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District, New Source Review'' (FRL No. 9837–5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2585. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference'' (FRL No. 9811–9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2586. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Wisconsin; Permit Exemption Rule'' (FRL No. 9834–4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2587. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Conditional Exclusions from Solid Waste and Hazardous Waste for Solvent-Contaminated Wipes'' (FRL No. 9838–2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2588. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Software Requirement Specifications for Digital Computer Software used in Safety Systems for Nuclear Power Plants'' (Regulatory Guide 1.172, Revision 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2589. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Developing Software Life Cycle Processes for Digital Computer Software used in Safety Systems for Nuclear Power Plants'' (Regulatory Guide 1.173, Revision 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2590. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Final Safety Evaluation of Westinghouse Electric Company Topical Report WCAP–12610–P–A and CENPD–404–P–A, Addendum 2/WCAP–14342–A and CENPD 404–NP–A, Addendum 2, 'Westinghouse Clad Corrosion Model for ZIRLOTM and Optimized ZIRLOTM' '' (Project No. 700) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2591. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Preparation of Environmental Reports for Nuclear Power Plant License Renewal Applications'' (Regulatory Guide 4.2, Supplement 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2592. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Verification, Validation, Reviews, and Audits for Digital Computer Software Used in Safety Systems of Nuclear Power Plants'' (Regulatory Guide 1.168, Revision 2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2593. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Configuration Management Plans for Digital Computer Software Used in Safety Systems for Nuclear Power Plants'' (Regulatory Guide 1.169, Revision 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2594. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Software Unit Testing for Digital Computer Software Used in Safety Systems of Nuclear Power Plants'' (Regulatory Guide 1.171, Revision 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2595. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Software Unit Testing for Digital Computer Software Used in Safety Systems for Nuclear Power Plants'' (Regulatory Guide 1.171, Revision 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2596. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division,

Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Promulgation of State Implementation Plan Revisions; Infrastructure Requirements for the 1997 and 2006 PM2.5 National Ambient Air Quality Standards; Montana'' (FRL No. 9839–2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2597. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to entering into a Memorandum of Understanding Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Belize Concerning the imposition of import restrictions on categories of archaeological material representing the cultural heritage of Belize from the pre-ceramic, pre-classic, classic, and post-classic periods of the pre-Columbian era through the early and late colonial periods; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2598. A communication from the Program Manager, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Medicare Program; Impatient Psychiatric Facilities Prospective Payment System—Update for Fiscal Year Beginning October 1, 2013 (FY 2014)'' (RIN0938–AR63) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2599. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Recognizing Advance Payments for Gift Cards that are Redeemable for Goods and Services from an Unrelated Entity'' (Rev. Proc. 2013–29) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2600. A communication from the General Counsel, Peace Corps, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report relative to a vacancy in the position of Director of the Peace Corps, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 24, 2013; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2601. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''U.S. Department of State, Category Rating Report''; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2602. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13–109); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2603. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to sections 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13–108); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2604. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to sections 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13–015); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2605. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis, Department of Homeland Security, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2606. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''ATF 2013 PACT Act Report''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–2607. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for a report entitled ''Transforming Today's Vision Into Tomorrow's Reality''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–2608. A communication from the Director of the Regulation Policy and Management Office of the General Counsel, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Patient Access to Records'' (RIN2900–AO61) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 25, 2013; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM–118. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Maine memorializing the President of the United States and Congress of the United States to adopt the Veterans Remembered Flag in honor of all veterans; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

JOINT RESOLUTION

Whereas, there are flags for all branches of the Armed Forces of the United States and there is a flag for prisoners of war and those missing in action, but there is no flag to honor the millions of former military personnel who have served our nation; and

Whereas, a flag is a symbol of recognition for a group or an ideal, and veterans compose a group, certainly represent an ideal and surely deserve their own symbol; and

Whereas, the estimated 20,400,000 veterans, affiliated and unaffiliated with veterans' organizations, who have served in our nation's military compose a significant portion of our nation's population; and

Whereas, there is now a flag that has been designed and created to honor the veterans of the United States called the Veterans Remembered Flag, and displaying and flying a Veterans Remembered Flag would honor the lives of millions of individuals who have served our country in times of war, peace and national crisis; and

Whereas, a Veterans Remembered Flag would memorialize and honor past, present and future veterans and provide an enduring symbol to support tomorrow's veterans today; and

Whereas, displaying and flying a Veterans Remembered Flag would fill the need for a flag honoring all veterans who have served in our nation's armed forces; and

Whereas, the symbolism of this unique flag's design would be all-inclusive, would pay respect to all branches of the military and to the history of our nation and would honor those who have lived, and died, serving our nation; and

Whereas, the design of the flag honors the founding of our nation through the 13 stars that emanate from the hoist of the flag and lead to the large red star that represents our nation and the five branches of our nation's military, the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marines and the Coast Guard; and

Whereas, the white star on the flag symbolizes veterans' dedication to service, the blue star on the flag honors all the men and women who have served in our nation's military and the central gold star on the flag memorializes those who have fallen defending our nation; and

Whereas, the blue stripe that bears the title of the flag honors the loyalty of veterans to our nation, flag and government, and the green field on the flag represents the hallowed ground where fallen veterans rest eternally; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That We, your Memorialists, request that the President of the United States and the United States Congress work together to support adoption of the Veterans Remembered Flag to honor our nation's veterans; and be it further

Resolved, That suitable copies of this resolution, duly authenticated by the Secretary of State, be transmitted to the Honorable Barack H. Obama, President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and to each Member of the Maine Congressional Delegation.

POM–119. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing the federal government of the United States to prioritize distribution of veterans' benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the members of the Armed Forces of the United States, including active duty members of the Massachusetts National Guard, have honorably and with great distinction served their country and have earned the right to be welcomed home with all honors and benefits prescribed by law by a grateful nation; and

Whereas, the words of our first president, George Washington, are a reminder of the importance of honoring promises made to our veterans and their families, when he said, ''the willingness with which our young people are likely to serve in any war, no matter how justified, shall be directly proportional to how they perceive the veterans of earlier wars were treated and appreciated by their nation''; and

Whereas, veterans' benefits must be delivered in a timely fashion out of respect for the significant sacrifice and valiant service of those to whom such benefits are owed, especially given the fact that today's veterans urgently need jobs, health care, housing, education and training in order to successfully re-enter civilian life; and

Whereas, the United States Department of Veterans Affairs is reported to be unable to keep up with a torrent of benefits claims, and the backlog leaves many service members waiting for well over a year after first filing their forms, according to a report from the Center for Investigative Reporting; and

Whereas, according to the center's report, the average wait time for veterans benefits is 273 days, and that veterans filing their first claim, including those who served in Iraq and Afghanistan, wait nearly two months longer, between 316 and 327 days, and in some major population centers wait up to twice as long—642 days in New York, 619 days in Los Angeles and 542 days in Chicago; and

Whereas, the ranks of veterans waiting more than a year for their benefits grew from 11,000 in 2009 to 245,000 in December 2012, an increase of more than 2,000 per cent, and the Veterans Administration is predicting that the situation will get worse, as the number of veterans waiting on the Department to process their claims is expected to reach 1 million by the end of March, 2013: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate hereby requests that the Federal Government of the United States provide sufficient funding and personnel to process veterans' claims in a more timely manner so that the tangible gratitude of the nation can be promptly distributed to all who have earned such recognition; and be it further

Resolved, That resolved, that a copy of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Clerk of the Senate to the President of the United States, the leaders of the Congress of the United States and to each United States senator and representative from Massachusetts.

POM–120. A communication from citizens of the State of Hawaii petitioning for verification and tabulation of State applications for an Article V Convention; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM–121. A resolution adopted by the Mayor and City Commission of the City of Miami Beach, Florida urging the United States Food and Drug Administration to repeal their longstanding prohibition on men who have sex with men from donating blood; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

POM–122. A resolution adopted by the Lawrence City Council of the City of Lawrence, Massachusetts supporting comprehensive immigration reform and urging action from the 113th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM–123. A resolution adopted by the City Electors of Fort Atkinson, Wisconsin seeking to reclaim democracy from the expansion of corporate personhood rights and the corrupting influence of unregulated political contributions and spending; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM–124. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of Orange County, New York opposing the enactment of any legislation that would infringe upon the right of people to bear arms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM–125. A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Webster, Texas protecting and defending the constitutional right to keep and bear arms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM–126. A resolution adopted by the Blount County Board of Commissioners of the State of Tennessee protecting and defending the constitutional right to keep and bear arms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM–127. A resolution adopted by the New Jersey State Federation of Women's Clubs urging the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation regarding gun control; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM–128. A resolution adopted by the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Edgewater, New Jersey expressing its condolences and support for the victims of gun violence and their families in Newtown, CT, Aurora, CO, Blacksburg, VA, Oak Creek, WI, Tucson, AZ, and other communities throughout the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM–129. A resolution adopted by the City of River Oaks, Texas supporting the Constitution of the United States and defending the constitutional right to keep and bear arms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM–130. A resolution adopted by the Board of Trustees of the Village of Tupper Lake, New York opposing any legislation infringing upon the right of the people to keep and bear arms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM–131. A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Naples, Florida urging Congress and the President to protect the constitutional right of the people to keep and bear arms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM–132. A resolution adopted by the Catlin Town Board of the State of New York calling for the repeal of the New York SAFE Act of 2013; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM–133. A resolution adopted by the Northwest Municipal Conference supporting immigration reform that provides a clear and earned path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants, clears immigration backlogs, addresses the current labor market needs and improves state and local economic competitiveness, provides for effective employment verification, promotes immigrant integration, and enhances national security and safety with a sensible enforcement policy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM–134. A resolution adopted by the Alabama Town Board of the State of New York opposing the Early Voting Proposal; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. DURBIN, from the Committee on Appropriations, without amendment:

S. 1429. An original bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113–85).

By Mr. LEAHY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 933. A bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to extend the authorization of the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program through fiscal year 2018.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MENENDEZ for the Committee on Foreign Relations. Steve A. Linick, of Virginia, to be Inspector General, Department of State.

*Matthew Winthrop Barzun, of Kentucky, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Nominee Matthew Winthrop Barzun.

Post United Kingdom.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributors, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: $215, 2/23/2009, Democratic National Committee; $2,500, 9/12/2011, Chandler; $5,000, 9/8/2011, Tim Kaine/Virginia; $35,800, 9/9/2011, Obama Victory Fund; $2,500, 10/10/2011, Yarmuth; $5,000, 12/15/2011, DWS for Congress Weston FL; $9,200, 12/31/2011, Swing State Victory Chicago; $30,800, 1/13/2012, Obama Victory Fund; $5,000, 1/30/2012, Mark Warner/Senator-Virginia; $5,000, 3/10/2012, Claire McCaskill/Senator-Missouri; $2,500, 3/24/2012, Yarmuth; $2,500, 6/29/2012, Chandler, Ben for Congress; $2,500 7/26/2012, Russ Carnahan/U.S. Senate; $2,500, 8/2/2012, Jon Tester/U.S. Senate; $100,000, 9/12/2012, Committee for Charlotte 2 NC; $2,500, 9/25/2012, Kentucky Hse Dem Caucus; $2,500, 10/30/2012, Shelli Yoder/Congress.

2. Spouse: Brooke Browne Barzun: $35,800, 9/9/2011, Obama Victory Fund; $2,500, 10/10/2011, Yarmuth; $9,200, 12/31/2011, Swing State Victory Chicago; $30,800, 1/13/2012, Obama Victory Fund; $2,500, 3/24/2012, Yarmuth; $5,0000, 6/30/2012, Elizabeth Warren for Massachusetts; $2,500, 8/28/2012, Chandler, Ben for Congress; $2,500, 9/24/2012, Kentucky Hse Dem Caucus; $2,500, 10/25/2012, Shelli Yoder/Congress.

3. Children and Spouses: Charles Winthrop Barzun, None; Eleanor C. Barzun, None; Jacques M. Barzun, None.

4. Parents: Roger Barzun: $700, 10/7/2011, Obama for America; $700, 10/7/2011, Obama Victory Fund; $250, 10/29/2012, House Majority PAC; $338, 10/31/2012, Barack Obama For America. Serita Winthrop: $500, 5/30/2011, Bill Nelson for U.S. Senate; $10,000, 11/17/2011, Obama Victory Fund 2012; $2,500, 11/17/2011, Obama for America; $2,500, 11/17/2011, Obama for America; $5,000, 11/17/2011, DNC Services Corp./Democratic National Committee.

5. Grandparents: Deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Charles Barzun: $250, 3/15/2012, John Douglass for Congress; $250, 9/9/2012, John Douglass for Congress; $500, 2/8/2010, Thomas Perriello for Congress; $500, 3/22/2010, Thomas Perriello for Congress; $250, 6/4/2010, Thomas Perriello for Congress; $2,100, 10/12/2011, Obama for America; $2,500, 10/12/2011, Obama for America; $4,600, 10/12/2011, Obama Victory Fund 2012. Emily Little Barzun (sister in law): None.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Mariana Mensch (sister), None; Jon Mensch (brother-in-law), None; Lucretia Barzun Donnelly (sister), None; Robert Donnelly (brother in law), None.

---

*David Hale, of New Jersey, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Lebanon

Nominee: David Hale.

Post: Beirut, Lebanon.

The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: N/A.

2. Spouse: N/A.

3. Children and Spouses: N/A.

Parents: Marjorie Freeman: $25, 5/20/10, RNC; $25, 2/19/12, RNC; $10, 4/12/12, RNC; $20, 8/15/12, RNC; $20, 9/21/12, RNC; $25, 9/27/12, Romney Victory Fund.

5. Grandparents: N/A.

6. Brothers and Spouses: John Hale: $50, 5/20/10; Bridgewater, NJ Republican Municipal Committee.

7. Sisters and Spouses: N/A.

---

*Liliana Ayalde, of Maryland, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federative Republic of Brazil.

Nominee: Liliana Ayalde

Post: State/WHA

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: None.

2. Spouse: Luis Jorge Narvaez: None.

3. Children and Spouses Names: Stefanie Narvaez: None. Natalia Narvaez: None.

4. Parents Names: Jaime Ayalde: None. Mercedes Ayalde: None.

5. Grandparents Names: Fernando Ayalde: Deceased; Elvia Ayalde: Deceased; Max Llorente: Deceased; Mercedes Llorente: Deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses Names: Jaime Ayalde: None. Julie Ayalde: None.

7. Sisters and Spouses Names: Gloria Perez-Ayalde: Deceased; Gustavo Perez: None. Maria Eugenia Ayalde: None. Sergio Romero: None.

---

*Kirk W.B. Wagar, of Florida, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Singapore.

Nominee: Kirk W.B. Wagar

Post: Singapore

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: $5,000, 9/30/10, Democratic Congressional Campaign Cmte; $2,500, 4/29/11, Obama, Barack; $2,500, 4/29/11, Obama, Barack; $2,300, 3/15/07, Obama, Barack; $2,300, 11/14/07, Wexler, Robert; $2,300, 5/7/07, Kerry, John; $1,500, 12/25/07, Loebsack, David; $1,000, 10/5/07, Democratic Party of Iowa; $1,000, 2/26/08, Warner, Mark; $1,000, 1/15/10, Coakley, Martha; $500, 4/25/08, Carson Andre; $500, 7/10/08, Clinton, Hillary; $400, 3/19/08, Montana Democratic Central Cmte; $250, 11/9/11, McCaskill, Claire; $1,000, 3/30/11, American Assn for Justice; $1,000, 7/31/12, American Assn for Justice; $1,000, 7/6/07, American Assn for Justice; $2,500, 11/21/11, Kaine, Tim; $250, 12/7/11, Kaine, Tim; $250, 11/9/11, Tester, Jon; $250, 11/30/11, Brown, Sherrod; $30,800, 4/29/11, DNC Services Corp; 15,200, 3/31/10, DNC Services Corp; $5,000, 10/31/09, DNC Services Corp; $5,000, 10/31/09, DNC Services Corp; $1,000, 7/1/09, DNC Services Corp; $28,500, 6/16/08, DNC Services Corp.

2. Spouse: $2,195, 2/19/12, Obama, Barack; $1,000, 10/7/12, Obama, Barack; $305, 2/19/12, Obama, Barack; $250, 3/29/12, Jacobs, Kristin; $200, 11/2/11, Obama, Barack; $1,000, 6/8/11, Obama, Barack; $290, 9/19/12, Obama, Barack; $500, 6/17/09, Gibson, Shirley; $500, 8/20/08, Obama, Barack; $250, 9/30/09, Meek, Kendrick; $250, 3/31/07, Obama, Barack.

---

*Terence Patrick McCulley, of Washington, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Cote d'Ivoire.

Nominee: Terence Patrick McCulley.

Post: Republic of Côte d'Ivoire.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: none.

2. Spouse: none.

3. Children and Spouses: Sean Patrick McCulley: none; Liam Tyler McCulley: none.

4. Parents: William M. McCulley—deceased; Doris J. McCulley: none.

5. Grandparents: Roy Millage—deceased; Grace Millage Smith—deceased; Jesse McCulley—deceased; Elzie McCully—deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Larry A. McCulley, none; Karen McCulley (sister-in-law), none; Stephen W. McCulley, none; Christine McCulley (sister-in-law), none.

7. Sisters and Spouses: none.

---

*James C. Swan, of California, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

Nominee: James Swan.

Post: Kinshasa, Democratic Republic of the Congo.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: none.

2. Spouse: none.

3. Children and Spouses: Mitchell Henry Swan (Minor): none; Garner Victoria Swan (Minor): none.

4. Parents: Harold Frank Swan—deceased; Corinne Anne Waltham—deceased.

5. Grandparents: James Swan—deceased; Ethel Victoria Swan—deceased; Bertha Chamberlain—deceased; Donald Waltham—deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: (no brother).

7. Sisters and Spouses: Carol Anne Swan: none; Wolf Reade (husband): none.

---

*John R. Phillips, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Italian Republic, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of San Marino.

Nominee: John R. Phillips.

Post: U.S. Ambassador to Italy.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee.

1. Self: $2,500, Summer 2012, Friends of Joe Kennedy; $2,500, 11/02/2012, Friends of Lois Capps for Congress (California); $2,500, October 2012, Chris Murphy (Connecticut); $2,500, October 2012, Richard Carmona (Arizona); $2,500, October 2012, Shelley Berkley (Nevada); $2,500, October 2012, Tammy Baldwin (Wisconson); $2,500, October 2012, Joe Donnelly (Indiana); $2,500, October 2012, Jon Tester (Wyoming); $2,500, October 2012, Claire McCaskill (Missouri); $2,500, September 2012, Elizabeth for Mass; $2,500, 8/21/2012, Act Blue; $2,500, 8/19/2012, Berman for Congress; $2,500, 4/02/2012, Friends of Joe Kennedy; $2,500, 3/28/2012, Elizabeth for Mass; $30,800, 3/27/2012, Obama Victory Fund; $2,500, 3/06/2012, Kaine for Virginia; $9,200, 12/14/2011, Swing State Victory Fund; $2,500, Fall 2011, Berman for Congress; $35,800, 5/18/2011, Obama Victory Fund; $2,500, 4/26/2011, Kaine for Virginia; $35,800, 4/7/2011, Obama Victory Fund; $16,000, 12/22/2010, DNC; $2,500, Summer 2012, Friends of Joe Kennedy; $2,600, May 2013, Markey for Senate.

S. Spouse: Linda D. Douglass: 0.

3. Children and Spouses: Katherine D. Byrd (daughter): Keith Byrd (son-in-law); 0.

4. Parents: Hilda M. Phillips—deceased; William E. Phillips—deceased.

5. Grandparents: Lucy Colussi—deceased; Angelo Filippi—deceased.

6. Brother: Ernest A. Phillips: Denise Phillips (sister-in-law): 0.

7. Brother: William Phillips: telephone response indicated contributions to several people but he has no records available to him. He has not responded further to my written request.

8. Sisters and Spouses: none.

---

*Kenneth Francis Hackett, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Holy See.

Nominee: Kenneth Francis Hackett.

Post: Ambassador to the Holy See.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: $250, 8/05/12, B. Obama; $250, 10/04/12, B. Obama.

2. Spouse: Joan: 0.

3. Children and Spouses: Jennifer: 0; Michael: 0.

4. Parents: Francis Mitchell: 0.

5. Grandparents: None.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Francis X Hackett: 0; Joseph & Ellie Hackett: 0.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Mary & Philip Rowlinson: 0; Kathryn Hackett: 0; Marjorie & David Weeks: 0.

Alexa Lange Wesner, of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Austria.

Nominee: Alexa Lange Wesner.

Post: U.S. Ambassador to the Republic of Austria.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

Self: $5,000, 06/27/13, Progress Texas PAC; $5,000, 05/29/13, Battleground Texas PAC; $1,000, 03/14/13, Udall for Colorado; $10,000, 03/12/13, Progress Texas PAC; $10,000, 03/08/13, Progress Texas PAC; $10,000, 12/13/12, Progress Texas PAC; $10,000, 11/14/12, Progress Texas PAC; $2,000, 09/30/12, Carmona for Arizona; $1,000, 09/30/12, Martin Heinrich for Senate; $2,500, 08/21/12, McCaskill for Missouri; $2,500, 05/15/12, Elizabeth for MA; $2,500, 05/15/12, Elizabeth for MA; $30,800, 02/29/12, DNC Services Corp; $2,000, 01/09/12, Al Franken for Senate; $1,012, 12/30/11, Dem Party of Virginia; $1,012, 12/27/11, Dem Party of Colorado; $552, 12/27/11, Dem Party of Nevada; $1,012, 12/27/11, Dem Party of North Carolina; $552, 12/27/11, Dem Party of Wisconsin; $276, 12/27/11, N.H. Dem. State Cmte.; $1,564, 12/27/11, Dem. Exec Cmte of Fld.; $1,472, 12/27/11, Dem Party of Ohio; $1,196, 12/27/11, Dem Party of Pennsylvania; $276, 12/27/11, MI Dem. State Central Cmte; $2,500, 09/23/11, Kaine for Virginia; $2,500, 06/28/11, Kaine for Virginia; $2,500, 05/03/11, Klobuchar, Amy; $2,500, 04/04/11, Obama, Barack; $2,500, 04/04/11, Obama, Barack; $400, 04/04/11, DNC Services Corp; $2,500, 04/04/11, Gillibrand, Kirsten; $2,500, 03/30/11, Cantwell, Maria; $2,500, 03/25/11, McCaskill, Claire; $2,400, 01/17/11, Friends of Sherrod Brown; $30,400, 01/07/11, DNC Services Corp; $500, 07/08/10, Bennet for Colorado; $2,400, 05/27/10, Friends of Mark Warner; $2,400, 05/27/10, Friends of Mark Warner; $500, 05/06/10, Mark Critz for Congress; $30,400, 03/24/10, DNC Services Corp; $2,400, 03/24/10, Robin Carnahan for Senate; $−2,400, 03/10/10, Friends of Chris Dodd; $1,400, 03/02/10, Chet Edwards for Congress; $1,500, 01/21/10, Travis Cnty Dem Party; $−2,400, 01/20/10, Jack McDonald for Congress; $−2,400, 01/20/10, Jack McDonald for Congress; $1,000, 01/15/10, Martha Coakley for Senate; $1,000, 11/17/09, Rob Miller for Congress; $9,100, 09/30/09, DCCC; $1,000, 08/03/09, Annie's List; $2,500, 07/30/09, Moving Wilco Forward; $5,000, 06/30/09, Annie's List; $2,400, 06/30/09, Robin Carnahan

for Senate; $1,000, 06/26/09, Chet Edwards for Congress; $500, 05/25/09, Franken Recount Fund; $500, 05/14/09, Murphy, Scott; $30,400, 04/30/09, DNC Services Corp; $2,400, 03/31/09, Ciro D. Rodriguez for Congress; $2,400, 03/31/09, Jack McDonald for Congress; $2,400, 03/31/09, Jack McDonald for Congress; $2,400, 03/30/09, Friends of Chris Dodd; $2,400, 03/30/09, Friends of Chris Dodd; $2,400, 02/26/09, Friends of Harry Reid; $2,400, 02/26/09, Friends of Harry Reid.

Spouse: Blaine Fleming Wesner: $2,773, 11/07/12, National Venture Cap. Assn.; $578, 10/26/12, Democratic Party of Virginia; $771, 10/20/12, Dem Party of Wisconsin; $964, 10/20/12, Dem Executive Cmte of Fld.; $449, 10/20/12, Democratic Party of CO; $642, 10/20/12, Democratic Party of Iowa; $642, 10/20/12, Democratic Party of Nevada; $449, 10/20/12, Democratic Party of North; $1,542, 10/20/12, Democratic Party of Ohio; $2,300, 07/25/12, Clinton, Hillary; $30,800, 02/29/12, DNC Services Corp; $2,773, 12/21/11, National Venture Cap. Assn; $2,500, 09/23/11, Kaine, Tim; $2,500, 09/23/11, Kaine, Tim; $30,800, 05/02/11, DNC Services Corp; $2,500, 05/02/11, Obama, Barack; $2,500, 05/02/11, Obama, Barack; $2,773, 11/16/10, National Venture Cap. Assn; $2,400, 05/27/10, Warner, Mark; $2,400, 05/27/10, Warner, Mark; $2,400, 03/02/10, Edwards, Chet; $−2,400, 01/20/10, McDonald, Jack; $−2,400, 01/20/10, McDonald, Jack; $5,000, 01/14/10, Forward Together PAC; $2,773, 12/22/09, National Venture Cap. Assn; $2,400, 03/31/09, McDonald, Jack; $2,400, 03/31/09, McDonald, Jack.

Children and Spouses: Natalie Keep Wesner: None; Tennyson Lange Wesner: None; Livia Hawk Wesner: None.

Parents: Per Lange: $1,000, 10/28/12, Obama, Barack; $250, 02/02/12, DNC Services Corp; $2,500, 12/31/11, Obama, Barack; $250, 04/15/11, DNC Services Corp; $250, 02/22/11, DNC Services Corp; Brigitte Lange: None.

Grandparents: Gertrude Bruecher-Herpel, Herald Bruecher-Herpel—Deceased.

Brothers and Spouses: (I have no brothers), NA.

Sisters and Spouses: (I have no sisters), NA.

---

*Daniel A. Sepulveda, of Florida, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Communications and Information Policy in the Bureau of Economic, Energy, and Business Affairs and U.S. Coordinator for International Communications and Information Policy.

*Ryan Clark Crocker, of Washington, to be a Member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors for a term expiring August 13, 2013.

*Ryan Clark Crocker, of Washington, to be a Member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors for a term expiring August 13, 2016.

*Matthew C. Armstrong, of Illinois, to be a Member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors for a term expiring August 13, 2015.

*Jeffrey Shell, of California, to be Chairman of the Broadcasting Board of Governors.

*Jeffrey Shell, of California, to be a Member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors for a term expiring August 13, 2015.

By Mr. LEAHY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Patricia Ann Millett, of Virginia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit.

Gregory Howard Woods, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York.

Debra M. Brown, of Mississippi, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Mississippi.

Elizabeth A. Wolford, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of New York.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mrs. HAGAN (for herself and Mr. HATCH):

S. 1417. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize programs under part A of title XI of such Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CARDIN:

S. 1418. A bill to require the Attorney General to make competitive grants to State, tribal, and local governments to establish and maintain witness protection and assistance programs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1419. A bill to promote research, development, and demonstration of marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. RISCH):

S. 1420. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide for transparency of payments made from the Judgment Fund; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEAHY:

S. 1421. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a refundable tax credit for the installation of sprinklers and elevators in historic structures; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. KING, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 1422. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 respecting the scoring of preventive health savings; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 1423. A bill to amend the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 to strengthen the quality control measures in place for part B lung disease claims and to establish the Advisory Board on Toxic Substances and Worker Health for the contractor employee compensation program under subtitle E of such Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. COONS):

S. 1424. A bill to require the Supreme Court of the United States to promulgate a code of ethics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 1425. A bill to improve the safety of dietary supplements by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require manufacturers of dietary supplements to register dietary supplements with the Food and Drug Administration and to amend labeling requirements with respect to dietary supplements; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 1426. A bill to prohibit employers from compelling or coercing any person to authorize access to a protected computer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 1427. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to clarify the rule allowing discharge as a nonpriority claim of governmental claims arising from the disposition of farm assets under chapter 12 bankruptcies; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 1428. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to provide for wildfire mitigation grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 1429. An original bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Appropriations; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 1430. A bill to authorize the continued use of certain water diversions located on National Forest System land in the Frank Church-River of No Return Wilderness and the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. THUNE, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. HELLER, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. 1431. A bill to permanently extend the Internet Tax Freedom Act; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. HIRONO:

S. 1432. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating portions of the Ka'u Coast in the State of Hawaii as a unit of the National Park System; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. PRYOR):

S. 1433. A bill to require that members of the Armed Forces who were killed or wounded in the attack that occurred at a recruiting station in Little Rock, Arkansas, on June 1, 2009, are treated in the same manner as members who are killed or wounded in a combat zone; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. 1434. A bill to designate the Junction City Community-Based Outpatient Clinic located at 715 Southwind Drive, Junction City, Kansas, as the Lieutenant General Richard J. Seitz Community-Based Outpatient Clinic; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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

S. 1435. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide certain port authorities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. VITTER, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 1436. A bill to prevent a fiscal crisis by enacting legislation to balance the Federal budget through reductions of discretionary and mandatory spending; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1437. A bill to provide for the release of the reversionary interest held by the United States in certain land conveyed in 1954 by the United States, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, to the State of Oregon for the establishment of the Hermiston Agricultural Research and Extension Center of Oregon State University in Hermiston, Oregon; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. PRYOR (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 1438. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to provide that military technicians (dual status) shall be included in military personnel accounts for purposes of any order issued under that Act; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 1439. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for advanced illness care coordination services for Medicare beneficiaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. REID (for Ms. LANDRIEU):

S. 1440. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to allow the use of physical damage disaster loans for the construction of safe rooms; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 1441. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to facilitate water leasing and water transfers to promote conservation and efficiency; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. ROBERTS, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. KING, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HARKIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 1442. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the minimum low-income housing tax credit rate for unsubsidized buildings and to provide a minimum 4 percent credit rate for existing buildings; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. BENNET):

S. 1443. A bill to facilitate the remediation of abandoned hardrock mines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 1444. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment under part A of the Medicare Program on a reasonable cost basis for anesthesia services furnished by an anesthesiologist in certain rural hospitals in the same manner as payments are provided for anesthesia services furnished by anesthesiologist assistants and certified anesthetists in such hospitals; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PRYOR:

S. 1445. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the participation of optometrists in the National Health Service Corps scholarship and loan repayment programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Ms. STABENOW, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 1446. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve the affordability of the health care tax credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

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

S. 1447. A bill to make technical corrections to certain Native American water rights settlements in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 1448. A bill to provide for equitable compensation to the Spokane Tribe of Indians of the Spokane Reservation for the use of tribal land for the production of hydropower by the Grand Coulee Dam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER:

S. 1449. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that income attributable to certain passenger cruise voyages beginning or ending in the United States shall be treated as effectively connected with the conduct of a trade or business within the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER:

S. 1450. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose an ad valorem excise tax on certain passenger cruise voyages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. REID, Mr. HELLER, and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 1451. A bill to provide for environmental restoration activities and forest management activities in the Lake Tahoe Basin, to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the importation or shipment of quagga mussels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. FRANKEN (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. DURBIN, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 1452. A bill to enhance transparency for certain surveillance programs authorized by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 1453. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish an interagency coordinating committee on pulmonary hypertension to develop recommendations to advance research, increase awareness and education, and improve health and health care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. REID (for Ms. LANDRIEU):

S. 1454. A bill to authorize the Small Business Administrator to establish a grant program to empower encore entrepreneurs; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. COBURN (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 1455. A bill to condition the provision of premium and cost-sharing subsidies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act upon a certification that a program to verify household income is operational; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. AYOTTE (for herself and Mr. BENNET):

S. 1456. A bill to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Shimon Peres; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself and Mr. PAUL):

S. 1457. A bill to exempt the aging process of distilled spirits from the production period for purposes of capitalization of interest costs; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 1458. A bill to establish the Daniel Webster Congressional Clerkship Program; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 1459. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to prohibit the transportation of horses in interstate transportation in a motor vehicle containing 2 or more levels stacked on top of one another; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. TESTER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1460. 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; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 1461. A bill to establish a National Catastrophe Risks Consortium and a National Homeowners' Insurance Stabilization Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. MCCASKILL, and Mr. PRYOR):

S. 1462. A bill to extend the positive train control system implementation deadline, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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

S. 1463. A bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to prohibit importation, exportation, transportation, sale, receipt, acquisition, and purchase in interstate or foreign commerce, or in a manner substantially affecting interstate or foreign commerce, of any live animal of any prohibited wildlife species; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. RISCH):

S. 1464. A bill to facilitate and enhance the declassification of information that merits declassification, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. HARKIN):

S. 1465. A bill to ensure that persons who form corporations in the United States disclose the beneficial owners of those corporations, in order to prevent the formation of corporations with hidden owners, stop the misuse of United States corporations by wrongdoers, and assist law enforcement in detecting, preventing, and punishing terrorism, money laundering, tax evasion, and other criminal and civil misconduct involving United States corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 1466. A bill to establish a regulatory review process for rules that the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency plans to propose, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. COONS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. TESTER, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. SCHATZ):

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; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 1468. A bill to require the Secretary of Commerce to establish the Network for Manufacturing Innovation and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 1469. A bill to provide higher-quality, lower-cost health care to seniors; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1470. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act with respect to the guidelines for specification of certain disposal sites for dredged or fill material; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. COATS (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. BURR):

S. 1471. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of the Army to reconsider decisions to inter or honor the memory of a person in a national cemetery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1472. A bill to create a division within the Congressional Budget Office that would perform regulatory analysis; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR:

S. 1473. A bill to develop a model disclosure form to assist consumers in purchasing long-term care insurance; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BEGICH (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1474. A bill to encourage the State of Alaska to enter into intergovernmental agreements with Indian tribes in the State relating to the enforcement of certain State laws by Indian tribes, to improve the quality of life in rural Alaska, to reduce alcohol and drug abuse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MERKLEY:

S. 1475. A bill to establish the position of National Nurse for Public Health, to be filled by the same individual serving as the Chief Nurse Officer of the Public Health Service; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 1476. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the denial of deduction for certain excessive employee remuneration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. THUNE):

S. 1477. A bill to clarify the rights of Indians and Indian tribes on Indian lands the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CARDIN:

S. 1478. A bill to provide that certain uses of a patent or copyright in compliance with an order of the Federal Communications Commission for emergency communications services shall be construed as use or manufacture for the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. FLAKE):

S. 1479. A bill to address the forest health, public safety, and wildlife habitat threat presented by the risk of wildfire, including catastrophic wildfire, on National Forest System land and public land managed by the Bureau of Land Management by requiring the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to expedite forest management projects relating to hazardous fuels reduction, forest health, and economic development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1480. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to provide assistance for condominiums and housing cooperatives damaged by a major disaster, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR:

S. 1481. A bill to require issuers of long term care insurance to establish third-party review processes for disputed claims; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. HEITKAMP, and Mr. VITTER):

S. 1482. A bill to recognize the primacy of States, provide for the consideration of the economic impact of additional regulations, and provide for standards and requirements relating to certain guidelines and regulations relating to health and the environment; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. CANTWELL:

S. 1483. A bill to amend the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 to establish the Federal Oil Spill Research Committee, and to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to include in a response plan certain planned and demonstrated investments in research relating to discharges of oil and to modify the dates by which a response plan must be updated; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. REID (for Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. CORNYN)):

S. 1484. A bill to provide for an exchange of land between the Secretary of Agriculture and the Sabine River Authority of Texas; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. 1485. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an income tax credit for eldercare expenses; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mr. COBURN):

S. 1486. A bill to improve, sustain, and transform the United States Postal Service; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. CHIESA, Mr. COATS, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Mr. KIRK, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. Res. 212. A resolution commending David J. Schiappa; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. NELSON, Mr. KAINE, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. KIRK):

S. Res. 213. A resolution expressing support for the free and peaceful exercise of representative democracy in Venezuela and condemning violence and intimidation against the country's political opposition; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. PRYOR (for himself and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. Res. 214. A resolution designating the week of October 13, 2013, through October 19, 2013, as ''National Case Management Week'' to recognize the value of case management in improving healthcare outcomes for patients; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. COATS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. SHELBY):

S. Res. 215. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the Federal Government should not bail out any State; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

S. Res. 216. A resolution electing Laura C. Dove, of Virginia, as Secretary for the Minority of the Senate; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. Res. 217. A resolution expressing support for designation of October 6, 2013, through October 10, 2013, as ''American College of Surgeons Days'' and recognizing the 100th anniversary of the founding of the organization; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. REID:

S. Con. Res. 22. A concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and an adjournment of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. Con. Res. 23. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States Postal Service should issue a commemorative postage stamp honoring the Reverend Doctor Leon Sullivan and that the

Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee should recommend to the Postmaster General that such a stamp be issued; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 15

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 15, a bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law.

S. 132

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 132, a bill to provide for the admission of the State of New Columbia into the Union.

S. 183

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 183, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for fairness in hospital payments under the Medicare program.

S. 203

At the request of Mr. KAINE, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 203, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition and celebration of the Pro Football Hall of Fame.

S. 316

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

S. 323

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 323, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for extended months of Medicare coverage of immunosuppressive drugs for kidney transplant patients and other renal dialysis provisions.

S. 367

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 367, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy caps.

S. 420

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 420, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the logical flow of return information between partnerships, corporations, trusts, estates, and individuals to better enable each party to submit timely, accurate returns and reduce the need for extended and amended returns, to provide for modified due dates by regulation, and to conform the automatic corporate extension period to long-standing regulatory rule.

S. 424

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 424, a bill to amend title IV of the Public Health Service Act to provide for a National Pediatric Research Network, including with respect to pediatric rare diseases or conditions.

S. 462

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 462, a bill to enhance the strategic partnership between the United States and Israel.

S. 489

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) were added as cosponsors of S. 489, a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to increase and adjust for inflation the maximum value of articles that may be imported duty-free by one person on one day, and for other purposes.

S. 501

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 501, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and increase the exclusion for benefits provided to volunteer firefighters and emergency medical responders.

S. 557

At the request of Mrs. HAGAN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 557, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to medication therapy management under part D of the Medicare program.

S. 623

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

S. 629

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 629, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to recognize the service in the reserve components of the Armed Forces of certain persons by honoring them with status as veterans under law, and for other purposes.

S. 635

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) and the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) were added as cosponsors of S. 635, a bill to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to provide an exception to the annual written privacy notice requirement.

S. 642

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 642, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make the provision of technical services for medical imaging examinations and radiation therapy treatments safer, more accurate, and less costly.

S. 653

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor 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. 654

At the request of Mr. MORAN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 654, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for collegiate housing and infrastructure grants.

S. 686

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 686, a bill to extend the right of appeal to the Merit Systems Protection Board to certain employees of the United States Postal Service.

S. 689

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 689, a bill to reauthorize and improve programs related to mental health and substance use disorders.

S. 695

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 695, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the authorization of appropriations for the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to pay a monthly assistance allowance to disabled veterans training or competing for the Paralympic Team and the authorization of appropriations for the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide assistance to United States Paralympics, Inc., and for other purposes.

S. 710

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 710, a bill to provide exemptions from municipal advisor registration requirements.

S. 719

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Delaware

(Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 719, a bill to provide for the expansion of Federal efforts concerning the prevention, education, treatment, and research activities related to Lyme and other tick-borne diseases, including the establishment of a Tick-Borne Diseases Advisory Committee.

S. 723

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 723, a bill to require the Commissioner of Social Security to revise the medical and evaluation criteria for determining disability in a person diagnosed with Huntington's Disease and to waive the 24-month waiting period for Medicare eligibility for individuals disabled by Huntington's Disease.

S. 734

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 734, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation.

S. 783

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

S. 798

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 798, a bill to address equity capital requirements for financial institutions, bank holding companies, subsidiaries, and affiliates, and for other purposes.

S. 862

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) were added as cosponsors of S. 862, a bill to amend section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an additional religious exemption from the individual health coverage mandate.

S. 878

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 878, a bill to amend title 9 of the United States Code with respect to arbitration.

S. 917

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

S. 971

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 971, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to exempt the conduct of silvicultural activities from national pollutant discharge elimination system permitting requirements.

S. 981

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 981, a bill to direct the Federal Trade Commission to prescribe rules prohibiting deceptive advertising of abortion services, and for other purposes.

S. 1048

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1048, a bill to revoke the charters for the Federal National Mortgage Corporation and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation upon resolution of their obligations, to create a new Mortgage Finance Agency for the securitization of single family and multifamily mortgages, and for other purposes.

S. 1056

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1056, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a refundable adoption tax credit.

S. 1064

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1064, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for treatment of clinical psychologists as physicians for purposes of furnishing clinical psychologist services under the Medicare program.

S. 1068

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1068, a bill to reauthorize and amend the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Commissioned Officer Corps Act of 2002, and for other purposes.

S. 1075

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1075, a bill to extend the phase-in of actuarial rates for flood insurance for certain properties under the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012.

S. 1088

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1088, a bill to end discrimination based on actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity in public schools, and for other purposes.

S. 1114

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1114, a bill to provide for identification of misaligned currency, require action to correct the misalignment, and for other purposes.

S. 1118

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1118, a bill to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to better enable State child welfare agencies to prevent sex trafficking of children and serve the needs of children who are victims of sex trafficking, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1118, supra.

S. 1123

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1123, a bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to curb waste, fraud, and abuse in the Medicare and Medicaid programs.

S. 1143

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1143, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to physician supervision of therapeutic hospital outpatient services.

S. 1158

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CHIESA), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1158, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins commemorating the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

S. 1174

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1174, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the 65th Infantry Regiment, known as the Borinqueneers.

S. 1181

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1181, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt certain stock of real estate investment trusts from the tax on foreign investments in

United States real property interests, and for other purposes.

S. 1188

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1188, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the definition of full-time employee for purposes of the individual mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 1235

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1235, a bill to restrict any State or local jurisdiction from imposing a new discriminatory tax on cell phone services, providers, or property.

S. 1254

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1254, a bill to amend the Harmful Algal Blooms and Hypoxia Research and Control Act of 1998, and for other purposes.

S. 1269

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1269, a bill to amend the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to support community college and industry partnerships, and for other purposes.

S. 1272

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1272, a bill to provide that certain requirements of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act do not apply if the American Health Benefit Exchanges are not operating on October 1, 2013.

S. 1282

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1282, a bill to reduce risks to the financial system by limiting banks' ability to engage in certain risky activities and limiting conflicts of interest, to reinstate certain Glass-Steagall Act protections that were repealed by the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1300

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1300, a bill to amend the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 to provide for the conduct of stewardship end result contracting projects.

S. 1302

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1302, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for cooperative and small employer charity pension plans.

S. 1313

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1313, a bill to promote transparency, accountability, and reform within the United Nations system, and for other purposes.

S. 1320

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 1320, a bill to establish a tiered hiring preference for members of the reserve components of the armed forces.

S. 1335

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1335, a bill to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes.

S. 1343

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1343, a bill to protect the information of livestock producers, and for other purposes.

S. 1349

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) 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. 1351

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1351, a bill to provide for fiscal gap and generational accounting analysis in the legislative process, the President's budget, and annual long-term fiscal outlook reports.

S. 1385

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1385, a bill to provide for the appointment of additional Federal circuit and district judges, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 13

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 13, a concurrent resolution commending the Boys & Girls Clubs of America for its role in improving outcomes for millions of young people and thousands of communities.

S. RES. 206

At the request of Mr. SESSIONS, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 206, a resolution designating September 2013 as ''National Prostate Cancer Awareness Month''.

S. RES. 208

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 208, a resolution designating the week beginning September 8, 2013, as ''National Direct Support Professionals Recognition Week''.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1419. A bill to promote research, development, and demonstration of marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today Senator MURKOWSKI and I are introducing legislation to promote a new form of hydropower, marine hydrokinetic renewable energy, or MHK. An MHK project generates energy from waves, currents, and tides in the ocean, an estuary or a tidal area as well as from the free-flowing water in a river, lake, or stream.

Our bill will help commercialize MHK technologies through research and development and a more efficient and timely regulatory process for the siting of pilot projects intended to demonstrate the viability of these technologies. It is an ideal follow-up to a pair of bills, H.R. 267 and H.R. 678, to streamline the regulatory process for low-impact conventional hydropower that were reported by the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources by unanimous bipartisan votes a few months ago. Considered together, the two conventional hydropower bills approved by the Committee along with this MHK legislation are a major step forward in advancing carbon-free hydropower technologies.

MHK has tremendous potential to generate a substantial amount of clean renewable energy in the United States and across the globe. It is poised to be a key participant in the transition to a low carbon economy.

What distinguishes MHK from conventional hydropower is that it generates energy without the use of a dam or other impoundment. This gets MHK off on the right foot in terms of minimizing any adverse environmental impact. Investments to capture our nation's rich domestic marine energy resources can also play a major role in the creation of essential domestic engineering and manufacturing jobs.

The energy contained in predictable waves, tidal flows and currents is the basis for worldwide investments in this emerging industry. Water is approximately 800 times denser than air, providing great potential power density along with predictability. These characteristics mean that MHK technologies could provide predictable

base-load renewable power in the future.

At the present time there are many different types of MHK technologies with multiple applications under development that are intended to capture the power contained in waves, tides and currents.

Wave energy devices capture the heave and/or surge power of waves and convert them via hydraulic or geared direct drive systems into electricity. Some of these devices are moored to the ocean floor, some are floating on the surface, while others are attached to breakwaters near shore. By last count, there are over 100 wave energy devices under development worldwide. Tidal energy technologies capture the ebb and flow of tides. It is estimated that 60 different tidal energy technologies are under development worldwide. There are other technologies that include run-of-river systems and offshore ocean current technologies. Most of these technologies under development capture uni-directional water flows and look similar to the tidal devices.

The United States has not been a world leader in the development of these cutting edge technologies to date. Instead, our country is seen as a huge potential market for our international competitors in this new industrial sector. The United States has significant wave, tidal, current and instream energy resources. The Electric Power Research Institute has estimated that the commercially available wave energy potential off the coast of the United States is roughly 252 million megawatt hours—equal to 6.5 percent of today's entire generating portfolio. This is approximately the amount of electricity presently being produced by the existing fleet of American conventional hydroelectric dams.

The Department of Energy, DOE, has released two nationwide resource assessments that indicate the waves, tides, and ocean currents off the nation's coasts could contribute significantly to the United States' total annual electricity production. DOE is currently developing an aggressive strategy to support its vision of producing at least fifteen percent of our nation's electricity from water power, including conventional hydropower, by 2030.

Our goal should be the establishment of a commercially viable U.S. MHK renewable energy industry, supported by a robust domestic supply chain for fabrication, installation, operations and maintenance of MHK devices. The development of a substantial marine hydrokinetic industry in the U.S. could drive billions of dollars of investment in heavy industrial and maritime sectors, as well as in advanced electrical systems and materials common to many renewable technologies. Federal investments would stimulate private funds and jobs in the construction, manufacturing, engineering, and environmental science sectors.

I am very pleased that my home State of Oregon has made a strategic decision to be an international leader in the commercialization of the marine renewable energy industry. Led by the Oregon Wave Energy Trust, the Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy Center co-located at Oregon State University, and several private companies that are part of the MHK supply chain, Oregon is positioning itself to be a leading force supporting this newly emerging industry.

Unfortunately, the U.S. is falling behind in the race to capture the rich energy potential of our oceans and the jobs that will come with this new industry. The United Kingdom, Ireland, Portugal, Scotland, Australia, and other countries are committed to producing emission-free, renewable energy from MHK sources. Scotland has had a grid-connected, wave energy convertor unit in operation since 2001 and maintains a national goal of producing 2 GW of generation capacity from MHK renewable energy. The U.K. and Ireland have also set aggressive goals for MHK generation by 2020.

The Ocean Renewable Energy Coalition, the industry's trade group here in Washington DC, calculates that more than $782 million has been spent by the UK government on wave energy R&D over the past 10 years. That total approaches $1 billion over the same period if you add in the commitments to ocean energy R&D from France, Portugal, Spain, Norway, and Denmark.

Early funding support, along with development of full-scale device testing centers, demonstrates that the significant technological advances and the competitive advantages in this industry are trending in Europe's direction. As an example of the disparity in investments, Europe currently has several wave and tidal energy test facilities, led by the European Marine Energy Center in Scotland, that are helping technology developers commercialize their wave and tidal energy convertors. The United States clearly has a need for such infrastructure. I know that Oregon State University has a strong desire to compete for funding to help establish a testing center in the Pacific Northwest. Unfortunately, recent funding levels have not supported development of such offshore testing infrastructure in the U.S. to date.

Given this internationally competitive situation, I believe that Congress must make targeted Federal investments to close the gap. Commercialization of technologies to harness marine renewable energy resources will require Federal funding to augment research and development efforts already underway in the private sector. Just as the wind and solar industries have received DOE funding support for over 3 decades, which has resulted in the rapid deployment of these technologies in recent years, the nascent marine energy industry seeks similar Federal assistance to develop promising technologies that are on the verge of commercial viability.

Unfortunately, in addition to the limited private sector funding available to these startup companies, permitting and regulatory obstacles are tremendous disincentives to technology developers of marine energy projects in the United States. While other countries have adopted permitting and regulatory regimes that appear to be more efficient, the United States is still struggling with how to permit and regulate these technologies. I cannot overstate the seriousness of this problem. To give just one example, it took one MHK developer 5 years and $2 million to obtain a license from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for a 1.5 megawatt project.

The regulatory situation is simply unacceptable and is greatly slowing progress in the MHK industry. Until companies get projects in the water, Congress and the public will not learn about the environmental impacts, engineering challenges or the true costs of offshore renewables.

Capturing the benefits of our vast marine-based renewable resources will require a mix of new incentives, updated regulatory regimes and general outreach and education. However, the most important actions that can be taken by the Federal Government in the short term are to provide the necessary resources for research, development and demonstration of various marine renewable energy technology platforms and a workable and efficient regulatory process. Increased federal support will accelerate deployment of these technologies, create thousands of high paying jobs, give confidence to investors, and help attract private capital.

The Marine and Hydrokinetic Renewable Energy Act of 2013 helps accomplish these goals in a number of ways. It reauthorizes the DOE's MHK research, development and demonstration 3 programs, including the National Marine Renewable Energy Research, Development, and Demonstration Centers.

Increased resources for the DOE Water Power Program will enable the United States to leverage its technological superiority in shipbuilding and offshore oil and gas production. This will create jobs and diversify these maritime industries. In the absence of such funding, however, the United States will have to depend on foreign suppliers for ocean energy technologies, and will have missed a significant opportunity to expand our economic competiveness in this renewable energy sector.

The regulatory component of the bill makes the regulatory process for MHK of not more than 10 MW more efficient and timely. It modifies and improves the FERC ''pilot license'' process in many ways. Improvements include a goal to complete the pilot license process in 12 months or less; a designation of FERC as the ''Lead Agency'' for the purpose of coordinating environmental review; a clarification that any shut

down requirement be ''reasonable,'' and a clarification that an MHK project does not need to be removed when it is shut down if FERC deems leaving it in place is preferable for environmental and other reasons

MHK is a clean, home-grown, emissions-free source of electricity that can improve the security and reliability of the electric grid. Investing in MHK research, development and demonstration today will pay great dividends in the future. MHK has tremendous potential to benefit the United States and the entire world. Now is the time to move forward on MHK and the Marine and Hydrokinetic Renewable Energy Act is the way to do it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1419

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Marine and Hydrokinetic Renewable Energy Act of 2013''.

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

TITLE I—MARINE AND HYDROKINETIC RENEWABLE ENERGY TECHNOLOGIES

SEC. 101. DEFINITION OF MARINE AND HYDROKINETIC RENEWABLE ENERGY.

Section 632 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17211) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking ''electrical''.

SEC. 102. MARINE AND HYDROKINETIC RENEWABLE ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

Section 633 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17212) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 633. MARINE AND HYDROKINETIC RENEWABLE ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

''The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, shall carry out a program of research, development, demonstration, and commercial application to expand marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy production, including programs—

''(1) to assist technology development to improve the components, processes, and systems used for power generation from marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy resources;

''(2) to establish critical testing infrastructure necessary—

''(A) to cost effectively and efficiently test and prove marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy devices; and

''(B) to accelerate the technological readiness and commercialization of those devices;

''(3) to support efforts to increase the efficiency of energy conversion, lower the cost, increase the use, improve the reliability, and demonstrate the applicability of marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy technologies by participating in demonstration projects;

''(4) to investigate variability issues and the efficient and reliable integration of marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy with the utility grid;

''(5) to identify and study critical short- and long-term needs to create a sustainable marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy supply chain based in the United States;

''(6) to increase the reliability and survivability of marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy technologies, including development of corrosion-resistant and anti-fouling materials;

''(7) to verify the performance, reliability, maintainability, and cost of new marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy device designs and system components in an operating environment;

''(8) to coordinate and avoid duplication of activities across programs of the Department and other applicable Federal agencies, including National Laboratories;

''(9) to identify opportunities for joint research and development programs and development of economies of scale between—

''(A) marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy technologies; and

''(B) other renewable energy and fossil energy programs, offshore oil and gas production activities, and activities of the Department of Defense; and

''(10) to support in-water technology development with international partners using existing cooperative procedures (including memoranda of understanding)—

''(A) to allow cooperative funding and other support of value to be exchanged and leveraged; and

''(B) to encourage the participation of international research centers and companies in the United States and the participation of research centers and companies of the United States in international projects.''.

SEC. 103. NATIONAL MARINE RENEWABLE ENERGY RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND DEMONSTRATION CENTERS.

Section 634 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17213) is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

''(b) PURPOSES.—The Centers (in coordination with the Department and National Laboratories) shall—

''(1) advance research, development, demonstration, and commercial application of marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy technologies;

''(2) support in-water testing and demonstration of marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy technologies, including facilities capable of testing—

''(A) marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy systems of various technology readiness levels and scales;

''(B) a variety of technologies in multiple test berths at a single location; and

''(C) arrays of technology devices; and

''(3) serve as information clearinghouses for the marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy industry by collecting and disseminating information on best practices in all areas relating to developing and managing marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy resources and energy systems.''.

SEC. 104. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 636 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17215) is amended by striking ''2008 through 2012'' and inserting ''2014 through 2017''.

TITLE II—MARINE AND HYDROKINETIC RENEWABLE ENERGY REGULATORY EFFICIENCY

SEC. 201. MARINE AND HYDROKINETIC RENEWABLE ENERGY PROJECTS AND FACILITIES.

Part I of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 792 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 34. PILOT LICENSE FOR MARINE AND HYDROKINETIC RENEWABLE ENERGY PROJECTS.

''(a) DEFINITION OF HYDROKINETIC PILOT PROJECT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In this section, the term 'hydrokinetic pilot project' means a facility that generates energy from—

''(A) waves, tides, or currents in an ocean, estuary, or tidal area; or

''(B) free-flowing water in a river, lake, or stream.

''(2) EXCLUSIONS.—The term 'hydrokinetic pilot project' does not include a project that uses a dam or other impoundment for electric power purposes.

''(b) PILOT LICENSES AUTHORIZED.—The Commission may issue a pilot license to construct, operate, and maintain a hydrokinetic pilot project that meets the criteria listed in subsection (c).

''(c) LICENSE CRITERIA.—The Commission may issue a pilot license for a hydrokinetic pilot project if the project—

''(1) will have an installed capacity of not more than 10 megawatts;

''(2) is for a term of not more than 10 years;

''(3) will not cause a significant adverse environmental impact or interfere with navigation;

''(4) is removable and can shut down on reasonable notice in the event of a significant adverse safety, navigation, or environmental impact;

''(5) can be removed, and the site can be restored, by the end of the license term, unless the project has obtained a new license or the Commission has determined, based on substantial evidence, that the project should not be removed because it would be preferable for environmental or other reasons not to; and

''(6) is primarily for the purpose of—

''(A) testing new hydrokinetic technologies;

''(B) locating appropriate sites for new hydrokinetic technologies; or

''(C) determining the environmental and other effects of a hydrokinetic technology.

''(d) LEAD AGENCY.—In carrying out this section, the Commission shall act as the lead agency—

''(1) to coordinate all applicable Federal authorizations; and

''(2) to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

''(e) SCHEDULE GOALS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Commission receives a completed application, and following consultation with Federal, State, and local agencies with jurisdiction over the hydrokinetic pilot project, the Commission shall develop and issue pilot license approval process scheduling goals that cover all Federal, State, and local permits required by law.

''(2) COMPLIANCE.—Applicable Federal, State, and local agencies shall comply with the goals established under paragraph (1) to the maximum extent practicable, consistent with applicable law.

''(3) 1-YEAR GOAL.—It shall be the goal of the Commission and the other applicable agencies to complete the pilot license process by not later than 1 year after the date on which the Commission receives the completed application.

''(f) SIZE LIMITATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission may grant a pilot license for a project located in the ocean if the project covers a surface area of not more than 1 square nautical mile.

''(2) EXCEPTION.—The Commission, at the discretion of the Commission and for good cause, may grant a pilot license for a project that covers a surface area of more than 1 square nautical mile.

''(3) LIMITATION.—For proposed projects located in an estuary, tidal area, river, lake, or stream, the Commission shall determine the size limit on a case-by-case basis, taking into account all relevant factors.

''(g) EXTENSIONS AUTHORIZED.—On application by a project, the Commission may make a 1-time extension of a pilot license for a term not to exceed 5 years.''.

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. RISCH):

S. 1420. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide for transparency of payments made from the Judgment Fund; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I rise to discuss legislation that I am introducing in the U.S. Senate today, the Judgment Fund Transparency Act.

As my colleagues may or may not know, the Judgment Fund is administered by the Treasury Department and is used to pay certain court judgments and settlements against the Federal Government. It is essentially an unlimited amount of money available to pay for Federal Government liability. It is not subject to the annual appropriations process, and even more remarkably, the Treasury Department has no reporting requirements, so these funds are paid out with very little oversight or scrutiny.

This is no small matter, as the Judgment Fund disburses billions of dollars in payments per year. In recent years, Treasury has paid the following from the Fund: fiscal year 2012—$2.9 billion, fiscal year 2011—$2.2 billion, fiscal year 2010—$1.1 billion, fiscal year 2009—$2.3 billion, fiscal year 2008—$790 million, fiscal year 2007—$1 billion, and fiscal year 2006—$628 million.

Before the Judgment Fund was established, claims against the government were assigned to a Congressional committee that would appropriate funds in order to pay liability, attorneys' fees, and costs associated with the claim. Once the Judgment Fund was established in 1956, however, Congressional committees stopped appropriating funds explicitly for this purpose. Now, if a government agency does not use its own annual budget to cover the costs, Treasury simply pays the bill out of the Fund.

Because the Treasury Department has no binding reporting requirements, few public details exist about where the funds are going and why, and the information that is readily accessible is only made available at the administration's discretion.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce highlighted the nature of this problem in an article about the Judgment Fund written by Bill Kovacs on February 1, 2013:

Without knowing who is being paid under the Judgment Fund and for what reason, not to mention the validity of the claim, Congress cannot oversee and control the federal governments litigation costs, risks and exposure. Simply, without disclosure Congress is being denied the opportunity to take effective mitigation measures against improper agency action that results in claims against the federal government. Non-disclosure of Judgment Fund payments hides from Congress what might be excessive markers of agency mismanagement and/or structural defects in statutes and programs. And due to a lack of reporting, Congress is denied the opportunity to understand claims against agencies that might shed light on how to improve agency operations.

The National Cattlemen's Beef Association has also decried the lack of oversight of the Judgment Fund by stating, ''Certain groups continuously sue the federal government, and Treasury simply writes a check to foot the bill without providing Members of Congress and American taxpayers basic information about the payment.''

The Judgment Fund Transparency Act seeks to address these problems by requiring a public accounting of the taxpayer funds distributed via the Judgment Fund to parties who bring successful claims against the Federal government.

The Judgment Fund Transparency Act promotes transparency and oversight by requiring the Treasury Department to post on a publicly accessible website the claimant, counsel, agency, fact summary, and payment amount for each claim from the Judgment Fund, unless a law or court order otherwise prohibits the disclosure of such information.

The Judgment Fund Transparency Act would increase transparency and oversight of the Fund and would provide Members of Congress and the public with the ability to see how taxpayers' dollars are being spent.

I am proud to introduce the Judgment Fund Transparency Act today and invite my colleagues to cosponsor this legislation.

By Mr. LEAHY:

S. 1421. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a refundable tax credit for the installation of sprinklers and elevators in historic structures; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, each year fire destroys hundreds of vulnerable historic buildings that serve as the anchors of America's vibrant villages and downtowns. These fires leave gaping holes in Main Streets all across the country. All have destroyed property. Some have taken lives. And many could have been prevented by sprinkler systems. This upfront but costly investment could have helped prevent the loss of life, reduced property damage, and decreased federal expenditures on rebuilding efforts after these fires.

To prevent fires from destroying buildings in historic downtowns and to preserve access to upper-story office, retail, and housing space in these buildings, I am introducing legislation today—the Historic Downtown Preservation and Access Act—that will create a 50 percent refundable tax credit, capped at $50,000, for the installation of fire sprinklers and elevators in older, multi-use buildings in historic downtowns.

Since 2000, Vermont has had more than a dozen significant downtown fires causing tens of millions of dollars of damage and taking at least three lives. The original owners of at least 8 of these buildings were unable to rebuild—leaving the critical task of rebuilding both the building and the community to nonprofit entities that rely primarily on Federal funds. These 8 projects cost the Federal Government $20 million in Low Income Housing Tax Credits, Community Development Block-Grant building, and HOME funding. Only one of these 8 buildings had a sprinkler system. If the building owners had installed sprinklers in all eight buildings using the credit created by this legislation, the Federal Government may have saved $19.6 million, dozens of Vermonters would still be in their homes, more than a dozen businesses would have been sparred, and at least three Vermonters might still be alive today.

According to the National Fire Sprinkler Association, housing units with sprinklers receive 69 percent less property damage during a fire than units without sprinklers, the death rate per fire in a home with a sprinkler is 83 percent less than in a home without a sprinkler, and firefighters are 65 percent less likely to be injured in a fire where a sprinkler is present than in a fire where a sprinkler is not present.

This legislation also incentivizes the installation of elevators because too often upper story office, retail, and housing space in historic downtown buildings goes unused due to accessibility requirements.

Financial cost-benefit modeling and existing federal incentives for rehabbing an historic building with sprinklers or an elevator fail to adequately incentivize building owners to install these assets. For instance, the Qualified Rehabilitation Tax Credit requires significant rehabilitation to a building equal to the value of the building before renovation in order to claim the credit. Asset depreciation tax benefits take decades for a building owner to offset the cost of a sprinkler or elevator system, and building owners who make no profit or minimal profit have no use for existing tax credits.

The new refundable tax credit I am introducing today—modeled after the State of Vermont's highly successful

downtown historic tax credit—would allow private entities with little tax liability and nonprofits alike to install these important property- and life-saving devices in historic buildings.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1421

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Historic Downtown Preservation and Access Act''.

SEC. 2. CREDIT FOR INSTALLATION OF SPRINKLERS AND ELEVATORS IN HISTORIC BUILDINGS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart C of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after section 36B the following new section:

''SEC. 36C. HISTORIC BUILDING EXPENSES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—There shall be allowed a credit against the tax imposed by this subtitle for the taxable year an amount equal to 50 percent of the qualified historic building expenses paid or incurred by the taxpayer during such taxable year.

''(b) LIMITATION.—The credit allowed under subsection (a) with respect to any taxpayer for any taxable year shall not exceed $50,000.

''(c) QUALIFIED HISTORIC BUILDING EXPENSES.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified historic building expenses' means amounts paid or incurred to install in a certified historic structure an elevator system or a sprinkler system that meets the requirements found in the most recent edition of NFPA 13: Standard for the Installation of Sprinkler Systems.

''(2) NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARKS.—In the case of a certified historic structure that is designated as a National Historic Landmark in accordance with section 101(a) of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470a(a)) and that is open to the public, the term 'qualified historic building expenses' shall not include an expense described in paragraph (1), unless the installation of property described in such paragraph meets the requirements for a certified rehabilitation under section 47(c)(2)(C).

''(3) CERTIFIED HISTORIC STRUCTURE.—The term 'certified historic structure' has the meaning given such term in section 47(c)(3), except that such term shall not include any structure which is a single-family residence.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 1324 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting '', 36C'' after '', 36B''.

(2) The table of sections for subpart C of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 36B the following new item:

''Sec. 36C. Historic building expenses.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to amounts paid or incurred in taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. KING, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 1422. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 respecting the scoring of preventive health savings; to the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise to introduce legislation to modernize the Congressional budget scoring process with respect to health spending and the effects of preventive health care.

Although the United States spends more than any other Nation in the world on health care, $2.6 trillion in 2010, our citizens' health status lags behind that of most developed countries, and we have the highest rate of preventable deaths among 19 industrialized nations. One reason is that the United States' expenditures for the treatment of disease far exceed our investments in preventive health.

Our neglect of prevention has been costly. Spending on the treatment of chronic diseases is overwhelming our health care budgets, particularly those of the Medicare and Medicaid programs. The following statistics come from the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention: 7 out of 10 deaths among Americans each year are from chronic diseases. Heart disease, cancer and stroke account for more than 50 percent of all deaths each year.

In 2005, 133 million Americans almost 1 out of every 2 adults had at least one chronic illness.

About ¼ of people with chronic conditions have one or more daily activity limitations.

Arthritis is the most common cause of disability, with nearly 19 million Americans reporting activity limitations.

Diabetes continues to be the leading cause of kidney failure, nontraumatic lower-extremity amputations, and blindness among adults, aged 20–74.

Excessive alcohol consumption is the third leading preventable cause of death in the U.S., behind diet, physical activity, and tobacco.

CDC also tells us that four health risk behaviors—lack of physical activity, poor nutrition, tobacco use, and excessive alcohol consumption—are responsible for much of the illness, suffering, and early death related to chronic diseases.

More than ⅓ of all adults do not meet recommendations for aerobic physical activity based on the 2008 Physical Activity Guidelines for Americans, and 23 percent report no leisure-time physical activity at all in the preceding month.

In 2007, 22 percent of high school students and only 24 percent of adults reported eating 5 or more servings of fruits and vegetables per day.

More than 43 million American adults, approximately 1 in 5, smoke. Lung cancer is the leading cause of cancer death, and cigarette smoking causes almost all cases. Compared to nonsmokers, men who smoke are about 23 times more likely to develop lung cancer and women who smoke are about 13 times more likely. Smoking causes about 90 percent of lung cancer deaths in men and almost 80 percent in women. Smoking also causes cancer of the voicebox, mouth and throat, esophagus, bladder, kidney, pancreas, cervix, and stomach, and causes acute myeloid leukemia.

Excessive alcohol consumption contributes to over 54 different diseases and injuries, including cancer of the mouth, throat, esophagus, liver, colon, and breast, liver diseases, and other cardiovascular, neurological, psychiatric, and gastrointestinal health problems.

Binge drinking, the most dangerous pattern of drinking, defined as consuming more than 4 drinks on an occasion for women or 5 drinks for men, is reported by 17 percent of U.S. adults, averaging 8 drinks per binge.

By addressing just these four behaviors, we can alter the trajectory of chronic disease and the health costs associated with them. That is the power of prevention. As Dr. Albert Reece of the University of Maryland School of Medicine once said, ''Lifestyle is primary care.''

Prevention also means early screening. In addition to increasing survival rates, identifying diseases early reduces health care costs. In the case of colorectal cancer, Medicare will pay under $400 for a colonoscopy, but if the patient is not diagnosed until the disease has metastasized, the costs of care can exceed $58,000 over the patient's lifetime. A screening mammography costs the Medicare program a small fraction of the tens of thousands of dollars that treatment of breast cancer costs, depending on when the cancer is found and the course of treatment used. One drug used to treat late stage breast cancer can cost as much as $40,000 a year.

Research has shown that increasing to 90 percent the number of women aged 40 and older who have been screened for breast cancer in the past two years would save more than 100,000 lives each year in the United States.

One of the most compelling cases for prevention is in the area of oral health. The tragic, preventable death of 12 year-old Marylander Deamonte Driver in 2007 illustrated the consequences of poor access to oral health care. His untreated tooth abscess spread to his brain and after two extensive operations, he died. Although a tooth extraction would have cost about $80, the final total cost of his medical care exceeded $250,000.

The American Academy of Pediatric Dentistry tells us that dental decay is the most common chronic childhood disease among children in the United States. It affects one in five children aged 2 to 4, half of those aged 6 to 8, and nearly ⅗ of 15 year olds. But it is also the most preventable disease if basic oral care is provided starting at an early age.

The good news in that for nearly every category of chronic disease we can reduce its prevalence by making preventive health care a priority. All around us are examples of why prevention is an essential part of health care

and why effective use of preventive measures, such as screening and smoking cessation can save lives and lower health care costs in the long run.

But the current Congressional budget process has hindered our ability to get appropriate credit for the cost savings that prevention can bring. For this reason, investing in initiatives that can move our Nation forward toward optimal health often requires us to cut funding in other important areas because of the budget rules.

Today, budget resolutions, budget reconciliation, and CBO scoring analyses use a ten-year ''scoring'' window. But the research performed at the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda, MD and at research centers across the nation has demonstrated that some expenditures for preventive services result in cost savings when considered in the long term. Unfortunately, Congressional budget scoring rules only permit taking into account the first ten years, a time frame in which savings may not be apparent.

We want to change that. Today, with Senators MIKE CRAPO, ANGUS KING, TOM UDALL, and JEANNE SHAHEEN, I am introducing the Preventive Health Savings Act of 2013. It would allow the Chairman or Ranking Member of the House or Senate Budget Committee, or the health committees—HELP, Finance, Ways and Means, or Energy and Commerce—to request an analysis of preventive measures extending beyond the existing 10-year window to two additional ten-year periods.

Re-evaluating our budget rules is not a new phenomenon. In recent years, Congress has increasingly looked for ways to assess long-term budget consequences. For example, Congress currently requests that CBO report on measures that would cause a large future increase in the deficit—more than $5 billion in the following four decades.

The Preventive Health Savings Act would direct CBO to incorporate credible data on prevention. Because we want to ensure that CBO's projections are tied to scientific data, our bill would define preventive health as ''an action designed to avoid future health care costs that is demonstrated by credible and publicly available epidemiological projection models, incorporating clinical trials or observational studies in humans, longitudinal studies, and meta-analysis.'' This narrow, responsible approach encourages a sensible review of health policy that Congress believes will promote public health, and it will make it easier for us to invest in proven methods of saving lives and money.

CBO would be required to conduct an initial analysis to determine whether the provision would result in substantial savings outside the 10-year scoring window and to include a description of those future-year savings in its budget projections.

The broad coalition of groups supporting this bill includes: the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics, Aetna, Allscripts, American Association of Diabetes Educators, American College of Occupational Medicine, American College of Preventative Medicine, American Diabetes Association, BlueCross BlueShield Tennessee, Building Healthier America, Care Continuum Alliance, Council for Affordable Health Coverage, Dialysis Patient Citizens, The Endocrine Society, Healthcare Leadership Council, Healthways, IHRSA: International Health Racquet & Sportsclub Association, Johnson & Johnson, Marshfield Clinic, Memorial Care Health System, National Association of Public Hospitals and Health Systems, National Retail Federation, National Kidney Foundation, Novo Nordisk, the Partnership to Fight Chronic Disease, Sanofi, Texas Health Resources, and Weight Watchers.

I also wish to applaud the bipartisan House sponsors of this legislation—two physicians—Representatives MICHAEL BURGESS of Texas and DONNA CHRISTENSEN of the U.S. Virgin Islands, for their vision in introducing the companion bill, HR 2663, which now has 19 cosponsors.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this legislation, which will give our budget process the flexibility needed to dramatically bend the health care cost curve.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 1423. A bill to amend the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 to strengthen the quality control measures in place for part B lung disease claims and to establish the Advisory Board on Toxic Substances and Worker Health for the contractor employee compensation program under subtitle E of such Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I rise to speak about bipartisan legislation I am introducing today with Senator ALEXANDER to provide much needed help to our Cold War patriots.

In 2000, Congress passed the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program to help Cold War workers like those from Rocky Flats in my home state of Colorado and other nuclear weapons facilities around the country. This effort was designed to get these patriots the help they need to treat cancer and other illnesses they developed as a result of exposure to radiation. Since then, the program has been plagued by procedural inconsistencies and delays preventing former nuclear workers from accessing the benefits they are owed.

In March 2010, the U.S. Government Accountability Office issued a report on the efficacy of EEOICPA, confirming workers' ongoing frustrations with the program and recommending that Congress consider creating an advisory board. More recently, in March 2013, the Institute of Medicine issued a report recommending that an external advisory panel be created to review the health effects of the Department of Labor's approach to awarding benefits.

Today, Senator ALEXANDER and I are reintroducing our bill requiring the President to establish an independent advisory panel to do just that. This advisory board would add much needed transparency and certainty to decisions made affecting workers' compensation and access to benefits.

Some 600,000 Cold War era workers, including thousands of workers at Rocky Flats, put their health on the line to preserve our national security during one of the most uncertain times in our nation's history. They were exposed to radiation and are sick and dying. Our country made a commitment to these patriots, but so far that promise has not been kept. Coloradans find that unacceptable. We cannot let another family suffer through the uncertainty of delays caused by bureaucratic red tape or see their loved ones denied the benefits they deserve. It is time for us to do right by these workers.

I urge my colleagues to join me and Senator ALEXANDER in this fight by cosponsoring this important legislation.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 1425. A bill to improve the safety of dietary supplements by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require manufacturers of dietary supplements to register dietary supplements with the Food and Drug Administration and to amend labeling requirements with respect to dietary supplements; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1425

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Dietary Supplement Labeling Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. REGULATION OF DIETARY SUPPLEMENTS.

(a) REGISTRATION REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 415(a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 350d(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(6) REQUIREMENTS WITH RESPECT TO DIETARY SUPPLEMENTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A facility engaged in manufacturing or processing dietary supplements that is required to register under this section shall comply with the requirements of this paragraph, in addition to the other requirements of this section.

''(B) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—A facility described in subparagraph (A) shall submit a registration under paragraph (1) that includes, in addition to the information required under paragraph (2)—

''(I) a description of each dietary supplement manufactured or processed by such facility;

''(II) a list of all ingredients in each such dietary supplement; and

''(III) a copy of the label for each such dietary supplement.

''(ii) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary shall make the information provided under clause (i) publicly available, including by posting such information on the Internet Web site of the Food and Drug Administration.

''(C) REGISTRATION WITH RESPECT TO NEW, REFORMULATED, AND DISCONTINUED DIETARY SUPPLEMENTS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the date described in clause (ii), if a facility described in subparagraph (A)—

''(I) manufactures or processes a dietary supplement that the facility previously did not manufacture or process and for which the facility did not submit the information required under subclauses (I) through (III) of subparagraph (B)(i);

''(II) reformulates a dietary supplement for which the facility previously submitted the information required under subclauses (I) through (III) of subparagraph (B)(i); or

''(III) no longer manufactures or processes a dietary supplement for which the facility previously submitted the information required under subclauses (I) through (III) of subparagraph (B)(i),

such facility shall submit to the Secretary an updated registration describing the change described in subclause (I), (II), or (III) and, in the case of a facility described in subclause (I) or (II), containing the information required under subclauses (I) through (III) of subparagraph (B)(i).

''(ii) DATE DESCRIBED.—The date described in this clause is—

''(I) in the case of a facility described in subclause (I) of clause (i), 30 days after the date on which such facility first markets the dietary supplement described in such subclause;

''(II) in the case of a facility described in subclause (II) of clause (i), 30 days after the date on which such facility first markets the reformulated dietary supplement described in such subclause; or

''(III) in the case of a facility described in subclause (III) of clause (i), 30 days after the date on which such facility removes the dietary supplement described in such subclause from the market.''.

(2) ENFORCEMENT.—Section 403 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 343) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(z) If it is a dietary supplement for which a facility is required to submit the registration information required under section 415(a)(6) and such facility has not complied with the requirements of such section 415(a)(6) with respect to such dietary supplement.''.

(b) LABELING.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF LABELING REQUIREMENTS.—Chapter IV of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 341 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 411 the following:

''SEC. 411A. DIETARY SUPPLEMENTS.

''(a) DIETARY SUPPLEMENT INGREDIENTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Dietary Supplement Labeling Act of 2013, the Secretary shall compile a list of dietary supplement ingredients and proprietary blends of ingredients that the Secretary determines could cause potentially serious adverse events, drug interactions, or contraindications, or potential risks to subgroups such as children and pregnant or breastfeeding women.

''(b) IOM STUDY.—The Secretary shall seek to enter into a contract with the Institute of Medicine under which the Institute of Medicine shall evaluate dietary supplement ingredients and proprietary blends of ingredients, including those on the list compiled by the Secretary under subsection (a), and scientific literature on dietary supplement ingredients and, not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of the Dietary Supplement Labeling Act of 2013, submit to the Secretary a report evaluating the safety of dietary supplement ingredients and proprietary blends of ingredients the Institute of Medicine determines could cause potentially serious adverse events, drug interactions, or contraindications, or potential risks to subgroups such as children and pregnant or breastfeeding women.

''(c) ESTABLISHMENT OF REQUIREMENTS.—Not later than 2 years after the date on which the Institute of Medicine issues the report under subsection (b), the Secretary, after providing for public notice and comment and taking into consideration such report, shall—

''(1) establish mandatory warning label requirements for dietary supplement ingredients that the Secretary determines to cause potentially serious adverse events, drug interactions, or contraindications, or potential risks to subgroups; and

''(2) identify proprietary blends of ingredients for which, because of potentially serious adverse events, drug interactions, or contraindications, or potential risks to subgroups such as children and pregnant or breastfeeding women, the weight per serving of the ingredient in the proprietary blend shall be provided on the label.

''(d) UPDATES.—As appropriate, the Secretary, after providing for public notice and comment, shall update—

''(1) the list compiled under subsection (a);

''(2) the mandatory warning label requirements established under paragraph (1) of subsection (c); and

''(3) the requirements under paragraph (2) of subsection (c).''.

(2) ENFORCEMENT.—Section 403 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 343) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (q)(5)(F)(ii), by inserting '', and for each proprietary blend identified by the Secretary under section 411A(c)(2), the weight of such proprietary blend,'' after ''ingredients)''; and

(B) in paragraph (s)(2)—

(i) in clause (A)(ii)(II), by inserting '', and for each proprietary blend identified by the Secretary under section 411A(c)(2), the weight of each such proprietary blend per serving'' before the semicolon at the end;

(ii) in clause (D)(iii), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(iii) in clause (E)(ii)(II), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

''(F) the label does not include information with respect to potentially serious adverse events, drug interactions, or contraindications, or potential risks to subgroups such as children and pregnant or breastfeeding women, as required under section 411A(c)(1); or

''(G) the label does not include the batch number.''.

(c) STRUCTURE AND FUNCTION CLAIMS.—Section 403(r)(6)(B) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 343(r)(6)(B)) is amended by inserting '', and provides such substantiation to the Secretary, as the Secretary may require'' after ''misleading''.

(d) CONVENTIONAL FOODS.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services, not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act and after providing for public notice and comment, shall establish a definition for the term ''conventional food'' for purposes of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 301 et seq.). Such definition shall take into account conventional foods marketed as dietary supplements, including products marketed as dietary supplements that simulate conventional foods.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 1427. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to clarify the rule allowing discharge as a nonpriority claim of governmental claims arising from the disposition of farm assets under chapter 12 bankruptcies; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce, along with Senator FRANKEN, the Family Farmer Bankruptcy Clarification Act of 2013. We introduced similar legislation in the 112th Congress, but the Senate never had a chance to consider the bill. The bill addresses the 2012 United States Supreme Court case Hall v. United States. In a 5–4 decision, the Supreme Court ruled that a provision I inserted into the 2005 Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act did not accomplish what we in Congress intended. The Family Farmer Bankruptcy Clarification Act of 2013 corrects this and clarifies that bankrupt family farmers reorganizing their debts are able to treat capital gains taxes owed to a governmental unit, arising from the sale of farm assets during a bankruptcy, as general unsecured claims. This bill will remove the Internal Revenue Service's veto power over a bankruptcy reorganization plan's confirmation, giving the family farmer a chance to reorganize successfully.

In 1986 Congress enacted Chapter 12 of the Bankruptcy Code to provide a specialized bankruptcy process for family farmers. In 2005 Chapter 12 was made permanent. Between 1986 and 2005 we learned what aspects worked and did not work for family farmers reorganizing in bankruptcy. One problematic area was where a family farmer needed to sell assets in order to generate cash for the reorganization. Specifically, a family farmer would have to sell portions of the farm to generate cash to fund a reorganization plan so that the creditors could receive payment. Unfortunately, in situations like this, the family farmer is selling land that has been owned for a very long time, with a very low cost basis. Thus, when the land is sold, the family farmer is hit with a substantial capital gains tax, which is owed to the Internal Revenue Service.

Under the Bankruptcy Code, taxes owed to the Internal Revenue Service receive priority treatment. Holders of priority claims must receive payment in full, unless the claim holder agrees to be treated differently. This creates problems for the family farmer who needs the cash to pay creditors to reorganize. However, since the Internal Revenue Service has the ability to require full payment, they hold veto

power over a plan's confirmation, which means in many instances the plan will not be confirmed. This does not make sense if the goal is to give the family farmer a fresh start. Thus, in 2005 Congress said that in these limited situations, the taxes owed to the Internal Revenue Service would be stripped of their priority and treated as general, unsecured debt. This removed the government's veto power over plan confirmation and paved the way for family farmers to reorganize.

Unfortunately, in Hall v. United States, the Supreme Court ruled that despite Congress's express goal of helping family farmers, the language inserted into the Bankruptcy Code in 2005 conflicted with the Tax Code. The Hall case was one of statutory interpretation. There is no question what Congress was trying to do; rather, did Congress use the correct language? My goal, along with others at the time, was to relieve family farmers from having their reorganization plans fail because of huge tax liabilities to the federal government. Justice Breyer noted this in the dissent: ''Congress was concerned about the effect on the farmer of collecting capital gains tax debts that arose during, and were connected with, the Chapter 12 proceedings themselves. . . . The majority does not deny the importance of Congress' objective. Rather, it feels compelled to hold that Congress put the Amendment in the wrong place.'' Hall v. United States, 132 S.Ct. 1882, 1897 (2012) (Breyer, J., dissenting) (internal citations and quotations omitted).

As a result of the Hall case, family farmers facing bankruptcy now find themselves caught in a tough spot. The rules have now changed and must be corrected in order to provide certainty and clarity in the law. The Family Farmer Bankruptcy Clarification Act of 2013 will provide the clarity needed to help family farmers.

This bill, which has been worked on over the past year to make sure the problem is addressed correctly, adds a new section 1232 to title 11 of the United States Code. This new section, along with other conforming changes to the Bankruptcy Code, will provide clarity to practitioners and courts as to how these claims are to be treated during bankruptcy. I am pleased that what we are introducing today, building from the bill we introduced last Congress, is an improved product that can help family farmers who are facing hard times. The Family Farmer Bankruptcy Clarification Act of 2013 will ensure that what Congress sought to do in 2005 actually occurs. In the wake of the Hall decision, clarification is needed to help family farmers reorganize successfully.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1427

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Family Farmer Bankruptcy Clarification Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. CLARIFICATION OF RULE ALLOWING DISCHARGE TO GOVERNMENTAL CLAIMS ARISING FROM THE DISPOSITION OF FARM ASSETS UNDER CHAPTER 12 BANKRUPTCIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 12 of title 11, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 1232. Claim by a governmental unit based on the disposition of property used in a farming operation

''(a) Any unsecured claim of a governmental unit against the debtor or the estate that arises before the filing of the petition, or that arises after the filing of the petition and before the debtor's discharge under section 1228, as a result of the sale, transfer, exchange, or other disposition of any property used in the debtor's farming operation—

''(1) shall be treated as an unsecured claim arising before the date on which the petition is filed;

''(2) shall not be entitled to priority under section 507;

''(3) shall be provided for under a plan; and

''(4) shall be discharged in accordance with section 1228.

''(b) For purposes of applying sections 1225(a)(4), 1228(b)(2), and 1229(b)(1) to a claim described in subsection (a) of this section, the amount that would be paid on such claim if the estate of the debtor were liquidated in a case under chapter 7 of this title shall be the amount that would be paid by the estate in a chapter 7 case if the claim were an unsecured claim arising before the date on which the petition was filed and were not entitled to priority under section 507.

''(c) For purposes of applying sections 523(a), 1228(a)(2), and 1228(c)(2) to a claim described in subsection (a) of this section, the claim shall not be treated as a claim of a kind specified in section 523(a)(1).

''(d)(1) A governmental unit may file a proof of claim for a claim described in subsection (a) that arises after the date on which the petition is filed.

''(2) If a debtor files a tax return after the filing of the petition for a period in which a claim described in subsection (a) arises, and the claim relates to the tax return, the debtor shall serve notice of the claim on the governmental unit charged with the responsibility for the collection of the tax at the address and in the manner designated in section 505(b)(1). Notice under this paragraph shall state that the debtor has filed a petition under this chapter, state the name and location of the court in which the case under this chapter is pending, state the amount of the claim, and include a copy of the filed tax return and documentation supporting the calculation of the claim.

''(3) If notice of a claim has been served on the governmental unit in accordance with paragraph (2), the governmental unit may file a proof of claim not later than 180 days after the date on which such notice was served. If the governmental unit has not filed a timely proof of the claim, the debtor or trustee may file proof of the claim that is consistent with the notice served under paragraph (2). If a proof of claim is filed by the debtor or trustee under this paragraph, the governmental unit may not amend the proof of claim.

''(4) A claim filed under this subsection shall be determined and shall be allowed under subsection (a), (b), or (c) of section 502, or disallowed under subsection (d) or (e) of section 502, in the same manner as if the claim had arisen immediately before the date of the filing of the petition.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 12 of title 11, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in section 1222(a)—

(i) in paragraph (2), by striking ''unless—'' and all that follows through ''the holder'' and inserting ''unless the holder'';

(ii) in paragraph (3), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(iii) in paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

''(5) subject to section 1232, provide for the treatment of any claim by a governmental unit of a kind described in section 1232(a).'';

(B) in section 1228—

(i) in subsection (a)—

(I) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(aa) by inserting a comma after ''all debts provided for by the plan''; and

(bb) by inserting a comma after ''allowed under section 503 of this title''; and

(II) in paragraph (2), by striking ''the kind'' and all that follows and inserting ''a kind specified in section 523(a) of this title, except as provided in section 1232(c).''; and

(ii) in subsection (c)(2), by inserting '', except as provided in section 1232(c)'' before the period at the end; and

(C) in section 1229(a)—

(i) in paragraph (2), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(ii) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) provide for the payment of a claim described in section 1232(a) that arose after the date on which the petition was filed.''.

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections for subchapter II of chapter 12 of title 11, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''1232. Claim by a governmental unit based on the disposition of property used in a farming operation.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to any bankruptcy case that—

(1) is pending on the date of enactment of this Act and relating to which an order of discharge under section 1228 of title 11, United States Code, has not been entered; or

(2) commences on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 1430. A bill to authorize the continued use of certain water diversions located on National Forest System land in the Frank Church-River of No Return Wilderness and the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a bill called the Idaho Wilderness Water Facilities Act. This bill is identical to the House version, H.R. 876, which was introduced and carried through the House by my colleague from Idaho, Representative MIKE SIMPSON, who did yeoman's work on pursuing this and putting it together and shepherding it through. It passed unanimously in the House. I thank him on behalf of all Idahoans for his work on this issue.

The need for this legislation is simple. The Frank Church River of No Return Wilderness, which was designated by Congress in 1980, abuts the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness area, which was designated by Congress in 1964. These areas contain some of the largest and most rugged remote tracts of land in the lower 48 States. It is magnificent in its beauty—substantially better, in my opinion, than the Alps.

There are a number of water diversions within the Idaho wilderness areas that have existed since the time of this legislation—since the time these wilderness areas were established. Although the diversions continue to exist, the owners currently lack authority to maintain and repair the facilities.

Predating the existence of these two wilderness areas, private landowners had received permits to maintain and repair water diversions that existed on National Forest System lands. The water is used for a combination of many things, including, but not limited to, drinking water for private cabins and ranches and also for generating electricity in some places on a very small scale. Many of the permits have since expired, leaving those who own the water diversions without any options for mechanically maintaining their water systems. In some cases, this lack of management threatens the environment and the watersheds in which they exist.

The Idaho Wilderness Water Facilities Act will give the Secretary of Agriculture the authority to reissue and issue special use authorizations to the owners of these diversion facilities within the Frank Church and the Selway Wilderness areas for the continued maintenance of their water facilities. The permits would only be issued if the owner could prove the facility existed prior to those lands being designated as wilderness, the facility has been used to deliver water to the owner's land since the designation, and the owner had a valid water right and it would not be practical to move the facility outside of the wilderness area. Undoubtedly, in exercising the discretion, the Secretary would ensure that in no way would it denigrate these wilderness areas. There are several different individuals or businesses that have water diversions in these wilderness areas that meet the description I have given.

Earlier this week the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources held a hearing on H.R. 876. The U.S. Forest Service appeared at that hearing and testified in support of this bill. I look forward to working with Chairman WYDEN and Ranking Member MURKOWSKI to pass this bill quickly so as to allow for the maintenance of this water infrastructure.

By Ms. HIRONO:

S. 1432. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating portions of the Ka'u Coast in the State of Hawaii as a unit of the National Park System; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Ka'u Coast Preservation Act of 2013, a bill directing the National Park Service to assess the feasibility of designating certain coastal lands on the Ka'u Coast of the island of Hawaii as units of the National Park System.

The National Park Service conducted a reconnaissance survey in 2006 that made a preliminary assessment of whether the Ka'u Coast would meet the National Park Service's demanding criteria as a resource of national significance. The reconnaissance survey concluded that ''based upon the significance of the resources in the study area and the current integrity and intact condition of these resources, a preliminary finding of national significance and suitability can be concluded.'' The report goes on to recommend that Congress proceed with a full resource study of the area.

Since the time of the initial reconnaissance report and my introduction of this Act in previous Congresses, two additional properties in the Ka'u that deserve evaluation have come to my attention: the Kahuku Coastal Property, also known as Sands of South Kona and Road to the Sea, and the Nani Kahuku 'Aina property adjacent to Pohue Bay. I have added these areas to the study area for the full resource study.

The coastline of Ka'u is still largely unspoiled. The study area contains significant natural, geological, and archeological features. The northern part of the study area is adjacent to Hawaii Volcanoes National Park and contains a number of noteworthy geological features, including an ancient lava tube known as the Great Crack, which the National Park Service has expressed interest in acquiring in the past.

The study area includes both black and green sand beaches as well as a significant number of endangered and threatened species, most notably the endangered hawksbill turtle, at least half of the Hawaiian population of this rare sea turtle nests within the study area, the threatened green sea turtle, the highly endangered Hawaiian monk seal, the endangered Hawaiian hawk, the endangered Hawaiian bat, native bees, the endangered and very rare Hawaiian orange-black damselfy, the largest population in the State, and a number of native birds. Humpback whales and spinner dolphins also frequent the area. The Ka'u Coast also boasts some of the best remaining examples of native coastal vegetation in Hawaii.

The archeological resources related to ancient Hawaiian settlements within the study area are also very impressive. These include dwelling complexes, heiau, religious shrines, walls, fishing and canoe houses or sheds, burial sites, petroglyphs, water and salt collection sites, caves, and trails. The Ala Kahakai National Historic Trail runs through the study area.

The Ka'u Coast is a truly remarkable area: its combination of natural, archeological, cultural, and recreational resources, as well as its spectacular viewscapes, are an important part of Hawaii's and our nation's natural and cultural heritage.

As this process evolves, the successful preservation of this pristine land will depend on the federal government working closely with local stakeholders, seeking their input, and collaborating with them to address concerns as they arise. I encourage the National Park Service to continue working with all involved to ensure this coastline is preserved for decades to come.

I believe a full feasibility study, which was recommended in the reconnaissance survey, will confirm that the area meets the National Park Service's high standards as an area of national significance.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1437. A bill to provide for the release of the reversionary interest held by the United States in certain land conveyed in 1954 by the United States, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, to the State of Oregon for the establishment of the Hermiston Agricultural Research and Extension Center of Oregon State University in Hermiston, Oregon; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I rise to introduce a bill that will give Oregon State University the flexibility to continue its important agricultural work in Hermiston, Oregon. I am pleased to be joined on this bill with my colleague from Oregon, Senator MERKELY. I look forward to working with Senator MERKLEY, other colleagues, and supporters of the bill to update the federal interests in the land to match current needs and conditions.

The Hermiston Agricultural Research & Extension Center, HAREC, provides support to one of the most unique and important agricultural areas in the world: the Columbia Basin region of Oregon and Washington. As one of Oregon State University's, OSU, 12 Agricultural Experiment Stations, HAREC concentrates on the discovery and implementation of agricultural opportunities while also providing solutions to production issues for regional growers and beyond.

Research at HAREC emphasizes identification of new crop opportunities, improved production practices that save money while reducing inputs, plant breeding and varietal evaluation of cereals and potatoes. Through this work it has developed new lines with higher nutritional value, integrated pest management of insects and insect-

transmitted diseases, and provided information related to environmental issues and salmon restoration. In recent years the center provided leadership, research, and new knowledge essential to allow growers to diversify production and convert 30,000 acres of commodity crops to high-value crops. The station has led efforts to cultivate value-added agriculture in Morrow and Umatilla counties, resulting in over $50,000,000 in annual economic return.

The history of HAREC and a Umatilla agricultural research center spans more than a century. The Federal Government paved the way in the development of farming and ranching in the Umatilla Basin. In 1954, the Bureau of Land Management granted land to the State of Oregon on the condition that the land is used for cooperative agricultural experimental work. Over the past nearly 60 years, OSU has developed a center with state-of-the-art laboratories, irrigation technology abilities, greenhouses, screenhouses and research and extension faculty. HAREC now supports nearly 500,000 acres of irrigated agriculture.

Just as agriculture in the Columbia Basin has grown by leaps and bounds since 1954, so has the community of Hermiston. This bill removes the reversionary clause from the original land grant while conditioning that any consideration gained by OSU from the sale, lease, or other use of the land be put back into agricultural experimental and research work. It gives OSU the flexibility to adapt to the population growth and city expansion that will ultimately necessitate the relocation of HAREC from inside the urban growth boundary to a more rural location. Without this bill, moving the station would mean triggering the federal reversionary clause and losing HAREC land and all the buildings and improvements over nearly six decades to the Federal Government. I'm sponsoring this bill to ensure HAREC can continue for another hundred years.

Regional leaders and Oregon State University support removing the barriers to the continued operation of the center. I express my gratitude for their work with me on this legislation. I also look forward to working with Senator Merkley to advance this bill and support the agricultural heart of the regional economy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1437

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Hermiston Agricultural Research and Extension Center Land Conveyance Act''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) RESEARCH CENTER LAND.—The term ''research center land'' means the approximately 290 acres of land in Hermiston, Oregon, identified as the ''Reversionary Interest Area'' on the map entitled ''Hermiston Agricultural Research and Extension Center'' and dated July 23, 2013, including any improvements to, and building on, the land.

(2) PATENT.—The term ''patent'' means the patent granted by the Director of the Bureau of Land Management (acting on behalf of the United States) to the State, numbered 130889, and dated September 17, 1954.

(3) STATE.—The term ''State'' means the State of Oregon (acting through the Oregon State Board of Higher Education on behalf of Oregon State University).

SEC. 3. RELEASE OF REVERSIONARY INTEREST AND RESERVATION OF MINERAL RIGHTS TO BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT LAND CONVEYED TO THE STATE OF OREGON FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF HERMISTON AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND EXTENSION CENTER.

(a) RELEASE OF REVERSIONARY INTEREST AND RESERVATION OF MINERAL RIGHTS.—Subject to subsection (b), there are released by the United States without consideration—

(1) the reversionary interest retained by the United States to the research center land under the patent; and

(2) the reservation of mineral rights by the United States to the research center land under the patent.

(b) CONDITION.—The release of the reversionary interest under subsection (a)(1) is subject to the condition that the State agrees to use any consideration received by the State from the sale, lease, or other conveyance of the research center land after the date of enactment of this Act for agricultural experimental and research work of Oregon State University.

(c) INSTRUMENT OF RELEASE.—The Secretary of the Interior (acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management) shall execute and file in the appropriate office a deed of release, amended deed, or other appropriate instrument reflecting the release under subsection (a).

By Mr. REID (for Ms. LANDRIEU):

S. 1440. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to allow the use of physical damage disaster loans for the construction of safe rooms; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to speak on an issue that is of great importance to my home state of Louisiana: disaster preparedness. As you know, along the Gulf Coast, we keep an eye trained on the Gulf of Mexico during hurricane season. This is following the devastating one-two punch of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita of 2005 as well as Hurricanes Gustav and Ike in 2008. Unfortunately, our region also has had to deal with the economic and environmental damage from the Deepwater Horizon disaster in 2010 and more recently Hurricane Isaac. For this reason, as Chair of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, ensuring Federal disaster programs are effective and responsive to disaster victims is one of my top priorities. While the Gulf Coast is prone to hurricanes, other parts of the country are no strangers to disaster. For example, the Midwest and Southeast have tornadoes, California experiences earthquakes and wildfires, and the Northeast sees crippling snowstorms. So no part of our country is spared from disasters—disasters which can and will strike at any moment. This certainly hit home when the northeast was struck by Hurricane Sandy in October of last year and when Moore, Oklahoma was hit by a massive tornado earlier this summer. With this in mind, we must ensure that families have the resources they need to be better prepared the next time disasters strike their communities.

In order to give families in tornado prone areas more resources to protect lives and property, I am proud to file the Tornado Family Safety Act of 2013. Representative TOM COLE from Oklahoma is filing the House companion bill today as well. I want to thank him for being my partner in this effort as his district has seen firsthand how destructive these tornadoes can be to homes and businesses. In particular, our bill would allow U.S. Small Business Administration, SBA, disaster home mitigation loans to go towards the construction of tornado safe rooms. Under current law, SBA can increase the size of a home disaster loan by 20 percent of the total damage to decrease future disaster risk. The Small Business Act lists out examples of mitigation activities such as ''. . . retaining walls, sea walls, grading and contouring land, relocating utilities and modifying structures . . .'' The bill would add safe rooms as an eligible activity so homeowners would have access to these low-interest loans. It does not replace or duplicate other programs, but instead provides a backstop for families in disaster prone areas.

Under guidelines from the Federal Emergency Management Agency, FEMA, and the International Code Council, ICC, a safe room should withstand 250 mph winds and the impact of a 15-pound plank hitting a wall at 100 miles per hour, according to the Insurance Institute for Business and Home Safety, IBHS. Safe rooms designed to the FEMA and ICC standards are recommended for both tornadoes and hurricanes. For individual homes, a safe room could range anywhere from $3,000 to $12,000.

The concept for the bill came about after discussions with the FEMA and the SBA on recent disasters. We learned that safe rooms are not allowable under FEMA preparedness grant programs. Safe rooms would be considered construction and FEMA only allows for limited construction under the preparedness grants for very specific items, such as communications towers, as specified in the appropriations acts. Safe rooms are an eligible activity under the FEMA Hazard Mitigation Grant Program, HMGP. States decide how they use their HMGP, and reimbursing safe room construction for homeowners could be eligible. However, given the larger cost involved in reimbursing individual homeowners, HMGP funded safe rooms are oftentimes community-owned not residential.

As I have indicated, FEMA Individual Assistance does not allow the construction of safe rooms. FEMA does allow HMGP grants for safe rooms and states can decide to reimburse safe room construction for homeowners. However, most are typically community-owned not residential since HMGP funds both single and multi-use facilities—schools, community centers, etc. For example, according to FEMA data, out of 21 states funding safe rooms, only four states, Oklahoma, Alabama, Mississippi, and Arkansas, represent the bulk of residential safe rooms, appproximately 21,600 of the 21,880 funded.

But let me give you an example of how the needs for these types of structures are often outpacing the resources currently available. Following the May 20, 2013 tornado there, Moore, OK, Mayor Glenn Lewis proposed a requirement that all new homes built in the city include a safe room. Oklahoma Governor Fallin also told the Associated Press that only 100 of the 1,752 public schools in Oklahoma have a safe room. In a subsequent June 9, 2013, interview, Albert Ashwood, Director of the Oklahoma Department of Emergency Management, estimated that putting safe rooms in 1,000 Oklahoma schools, via traditional FEMA grant programs, would cost between $500 million to $1 billion alone. So in the near future, there is likely to be less, not more, Federal funding available at the State level for these types of residential safe rooms. Our bill would allow a backstop to homeowners in the event that other Federal/State funds are not available for safe rooms for that particular disaster.

In closing, I believe that this commonsense disaster reform will greatly benefit homeowners impacted by future tornadoes and other disasters.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1440

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Tornado Family Safety Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. USE OF PHYSICAL DAMAGE DISASTER LOANS.

Section 7(b)(1)(A) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(b)(1)(A)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''the Administration may increase'' and inserting ''the Administration may, subject to section 18(a), increase''; and

(2) by striking ''and modifying structures'' and inserting '', and modifying structures (including construction of a safe room or similar storm shelter designed to protect property and occupants from tornadoes or other natural disasters)''.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. BENNET):

S. 1443. A bill to facilitate the remediation of abandoned hardrock mines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, today I am reintroducing legislation designed to help promote the cleanup of abandoned and inactive hard rock mines that are a great detriment to the environment and public health throughout the country, but especially to the West. I want to thank my colleague Senator BENNET for joining me in this effort.

For over one hundred years, miners and prospectors have searched for and developed valuable ''hard rock'' minerals—gold, silver, copper, molybdenum, and others. Hard rock mining has played a key role in the history of Colorado and other states, and the resulting mineral wealth has been an important contributor to our economy and the development of essential products.

Too often, however, the miners would abandon their work and move on, seeking riches over the next mountain. The resulting legacy of unsafe open mine shafts and acid mine drainages can be seen throughout the country and especially on public lands in the West where mineral development was encouraged to help settle our region.

Unfortunately, many of our current environmental laws designed to mitigate the impact from operating hard rock mines are of limited effectiveness when applied to abandoned and inactive mines. As a result, many of these old mines continue to pollute streams and rivers and pose a risk to the health of people who live nearby or downstream.

The bill I am reintroducing today will help address this impediment and make it easier for volunteers, who had no role in creating the problem, to help clean up these sites and improve the environment. It does so by providing a new permit program under the Clean Water Act whereby volunteers can, under an approved plan, reduce the water pollution flowing from an abandoned mine. At the same time, volunteers will not be exposed to the full liability and ongoing responsibility provisions of the Clean Water Act.

I would be remiss not to thank the Environmental Protection Agency for its work in addressing this issue. Most recently, EPA issued a memorandum on December 12, 2012, to reduce the Clean Water Act legal vulnerability faced by ''Good Samaritans'' by clarifying that parties who volunteer to clean up these abandoned sites are generally not responsible for obtaining a permit under the Clean Water Act both during and following a successful cleanup. While this was an important step forward, my legislation will provide binding legal protections for Good Samaritans, allowing them to move forward—knowing the long-term certainty of their rights—with the imperative work of mine cleanup.

The new permits proposed in this bill would help address problems that have frustrated federal and state agencies throughout the country. As population growth continues near these old mines, more and more risks to public health and safety are likely to occur. We simply must begin to address this issue—not only to improve the environment, but also to ensure that our water supplies are safe and usable. This bill does not address all the concerns some would-be Good Samaritans may have about initiating cleanup projects and I am committed to continue working to address those additional concerns, through additional legislation and in other ways. However, this bill can make a real difference, and I think it deserves approval without unnecessary delay.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 1444. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment under part A of the Medicare Program on a reasonable cost basis for anesthesia services furnished by an anesthesiologist in certain rural hospitals in the same manner as payments are provided for anesthesia services furnished by anesthesiologist assistants and certified anesthetists in such hospitals; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President. I am honored to join my colleague from Georgia, Senator JOHNNY ISAKSON, in introducing a bill essential to expanding health care options for rural hospitals and beneficiaries living in rural areas, the Medicare Access to Rural Anesthesiology Act.

As it stands today, low Medicare Part B anesthesia payments and low patient volume in rural areas makes it difficult for rural hospitals to attract and retain anesthesiologists. Our legislation would take an important step towards leveling the playing field between urban and rural health care by ensuring that rural Medicare beneficiaries have similar access to anesthesia services.

Generally, Medicare pays for anesthesia services under the Medicare Part B fee schedule, but in order to attract anesthesia providers to rural areas, a statutory exception was created in the 1980s that allows eligible rural hospital to use Part A funds to employ or contract with non-physician anesthesiologist assistants, AA, or certified registered nurse anesthetists, CRNA. This policy however, does not permit eligible hospitals to use pass-through funds to pay anesthesiologists. Leaving anesthesiologists out also prevents AAs from receiving pass through payment because AAs must have an anesthesiologist on premises in order to practice. As a result, many folks in rural areas only have access to one type of anesthesia provider compared to folks in urban areas who can easily visit an anesthesiologist, CRNA, or an AA.

Our legislation would allow eligible rural hospitals to use ''pass-through'' Part A funds to employ CRNAs, AAs, and anesthesiologists. This common

sense change would give eligible rural hospitals the power to choose the anesthesia providers that best suit the medical needs of their patients, and would provide these hospitals with another tool to recruit and retain anesthesiology professionals as well as expand the availability of anesthesiology care in medically underserved areas.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed In the RECORD.

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

S. 1444

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Medicare Access to Rural Anesthesiology Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. MEDICARE PART A PAYMENT FOR ANESTHESIOLOGIST SERVICES IN CERTAIN RURAL HOSPITALS BASED ON CRNA PASS-THROUGH RULES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1814 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395f) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''Anesthesiologist Services Provided in Certain Rural Hospitals

''(m)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, coverage and payment shall be provided under this part for physicians' services that are anesthesia services furnished by a physician who is an anesthesiologist in a rural hospital described in paragraph (3) in the same manner as payment is made under the exception provided in section 9320(k) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1986, as amended by section 6132 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1989 (42 U.S.C. 1395k note) (relating to payment on a reasonable cost, pass-through basis), for certified registered nurse anesthetist services furnished by a certified registered nurse anesthetist in a hospital described in such section.

''(2) No payment shall be made under any other provision of this title for physicians' services for which payment is made under this subsection.

''(3) A rural hospital described in this paragraph is a hospital described in section 9320(k) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1986, as so amended (42 U.S.C. 1395k note), except that—

''(A) any reference in such section to a 'certified registered nurse anesthetist' or 'anesthetist' is deemed a reference to a 'physician who is an anesthesiologist' or 'anesthesiologist', respectively; and

''(B) any reference to 'January 1, 1988' or '1987' is deemed a reference to such date and year as the Secretary shall specify.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to services furnished during cost reporting periods beginning on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER:

S. 1449. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that income attributable to certain passenger cruise voyages beginning or ending in the United States shall be treated as effectively connected with the conduct of a trade or business within the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, today I am introducing comprehensive legislation to repeal corporate tax loopholes that allow the cruise industry to avoid paying its fair share of U.S. corporate income taxes.

These bills change the treatment of the revenue that foreign-based cruise lines earn from ships that embark or disembark nearly 15 million passengers a year in the United States. A string of recent incidents has demonstrated that when cruise ships get into trouble, the companies rely on the resources and assistance of the U.S. Navy and Coast Guard. The industry also uses the services of over 20 other U.S. agencies to the tune of millions of taxpayer dollars every year.

The majority of cruise companies are organized as foreign corporations, even though many of their headquarters and executives are located in the United States. By incorporating in foreign countries, the cruise industry enjoys a special exemption under section 883 of the Internal Revenue Code, which provides that certain foreign corporations are not subject to U.S. taxes on income derived from the international operation of ships, even if the source of the income is in the United States.

Today, I am introducing two bills, S. 1449 and S. 1450. The first would eliminate the section 883 special exemption for cruise industry income derived from passenger cruise voyages that embark or disembark passengers in the United States. This income would be treated as being U.S. sourced and effectively connected with a U.S. trade or business, so it would be subject to U.S. taxes at the same rate as other income.

The second bill would impose a 5 percent excise tax on gross income from cruises where passengers embark or disembark in the United States. Funds generated from the excise tax will help fund a national program to make infrastructure improvements vital to the efficient transportation of goods and services.

For too long, the cruise industry has been able to use taxpayer provided services without actually paying for them. It is time the cruise industry begins to pay for the services it uses.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bills be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bills were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1449

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. TAXATION OF UNITED STATES CRUISE INDUSTRY INCOME OF NONRESIDENT ALIENS AND FOREIGN CORPORATIONS.

(a) UNITED STATES CRUISE INDUSTRY INCOME TREATED AS EFFECTIVELY CONNECTED TO THE CONDUCT OF A TRADE OR BUSINESS WITHIN THE UNITED STATES.—

(1) INCOME FROM SOURCES WITHOUT THE UNITED STATES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (4) of section 864(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (C) and by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following new subparagraph:

''(C) UNITED STATES CRUISE INDUSTRY INCOME.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—United States cruise industry income shall be treated as effectively connected with the conduct of a trade or business within the United States.

''(ii) UNITED STATES CRUISE INDUSTRY INCOME.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term 'United States cruise industry income' means income attributable to any covered passenger cruise (as defined in paragraph (8)), including income directly or indirectly attributable to the carriage of passengers and any on-board or off-board activities incidental to such covered passenger cruise.''.

(B) COVERED PASSENGER CRUISE.—Subsection (c) of section 864 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(8) COVERED PASSENGER CRUISE.—For purposes of paragraph (4)(C)—

''(A) DEFINITION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The term 'covered passenger cruise' means a voyage of a commercial passenger cruise vessel—

''(I) that extends over 1 or more nights,

''(II) during which passengers embark or disembark the vessel in the United States.

''(ii) EXCEPTIONS FOR CERTAIN VOYAGES.—Such term shall not include any voyage—

''(I) on any vessel owned or operated by the United States, a State, or any subdivision thereof,

''(II) which occurs exclusively on the inland waterways of the United States, or

''(III) in which a vessel in the usual course of employment proceeds, without an intervening foreign port of call from one port or place in the United States to the same port or place or to another port or place in the United States.

''(B) PASSENGER CRUISE VESSEL.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The term 'passenger cruise vessel' means any passenger vessel having berth or stateroom accommodations for at least 250 passengers.

''(ii) EXCEPTIONS.—Such term shall not include any ferry, recreational vessel, sailing school vessel, small passenger vessel, offshore supply vessel, or any other vessel determined under regulations by the Secretary to be excluded from the application of this part.

''(iii) DEFINITIONS.—Any term used in this section which used in chapter 21 of title 46, United States Code, shall have the meaning given such term under section 2101 of such title.''.

(C) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subparagraph (A) of section 864(c)(4) of such Code is amended by striking ''subparagraphs (B) and (C)'' and inserting ''subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D)''.

(2) INCOME FROM SOURCES WITHIN THE UNITED STATES.—Paragraph (4) of section 887(b) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following flush sentence:

''The preceding sentence shall not apply to with respect to any United State source gross transportation income which is United States cruise industry income (as defined in section 864(c)((4)(C)(ii)).''.

(b) REPEAL OF EXEMPTION FROM GROSS INCOME FOR CERTAIN TAXPAYERS.—

(1) NONRESIDENT ALIENS.—Paragraph (1) of section 872(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting ''(other than United States cruise industry income (as defined in section 864(c)(4)(C)))'' after ''or ships''.

(2) FOREIGN CORPORATIONS.—Paragraph (1) of section 883(a) of such Code is amended by inserting ''(other than United States cruise industry income (as defined in section 864(c)(4)(C)))'' after ''or ships''.

(c) INCOME TAX TREATIES.—Section 894 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) SPECIAL RULE FOR UNITED STATES CRUISE INDUSTRY INCOME.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), no tax exemption or reduced tax rate shall be permitted under any treaty of the United States with respect to United States cruise industry income (as defined in section 864(c)(4)(C)).''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to income attributable to voyages made after the date of the enactment of this Act.

S. 1450

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXCISE TAX ON GROSS RECEIPTS DERIVED FROM CRUISES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter B of chapter 36 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after section 4472 the following:

''PART II—AD VALOREM TAX

''Sec. 4476. Imposition of tax.
''Sec. 4477. Definitions.

''SEC. 4476. IMPOSITION OF TAX.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—In addition to any other tax, there is hereby imposed a tax of 5 percent of the allocable amount with respect to any covered passenger cruise.

''(b) BY WHOM PAID.—The tax imposed by this section shall be paid by the person providing the covered passenger cruise.

''SEC. 4477. DEFINITIONS.

''For purposes of this section—

''(1) COVERED PASSENGER CRUISE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'covered passenger cruise' means a voyage of a commercial passenger cruise vessel—

''(i) that extends over 1 or more nights,

''(ii) during which passengers embark or disembark the vessel in the United States.

''(B) EXCEPTIONS FOR CERTAIN VOYAGES.—Such term shall not include any voyage—

''(i) on any vessel owned or operated by the United States, a State, or any subdivision thereof,

''(ii) which occurs exclusively on the inland waterways of the United States, or

''(iii) in which a vessel in the usual course of employment proceeds, without an intervening foreign port of call from one port or place in the United States to the same port or place or to another port or place in the United States.

''(2) PASSENGER CRUISE VESSEL.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'passenger cruise vessel' means any passenger vessel—

''(i) having berth or stateroom accommodations for at least 250 passengers, and

''(ii) that is used in the business of carrying passengers for hire.

''(B) EXCEPTIONS.—Such term shall not include any ferry, recreational vessel, sailing school vessel, small passenger vessel, offshore supply vessel, or any other vessel determined under regulations by the Secretary to be excluded from the application of this part.

''(C) DEFINITIONS.—Any term used in this section which is used in chapter 21 of title 46, United States Code, shall have the meaning given such term under section 2101 of such title.

''(3) ALLOCABLE AMOUNT.—The term 'allocable amount' means—

''(A) in the case in which a majority of the passengers on any covered passenger cruise embark or disembark in the United States, 100 percent of the gross receipts attributable to such covered passenger cruise, and

''(B) in any other case, 50 percent of the gross receipts attributable to such covered passenger cruise.

''(4) UNITED STATES.—The term 'United States' includes any possession of the United States.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subchapter B of chapter 36 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking all preceding section 4471 and inserting the following:

''Subchapter B—Transportation by Water

''PART I—PER PASSENGER TAX

''PART II—AD VALOREM TAX

''PART I—PER PASSENGER TAX

''Sec. 4471. Imposition of tax.
''Sec. 4472. Definitions.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to voyages made after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 2. INTERMODAL INFRASTRUCTURE TRUST FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter A of Chapter 98 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 9512. INTERMODAL INFRASTRUCTURE TRUST FUND.

''(a) CREATION OF TRUST FUND.—There is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States a trust fund to be known as the 'Intermodal Infrastructure Trust Fund', consisting of such amounts as may be appropriated or credited to the Intermodal Infrastructure Trust Fund in this section or section 9602(b).

''(b) TRANSFERS TO INTERMODAL INFRASTRUCTURE TRUST FUND.—There are hereby appropriated to the Intermodal Infrastructure Trust Fund amounts equivalent to the taxes received in the Treasury under section 4471.

''(c) EXPENDITURES FROM INTERMODAL INFRASTRUCTURE TRUST FUND.—Amounts in the Intermodal Infrastructure Trust Fund shall be available, as provided in appropriations Acts, for transportation improvement, including—

''(1) the construction or improvement of—

''(A) passenger or freight rail lines,

''(B) highways,

''(C) bridges,

''(D) airports,

''(E) air traffic control systems,

''(F) port or marine facilities,

''(G) inland waterways,

''(H) transmission or distribution pipelines,

''(I) public transportation facilities or systems

''(J) intercity passenger bus or passenger rail facilities or equipment, and

''(K) freight rail facilities or equipment, and

''(2) planning, preparation, or design of any project described in paragraph (1).''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subchapter A of Chapter 98 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''Sec. 9512. Intermodal Infrastructure Trust Fund.''.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. REID, Mr. HELLER, and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 1451. A bill to provide for environmental restoration activities and forest management activities in the Lake Tahoe Basin, to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the importation or shipment of quagga mussels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to again discuss the need to restore and protect Lake Tahoe. Lake Tahoe is a national treasure. Her alpine beauty has drawn and inspired people for centuries: artists and poets, John Muir and Mark Twain, and countless millions the world over.

As a girl, I went to Lake Tahoe to ride horses through the woods, to swim in the clear blue waters and to bike around the magnificent Basin.

For over 16 years, representatives from different ends of the political spectrum have come together to Keep Tahoe Blue.

The challenges are great. Climate change and drought have created a persistent threat from catastrophic wildfire. Sedimentation and pollution threaten water quality and the lake's treasured clarity. And invasive species threaten the economy of the region.

The time to act is now, and the federal government must take a leading role—78 percent of the land surrounding Lake Tahoe is public land, primarily the Eldorado, Toiyabe and Tahoe National Forests.

That is why today I am reintroducing the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act of 2013, which is co-sponsored by Senators HARRY REID, DEAN HELLER and BARBARA BOXER.

The bill would continue the Federal commitment at Lake Tahoe by authorizing $415 million over ten years to improve water clarity, reduce the threat of catastrophic fire, combat invasive species, and restore and protect the environment in the Lake Tahoe Basin.

Specifically, it would do the following:

Provide $243 million over 10 years for the highest priority restoration projects, according to scientific data. The legislation authorizes at least $138 million for stormwater management and watershed restoration projects scientifically determined to be the most effective ways to improve water clarity.

This bill also requires prioritized ranking of environmental restoration projects and authorizes $80 million for State and local agencies to implement these projects with costs being split evenly between the Federal agencies and non-federal partners.

Eligible projects must demonstrate their cost effectiveness, stakeholder support, ability to leverage non-federal contributions and meet environmental improvement goals.

Implementation of priority projects will improve water quality, forest health, air quality and fish and wildlife habitat around Lake Tahoe.

Authorizes $135 million over ten years to reduce the threat of wildfire in Lake Tahoe. These funds will finance hazardous fuels reduction projects including grants to local fire agencies, who must contribute at least 25 percent of project costs.

The bill also authorizes important restoration work related to the devastating 2007 Angora fire, which destroyed 242 residences and 67 commercial structures. Fuels treatment on Washoe Tribal lands, wildfire prevention planning, and improvements to

local water district infrastructure to fight wildfires that reach urban areas are eligible for grant funding.

The bill also creates incentives for local communities to have dedicated funding for defensible space inspections and enforcement.

Protecting Lake Tahoe from the threat of quagga mussels and other invasive aquatic species. Protecting Lake Tahoe from the threat of quagga mussels and other invasive aquatic species is a major priority because of the serious threats posed to Lake Tahoe.

University of California, Davis and University of Nevada, Reno scientists report that they have found up to 3,000 Asian clams per square meter at spots between Zephyr Point and Elk Point in Lake Tahoe. The spreading Asian clam population could put sharp shells and rotting algae on the Lake's beaches and help spread other invasive species such as quagga mussels.

The bill would authorize $30 million for watercraft inspections and removal of existing invasive species. It would require all watercraft to be inspected and decontaminated if they are determined to be a risk to the lake.

These invasive species threats are serious. For example, one quagga or zebra mussel can lay 1 million eggs in a year. This means that a single boat carrying quagga could devastate the lake's biology, local infrastructure, and the local economy.

The threat to Lake Tahoe cannot be overstated. In 2007 quagga mussels were discovered in Lake Mead. In the 6 years since, there population has swelled exponentially. Today there are more than 3 trillion. The infestation is probably irreversible.

There is good news. There is promising news on this front. Scientists have begun testing a new strategy by placing long rubber mats across the bottom of Lake Tahoe to cut off the oxygen to the Asian clams. Early research suggests that these mats were very effective at killing the clams. We continue to learn from this important research about how best to manage invasive species.

We can fight off these invaders. But it will require drive and imagination and the help authorized within this bill.

Supports reintroduction of the Lahontan Cutthroat Trout. The legislation authorizes $20 million over 10 years for the Lahontan Cutthroat Trout Recovery Plan. The Lahontan Cutthroat Trout is an iconic species that has an important historic legacy in Lake Tahoe.

When John C. Fremont first explored the Truckee River in January of 1844, he called it the Salmon Trout River because he found the Pyramid Lake Lahontan Cutthroat Trout. The trout relied on the Truckee River and its tributaries for their spawning runs in spring, traveling up the entire river's length as far as Lake Tahoe and Donner Lake, where they used the cool, pristine waters and clean gravel beds to lay their eggs. But dams, pollution and overfishing caused the demise of the Lahontan Cutthroat Trout.

Lake Tahoe is one of the historic 11 lakes where Lahontan Cutthroat Trout flourished in the past, and it's a critical part of the strategy to recover the species.

Funds scientific research. The legislation authorizes $30 million over ten years for scientific programs and research which will produce information on long-term trends in the Basin and inform the most cost-effective projects.

Prohibiting mining operations in the Tahoe Basin. This legislation would prohibit new mining operations in the Basin, ensuring that the fragile watershed and Lake Tahoe's water clarity are not threatened by pollution from mining operations.

Increases accountability and oversight. Every project funded by this legislation will have monitoring and assessment to determine the most cost-effective projects and best management practices for future projects.

The legislation also requires the Chair of the Federal Partnership to work with the Forest Service, Environmental Protection Agency, Fish and Wildlife Service and regional and state agencies, to prepare an annual report to Congress detailing the status of all projects undertaken, including project scope, budget and justification and overall expenditures and accomplishments.

This will ensure that Congress can have oversight on the progress of environmental restoration in Lake Tahoe.

Provides for public outreach and education. The Forest Service, Environmental Protection Agency, Fish and Wildlife Service and Tahoe Regional Planning Agency will implement new public outreach and education programs including encouraging Basin residents and visitors to implement defensible space, conducting best management practices for water quality and preventing the introduction and proliferation of invasive species. In addition, the legislation requires signage on federally financed projects to improve public awareness of restoration efforts.

Allows for increased efficiency in the management of public land. Under this legislation, the Forest Service would have increased flexibility to exchange land with state agencies which will allow for more cost-efficient management of public land. There is currently a checkerboard pattern of ownership in some areas of the Basin.

Under this new authority, the Forest Service could exchange land with the California Tahoe Conservancy and the California Department of Parks and Recreation of approximately equal value without going through a lengthy process to assess the land.

For example, if there are several plots of Forest Service land that surround or are adjacent to Tahoe Conservancy or California State Parks land, the state could transfer that land to the Forest Service so that it can be managed more efficiently.

This legislation is needed because the ''Jewel of the Sierra'' is in big trouble. If we don't act now, we could lose Lake Tahoe, lose it with stunning speed, to several devastating threats.

Anyone doubting that climate change poses a severe threat to Lake Tahoe should read an alarming recent report by the UC Davis Tahoe Environmental Research Center.

It was written for the U.S. Forest Service by scientists who have devoted their professional careers to studying Lake Tahoe. And it paints a distinctly bleak picture of the future for the ''Jewel of the Sierra.''

Among its findings are the Tahoe Basin's regional snowpack could decline by as much as 60 percent in the next century, with increased floods likely by 2050 and prolonged droughts by 2100.

Even ''under the most optimistic projections,'' average snowpack in the Sierra Nevada around Tahoe will decline by 40 to 60 percent by 2100, according to the report.

This would likely bankrupt Tahoe's ski industry, threaten the water supply of Reno and other communities, and degrade the lake's fabled water clarity. It is devastating.

According to the UC Davis report, an all-out attack on pollution and sedimentation may be the lake's last best hope.

Geoff Schladow, director of the UC Davis Tahoe Environmental Research Center and one of the report's authors, noted the need to restore short-term water quality in Lake Tahoe—while there's still time to do it.

''Reducing the load of external nutrients entering the lake in the coming decades may be the only possible mitigation measure to reduce the impact of climate change on lake clarity . . . ,'' the report said.

Without such an effort, the ''internal loading of nutrients'' could fundamentally change the lake and fuel algal growth, creating a downward spiral in water quality and clarity.

Water clarity is one of the central problems the legislation would address.

Pollution and sedimentation have threatened Lake Tahoe's water clarity for years now. In 1968, the first year UC Davis scientists made measurements using a device called a Secchi disk, clarity was measured at an average depth of 102.4 feet. Clarity declined over the next three decades, hitting a low of 64 feet in 1997.

There has been some improvement in this decade. Last year scientists recorded average clarity at 75.3 feet—the clearest readings in a decade. But it is a fragile gain. Sedimentation and stormwater runoff pose a persistent threat.

Climate change has already made itself apparent at Lake Tahoe. It makes the basin dry and tinder-hot, raising the risks of catastrophic wildfire. Daily air temperatures have increased 4 degrees since 1911. Snow has

declined as a fraction of total precipitation, from an average of 52 percent in 1910 to just 36 percent in recent years.

Climate change has caused Lake Tahoe's surface water temperature to rise over 2 degrees in 44 years. That means the cyclical deep-water mixing of the lake's waters will occur less frequently, and this could significantly disrupt Lake Tahoe's ecosystem.

This legislation is intended to address these problems.

Last year, the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee reported out the bill favorably, but there was not enough time for a floor vote. It is my hope that this legislation can move through committee quickly and be passed later this year.

A lot of good work has been done. But there's a lot more work to do, and time is running out.

Mark Twain called Lake Tahoe ''the fairest picture the whole world affords.'' We must not be the generation who lets this picture fall into ruin. We must rise to the challenge, and do all we can to preserve this ''noble sheet of water.''

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1451

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Lake Tahoe Restoration Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

The Lake Tahoe Restoration Act (Public Law 106–506; 114 Stat. 2351) is amended by striking section 2 and inserting the following:

''SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

''(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

''(1) Lake Tahoe—

''(A) is 1 of the largest, deepest, and clearest lakes in the world;

''(B) has a cobalt blue color, a biologically diverse alpine setting, and remarkable water clarity; and

''(C) is recognized nationally and worldwide as a natural resource of special significance;

''(2) in addition to being a scenic and ecological treasure, the Lake Tahoe Basin is 1 of the outstanding recreational resources of the United States, which—

''(A) offers skiing, water sports, biking, camping, and hiking to millions of visitors each year; and

''(B) contributes significantly to the economies of California, Nevada, and the United States;

''(3) the economy in the Lake Tahoe Basin is dependent on the protection and restoration of the natural beauty and recreation opportunities in the area;

''(4) the Lake Tahoe Basin continues to be threatened by the impacts of land use and transportation patterns developed in the last century that damage the fragile watershed of the Basin;

''(5) the water clarity of Lake Tahoe declined from a visibility level of 105 feet in 1967 to only 70 feet in 2008;

''(6) the rate of decline in water clarity of Lake Tahoe has decreased in recent years;

''(7) a stable water clarity level for Lake Tahoe could be achieved through feasible control measures for very fine sediment particles and nutrients;

''(8) fine sediments that cloud Lake Tahoe, and key nutrients such as phosphorus and nitrogen that support the growth of algae and invasive plants, continue to flow into the lake from stormwater runoff from developed areas, roads, turf, other disturbed land, and streams;

''(9) the destruction and alteration of wetland, wet meadows, and stream zone habitat have compromised the natural capacity of the watershed to filter sediment, nutrients, and pollutants before reaching Lake Tahoe;

''(10) approximately 25 percent of the trees in the Lake Tahoe Basin are either dead or dying;

''(11) forests in the Tahoe Basin suffer from over a century of fire suppression and periodic drought, which have resulted in—

''(A) high tree density and mortality;

''(B) the loss of biological diversity; and

''(C) a large quantity of combustible forest fuels, which significantly increases the threat of catastrophic fire and insect infestation;

''(12) the establishment of several aquatic and terrestrial invasive species (including perennial pepperweed, milfoil, and Asian clam) threatens the ecosystem of the Lake Tahoe Basin;

''(13) there is an ongoing threat to the Lake Tahoe Basin of the introduction and establishment of other invasive species (such as yellow starthistle, New Zealand mud snail, and quagga mussel);

''(14) the report prepared by the University of California, Davis, entitled the 'State of the Lake Report', found that conditions in the Lake Tahoe Basin had changed, including—

''(A) the average surface water temperature of Lake Tahoe has risen by more than 1.2 degrees Fahrenheit in the past 43 years;

''(B) since 1910, the percent of precipitation that has fallen as snow in the Lake Tahoe Basin decreased from 51 percent to 35.5 percent; and

''(C) daily air temperatures have increased by more than 4 degrees Fahrenheit and the trend in daily maximum temperature has risen by approximately 2 degrees Fahrenheit;

''(15) 75 percent of the land in the Lake Tahoe Basin is owned by the Federal Government, which makes it a Federal responsibility to restore environmental health to the Basin;

''(16) the Federal Government has a long history of environmental preservation at Lake Tahoe, including—

''(A) congressional consent to the establishment of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency with—

''(i) the enactment in 1969 of Public Law 91–148 (83 Stat. 360); and

''(ii) the enactment in 1980 of Public Law 96–551 (94 Stat. 3233);

''(B) the establishment of the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit in 1973;

''(C) the enactment of Public Law 96–586 (94 Stat. 3381) in 1980 to provide for the acquisition of environmentally sensitive land and erosion control grants in the Lake Tahoe Basin;

''(D) the enactment of sections 341 and 342 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2004 (Public Law 108–108; 117 Stat. 1317), which amended the Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–263; 112 Stat. 2346) to provide payments for the environmental restoration projects under this Act; and

''(E) the enactment of section 382 of the Tax Relief and Health Care Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–432; 120 Stat. 3045), which amended the Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–263; 112 Stat. 2346) to authorize development and implementation of a comprehensive 10-year hazardous fuels and fire prevention plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin;

''(17) the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works was an original signatory in 1997 to the Agreement of Federal Departments on Protection of the Environment and Economic Health of the Lake Tahoe Basin;

''(18) the Chief of Engineers, under direction from the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works, has continued to be a significant contributor to Lake Tahoe Basin restoration, including—

''(A) stream and wetland restoration;

''(B) urban stormwater conveyance and treatment; and

''(C) programmatic technical assistance;

''(19) at the Lake Tahoe Presidential Forum in 1997, the President renewed the commitment of the Federal Government to Lake Tahoe by—

''(A) committing to increased Federal resources for environmental restoration at Lake Tahoe; and

''(B) establishing the Federal Interagency Partnership and Federal Advisory Committee to consult on natural resources issues concerning the Lake Tahoe Basin;

''(20) at the 2011 and 2012 Lake Tahoe Forums, Senator Reid, Senator Feinstein, Senator Heller, Senator Ensign, Governor Gibbons, Governor Sandoval, and Governor Brown—

''(A) renewed their commitment to Lake Tahoe; and

''(B) expressed their desire to fund the Federal and State shares of the Environmental Improvement Program through 2022;

''(21) since 1997, the Federal Government, the States of California and Nevada, units of local government, and the private sector have contributed more than $1,620,000,000 to the Lake Tahoe Basin, including—

''(A) $521,100,000 from the Federal Government;

''(B) $636,200,000 from the State of California;

''(C) $101,400,000 from the State of Nevada;

''(D) $68,200,000 from units of local government; and

''(E) $299,600,000 from private interests;

''(22) significant additional investment from Federal, State, local, and private sources is necessary—

''(A) to restore and sustain the environmental health of the Lake Tahoe Basin;

''(B) to adapt to the impacts of changing water temperature and precipitation; and

''(C) to protect the Lake Tahoe Basin from the introduction and establishment of invasive species; and

''(23) the Secretary has indicated that the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit has the capacity for at least $10,000,000 for the Fire Risk Reduction and Forest Management Program.

''(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are—

''(1) to enable the Chief of the Forest Service, the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in cooperation with the Planning Agency and the States of California and Nevada, to fund, plan, and implement significant new environmental restoration activities and forest management activities to address in the Lake Tahoe Basin the issues described in paragraphs (4) through (14) of subsection (a);

''(2) to ensure that Federal, State, local, regional, tribal, and private entities continue to work together to manage land in

the Lake Tahoe Basin and to coordinate on other activities in a manner that supports achievement and maintenance of—

''(A) the environmental threshold carrying capacities for the region; and

''(B) other applicable environmental standards and objectives;

''(3) to support local governments in efforts related to environmental restoration, stormwater pollution control, fire risk reduction, and forest management activities; and

''(4) to ensure that agency and science community representatives in the Lake Tahoe Basin work together—

''(A) to develop and implement a plan for integrated monitoring, assessment, and applied research to evaluate the effectiveness of the Environmental Improvement Program; and

''(B) to provide objective information as a basis for ongoing decisionmaking, with an emphasis on decisionmaking relating to public and private land use and resource management in the Basin.''.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

The Lake Tahoe Restoration Act (Public Law 106–506; 114 Stat. 2351) is amended by striking section 3 and inserting the following:

''SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

''In this Act:

''(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term 'Administrator' means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

''(2) ASSISTANT SECRETARY.—The term 'Assistant Secretary' means the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works.

''(3) CHAIR.—The term 'Chair' means the Chair of the Federal Partnership.

''(4) COMPACT.—The term 'Compact' means the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact included in the first section of Public Law 96–551 (94 Stat. 3233).

''(5) DIRECTORS.—The term 'Directors' means—

''(A) the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service; and

''(B) the Director of the United States Geological Survey.

''(6) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.—The term 'Environmental Improvement Program' means—

''(A) the Environmental Improvement Program adopted by the Planning Agency; and

''(B) any amendments to the Program.

''(7) ENVIRONMENTAL THRESHOLD CARRYING CAPACITY.—The term 'environmental threshold carrying capacity' has the meaning given the term in article II of the compact.

''(8) FEDERAL PARTNERSHIP.—The term 'Federal Partnership' means the Lake Tahoe Federal Interagency Partnership established by Executive Order 13957 (62 Fed. Reg. 41249) (or a successor Executive order).

''(9) FOREST MANAGEMENT ACTIVITY.—The term 'forest management activity' includes—

''(A) prescribed burning for ecosystem health and hazardous fuels reduction;

''(B) mechanical and minimum tool treatment;

''(C) road decommissioning or reconstruction;

''(D) stream environment zone restoration and other watershed and wildlife habitat enhancements;

''(E) nonnative invasive species management; and

''(F) other activities consistent with Forest Service practices, as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

''(10) MAPS.—The term 'Maps' means the maps—

''(A) entitled—

''(i) 'LTRA USFS-CA Land Exchange/North Shore';

''(ii) 'USFS-CA Land Exchange/West Shore'; and

''(iii) 'USFS-CA Land Exchange/South Shore'; and

''(B) dated April 12, 2013, and on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of—

''(i) the Forest Service;

''(ii) the California Tahoe Conservancy; and

''(iii) the California Department of Parks and Recreation.

''(11) NATIONAL WILDLAND FIRE CODE.—The term 'national wildland fire code' means—

''(A) the most recent publication of the National Fire Protection Association codes numbered 1141, 1142, 1143, and 1144;

''(B) the most recent publication of the International Wildland-Urban Interface Code of the International Code Council; or

''(C) any other code that the Secretary determines provides the same, or better, standards for protection against wildland fire as a code described in subparagraph (A) or (B).

''(12) PLANNING AGENCY.—The term 'Planning Agency' means the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency established under Public Law 91–148 (83 Stat. 360) and Public Law 96–551 (94 Stat. 3233).

''(13) PRIORITY LIST.—The term 'Priority List' means the environmental restoration priority list developed under section 8.

''(14) SECRETARY.—The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service.

''(15) STREAM ENVIRONMENT ZONE.—The term 'Stream Environment Zone' means an area that generally owes the biological and physical characteristics of the area to the presence of surface water or groundwater.

''(16) TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOAD.—The term 'total maximum daily load' means the total maximum daily load allocations adopted under section 303(d) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1313(d)).

''(17) WATERCRAFT.—The term 'watercraft' means motorized and non-motorized watercraft, including boats, seaplanes, personal watercraft, kayaks, and canoes.''.

SEC. 4. ADMINISTRATION OF THE LAKE TAHOE BASIN MANAGEMENT UNIT.

Section 4 of the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act (Public Law 106–506; 114 Stat. 2353) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(3), by striking ''basin'' and inserting ''Basin''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(c) TRANSIT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit shall, consistent with the regional transportation plan adopted by the Planning Agency, manage vehicular parking and traffic in the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit, with priority given—

''(A) to improving public access to the Lake Tahoe Basin, including the prioritization of alternatives to the private automobile, consistent with the requirements of the Compact;

''(B) to coordinating with the Nevada Department of Transportation, Caltrans, State parks, and other entities along Nevada Highway 28 and California Highway 89; and

''(C) to providing support and assistance to local public transit systems in the management and operations of activities under this subsection.

''(2) NATIONAL FOREST TRANSIT PROGRAM.—Consistent with the support and assistance provided under paragraph (1)(C), the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Transportation, may enter into a contract, cooperative agreement, interagency agreement, or other agreement with the Department of Transportation to secure operating and capital funds from the National Forest Transit Program.

''(d) FOREST MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES.—

''(1) COORDINATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In conducting forest management activities in the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit, the Secretary shall, as appropriate, coordinate with the Administrator and State and local agencies and organizations, including local fire departments and volunteer groups.

''(B) GOALS.—The coordination of activities under subparagraph (A) should aim to increase efficiencies and maximize the compatibility of management practices across public property boundaries.

''(2) MULTIPLE BENEFITS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In conducting forest management activities in the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit, the Secretary shall conduct the activities in a manner that—

''(i) except as provided in subparagraph (B), attains multiple ecosystem benefits, including—

''(I) reducing forest fuels;

''(II) maintaining or restoring biological diversity;

''(III) improving wetland and water quality, including in Stream Environment Zones; and

''(IV) increasing resilience to changing water temperature and precipitation; and

''(ii) helps achieve and maintain the environmental threshold carrying capacities established by the Planning Agency.

''(B) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding clause (A)(i), the attainment of multiple ecosystem benefits shall not be required if the Secretary determines that management for multiple ecosystem benefits would excessively increase the cost of a project in relation to the additional ecosystem benefits gained from the management activity.

''(3) GROUND DISTURBANCE.—Consistent with applicable Federal law and Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit land and resource management plan direction, the Secretary shall—

''(A) establish post-project ground condition criteria for ground disturbance caused by forest management activities; and

''(B) provide for monitoring to ascertain the attainment of the post-project conditions.

''(e) WITHDRAWAL OF FEDERAL LAND.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to valid existing rights and paragraph (2), the Federal land located in the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit is withdrawn from—

''(A) all forms of entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws;

''(B) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

''(C) disposition under all laws relating to mineral and geothermal leasing.

''(2) EXCEPTIONS.—A conveyance of land shall be exempt from withdrawal under this subsection if carried out under—

''(A) the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act (Public Law 106–506; 114 Stat. 2351); or

''(B) the Santini-Burton Act (Public Law 96–586; 94 Stat. 3381).

''(f) ENVIRONMENTAL THRESHOLD CARRYING CAPACITY.—The Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit shall support the attainment of the environmental threshold carrying capacities.

''(g) COOPERATIVE AUTHORITIES.—During the 4 fiscal years following the date of enactment of the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act of 2013, the Secretary, in conjunction with land adjustment projects or programs, may enter into contracts and cooperative agreements with States, units of local government, and other public and private entities to provide for fuel reduction, erosion control, reforestation, Stream Environment Zone restoration, and similar management activities on Federal land and non-Federal land within the projects or programs.''.

SEC. 5. CONSULTATION.

The Lake Tahoe Restoration Act (Public Law 106–506; 114 Stat. 2351) is amended by striking section 5 and inserting the following:

''SEC. 5. CONSULTATION.

''In carrying out this Act, the Secretary, the Administrator, and the Directors shall, as appropriate and in a timely manner, consult with the heads of the Washoe Tribe, applicable Federal, State, regional, and local governmental agencies, and the Lake Tahoe Federal Advisory Committee.''.

SEC. 6. AUTHORIZED PROJECTS.

The Lake Tahoe Restoration Act (Public Law 106–506; 114 Stat. 2351) is amended by striking section 6 and inserting the following:

''SEC. 6. AUTHORIZED PROJECTS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, the Assistant Secretary, the Directors, and the Administrator, in coordination with the Planning Agency and the States of California and Nevada, may carry out or provide financial assistance to any project or program that—

''(1) is described in subsection (d);

''(2) is included in the Priority List under section 8; and

''(3) furthers the purposes of the Environmental Improvement Program if the project has been subject to environmental review and approval, respectively, as required under Federal law, article 7 of the Compact, and State law, as applicable.

''(b) RESTRICTION.—The Administrator shall use not more than 3 percent of the funds provided under subsection (a) for administering the projects or programs described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (d).

''(c) MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT.—All projects authorized under subsection (d) shall—

''(1) include funds for monitoring and assessment of the results and effectiveness at the project and program level consistent with the program developed under section 11; and

''(2) use the integrated multiagency performance measures established under section 13.

''(d) DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITIES.—

''(1) STORMWATER MANAGEMENT, EROSION CONTROL, AND TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOAD IMPLEMENTATION.—Of the amounts made available under section 17(a), $75,000,000 shall be made available—

''(A) to the Secretary or the Administrator for the Federal share of stormwater management and related projects and programs consistent with the adopted Total Maximum Daily Load and near-shore water quality goals; and

''(B) for grants by the Secretary and the Administrator to carry out the projects and programs described in subparagraph (A).

''(2) STREAM ENVIRONMENT ZONE AND WATERSHED RESTORATION.—Of the amounts made available under section 17(a), $38,000,000 shall be made available—

''(A) to the Secretary or the Assistant Secretary for the Federal share of the Upper Truckee River restoration projects and other watershed restoration projects identified in the priority list established under section 8; and

''(B) for grants by the Administrator to carry out the projects described in subparagraph (A).

''(3) FIRE RISK REDUCTION AND FOREST MANAGEMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Of the amounts made available under section 17(a), $135,000,000 shall be made available to the Secretary to carry out, including by making grants, the following projects:

''(i) Projects identified as part of the Lake Tahoe Basin Multi-Jurisdictional Fuel Reduction and Wildfire Prevention Strategy 10-Year Plan.

''(ii) Competitive grants for fuels work to be awarded by the Secretary to communities that have adopted national wildland fire codes to implement the applicable portion of the 10-year plan described in clause (i).

''(iii) Biomass projects, including feasibility assessments and transportation of materials.

''(iv) Angora Fire Restoration projects under the jurisdiction of the Secretary.

''(v) Washoe Tribe projects on tribal lands within the Lake Tahoe Basin.

''(vi) Development of an updated Lake Tahoe Basin multijurisdictional fuel reduction and wildfire prevention strategy, consistent with section 4(d).

''(vii) Development of updated community wildfire protection plans by local fire districts.

''(viii) Municipal water infrastructure that significantly improves the firefighting capability of local government within the Lake Tahoe Basin.

''(B) MINIMUM ALLOCATION.—Of the amounts made available to the Secretary to carry out subparagraph (A), at least $80,000,000 shall be used by the Secretary for projects under subparagraph (A)(i).

''(C) PRIORITY.—Units of local government that have dedicated funding for inspections and enforcement of defensible space regulations shall be given priority for amounts provided under this paragraph.

''(D) COST-SHARING REQUIREMENTS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—As a condition on the receipt of funds, communities or local fire districts that receive funds under this paragraph shall provide a 25 percent match.

''(ii) FORM OF NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—The non-Federal share required under clause (i) may be in the form of cash contributions or in-kind contributions, including providing labor, equipment, supplies, space, and other operational needs.

''(II) CREDIT FOR CERTAIN DEDICATED FUNDING.—There shall be credited toward the non-Federal share required under clause (i) any dedicated funding of the communities or local fire districts for a fuels reduction management program, defensible space inspections, or dooryard chipping.

''(III) DOCUMENTATION.—Communities and local fire districts shall—

''(aa) maintain a record of in-kind contributions that describes—

''(AA) the monetary value of the in-kind contributions; and

''(BB) the manner in which the in-kind contributions assist in accomplishing project goals and objectives; and

''(bb) document in all requests for Federal funding, and include in the total project budget, evidence of the commitment to provide the non-Federal share through in-kind contributions.

''(4) INVASIVE SPECIES MANAGEMENT.—Of the amounts to be made available under section 17(a), $30,000,000 shall be made available to the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for the Aquatic Invasive Species Program and the watercraft inspections described in section 9.

''(5) SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES MANAGEMENT.—Of the amounts to be made available under section 17(a), $20,000,000 shall be made available to the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for the Lahontan Cutthroat Trout Recovery Program.

''(6) LAKE TAHOE BASIN SCIENCE PROGRAM.—Of the amounts to be made available under section 17(a), $30,000,000 shall be made available to the Chief of the Forest Service to develop and implement, in coordination with the Tahoe Science Consortium, the Lake Tahoe Basin Science Program established under section 11.

''(7) PROGRAM PERFORMANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Of the amounts to be made available under section 17(a), $5,000,000 shall be made available to the Secretary to carry out sections 12, 13, and 14.

''(B) PLANNING AGENCY.—Of the amounts described in subparagraph (A), not less than 50 percent shall be made available to the Planning Agency to carry out the program oversight, coordination, and outreach activities established under sections 12, 13, and 14.

''(8) LAND CONVEYANCE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount made available under section 17(a), $2,000,000 shall be made available to the Secretary to carry out the activities under section 3(b)(2) of Public Law 96–586 (94 Stat. 3384) (commonly known as the 'Santini-Burton Act').

''(B) OTHER FUNDS.—Of the amounts available to the Secretary under subparagraph (A), not less than 50 percent shall be provided to the California Tahoe Conservancy to facilitate the conveyance of land described in section 3(b)(2) of Public Law 96–586 (94 Stat. 3384) (commonly known as the 'Santini-Burton Act').''.

SEC. 7. ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION PRIORITY LIST.

The Lake Tahoe Restoration Act (Public Law 106–506; 114 Stat. 2351) is amended—

(1) by striking sections 8 and 9;

(2) by redesignating sections 10, 11, and 12 as sections 15, 16, and 17, respectively; and

(3) by inserting after section 7 the following:

''SEC. 8. ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION PRIORITY LIST.

''(a) DEADLINE.—Not later than February 15 of the year after the date of enactment of the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act of 2013, the Chair, in consultation with the Secretary, the Administrator, the Directors, the Planning Agency, the States of California and Nevada, the Federal Partnership, the Washoe Tribe, the Lake Tahoe Federal Advisory Committee, and the Tahoe Science Consortium shall submit to Congress a prioritized list of all Environmental Improvement Program projects for the Lake Tahoe Basin for each program category described in section 6(d).

''(b) CRITERIA.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The priority of projects included in the Priority List shall be based on the best available science and the following criteria:

''(A) The 5-year threshold carrying capacity evaluation.

''(B) The ability to measure progress or success of the project.

''(C) The potential to significantly contribute to the achievement and maintenance of the environmental threshold carrying capacities identified in the Compact for—

''(i) air quality;

''(ii) fisheries;

''(iii) noise;

''(iv) recreation;

''(v) scenic resources;

''(vi) soil conservation;

''(vii) forest health;

''(viii) water quality; and

''(ix) wildlife.

''(D) The ability of a project to provide multiple benefits.

''(E) The ability of a project to leverage non-Federal contributions.

''(F) Stakeholder support for the project.

''(G) The justification of Federal interest.

''(H) Agency priority.

''(I) Agency capacity.

''(J) Cost-effectiveness.

''(K) Federal funding history.

''(2) SECONDARY FACTORS.—In addition to the criteria under paragraph (1), the Chair

shall, as the Chair determines to be appropriate, give preference to projects in the Priority List that benefit existing neighborhoods in the Basin that are at or below regional median income levels, based on the most recent census data available.

''(c) REVISIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Priority List submitted under subsection (b) shall be revised—

''(A) every 2 years; or

''(B) on a finding of compelling need under paragraph (2).

''(2) FINDING OF COMPELLING NEED.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary, the Administrator, or the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service makes a finding of compelling need justifying a priority shift and the finding is approved by the Secretary, the Executive Director of the Planning Agency, the California Natural Resources Secretary, and the Director of the Nevada Department of Conservation, the Priority List shall be revised in accordance with this subsection.

''(B) INCLUSIONS.—A finding of compelling need includes—

''(i) major scientific findings;

''(ii) results from the threshold evaluation of the Planning Agency;

''(iii) emerging environmental threats; and

''(iv) rare opportunities for land acquisition.

''(d) FUNDING.—Of the amount made available under section 17(a), $80,000,000 shall be made available to the Secretary to carry out this section.

''SEC. 9. AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES PREVENTION.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, in coordination with the Planning Agency, the California Department of Fish and Game, and the Nevada Department of Wildlife, shall deploy strategies consistent with the Lake Tahoe Aquatic Invasive Species Management Plan to prevent the introduction of aquatic invasive species into the Lake Tahoe Basin.

''(b) CRITERIA.—The strategies referred to in subsection (a) shall provide that—

''(1) combined inspection and decontamination stations be established and operated at not less than 2 locations in the Lake Tahoe Basin; and

''(2) watercraft not be allowed to launch in waters of the Lake Tahoe Basin if the watercraft has not been inspected in accordance with the Lake Tahoe Aquatic Invasive Species Management Plan.

''(c) CERTIFICATION.—The Planning Agency may certify State and local agencies to perform the decontamination activities described in subsection (b)(3) at locations outside the Lake Tahoe Basin if standards at the sites meet or exceed standards for similar sites in the Lake Tahoe Basin established under this section.

''(d) APPLICABILITY.—The strategies and criteria developed under this section shall apply to all watercraft to be launched on water within the Lake Tahoe Basin.

''(e) FEES.—The Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service may collect and spend fees for decontamination only at a level sufficient to cover the costs of operation of inspection and decontamination stations under this section.

''(f) CIVIL PENALTIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Any person that launches, attempts to launch, or facilitates launching of watercraft not in compliance with strategies deployed under this section shall be liable for a civil penalty in an amount not to exceed $1,000 per violation.

''(2) OTHER AUTHORITIES.—Any penalties assessed under this subsection shall be separate from penalties assessed under any other authority.

''(g) LIMITATION.—The strategies and criteria under subsections (a) and (b), respectively, may be modified if the Secretary of the Interior, in a nondelegable capacity and in consultation with the Planning Agency and State governments, issues a determination that alternative measures will be no less effective at preventing introduction of aquatic invasive species into Lake Tahoe than the strategies and criteria.

''(h) SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITY.—The authority under this section is supplemental to all actions taken by non-Federal regulatory authorities.

''(i) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this title shall be construed as restricting, affecting, or amending any other law or the authority of any department, instrumentality, or agency of the United States, or any State or political subdivision thereof, respecting the control of invasive species.

''SEC. 10. CORPS OF ENGINEERS; INTERAGENCY AGREEMENTS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Assistant Secretary may enter into interagency agreements with non-Federal interests in the Lake Tahoe Basin to use Lake Tahoe Partnership-Miscellaneous General Investigations funds to provide programmatic technical assistance for the Environmental Improvement Program.

''(b) LOCAL COOPERATION AGREEMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Before providing technical assistance under this section, the Assistant Secretary shall enter into a local cooperation agreement with a non-Federal interest to provide for the technical assistance.

''(2) COMPONENTS.—The agreement entered into under paragraph (1) shall—

''(A) describe the nature of the technical assistance;

''(B) describe any legal and institutional structures necessary to ensure the effective long-term viability of the end products by the non-Federal interest; and

''(C) include cost-sharing provisions in accordance with paragraph (3).

''(3) FEDERAL SHARE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Federal share of project costs under each local cooperation agreement under this subsection shall be 65 percent.

''(B) FORM.—The Federal share may be in the form of reimbursements of project costs.

''(C) CREDIT.—The non-Federal interest may receive credit toward the non-Federal share for the reasonable costs of related technical activities completed by the non-Federal interest before entering into a local cooperation agreement with the Assistant Secretary under this subsection.

''SEC. 11. LAKE TAHOE BASIN SCIENCE PROGRAM.

''The Secretary (acting through the Station Director of the Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Research Station), the Administrator, the Planning Agency, the States of California and Nevada, and the Tahoe Science Consortium, shall develop and implement the Lake Tahoe Basin Science Program that—

''(1) develops and regularly updates an integrated multiagency programmatic assessment and monitoring plan—

''(A) to evaluate the effectiveness of the Environmental Improvement Program;

''(B) to evaluate the status and trends of indicators related to environmental threshold carrying capacities; and

''(C) to assess the impacts and risks of changing water temperature, precipitation, and invasive species;

''(2) produces and synthesizes scientific information necessary for—

''(A) the identification and refinement of environmental indicators for the Lake Tahoe Basin; and

''(B) the evaluation of standards and benchmarks;

''(3) conducts applied research, programmatic technical assessments, scientific data management, analysis, and reporting related to key management questions;

''(4) develops new tools and information to support objective assessments of land use and resource conditions;

''(5) provides scientific and technical support to the Federal Government and State and local governments in—

''(A) reducing stormwater runoff, air deposition, and other pollutants that contribute to the loss of lake clarity; and

''(B) the development and implementation of an integrated stormwater monitoring and assessment program;

''(6) establishes and maintains independent peer review processes—

''(A) to evaluate the Environmental Improvement Program; and

''(B) to assess the technical adequacy and scientific consistency of central environmental documents, such as the 5-year threshold review; and

''(7) provides scientific and technical support for the development of appropriate management strategies to accommodate changing water temperature and precipitation in the Lake Tahoe Basin.

''SEC. 12. PUBLIC OUTREACH AND EDUCATION.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, the Administrator, and the Directors will coordinate with the Planning Agency to conduct public education and outreach programs, including encouraging—

''(1) owners of land and residences in the Lake Tahoe Basin—

''(A) to implement defensible space; and

''(B) to conduct best management practices for water quality; and

''(2) owners of land and residences in the Lake Tahoe Basin and visitors to the Lake Tahoe Basin, to help prevent the introduction and proliferation of invasive species as part of the private share investment in the Environmental Improvement Program.

''(b) SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL GUIDANCE.—The Director of the United States Geological Survey shall provide scientific and technical guidance to public outreach and education programs conducted under this section.

''(c) REQUIRED COORDINATION.—Public outreach and education programs for aquatic invasive species under this section shall—

''(1) be coordinated with Lake Tahoe Basin tourism and business organizations; and

''(2) include provisions for the programs to extend outside of the Lake Tahoe Basin.

''SEC. 13. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

''Not later than February 15 of each year, the Secretary, in cooperation with the Chair, the Administrator, the Directors, the Planning Agency, and the States of California and Nevada, consistent with section 6(d)(6), shall submit to Congress a report that describes—

''(1) the status of all Federal, State, local, and private projects authorized under this Act, including to the maximum extent practicable, for projects that will receive Federal funds under this Act during the current or subsequent fiscal year—

''(A) the project scope;

''(B) the budget for the project; and

''(C) the justification for the project, consistent with the criteria established in section 8(b)(1);

''(2) Federal, State, local, and private expenditures in the preceding fiscal year to implement the Environmental Improvement Program and projects otherwise authorized under this Act;

''(3) accomplishments in the preceding fiscal year in implementing this Act in accordance with the performance measures and

other monitoring and assessment activities; and

''(4) public education and outreach efforts undertaken to implement programs and projects authorized under this Act.

''SEC. 14. ANNUAL BUDGET PLAN.

''As part of the annual budget of the President, the President shall submit information regarding each Federal agency involved in the Environmental Improvement Program (including the Forest Service, the Environmental Protection Agency, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service), the United States Geological Survey, and the Corps of Engineers), including—

''(1) an interagency crosscut budget that displays the proposed budget for use by each Federal agency in carrying out restoration activities relating to the Environmental Improvement Program for the following fiscal year;

''(2) a detailed accounting of all amounts received and obligated by Federal agencies to achieve the goals of the Environmental Improvement Program during the preceding fiscal year; and

''(3) a description of the Federal role in the Environmental Improvement Program, including the specific role of each agency involved in the restoration of the Lake Tahoe Basin.''.

SEC. 8. RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAWS.

Section 16 of The Lake Tahoe Restoration Act (Public Law 106–506; 114 Stat. 2358) (as redesignated by section 7(2)) is amended by inserting '', Director, or Administrator'' after ''Secretary''.

SEC. 9. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

The Lake Tahoe Restoration Act (Public Law 106–506; 114 Stat. 2351) is amended by striking section 17 (as redesignated by section 7(2)) and inserting the following:

''SEC. 17. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

''(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act $415,000,000 for a period of 10 fiscal years beginning the first fiscal year after the date of enactment of the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act of 2013.

''(b) EFFECT ON OTHER FUNDS.—Amounts authorized under this section and any amendments made by this Act—

''(1) shall be in addition to any other amounts made available to the Secretary, the Administrator, or the Directors for expenditure in the Lake Tahoe Basin; and

''(2) shall not reduce allocations for other Regions of the Forest Service, Environmental Protection Agency, or the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

''(c) COST-SHARING REQUIREMENT.—Except as provided in subsection (d) and section 6(d)(3)(D), the States of California and Nevada shall pay 50 percent of the aggregate costs of restoration activities in the Lake Tahoe Basin funded under section 6.

''(d) RELOCATION COSTS.—Notwithstanding subsection (c), the Secretary shall provide to local utility districts two-thirds of the costs of relocating facilities in connection with—

''(1) environmental restoration projects under sections 6 and 8; and

''(2) erosion control projects under section 2 of Public Law 96–586 (94 Stat. 3381).

''(e) SIGNAGE.—To the maximum extent practicable, a project provided assistance under this Act shall include appropriate signage at the project site that—

''(1) provides information to the public on—

''(A) the amount of Federal funds being provided to the project; and

''(B) this Act; and

''(2) displays the visual identity mark of the Environmental Improvement Program.''.

SEC. 10. ADMINISTRATION OF ACQUIRED LAND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3(b) of Public Law 96–586 (94 Stat. 3384) (commonly known as the ''Santini-Burton Act'') is amended—

(1) by striking ''(b) Lands'' and inserting the following:

''(b) ADMINISTRATION OF ACQUIRED LAND.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Land''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) CONVEYANCE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If the State of California (acting through the California Tahoe Conservancy and the California Department of Parks and Recreation) offers to donate to the United States acceptable title to the non-Federal land described in subparagraph (B)(i), the Secretary—

''(i) may accept the offer; and

''(ii) not later than 180 days after the date on which the Secretary receives acceptable title to the non-Federal land described in subparagraph (B)(i), convey to the State of California, subject to valid existing rights and for no consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal land that is acceptable to the State of California.

''(B) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—

''(i) NON-FEDERAL LAND.—The non-Federal land referred to in subparagraph (A) includes—

''(I) the approximately 1,981 acres of land administered by the Conservancy and identified on the Maps as 'Conservancy to the United States Forest Service'; and

''(II) the approximately 187 acres of land administered by California State Parks and identified on the Maps as 'State Parks to the U.S. Forest Service'.

''(ii) FEDERAL LAND.—The Federal land referred to in subparagraph (A) includes the approximately 1,995 acres of Forest Service land identified on the Maps as 'U.S. Forest Service to Conservancy and State Parks'.

''(C) CONDITIONS.—Any land conveyed under this paragraph shall—

''(i) be for the purpose of consolidating Federal and State ownerships and improving management efficiencies;

''(ii) not result in any significant changes in the uses of the land; and

''(iii) be subject to the condition that the applicable deed include such terms , restrictions, covenants, conditions, and reservations as the Secretary determines necessary to—

''(I) ensure compliance with this Act; and

''(II) ensure that the development rights associated with the conveyed parcels shall not be recognized or available for transfer under section 90.2 of the Code of Ordinances for the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency.''.

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself and Mr. PAUL):

S. 1457. A bill to exempt the aging process of distilled spirits from the production period for purposes of capitalization of interest costs; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1457

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Aged Distilled Spirits Competitiveness Act''.

SEC. 2. PRODUCTION PERIOD OF DISTILLED SPIRITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 263A(f) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5), and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

''(4) EXEMPTION FOR AGING PROCESS OF DISTILLED SPIRITS.—For purposes of this subsection, the production period shall not include the aging period for distilled spirits (as described in section 5002(a)(8)).''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to the production of distilled spirits that begins on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. HARKIN):

S. 1465. A bill to ensure that persons who form corporations in the United States disclose the beneficial owners of those corporations, in order to prevent the formation of corporations with hidden owners, stop the misuse of United States corporations by wrongdoers, and assist law enforcement in detecting, preventing, and punishing terrorism, money laundering, tax evasion, and other criminal and civil misconduct involving United States corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, today, along with my colleagues, Senator GRASSLEY, Senator FEINSTEIN, and Senator HARKIN, I am reintroducing the Incorporation Transparency and Law Enforcement Assistance Act, a bill designed to combat terrorism, money laundering, tax evasion, and other wrongdoing facilitated by U.S. corporations with hidden owners. This commonsense bill would end the practice of our States forming about 2 million new corporations each year for unidentified persons, and instead require a list of the real owners to be submitted so that, if misconduct later occurred, law enforcement could access the owners list and have a trail to chase, instead of confronting what has all too often been a dead end.

Our bill is supported by key law enforcement organizations, including the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Association of Assistant United States Attorneys, and the Society of Former Special Agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, as well as by Manhattan District Attorney Cyrus Vance. It is also endorsed by a number of small business, public interest, and good government groups, including the Main Street Alliance, American Sustainable Business Council, National Money Transmitters Association, AFL–CIO, SEIU, Global Financial Integrity, Global Witness, U.S. Public Interest Research Group, Transparency International, Public Citizen, Project on Government Oversight, Jubilee USA Network, Tax Justice Network USA, Human Rights Watch, Friends of the Earth, Open Society Policy Center, Revenue Watch Institute, the FACT Coalition, and more. .

This is the fourth Congress in which this bill has been introduced to provide a solution to a problem that has gained only more urgency with time. In 2008,

when the bill was first introduced, President Obama was a member of the U.S. Senate and an original cosponsor. In 2013, President Obama stood with other international leaders at a G8 summit in June to condemn corporations with hidden owners who commit crimes, tax evasion, and other wrongdoing. The G8 leaders made a joint commitment to combat that problem. President Obama immediately responded with a U.S. action plan that, among other measures, calls for enacting legislation to end the shameful practice in this country of forming U.S. corporations with unnamed owners and unleashing them on, not only our own communities, but the international community as well.

A World Bank study found that the United States forms more corporations per year than all the rest of the countries in the world put together. Under current law, those U.S. corporations can be established anonymously, by hidden owners who don't reveal their identity. According to another recent study by Griffith University examining multiple jurisdictions, it is easier to obtain an anonymous shell company in the United States than almost anywhere else in the world. That study also found that ''only a tiny portion of U.S. providers of any kind met the international standard of requiring notarized identity documents.''

Right now, in the United States, it takes more information to get a driver's license or to open a U.S. bank account than to form a U.S. corporation. Our bill would change that by requiring any State that accepts crime-fighting grants from the Department of Justice to add one new question to their existing incorporation forms asking applicants to identify the company's true owners.

That is it. One new question on an existing form. It is not a complicated question, yet the answer could play a key role in helping law enforcement do their jobs. Our bill would not require States to verify the information, but penalties would apply to persons who submit false information. States, or licensed formation agents if a State has delegated the task to them, would supply the ownership information to law enforcement upon receipt of a subpoena or summons.

The Problem. We have all seen the news reports about U.S. corporations involved in wrongdoing—from facilitating terrorism to money laundering, financial fraud, tax evasion, corruption, and more. Let me give you a few examples that indicate the scope of the problem.

We now know that some terrorists use U.S. corporations to carry out their activities. Viktor Bout, an arms dealer who was found guilty in November 2011 of conspiring to kill U.S. nationals and selling weapons to a terrorist organization, used corporations around the world in his work, including a dozen formed in Texas, Delaware, and Florida. At the time of Mr. Bout's extradition to face justice here in America, Attorney General Eric Holder stated: ''Long considered one of the world's most prolific arms traffickers, Mr. Bout will now appear in federal court in Manhattan to answer to charges of conspiring to sell millions of dollars worth of weapons to a terrorist organization for use in trying to kill Americans.'' It is unacceptable that Mr. Bout was able to set up corporations in three of our States and use them in illicit activities without ever being asked for the names of the corporate owners.

In another case, a New York company called the Assa Corporation owned a Manhattan skyscraper and, in 2007, wire transferred about $4.5 million in rental payments to a bank in Iran. U.S. law enforcement tracking the funds had no idea who was behind that corporation, until another government disclosed that it was owned by the Alavi Foundation which had known ties to the Iranian military. In other words, a New York corporation was being used to ship millions of U.S. dollars to Iran, a notorious supporter of terrorism.

U.S. corporations with hidden owners have also been involved in financial crimes. In 2011, a former Russian military officer, Victor Kaganov, pled guilty to operating an illegal money transmitter business from his home in Oregon, and using Oregon shell corporations to wire more than $150 million around the world on behalf of Russian clients. U.S. Attorney Dwight Holton of the District of Oregon used stark language when describing the case: ''When shell corporations are illegally manipulated in the shadows to hide the flow of tens of millions of dollars overseas, it threatens the integrity of our financial system.''

Another financial fraud case involves Florida attorney Scott Rothstein who, in 2010, pled guilty to fraud and money laundering in connection with a $1.2 billion Ponzi investment scheme, in which he used 85 U.S. limited liability companies to conceal his participation and ownership stake in various business ventures. In still another case earlier this year, the Securities and Exchange Commission suspended trading in 61 shell corporations suspected of being misused to defraud investors.

Shell corporations are also notorious for their role in health care fraud. One example involves an individual named Michel Huarte who formed 29 shell companies in several states including Florida, Louisiana, and North Carolina, used them to make fraudulent health care claims, and bilked Medicare out of more than $50 million. In 2010, he was sentenced to 22 years in prison. He is one in a long line of fraudsters who have hidden behind U.S. corporations to defraud Medicare and Medicaid.

Tax evasion is another type of misconduct which all too often involves the use of U.S. corporations with hidden owners. One Subcommittee investigation showed, for example, how Kurt Greaves, a Michigan businessman, worked with Terry Neal, an offshore promoter, to form shell corporations in Nevada, Canada, and offshore secrecy jurisdictions, to hide more than $400,000 in untaxed business income. Both Mr. Greaves and Mr. Neal later pled guilty to federal tax evasion. The Subcommittee also showed how two brothers from Texas, Sam and Charles Wyly, created a network of 58 trusts and shell corporations to dodge the payment of U.S. taxes, including using a set of Nevada corporations to move offshore over $190 million in stock options without paying taxes on that compensation.

Still another area of abuse involves corrupt foreign officials using U.S. corporations to hide and spend their illicit funds. One example involves Teodoro Obiang, who is the son of the President of Equatorial Guinea, holds office in that country, and has purchased luxury homes, cars, and even a personal jet here in the United States. A Subcommittee investigation disclosed that, as part of his actions, Mr. Obiang used U.S. lawyers to form several California shell corporations with names like Beautiful Vision, Unlimited Horizon, and Sweet Pink to open bank accounts in the names of those corporations, move millions of dollars in suspect funds into the United States, and use those funds to support an affluent lifestyle. The Department of Justice has since filed suit to seize his U.S. property, alleging that Mr. Obiang acquired it through corruption and money laundering.

One last example involves 800 U.S. corporations whose hidden owners have stumped U.S. law enforcement trying to investigate their suspect conduct. In October 2004, the Homeland Security Department's division of Immigration and Customs Enforcement or ICE identified a single Utah corporation that had engaged in $150 million in suspicious transactions. ICE found that the corporation had been formed in Utah and was owned by two Panamanian entities which, in turn, were owned by a group of Panamanian holding corporations, all located at the same Panama City office. By 2005, ICE had located 800 U.S. corporations in nearly all 50 states associated with the same shadowy group in Panama, but was unable to obtain the name of a single natural person who owned any one of the corporations. ICE had learned that the 800 corporations were associated with multiple U.S. investigations into tax fraud and other wrongdoing, but no one had been able to find the corporate owners. The trail went cold, and ICE closed the case. Yet it may be that many of those U.S. corporations are still enaged in wrongdoing.

These examples of U.S. corporations with hidden owners facilitating terrorism, financial crime, health care fraud, tax evasion, corruption, and other misconduct provide ample evidence of the need for legislation to find out who is behind the mayhem. That's

why law enforcement officials are among the bill's strongest supporters.

The Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association or FLEOA, which represents more than 26,000 Federal law enforcement officers, has explained its strong support for the bill as follows:

Suspected terrorists, drug trafficking organizations and other criminal enterprises continue to exploit the anonymity afforded to them through the current corporate filing process in a few states. Hiding behind a registered agent, these criminals are able to incorporate without disclosing who the beneficial owners are for their company(s). This enables them to establish corporate flow-through entities, otherwise known as shell companies,' to facilitate money laundering and narcoterrorist financing.

Even through the due process of proper service of a court order, law enforcement officers are unable to determine who the beneficial owners are of these entities. This has to stop. While we fully recognize and respect the privacy concerns of law abiding citizens, we need to install a baseline of checks and balances to deter the criminal exploitation of our corporate filing process.

The Fraternal Order of Police, which has 330,000 members across the country, offers a similar explanation for its support of the bill:

For years corporations have been used as front organizations by criminals conducting illegal activity such as money laundering, fraud, and tax evasion. . . . This bill is critical to our work because, all too often, investigations are stymied when we encounter a company with hidden ownership. . . . [T]he sharing of beneficial ownership information with law enforcement will greatly assist our investigations. When we are able to expose the link between shell companies and drug trafficking, corruption, organized crime and terrorist finance, the law enforcement community is better able to keep America safe from these illegal activities and keep the proceeds of these crimes out of the U.S. financial system.

The National Association of Assistant United States Attorneys, which represents more than 1,500 federal prosecutors, has urged Congress to take legislative action to strengthen inadequate state incorporation practices: ''[M]indful of the ease with which criminals establish 'front organizations' to assist in money laundering, terrorist financing, tax evasion and other misconduct, it is shocking and unacceptable that many State laws permit the creation of corporations without asking for the identity of the corporation's beneficial owners. The legislation will guard against that and no longer permit criminals to exploit the lack of transparency in the registration of corporations.''

Manhattan District Attorney Cyrus Vance Jr. has publicly urged Congress to enact this bill. He wrote: ''I have spoken with many colleagues in the law enforcement community, and every one of us supports the bill as a simple and common sense movement to help prevent white collar crime. . . . Because there is no national standard requiring disclosure of beneficial ownership, criminals can set up U.S. corporations anonymously and use them as fronts for all kinds of illicit activity without having to identify who actually controls and profits from the activity. In a simple stroke, the proposed bill would eliminate this needless barrier to the detection and prosecution of financial crimes.''

Some members of the U.S. financial industry with obligations under U.S. anti-money laundering laws to know their customers, including when doing business with a shell corporation, support the legislation because it will help them know who is behind U.S. corporations seeking to open accounts with them. The National Money Transmitters Association, NMTA, for example, which represents state-licensed money transmitters, has written in support of the bill, explaining: ''The NMTA urges you to give us the KYC, know-your-customer, tools we need to do our job efficiently and make sure that our nation's standards are brought up to a level equal to that of other advanced countries.''

We need legislation not only to stop the abuses being committed by U.S. corporations with hidden owners, but also to meet our international commitments. In 2006, the leading international anti-money laundering body in the world, the Financial Action Task Force on Money Laundering—known as FATF—issued a report criticizing the United States for its failure to comply with a FATF standard requiring countries to obtain beneficial ownership information for the corporations formed under their laws. This standard is one of 40 FATF standards that this country has publicly committed itself to implementing as part of its efforts to promote strong anti-money laundering laws around the world.

FATF gave the United States two years, until 2008, to make progress toward complying with the FATF standard on beneficial ownership information. But that deadline passed five years ago, with no real progress. Enacting the bill we are introducing today would help bring the United States into compliance with the FATF standard by requiring the States to obtain beneficial ownership information for the corporations formed under their laws. It would help ensure that the United States meets its international anti-money laundering commitments.

Combating the misuse of corporations with hidden owners has increasingly become a global priority. In a letter to President Obama earlier this year, prominent prosecutors and corruption hunters from across the globe urged the United States to collect company beneficial ownership information to fight wrongdoing. According to the letter: ''Grand corruption would not be possible without the help of the global financing system—in particular, banks that accept corrupt assets and secrecy rules that allow money launderers to disguise their activity. . . . We believe that part of the solution is for governments to require existing company registers to collect information on the ultimate owners of companies.''

As I mentioned earlier, countries around the world have begun to take action to tackle the problem. Just last month, during the G8 summit in Northern Ireland, leaders announced their commitment to ending the practice of establishing anonymous shell companies and declared: ''Companies should know who really owns them and tax collectors and law enforcers should be able to obtain this information easily.'' To implement that principle, the G8 leaders pledged to publish national Action Plans outlining the concrete steps each country will take to ensure that law enforcement and tax authorities have ready access to information on who owns and controls the companies formed under their laws.

In announcing the U.S. Action Plan, the White House expressed its commitment to ensuring that law enforcement and tax authorities have access to ownership information for companies formed within U.S. borders. The Plan explicitly calls for enactment of legislation that meets certain principles, all of which are met by the bill introduced today. Those principles are the following:

''Requirements for covered legal entities to disclose beneficial ownership to states or regulated corporate formation agents at the time of company formation.

''Requirements for verification of the identity of the beneficial owner.

''Options for covering legal entities depending on whether the applicant forms the legal entity directly or uses a regulated company formation agent.

''Requirements for law enforcement authorities, including tax authorities, to be able to access beneficial ownership information upon appropriate request through a central registry at the state level.

''An extension of anti-money laundering obligations to company formation agents, including an obligation to identify and verify beneficial ownership information.

''A mandate that entities provide updated information when changes of beneficial ownership occur within 60 days; and

''The imposition of civil and criminal penalties for knowingly providing false information.''

The White House and the international community have made the collection of beneficial ownership information for corporations a global priority this year. It is time for Congress to step up to the plate and take the necessary action.

The bill introduced today is the product of years of work by the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, which I chair. Over twelve years ago, in 2000, the Government Accountability Office, at my request, conducted an investigation and released a report entitled, ''Suspicious Banking

Activities: Possible Money Laundering by U.S. Corporations Formed for Russian Entities.'' That report revealed that one person was able to set up more than 2,000 Delaware shell corporations and, without disclosing the identity of any of the beneficial owners, open U.S. bank accounts for those corporations, which then collectively moved about $1.4 billion through the accounts. It is one of the earliest government reports to give some sense of the law enforcement problems caused by U.S. corporations with hidden owners. The alarm it sounded years ago is still ringing.

In April 2006, in response to a second Subcommittee request, GAO released a report entitled, ''Corporation Formations: Minimal Ownership Information Is Collected and Available,'' which reviewed the corporate formation laws in all 50 States. GAO disclosed that the vast majority of the States do not collect any information at all on the beneficial owners of the corporations and limited liability companies, or LLCs, formed under their laws. The report also found that several States had established automated procedures that allow a person to form a new corporation or LLC in the State within 24 hours of filing an online application without any prior review of that application by State personnel. In exchange for a substantial fee, at least two States will form a corporation or LLC within one hour of a request. After examining these State incorporation practices, the GAO report described the problems that the lack of beneficial ownership information caused for a range of law enforcement investigations.

In November 2006, our Subcommittee held a hearing on the problem. At that hearing, representatives of the U.S. Department of Justice, the Internal Revenue Service, and the Department of Treasury's Financial Crimes Enforcement Network or FinCEN testified that the failure of States to collect adequate information on the beneficial owners of the legal entities they form had impeded federal efforts to investigate and prosecute criminal acts such as terrorism, money laundering, securities fraud, and tax evasion. At the hearing, the Justice Department testified: ''We had allegations of corrupt foreign officials using these [U.S.] shell accounts to launder money, but were unable—due to lack of identifying information in the corporate records—to fully investigate this area.'' The IRS testified: ''Within our own borders, the laws of some states regarding the formation of legal entities have significant transparency gaps which may even rival the secrecy afforded in the most attractive tax havens.'' As part of its testimony, FinCEN described identifying 768 incidents of suspicious international wire transfer activity involving U.S. shell corporations.

The next year, in 2007, in a ''Dirty Dozen'' list of tax scams active that year, the IRS highlighted shell corporations with hidden owners as number four on the list. It wrote:

> 4. Disguised Corporate Ownership: Domestic shell corporations and other entities are being formed and operated in certain states for the purpose of disguising the ownership of the business or financial activity. Once formed, these anonymous entities can be, and are being, used to facilitate underreporting of income, non-filing of tax returns, listed transactions, money laundering, financial crimes and possibly terrorist financing. The IRS is working with state authorities to identify these entities and to bring their owners into compliance.

In 2008, we first introduced our bipartisan legislation to stop the formation of U.S. corporations with hidden owners. It was a Levin-Coleman-Obama bill, S. 2956, back then. When asked about the bill in 2008, then DHS Secretary Michael Chertoff wrote: ''In countless investigations, where the criminal targets utilize shell corporations, the lack of law enforcement's ability to gain access to true beneficial ownership information slows, confuses or impedes the efforts by investigators to follow criminal proceeds.''

In 2009, the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee held two hearings which examined not only the problem, but also possible solutions, including our revised bill, S. 569. At the first hearing entitled, ''Examining State Business Incorporation Practices: A Discussion of the Incorporation Transparency and Law Enforcement Assistance Act,'' held in June 2009, DHS testified that ''shell corporations established in the United States have been utilized to commit crimes against individuals around the world.'' The Manhattan District Attorney's office testified: ''For those of us in law enforcement, these issues with shell corporations are not some abstract idea. This is what we do and deal with every day. We see these shell corporations being used by criminal organizations, and the record is replete with examples of their use for money laundering, for their use in tax evasion, and for their use in securities fraud.''

At the second hearing, ''Business Formation and Financial Crime: Finding a Legislative Solution,'' held in November 2009, the Justice Department again testified about criminals using U.S. shell corporations. It noted that ''each of these examples involves the relatively rare instance in which law enforcement was able to identify the perpetrator misusing U.S. shell corporations. Far too often, we are unable to do so.'' The Treasury Department testified that ''the ability of illicit actors to form corporations in the United States without disclosing their true identity presents a serious vulnerability and there is ample evidence that criminal organizations and others who threaten our national security exploit this vulnerability.''

The 2009 hearings also presented evidence of dozens of Internet websites advertising corporate formation services that highlighted the ability of corporations to be formed in the United States without asking for the identity of the beneficial owners. Those websites explicitly pointed to anonymous ownership as a reason to incorporate within the United States, and often listed certain States alongside notorious offshore jurisdictions as preferred locations in which to form new corporations, essentially providing an open invitation for wrongdoers to form entities within the United States.

One website, for example, set up by an international incorporation firm, advocated setting up corporations in Delaware by saying: ''DELAWARE—An Offshore Tax Haven for Non US Residents.'' It cited as one of Delaware's advantages that: ''Owners' names are not disclosed to the state.'' Another website, from a U.K. firm called ''formacorporation-offshore.com,'' listed the advantages to incorporating in Nevada. Those advantages included: ''Stockholders are not on Public Record allowing complete anonymity.''

During the 2009 hearings, I presented evidence of how one Wyoming outfit was selling so-called shelf corporations—corporations formed and then left ''on the shelf'' for later sale to purchasers who could then pretend the corporations had been in operation for years. A June 2011 Reuters news article wrote a detailed expose of how that same outfit, Wyoming Corporate Services, had formed thousands of U.S. corporations all across the country, all with hidden owners. The article quoted the website as follows: ''A corporation is a legal person created by state statute that can be used as a fall guy, a servant, a good friend or a decoy. A person you control . . . yet cannot be held accountable for its actions. Imagine the possibilities!''

The article described a small house in Cheyenne, Wyoming, which Wyoming Corporate Services used to provide a U.S. address for more than 2,000 corporations that it had helped to form. The article described ''the walls of the main room'' as ''covered floor to ceiling with numbered mailboxes labeled as corporate suites.'' The article reported that among the corporations using the address was a shell corporation controlled by a former Ukranian prime minister who had been convicted of money laundering and extortion; a corporation indicted for helping online-poker operators evade a U.S. ban on Internet gambling; and two corporations barred from U.S. federal contracting for selling counterfeit truck parts to the Pentagon. The article observed that Wyoming Corporate Services continued to sell shelf corporations that existed solely on paper but could show a history of regulatory and tax filings, despite having had no real U.S. operations. That's the type of deceptive conduct going on right now, here in our own backyard, with respect to U.S. corporations with hidden owners.

Despite the evidence of U.S. corporations being misused by organized

crime, terrorists, tax evaders, and other wrongdoers, and despite years of law enforcement complaints, many of our States are reluctant to admit there is a problem in establishing U.S. corporations and LLCs with hidden owners. Too many of our States are eager to explain how quick and easy it is to set up corporations within their borders, without acknowledging that those same quick and easy procedures enable wrongdoers to utilize U.S. corporations in a variety of crimes and tax dodges both here and abroad.

Beginning in 2006, the Subcommittee worked with the States to encourage them to recognize the law enforcement and national security problem they'd created and to come up with their own solution. After the Subcommittee's 2006 hearing on this issue, for example, the National Association of Secretaries of State or NASS convened a 2007 task force to examine state incorporation practices. At the request of NASS and several States, I delayed introducing legislation while they worked on a proposal to require the collection of beneficial ownership information. My Subcommittee staff participated in multiple conferences, telephone calls, and meetings on the issue.

In July 2007, the NASS task force issued a proposal. Rather than cure the problem, however, the proposal had multiple serious deficiencies, leading the Treasury Department to state in a letter that the NASS proposal ''falls short'' and ''does not fully address the problem of legal entities masking the identity of criminals.''

Among other shortcomings, the NASS proposal would not require States to obtain the names of the natural individuals who would be the beneficial owners of a U.S. corporation or LLC. Instead, it would allow States to obtain a list of a corporation's ''owners of record'' who can be, and often are, offshore corporations or trusts with their own hidden owners. The NASS proposal also did not require the States to maintain the beneficial ownership information, or to supply it to law enforcement upon receipt of a subpoena or summons. Instead, law enforcement would have to get the information from the suspect corporation or one of its agents, thereby tipping off the corporation to the investigation. The proposal also failed to require the beneficial ownership information to be updated over time. These and other flaws in the proposal were identified by the Treasury Department, the Department of Justice, and others, but NASS continued on the same course.

NASS enlisted the help of the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws or NCCUSL, which produced a proposed model law for States that wanted to adopt the NASS approach. NCCUSL presented its proposal at the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee's June 2009 hearing, where it was subjected to significant criticism. The Manhattan District Attorney's office, for example, testified: ''I say without hesitation or reservation—that from a law enforcement perspective, the bill proposed by NCCUSL would be worse than no bill at all. And there are two very basic reasons for this. It eliminates the ability of law enforcement to get corporate information without alerting the target of the investigation that the investigation is ongoing. That is the primary reason. It also sets up a system that is time-consuming and complicated.''

The Department of Justice testified: ''Senator, I would submit to you that in a criminal organization everyone knows who is in control and this will not be an issue of determining who is in control. What we are concerned about here from the law enforcement perspective are the criminals and the criminal organizations and so what we are asking is that when criminals use shell companies, they provide the name of the beneficial owner. That is the person who is in control, the criminal in control, as opposed to the NCCUSL proposal where they are suggesting that instead two nominees are provided—two nominees between law enforcement and the criminal in control.''

Despite these criticisms, NCCUSL finalized its model law in July 2009, issuing it under the title, ''Uniform Law Enforcement Access to Entity Information Act.'' At the November 2009 hearing, law enforcement again criticized the NCCUSL model for failing to provide the names of the true owners of the corporations being formed. The Justice Department testified: ''To allow companies to provide anything less than the beneficial owner information merely provides criminals with an opportunity to evade responsibility and put nominees between themselves and the true perpetrator.'' With regard to NCCUSL's proposal, Treasury testified: ''[T]here is not an obligation for that live person to not be a nominee. And what I think is important in the legislation is that we get at the true beneficial owner and not someone who may be a nominee.''

In addition to its flaws, the NCCUSL model law has proven unpopular with the States for whom it was written. Despite the effort and fanfare attached to the uniform model, after four years of sitting on the books, not a single State has adopted it or given any indication of doing so.

It is deeply disappointing that the States, despite the passage of many years, have been unable to devise an effective proposal to stop the formation of corporations with hidden owners. One key difficulty is that the States are competing against each other to attract persons who want to set up U.S. corporations. That competition creates pressure for each individual State to favor procedures that allow quick and easy incorporations, with no questions asked. It's a classic case of competition causing a race to the bottom, making it difficult for any one State to do the right thing and ask for the identity of the persons behind the corporations being formed.

That is why Federal legislation in this area is critical. Federal legislation is needed to level the playing field among the States, set minimum standards for obtaining beneficial ownership information, put an end to the practice of States forming millions of legal entities each year without knowing who is behind them, and bring the United States into compliance with its international commitments.

The bill's provisions would require the States to ask incorporation applicants for a list of the beneficial owners of each corporation or LLC formed under their laws, to maintain this information for a period of years after a corporation is terminated, and to provide the information to law enforcement upon receipt of a subpoena or summons. The bill would also require corporations and LLCs to update their beneficial ownership information on a regular basis. The ownership information would be kept by the State or, if a State maintains a formation agent licensing system and delegates this task, by a State's licensed formation agents.

The particular information that would have to be provided for each beneficial owner is the owner's name, address, and a unique identifying number from a State driver's license or a U.S. passport. The bill would not require States to verify this information, but penalties would apply to persons who submit false information.

In the case of U.S. corporations formed by individuals who do not possess a driver's license or passport from the United States, the bill would permit them to submit their names, addresses, and identifying information from a non-U.S. passport to a formation agent residing within the State. They would have to include a copy of a passport photograph. The incorporation application would have to include a written certification that the formation agent had obtained the information and verified the identity of the non-U.S. corporate owners. The formation agent would have to retain the information in the State for a specified period of time and produce it upon receipt of a subpoena or summons from law enforcement.

To ensure that its provisions are tightly targeted, the bill would exempt a wide range of corporations from the disclosure obligation. It would exempt, for example, virtually all highly regulated corporations, because we already know who owns them. That includes all publicly-traded corporations, banks, broker-dealers, commodity brokers, registered investment funds, registered accounting firms, insurers, and utilities. The bill would also exempt corporations with a substantial U.S. presence, including at least 20 employees physically located in the United States, since those individuals could provide law enforcement with the leads needed to trace a corporation's true

owners. In addition, the bill would exempt businesses set up by governments, churches, charities, and nonprofit corporations, since disclosure of their beneficial ownership information would not advance the public interest or assist law enforcement. These exemptions dramatically reduce the number of corporations who would actually have to file beneficial ownership information on state incorporation forms in order to ensure that the bill's disclosure obligations focus only on owners whose identities are currently hidden.

The bill does not take a position on the issue of whether the States should make beneficial ownership information available to the public. Instead, the bill leaves it entirely up to the States to decide whether, under what circumstances, and to what extent to make beneficial ownership information available to the public. The bill explicitly permits the States to place restrictions on providing beneficial ownership information to persons other than government officials. The bill focuses instead on ensuring that law enforcement with a subpoena or summons is given ready access to the beneficial ownership information.

Relative to the costs of compliance, the bill provides States with access to two separate funding sources, neither of which involves appropriated funds. For the first three years after the bill's enactment, the bill requires both the Justice and Treasury Departments to make funds available from their individual forfeiture programs to States incurring reasonable expenses to comply with the Act. These forfeiture funds do not contain taxpayer dollars; instead they contain the proceeds of forfeiture actions taken against persons involved in money laundering, drug trafficking, or other wrongdoing. The bill would direct a total of $40 million over 3 years to be provided to the States from the two funds to carry out the Act. These provisions would ensure that States have adequate funds for the modest compliance costs involved with adding a new question to their incorporation forms requesting the names of the covered corporations' beneficial owners.

The compliance costs would be modest, because the bill does not require any State to change its laws, set up new forms, create new databases of information, or verify the information provided. To the contrary, the only steps that a State would need to take would be to add one question to its existing incorporation form asking for the corporation's beneficial owners, keep that incorporation application on file which all States do already, and make the ownership information available to law enforcement upon receipt of a subpoena or summons.

It is common for bills establishing minimum Federal standards to seek to ensure State action by making some Federal funding dependent upon a State's meeting the specified standards. Our bill, however, states explicitly that nothing in its provisions authorizes the withholding of federal funds from a State for failing to modify its incorporation practices to meet the beneficial ownership information requirements of the act. Instead, the bill calls for a GAO report within 5 years of enactment to identify any States that had failed to strengthen their incorporation practices as required by the act. After getting this status report, a future Congress can decide what steps to take in the event there are any noncompliant States.

The bill also contains a provision that would require corporations bidding on federal contracts to provide the same beneficial ownership information to the federal government as provided to the relevant State. The Subcommittee has become aware of instances in which the federal government has found itself doing business with U.S. corporations whose owners are hidden, including owners under investigation for suspect conduct. It is important that when the federal government contracts to do business with someone, it knows who it is dealing with.

Finally, the bill would require the Treasury Department to issue a rule requiring U.S. formation agents to establish anti-money laundering programs to ensure they are not forming U.S. corporations or LLCs for wrongdoers. The bill requires the programs to be risk based so that formation agents can target their preventative efforts toward persons who pose a high risk of being involved with wrongdoing. GAO would also be asked to conduct a study of existing State formation procedures for partnerships, trusts, and charitable organizations to see if additional ownership disclosure requirements are warranted.

We have worked with the Departments of Justice, Treasury, and Homeland Security to craft a bill that would address, in a fair and reasonable way, the significant law enforcement problems created by States allowing the formation of millions of U.S. corporations and LLCs with hidden owners. When those corporations commit crimes, they affect not only interstate commerce with U.S. victims, but also our relationships with other countries whose citizens may become victims of U.S. corporate wrongdoing. What the bill comes down to is a simple requirement that States strengthen their incorporation applications to add a single question requesting identifying information for the true owners of the corporations they form. That is not too much to ask to protect this country and the international community from wrongdoers misusing U.S. corporations.

For those who say that, if the United States tightens its incorporation rules, new corporations will be formed elsewhere, it is appropriate to ask exactly where they will go. A recent report found that virtually every other country is already tougher than the United States in terms of demanding and verifying beneficial ownership information. Most offshore tax havens, for example, already require this information to be collected, including the Bahamas, Cayman Islands, and the Channel Islands. Countries around the world already request beneficial ownership information, in part because of their commitment to FATF's international anti-money laundering standards. Our 50 States should be meeting the same standards, but there is no indication that they will, unless required to do so.

I wish Federal legislation weren't necessary. I wish the States could solve this law enforcement problem on their own, but ongoing competitive pressures make it unlikely that the States will do the right thing. It's been nearly seven years since our 2006 hearing on this issue and more than four years since the States came up with a model law on the subject, with no progress to speak of, despite repeated pleas from law enforcement.

Federal legislation is necessary to reduce the vulnerability of the United States to wrongdoing by U.S. corporations with hidden owners, to protect interstate and international commerce from criminals misusing U.S. corporations, to strengthen the ability of law enforcement to investigate suspect U.S. corporations, to level the playing field among the States, and to bring the United States into compliance with its international anti-money laundering obligations.

There is also an issue of consistency. For years, I have been fighting offshore corporate secrecy laws and practices that enable wrongdoers to secretly control offshore corporations involved in money laundering, tax evasion, and other misconduct. I have pointed out on more than one occasion that corporations were not created to hide ownership, but to protect owners from personal liability for corporate acts. Unfortunately, today, the corporate form has too often been corrupted into serving those who wish to conceal their identities. It is past time to stop this misuse of the corporate form. But if we want to stop inappropriate corporate secrecy offshore, we need to stop it here at home as well.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this legislation and putting an end to incorporation practices that promote corporate secrecy and render the United States and other countries vulnerable to abuse by U.S. corporations with hidden owners.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a summary of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

SUMMARY OF INCORPORATION TRANSPARENCY AND LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ACT

To protect the United States from U.S. corporations being misused to support terrorism, money laundering, tax evasion, and other misconduct, the Levin-Grassley-Feinstein-Harkin Incorporation Transparency and Law Enforcement Assistance Act would:

Beneficial Ownership Information. Require the States directly or through licensed formation agents to obtain the names of beneficial owners of the corporations or limited liability companies (LLCs) formed under State law, ensure this information is updated, and provide the information to law enforcement upon receipt of a subpoena or summons.

Shelf Corporations. Require formation agents who sell ''shelf corporations''—corporations formed for later sale to third parties—to identify the beneficial owners who buy them.

Federal Contractors. Require corporations or LLCs bidding on federal contracts to provide beneficial ownership information to the federal government.

Identifying Information. Require the provision of beneficial owners' names, addresses, and a U.S. drivers license or passport number, or information from a non-U.S. passport.

Penalties for False Information. Establish penalties for persons who knowingly provide false information, or willfully fail to provide required information, on beneficial ownership.

Exemptions. Exempt from the disclosure obligation regulated corporations, including publicly traded companies, banks, broker-dealers, insurers, and accounting firms; corporations with a substantial U.S. presence; and corporations whose beneficial ownership information would not benefit the public interest or assist law enforcement.

Funding. Provide $40 million over three years to States from existing Justice and Treasury Department forfeiture funds to pay for the costs of complying with the Act.

State Compliance Report. Specify that funds may not be withheld from any State for failure to comply with the Act, but also require a GAO report in five years identifying any States not in compliance so a future Congress can determine if additional steps are needed.

Transition Period. Give the States two years to begin requiring existing corporations and LLCs to provide beneficial ownership information.

Anti-Money Laundering Safeguards. Require paid formation agents to establish anti-money laundering programs to guard against supplying U.S. corporations or LLCs to wrongdoers. Attorneys using paid formation agents would be exempt from this requirement.

GAO Study. Require GAO to complete a study of existing beneficial ownership information requirements for partnerships, charities, and trusts.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1470. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act with respect to the guidelines for specification of certain disposal sites for dredged or fill material; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, today, my colleague Senator MARK WARNER and I are introducing the Commonsense Permitting for Job Creation Act of 2013, a bipartisan, bicameral piece of legislation to address an aspect of water permitting law that has touched several economic development projects.

In my home State of Virginia, there is a county that has been working on securing a permit for the proposed site of a business center, where one or multiple firms could establish job-creating manufacturing plants. This area—Henry County, on the North Carolina border, has seen profound economic challenges in recent years. The county's 5-year average unemployment rate is 11 percent. In the county's largest city, Martinsville, the 5-year average unemployment rate is over 17 percent. This part of Virginia would benefit greatly from the jobs this site could bring.

Henry County has worked with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers on site preparation. However, the Corps has been reluctant to issue the permit because no company has yet committed to the site and prepared detailed blueprints. The problem is that a company will not relocate to the site without an approved permit, but a permit cannot be approved without a company willing to relocate.

Henry County, the Martinsville-Henry Co. Economic Development Corp., and the Commonwealth of Virginia have together devoted more than $16 million to this project. They have worked in good faith, at great cost in money and personnel hours, to promote economic development in line with environmental protection and all requirements of the law. Yet due to this regulatory ambiguity, this process is unable to move forward.

Our legislation clarifies that ambiguity. It specifies that the lack of a committed end-user shall not be a reason to deny a Corps permit that meets all other legal requirements. I believe this bill will allow the site in Henry County, and similar sites elsewhere, to move forward, while maintaining all environmental protections.

Senator WARNER and I have introduced this legislation in partnership with our friends and Virginia colleagues in the House, U.S. Representatives ROBERT HURT and MORGAN GRIFFITH. We believe this will expedite the approval of important economic development projects, and we are proud to be able to work across the aisle and with state and local officials on this commonsense, bipartisan solution.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 1476. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the denial of deduction for certain excessive employee remuneration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I am introducing, along with Senator BLUMENTHAL, the Stop Subsidizing Multimillion Dollar Corporate Bonuses Act. This bill closes a loophole that allows publicly traded corporations to deduct an executive's pay over $1 million from their tax bill.

Under current tax law, when a public corporation calculates its taxable income, generally it is permitted to deduct the cost of compensation from its revenues, with limits up to $1 million for some of the firm's most senior executives. However, a loophole has allowed many public corporations to avoid such limits and freely deduct excessive executive compensation. For example, because of this loophole, if a CEO receives $15 million in compensation in a given year, that amount can cause the corporation's taxable income to decline by $15 million. With the current corporate tax rate at 35 percent, the corporation in this case would pay less tax to the U.S. Treasury, up to 35 percent of $15 million, leaving the corporation's shareholders to bear only $9.75 million of the $15 million cost of executive pay, while U.S. taxpayers foot the remaining $5.25 million.

The Stop Subsidizing Multimillion Dollar Corporate Bonuses Act would allow a public corporation to deduct compensation up to only $1 million. Using the same example, this would mean that corporate shareholders would bear $14.65 million of the $15 million in compensation.

Over a ten-year window, the Joint Committee on Taxation has estimated this legislation would close a loophole that costs U.S. taxpayers over $50 billion by making some simple changes to existing law.

First, our legislation extends section 162(m) of the tax code to all employees of publicly traded corporations so that all compensation is subject to a deductibility cap of $1 million. Publicly traded corporations would still be permitted to pay their executives as much as they want, but compensation above and beyond $1 million would no longer be bankrolled, in part, through our tax code.

Second, our bill removes the exemption for performance-based compensation, which currently permits compensation deductions above and beyond $1 million when executives have met performance benchmarks set by the corporation's Board of Directors. As a result, publicly traded corporations would still be able to incentivize their executives, but all such incentives would be subject to a corporate deductibility cap of $1 million.

Finally, our legislation makes a technical correction to ensure that all publicly traded corporations that are required to provide quarterly and annual reports to their investors under Securities and Exchange Commission rules and regulations are subject to section 162(m). Currently, this section of the tax code only covers some publicly traded corporations who are required to provide these periodic reports to their shareholders. Discouraging unrestrained compensation packages shouldn't hinge on whether a publicly traded corporation falls into one SEC reporting requirement or another, and my bill closes this technical loophole.

With this legislation, we aim to put an end to some of the extravagant tax breaks that exclusively benefit public corporations. This is simply a matter of fairness at a time of fiscal belt tightening, when so many of our constituents have already sacrificed.

I want to thank Senator BLUMENTHAL and his staff for working with me on this issue, and I urge our colleagues to

join us by cosponsoring this legislation.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 212—COMMENDING DAVID J. SCHIAPPA

Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mr. REID of Nevada, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. CHIESA, Mr. COATS, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Mr. KIRK, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 212

Whereas, David Schiappa has loyally served the Senate for 29 years, his entire professional career, starting in the Senate in December 1984;

Whereas, David Schiappa grew up in Maryland and graduated from DeMatha Catholic High School, the University of Maryland, and Johns Hopkins University;

Whereas, David Schiappa rose through all the positions in the Republican Cloakroom finally serving as either Secretary for the Majority or Secretary for the Minority for the last three Republican Leaders;

Whereas, David Schiappa has at all times discharged the duties of his office with great dedication, diligence, and sense of service, thus earning the respect of Republican and Democratic Senators alike, as well as their staffs; and

Whereas, his good humor, storytelling ability, and easy-going manner have made him an invaluable member of the Senate family. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate expresses its appreciation to David Schiappa and his family and commends him for his outstanding and faithful service to the Senate.

The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit a copy of this resolution to David J. Schiappa.

SENATE RESOLUTION 213—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE FREE AND PEACEFUL EXERCISE OF REPRESENTATIVE DEMOCRACY IN VENEZUELA AND CONDEMNING VIOLENCE AND INTIMIDATION AGAINST THE COUNTRY'S POLITICAL OPPOSITION

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. NELSON, Mr. KAINE, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. KIRK) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 213

Whereas the National Electoral Council (CNE) of Venezuela declared Nicolás Maduro to be the winner of Venezuela's April 14, 2013, presidential election, after crediting him with receiving 50.6 percent of votes cast;

Whereas Venezuela's political opposition has highlighted widespread incidents of potential electoral irregularities, voter intimidation, and other abuses perpetrated by the Government of Venezuela in favor of the candidacy of Nicolás Maduro;

Whereas the Organization of American States and other multilateral institutions called for a full recount and audit that addresses all claims by participants in the electoral process in Venezuela;

Whereas the Senate of the Republic of Chile, the Christian Democratic Organization of the Americas, the Socialist International, the Union of Latin American parties, and other political organizations in the region have issued declarations recognizing the alleged irregularities documented by the opposition in Venezuela and urged a complete audit of the election results;

Whereas the CNE has denied the political opposition's request for a full and comprehensive audit of the election results that includes the review and comparison of voter registry log books, vote tallies produced by electronic voting machines, and the paper receipts printed by electronic voting machines;

Whereas the Preamble of the Charter of the Organization of American States affirms that ''representative democracy is an indispensable condition for the stability, peace and development of the region,'' and Article 1 of the Inter-American Democratic Charter recognizes that ''the people of the Americas have a right to democracy and their governments have an obligation to promote and defend it'';

Whereas the republican form of government prescribed in the Constitution of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela has its legislative branch in the National Assembly, where the free participation and deliberation of its democratically elected representatives is essential to legislate and check the powers of the executive branch;

Whereas the President of the National Assembly denied opposition parties the right to speak in the legislature from April 16 to May 21, 2013, and removed them from key committees in response to their refusal to recognize Nicolás Maduro as president;

Whereas members of the ruling United Socialist Party of Venezuela (PSUV) violently assaulted opposition legislators on April 16 and April 30, 2013, in the National Assembly, causing lacerations, broken bones, and other injuries to members of the political opposition;

Whereas the Department of State responded to the violence against opposition legislators in Venezuela by declaring that ''violence has no place in a representative and democratic system, and is particularly inappropriate in the National Assembly'';

Whereas the Secretary General of the Organization of American States (OAS) has repudiated the incident by stating that it ''reflects, in a dramatic manner, the absence of a political dialogue that can bring tranquility to the citizens and to the members of the different public powers to resolve in a peaceful climate and with everybody's participation the pending matters of the country'';

Whereas the Congress of the Republic of Peru passed a resolution rejecting the use of violence against opposition parties in the Venezuelan National Assembly and expressing solidarity with those injured by the events of April 2013; and

Whereas, as a member of the Organization of American States and signatory to the Inter-American Democratic Charter, the Bolivarian Government of Venezuela has agreed to abide by the principles of constitutional, representative democracy, which include free and fair elections and adherence to its own constitution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the people of Venezuela in their pursuit of the free exercise of representative democracy in Venezuela;

(2) calls for greater dialogue between all political actors in Venezuela and strongly deplores the undemocratic denial of legitimate parliamentary rights to members of opposition parties in the National Assembly and the inexcusable violence perpetrated against opposition legislators inside the legislative chambers of Venezuela;

(3) commends legislators from other nations in the Americas who have declared their opposition to political irregularities and the use of violence against opposition parliamentarians in Venezuela;

(4) urges the Organization of American States to issue a detailed report on any and all irregularities resulting from the April 14, 2013, presidential election in Venezuela;

(5) urges the United States Ambassador to the Organization of American States to work in concert with other member states to use the full power of the organization in support of meaningful steps to ensure full parliamentary democracy and the rule of law in Venezuela in accordance with the Inter-American Democratic Charter, including invoking articles related to unconstitutional interruptions of the democratic order in a member state; and

(6) urges the United States Ambassador to the Organization of American States to work in concert with other member states to strengthen the ability of the Organization to protect democratic institutions and to respond to the erosion of democracy in member states.

SENATE RESOLUTION 214—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF OCTOBER 13, 2013, THROUGH OCTOBER 19, 2013, AS ''NATIONAL CASE MANAGEMENT WEEK'' TO RECOGNIZE THE VALUE OF CASE MANAGEMENT IN IMPROVING HEALTHCARE OUTCOMES FOR PATIENTS

Mr. PRYOR (for himself and Mr. BOOZMAN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 214

Whereas case management is a collaborative process of assessment, education, planning, facilitation, care coordination, evaluation, and advocacy;

Whereas the goal of case management is to meet the health needs of the patient and the

family of the patient, while respecting and assuring the right of the patient to self determination, through communication and available resources in order to promote quality, cost-effective outcomes;

Whereas case managers are advocates who help patients understand their current health status and ways to improve their health, and in this way serve as catalysts who guide patients and provide cohesion with other professionals in the healthcare delivery team;

Whereas case managers are an important link to quality healthcare;

Whereas the American Case Management Association and the Case Management Society of America work diligently to bring awareness to the broad range of services case managers offer and to educate providers, payers, and regulators on the improved patient outcomes that case management services can provide;

Whereas, through National Case Management Week, the American Case Management Association and the Case Management Society of America hope to continue to educate providers, payers, regulators, and consumers about the value case managers bring to the successful delivery of healthcare;

Whereas the American Case Management Association and the Case Management Society of America will celebrate National Case Management Week during the week of October 13, 2013, through October 19, 2013, in order to recognize case managers as an essential link to quality healthcare; and

Whereas it is appropriate at that time to recognize the many achievements of case managers in improving healthcare outcomes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of October 13, 2013, through October 19, 2013, as ''National Case Management Week'';

(2) recognizes the value of case management in providing successful and cost-effective healthcare; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to observe National Case Management Week and learn about the field of case management.

SENATE RESOLUTION 215—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD NOT BAIL OUT ANY STATE

Mr. KIRK (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. COATS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. SHELBY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

S. RES. 215

Whereas every State in the United States is a sovereign entity with a constitution and the authority to issue sovereign debt;

Whereas the legislature of every State in the United States has the authority to reduce spending or raise taxes to pay the obligations owed by the State;

Whereas officials in every State in the United States have the legal obligation to fully disclose the financial condition of the State to investors who purchase the debt of the State;

Whereas Congress has rejected prior requests from creditors of a State for payment of the defaulted debt of a State; and

Whereas, during the financial crisis in 1842, the Senate requested that the Secretary of the Treasury report any negotiations with creditors of a State to assume or guaranty any debt of a State, to ensure that promises of Federal Government support were not proffered: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) the Federal Government should take no action to redeem, assume, or guarantee any debt of a State; and

(2) the Secretary of the Treasury should report to Congress any negotiations to engage in actions that would result in an outlay of Federal funds on behalf of creditors of a State.

SENATE RESOLUTION 216—ELECTING LAURA C. DOVE, OF VIRGINIA, AS SECRETARY FOR THE MINORITY OF THE SENATE

Mr. MCCONNELL submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 216

Resolved, That Laura C. Dove of Virginia be, and she is hereby, elected Secretary for the Minority of the Senate, effective Friday, August 2, 2013.

SENATE RESOLUTION 217—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR DESIGNATION OF OCTOBER 6, 2013, THROUGH OCTOBER 10, 2013, AS ''AMERICAN COLLEGE OF SURGEONS DAYS'' AND RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE ORGANIZATION

Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. DURBIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to.:

S. RES. 217

Whereas the American College of Surgeons is the largest surgical organization in the world and remains steadfast in its mission to improve the care of the surgical patient and to safeguard standards of care in an optimal and ethical practice environment;

Whereas the American College of Surgeons continues its work into the 21st century to sustain and develop relevant programs that are inspired by quality;

Whereas the 100th anniversary celebrations serve as a testament that the American College of Surgeons is fulfilling its mission of engaging surgeons as leaders and educators, and developing initiatives that improve surgery and the quality of care for surgical patients;

Whereas the 2013 American College of Surgeons Clinical Congress is the most prestigious international surgical conference, bringing together thousands of Fellows of the College and other health care professionals who each year rely on the Clinical Congress to learn about the latest surgical advances, practice management methods, and health policy issues; and

Whereas October 6, 2013, through October 10, 2013, would be appropriate dates to designate as ''American College of Surgeons Days'' to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the founding of the American College of Surgeons, the achievements of which continue to significantly influence the course of surgery in the United States and around the world, and which was established as an advocate for all surgical patients: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of ''American College of Surgeons Days'';

(2) recognizes the 100th anniversary of the founding of the American College of Surgeons; and

(3) recognizes the many important contributions of the American College of Surgeons to the welfare of surgical patients and the health care system of the United States.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 22—PROVIDING FOR A CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE SENATE AND AN ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. REID of Nevada submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. CON. RES. 22

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

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

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 23—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE SHOULD ISSUE A COMMEMORATIVE POSTAGE STAMP HONORING THE REVEREND DOCTOR LEON SULLIVAN AND THAT THE CITIZENS' STAMP ADVISORY COMMITTEE SHOULD RECOMMEND TO THE POSTMASTER GENERAL THAT SUCH A STAMP BE ISSUED

Mr. CASEY submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.:

S. CON. RES. 23

Whereas the Reverend Doctor Leon Sullivan impacted millions of people throughout the world, particularly throughout the United States and in Africa, by advocating self-help principles of empowerment, community development, and self-reliance;

Whereas the Reverend Dr. Sullivan founded the Opportunities Industrialization Centers

(commonly referred to as the ''OIC''), a skills training program providing training and retraining on a massive scale;

Whereas the Reverend Dr. Sullivan founded Opportunities Industrialization Centers International (commonly referred to as ''OICI'') and the International Foundation for Education and Self-Help (commonly referred to as ''IFESH'');

Whereas the Reverend Dr. Sullivan made a substantial impact on the lives of the people in Africa through the actions of OICI and IFESH;

Whereas the Reverend Dr. Sullivan founded the Progress Investment Associates (commonly referred to as the ''PIA'') and the Zion Nonprofit Charitable Trust (commonly referred to as the ''ZNCT''), which was established to fund housing, shopping, human services, educational, and other nonprofit ventures for inner-city dwellers;

Whereas the Reverend Dr. Sullivan established inner-city retirement and assisted living complexes for the elderly and disabled in Philadelphia and other cities throughout the United States, named Opportunities Towers;

Whereas the Reverend Dr. Sullivan was able, as the first African-American member on the board of General Motors Corporation, to secure the support of the other board members to back him in the development of the unprecedented Global Sullivan Principles, a code of conduct written in 1977, for United States businesses operating in South Africa;

Whereas the Reverend Dr. Sullivan has been the recipient of the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the Notre Dame Award, the Eleanor Roosevelt Human Rights Award, the NAACP Spingarn Award, the Kappa Alpha Psi Laurel Wreath, and more than 50 doctoral degrees;

Whereas the Reverend Dr. Sullivan economically empowered individuals and combated poverty wherever he implemented programs;

Whereas the Reverend Dr. Sullivan established the African-African American summits to bring together the leaders of African countries, the United States, and other countries; and

Whereas the Reverend Dr. Sullivan established the Global Sullivan Principles (for Corporate Social Responsibility) in the late 1990s to apply the same type of principles for countries and businesses throughout the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States Postal Service should issue a commemorative postage stamp honoring the Reverend Doctor Leon Sullivan; and

(2) the Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee should recommend to the Postmaster General that such a stamp be issued.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1840. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1841. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1842. Mr. COONS (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. REED) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1843. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1844. Mr. ISAKSON (for himself and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1845. Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1846. Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. RISCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1847. Mr. BENNET (for himself and Ms. AYOTTE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1848. Mr. REID (for Mr. PRYOR (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mr. COBURN)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1344, to amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to provide expedited air passenger screening to severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1840. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. USE OF ENERGY AND WATER EFFICIENCY MEASURES IN FEDERAL BUILDINGS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Private sector funding and expertise can help address the energy efficiency challenges facing the United States.

(2) The Federal Government spends more than $6 billion annually in energy costs.

(3) Reducing Federal energy costs can help save money, create jobs, and reduce waste.

(4) Energy savings performance contracts and utility energy savings contracts are tools for utilizing private sector investment to upgrade Federal facilities without any upfront cost to the taxpayer.

(5) Performance contracting is a way to retrofit Federal buildings using private sector investment in the absence of appropriated dollars. Retrofits seek to reduce energy use, improve infrastructure, protect national security, and cut facility operations and maintenance costs.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION OF IDENTIFIED ENERGY AND WATER EFFICIENCY MEASURES.—Section 543(f)(4) of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8253(f)(4)) is amended to read as follows:

''(4) IMPLEMENTATION OF IDENTIFIED ENERGY AND WATER EFFICIENCY MEASURES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the completion of each evaluation under paragraph (3), each energy manager shall consider—

''(i) implementing any energy- or water-saving or conservation measure that the Federal agency identified in the evaluation conducted under paragraph (3) that is life cycle cost-effective; and

''(ii) bundling individual measures of varying paybacks together into combined projects.

''(B) MEASURES NOT IMPLEMENTED.—The energy manager, as part of the certification system under paragraph (7) and using guidelines developed by the Secretary, shall provide reasons for not implementing any life cycle cost-effective measures under subparagraph (A).''.

(c) ANNUAL CONTRACTING GOAL.—Section 543(f)(10)(C) of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8253(f)(10)(C)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Each Federal agency'' and inserting the following:

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Each Federal agency''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new clauses:

''(ii) TRACKING.—Each Federal agency shall use the benchmarking systems selected or developed for the agency under paragraph (8) to track energy savings realized by the agency through the implementation of energy- or water-saving or conservation measures pursuant to paragraph (4), and shall submit information regarding such savings to the Secretary to be published on a public website of the Department of Energy.

''(iii) CONSIDERATION.—Each Federal agency shall consider using energy savings performance contracts or utility energy service contracts to implement energy- or water-saving or conservation measures pursuant to paragraph (4).

''(iv) CONTRACTING GOAL.—It shall be the goal of the Federal Government, in the implementation of energy- or water-saving or conservation measures pursuant to paragraph (4), to enter into energy savings performance contracts or utility energy service contracts equal to $1,000,000,000 in each year during the 5-year period beginning on January 1, 2014.

''(v) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than September 30 of each year during the 5-year period referred to in clause (iv), each Federal agency shall submit to the Secretary information regarding progress made by the agency towards achieving the goal described in such clause. Not later than 60 days after each such September 30, the Secretary, acting through the Federal Energy Management Program, shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report describing the progress made by the Federal Government towards achieving such goal.''.

SA 1841. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 401, insert the following:

SEC. ___. EXTENSION OF PUBLICLY TRADED PARTNERSHIP OWNERSHIP STRUCTURE TO ENERGY POWER GENERATION PROJECTS, TRANSPORTATION FUELS, AND RELATED ENERGY ACTIVITIES.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Master Limited Partnerships Parity Act''.

(b) GENERAL RULE.—Subparagraph (E) of section 7704(d)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''income and gains derived from the exploration'' and inserting ''income and gains derived from the following:

''(i) MINERALS, NATURAL RESOURCES, ETC.—The exploration'',

(2) by inserting ''or'' before ''industrial source'',

(3) by inserting a period after ''carbon dioxide'', and

(4) by striking '', or the transportation or storage'' and all that follows and inserting the following:

''(ii) RENEWABLE ENERGY.—The generation of electric power exclusively utilizing any resource described in section 45(c)(1) or energy property described in section 48 (determined without regard to any termination date), or in the case of a facility described in paragraph (3) or (7) of section 45(d) (determined without regard to any placed in service date or date by which construction of the facility is required to begin), the accepting or processing of such resource.

''(iii) ELECTRICITY STORAGE DEVICES.—The receipt and sale of electric power that has been stored in a device directly connected to the grid.

''(iv) COMBINED HEAT AND POWER.—The generation, storage, or distribution of thermal energy exclusively utilizing property described in section 48(c)(3) (determined without regard to subparagraphs (B) and (D) thereof and without regard to any placed in service date).

''(v) RENEWABLE THERMAL ENERGY.—The generation, storage, or distribution of thermal energy exclusively using any resource described in section 45(c)(1) or energy property described in clause (i) or (iii) of section 48(a)(3)(A).

''(vi) WASTE HEAT TO POWER.—The use of recoverable waste energy, as defined in section 371(5) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6341(5)) (as in effect on the date of the enactment of the Master Limited Partnerships Parity Act).

''(vii) RENEWABLE FUEL INFRASTRUCTURE.—The storage or transportation of any fuel described in subsection (b), (c), (d), or (e) of section 6426.

''(viii) RENEWABLE FUELS.—The production, storage, or transportation of any renewable fuel described in section 211(o)(1)(J) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(1)(J)) (as in effect on the date of the enactment of the Master Limited Partnerships Parity Act) or section 40A(d)(1).

''(ix) RENEWABLE CHEMICALS.—The production, storage, or transportation of any renewable chemical (as defined in paragraph (6)).

''(x) ENERGY EFFICIENT BUILDINGS.—The audit and installation through contract or other agreement of any energy efficient building property described in section 179D(c)(1).

''(xi) GASIFICATION WITH SEQUESTRATION.—The production of any product from a project that meets the requirements of subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 48B(c)(1) and that separates and sequesters in secure geological storage (as determined under section 45Q(d)(2)) at least 75 percent of such project's total qualified carbon dioxide (as defined in section 45Q(b)).

''(xii) CARBON CAPTURE AND SEQUESTRATION.—The generation or storage of electric power produced from any facility which is a qualified facility described in section 45Q(c) and which disposes of any captured qualified carbon dioxide (as defined in section 45Q(b)) in secure geological storage (as determined under section 45Q(d)(2)).''.

(c) RENEWABLE CHEMICAL.—Section 7704(d) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(6) RENEWABLE CHEMICAL.—The term 'renewable chemical' means a monomer, polymer, plastic, formulated product, or chemical substance produced from renewable biomass (as defined in section 9001(12) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8101(12)), as in effect on the date of the enactment of the Master Limited Partnerships Parity Act).''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, in taxable years ending after such date.

SA 1842. Mr. COONS (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. REED) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

Subtitle B—Weatherization Enhancement and Local Energy Efficiency Investment and Accountability

SEC. 411. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the State energy program established under part D of title III of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6321 et seq.) (referred to in this section as ''SEP'') and the Weatherization Assistance Program for Low-Income Persons established under part A of title IV of the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6861 et seq.) (referred to in this section as ''WAP'') have proven to be beneficial, long-term partnerships among Federal, State, and local partners;

(2) the SEP and the WAP have been reauthorized on a bipartisan basis over many years to address changing national, regional, and State circumstances and needs, especially through—

(A) the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6201 et seq.);

(B) the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6801 et seq.);

(C) the State Energy Efficiency Programs Improvement Act of 1990 (Public Law 101–440; 104 Stat. 1006);

(D) the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13201 et seq.);

(E) the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15801 et seq.); and

(F) the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17001 et seq.);

(3) the SEP, also known as the ''State energy conservation program''—

(A) was first created in 1975 to implement a State-based, national program in support of energy efficiency, renewable energy, economic development, energy emergency preparedness, and energy policy; and

(B) has come to operate in every sector of the economy in support of the private sector to improve productivity and has dramatically reduced the cost of government through energy savings at the State and local levels;

(4) Federal laboratory studies have concluded that, for every Federal dollar invested through the SEP, more than $7 is saved in energy costs and almost $11 in non-Federal funds is leveraged;

(5) the WAP—

(A) was first created in 1976 to assist low-income families in response to the first oil embargo;

(B) has become the largest residential energy conservation program in the United States, with more than 7,100,000 homes weatherized since the WAP was created;

(C) saves an estimated 35 percent of consumption in the typical weatherized home, yielding average annual savings of $437 per year in home energy costs;

(D) has created thousands of jobs in both the construction sector and in the supply chain of materials suppliers, vendors, and manufacturers who supply the WAP;

(E) returns $2.51 in energy savings for every Federal dollar spent in energy and nonenergy benefits over the life of weatherized homes;

(F) serves as a foundation for residential energy efficiency retrofit standards, technical skills, and workforce training for the emerging broader market and reduces residential and power plant emissions of carbon dioxide by 2.65 metric tons each year per home; and

(G) has decreased national energy consumption by the equivalent of 24,100,000 barrels of oil annually;

(6) the WAP can be enhanced with the addition of a targeted portion of the Federal funds through an innovative program that supports projects performed by qualified nonprofit organizations that have a demonstrated capacity to build, renovate, repair, or improve the energy efficiency of a significant number of low-income homes, building on the success of the existing program without replacing the existing WAP network or creating a separate delivery mechanism for basic WAP services;

(7) the WAP has increased energy efficiency opportunities by promoting new, competitive public-private sector models of retrofitting low-income homes through new Federal partnerships;

(8) improved monitoring and reporting of the work product of the WAP has yielded benefits, and expanding independent verification of efficiency work will support the long-term goals of the WAP;

(9) reports of the Government Accountability Office in 2011, Inspector General's of the Department of Energy, and State auditors have identified State-level deficiencies in monitoring efforts that can be addressed in a manner that will ensure that WAP funds are used more effectively;

(10) through the history of the WAP, the WAP has evolved with improvements in efficiency technology, including, in the 1990s, many States adopting advanced home energy audits, which has led to great returns on investment; and

(11) as the home energy efficiency industry has become more performance-based, the WAP should continue to use those advances in technology and the professional workforce.

PART I—WEATHERIZATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

SEC. 421. REAUTHORIZATION OF WEATHERIZATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Section 422 of the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6872) is amended by striking ''appropriated—'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''appropriated $450,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 422. GRANTS FOR NEW, SELF-SUSTAINING LOW-INCOME, SINGLE-FAMILY AND MULTIFAMILY HOUSING ENERGY RETROFIT MODEL PROGRAMS TO ELIGIBLE MULTISTATE HOUSING AND ENERGY NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS.

The Energy Conservation and Production Act is amended by inserting after section 414B (42 U.S.C. 6864b) the following:

''SEC. 414C. GRANTS FOR NEW, SELF-SUSTAINING LOW-INCOME, SINGLE-FAMILY AND MULTIFAMILY HOUSING ENERGY RETROFIT MODEL PROGRAMS TO ELIGIBLE MULTISTATE HOUSING AND ENERGY NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS.

''(a) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section are—

''(1) to expand the number of low-income, single-family and multifamily homes that receive energy efficiency retrofits;

''(2) to promote innovation and new models of retrofitting low-income homes through new Federal partnerships with covered organizations that leverage substantial donations, donated materials, volunteer labor,

homeowner labor equity, and other private sector resources;

''(3) to assist the covered organizations in demonstrating, evaluating, improving, and replicating widely the model low-income energy retrofit programs of the covered organizations; and

''(4) to ensure that the covered organizations make the energy retrofit programs of the covered organizations self-sustaining by the time grant funds have been expended.

''(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) COVERED ORGANIZATION.—The term 'covered organization' means an organization that—

''(A) is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from taxation under 501(a) of that Code; and

''(B) has an established record of constructing, renovating, repairing, or making energy efficient a total of not less than 250 owner-occupied, single-family or multifamily homes per year for low-income households, either directly or through affiliates, chapters, or other direct partners (using the most recent year for which data are available).

''(2) LOW-INCOME.—The term 'low-income' means an income level that is not more than 200 percent of the poverty level (as determined in accordance with criteria established by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget) applicable to a family of the size involved, except that the Secretary may establish a higher or lower level if the Secretary determines that a higher or lower level is necessary to carry out this section.

''(3) WEATHERIZATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR LOW-INCOME PERSONS.—The term 'Weatherization Assistance Program for Low-Income Persons' means the program established under this part (including part 440 of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations).

''(c) COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall make grants to covered organizations through a national competitive process for use in accordance with this section.

''(d) AWARD FACTORS.—In making grants under this section, the Secretary shall consider—

''(1) the number of low-income homes the applicant—

''(A) has built, renovated, repaired, or made more energy efficient as of the date of the application; and

''(B) can reasonably be projected to build, renovate, repair, or make energy efficient during the 10-year period beginning on the date of the application;

''(2) the qualifications, experience, and past performance of the applicant, including experience successfully managing and administering Federal funds;

''(3) the number and diversity of States and climates in which the applicant works as of the date of the application;

''(4) the amount of non-Federal funds, donated or discounted materials, discounted or volunteer skilled labor, volunteer unskilled labor, homeowner labor equity, and other resources the applicant will provide;

''(5) the extent to which the applicant could successfully replicate the energy retrofit program of the applicant and sustain the program after the grant funds have been expended;

''(6) regional diversity;

''(7) urban, suburban, and rural localities; and

''(8) such other factors as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

''(e) APPLICATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall request proposals from covered organizations.

''(2) ADMINISTRATION.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, an applicant shall submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

''(3) AWARDS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of issuance of a request for proposals, the Secretary shall award grants under this section.

''(f) ELIGIBLE USES OF GRANT FUNDS.—A grant under this section may be used for—

''(1) energy efficiency audits, cost-effective retrofit, and related activities in different climatic regions of the United States;

''(2) energy efficiency materials and supplies;

''(3) organizational capacity—

''(A) to significantly increase the number of energy retrofits;

''(B) to replicate an energy retrofit program in other States; and

''(C) to ensure that the program is self-sustaining after the Federal grant funds are expended;

''(4) energy efficiency, audit and retrofit training, and ongoing technical assistance;

''(5) information to homeowners on proper maintenance and energy savings behaviors;

''(6) quality control and improvement;

''(7) data collection, measurement, and verification;

''(8) program monitoring, oversight, evaluation, and reporting;

''(9) management and administration (up to a maximum of 10 percent of the total grant);

''(10) labor and training activities; and

''(11) such other activities as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

''(g) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—The amount of a grant provided under this section shall not exceed—

''(1) if the amount made available to carry out this section for a fiscal year is $225,000,000 or more, $5,000,000; and

''(2) if the amount made available to carry out this section for a fiscal year is less than $225,000,000, $1,500,000.

''(h) GUIDELINES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall issue guidelines to implement the grant program established under this section.

''(2) ADMINISTRATION.—The guidelines—

''(A) shall not apply to the Weatherization Assistance Program for Low-Income Persons, in whole or major part; but

''(B) may rely on applicable provisions of law governing the Weatherization Assistance Program for Low-Income Persons to establish—

''(i) standards for allowable expenditures;

''(ii) a minimum savings-to-investment ratio;

''(iii) standards—

''(I) to carry out training programs;

''(II) to conduct energy audits and program activities;

''(III) to provide technical assistance;

''(IV) to monitor program activities; and

''(V) to verify energy and cost savings;

''(iv) liability insurance requirements; and

''(v) recordkeeping requirements, which shall include reporting to the Office of Weatherization and Intergovernmental Programs of the Department of Energy applicable data on each home retrofitted.

''(i) REVIEW AND EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall review and evaluate the performance of any covered organization that receives a grant under this section (which may include an audit), as determined by the Secretary.

''(j) COMPLIANCE WITH STATE AND LOCAL LAW.—Nothing in this section or any program carried out using a grant provided under this section supersedes or otherwise affects any State or local law, to the extent that the State or local law contains a requirement that is more stringent than the applicable requirement of this section.

''(k) ANNUAL REPORTS.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress annual reports that provide—

''(1) findings;

''(2) a description of energy and cost savings achieved and actions taken under this section; and

''(3) any recommendations for further action.

''(l) FUNDING.—Of the amount of funds that are made available to carry out the Weatherization Assistance Program for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018 under section 422, the Secretary shall use to carry out this section—

''(1) for fiscal year 2014—

''(A) 1 percent of the amount if the amount is less than $200,000,000;

''(B) 2 percent of the amount if the amount is $200,000,000 or more but less than $225,000,000;

''(C) 5 percent of the amount if the amount is $225,000,000 or more but less than $260,000,000;

''(D) 10 percent of the amount if the amount is $260,000,000 or more but less than $400,000,000; and

''(E) 20 percent of the amount if the amount is $400,000,000 or more; and

''(2) for each of fiscal year 2015 through 2018—

''(A) 2 percent of the amount if the amount is less than $225,000,000;

''(B) 5 percent of the amount if the amount is $225,000,000 or more but less than $260,000,000;

''(C) 10 percent of the amount if the amount is $260,000,000 or more but less than $400,000,000; and

''(D) 20 percent of the amount if the amount is $400,000,000 or more.''.

SEC. 423. STANDARDS PROGRAM.

Section 415 of the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6865) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f) STANDARDS PROGRAM.—

''(1) CONTRACTOR QUALIFICATION.—Effective beginning January 1, 2015, to be eligible to carry out weatherization using funds made available under this part, a contractor shall be selected through a competitive bidding process and be—

''(A) accredited by the Building Performance Institute;

''(B) an Energy Smart Home Performance Team accredited under the Residential Energy Services Network; or

''(C) accredited by an equivalent accreditation or program accreditation-based State certification program approved by the Secretary.

''(2) GRANTS FOR ENERGY RETROFIT MODEL PROGRAMS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible to receive a grant under section 414C, a covered organization (as defined in section 414C(b)) shall use a crew chief who—

''(i) is certified or accredited in accordance with paragraph (1); and

''(ii) supervises the work performed with grant funds.

''(B) VOLUNTEER LABOR.—A volunteer who performs work for a covered organization that receives a grant under section 414C shall not be required to be certified under this subsection if the volunteer is not directly installing or repairing mechanical equipment or other items that require skilled labor.

''(C) TRAINING.—The Secretary shall use training and technical assistance funds available to the Secretary to assist covered organizations under section 414C in providing

training to obtain certification required under this subsection, including provisional or temporary certification.

''(3) MINIMUM EFFICIENCY STANDARDS.—Effective beginning October 1, 2015, the Secretary shall ensure that—

''(A) each retrofit for which weatherization assistance is provided under this part meets minimum efficiency and quality of work standards established by the Secretary after weatherization of a dwelling unit; and

''(B) at least 10 percent of the dwelling units are randomly inspected by a third party accredited under this subsection to ensure compliance with the minimum efficiency and quality of work standards established under subparagraph (A); and

''(C) the standards established under this subsection meet or exceed the industry standards for home performance work that are in effect on the date of enactment of this subsection, as determined by the Secretary.''.

PART II—STATE ENERGY PROGRAM

SEC. 431. REAUTHORIZATION OF STATE ENERGY PROGRAM.

Section 365(f) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6325(f)) is amended by striking ''$125,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2012'' and inserting ''$75,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018''.

SA 1843. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 188, after line 24, insert the following:

SEC. 422. Funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act for grants to be awarded by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development or the Secretary of Transportation shall be subject to the following accountability provisions:

(1) AUDIT REQUIREMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of the enactment of this title, and in each fiscal year thereafter, the Inspector Generals of the Department of Transportation and the Department of Housing and Development shall conduct audits of any grant amounts appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse of funds by grantees. The Inspectors General shall determine the appropriate number of such audits to be conducted each year.

(B) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term ''unresolved audit finding'' means a finding in the final audit report of the Inspectors General of the Department of Transportation and the Department of Housing and Urban Development that the grantee has utilized grant funds for an unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost that is not closed or resolved within 12 months from the date when the final audit report is issued.

(C) MANDATORY EXCLUSION.—A recipient of grant amounts appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act that is found to have an unresolved audit finding shall not be eligible to receive grant amounts appropriated or otherwise made available under this title during the following 2 fiscal years beginning after the end of the 12-month period described under subparagraph (A).

(D) PRIORITY.—In awarding amounts appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act, the Secretary of Transportation or the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall give priority to eligible entities that did not have an unresolved audit finding during the 3 fiscal years prior to submitting an application for grant amounts appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act.

(E) REIMBURSEMENT.—If an entity is awarded grant amounts appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act during the 2-fiscal-year period in which the entity is barred from receiving grants under subparagraph (B), the Secretary of Transportation or the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall recoup the costs of the repayment to the fund from the grant recipient that was erroneously awarded grant funds.

(2) NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this paragraph and any grant programs described in this Act, the term ''nonprofit organization'' means an organization that is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code.

(B) PROHIBITION.—The Secretary of Transportation and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may not award any grant amounts appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act to a nonprofit organization that holds money in offshore accounts for the purpose of avoiding paying the tax described in section 511(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(C) DISCLOSURE.—Each nonprofit organization that is a recipient of grant amounts appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act and uses the procedures prescribed in regulations to create a rebuttable presumption of reasonableness for the compensation of its officers, directors, trustees and key employees, shall disclose to the Secretary of Transportation and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, in the application for the grant, the process for determining such compensation, including the independent persons involved in reviewing and approving such compensation, the comparability data used, and contemporaneous substantiation of the deliberation and decision. Upon request, the Secretary of Transportation or the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall make the information disclosed under this paragraph available for public inspection.

SA 1844. Mr. ISAKSON (for himself and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4____. ENHANCED ENERGY EFFICIENCY UNDERWRITING.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COVERED AGENCY.—The term ''covered agency''—

(A) means—

(i) an executive agency, as that term is defined in section 102 of title 31, United States Code; and

(ii) any other agency of the Federal Government; and

(B) includes any enterprise, as that term is defined under section 1303 of the Federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4502).

(2) COVERED LOAN.—The term ''covered loan'' means a loan secured by a home that is issued, insured, purchased, or securitized by a covered agency.

(3) HOMEOWNER.—The term ''homeowner'' means the mortgagor under a covered loan.

(4) MORTGAGEE.—The term ''mortgagee'' means—

(A) an original lender under a covered loan or the holder of a covered loan at the time at which that mortgage transaction is consummated;

(B) any affiliate, agent, subsidiary, successor, or assignee of an original lender under a covered loan or the holder of a covered loan at the time at which that mortgage transaction is consummated;

(C) any servicer of a covered loan; and

(D) any subsequent purchaser, trustee, or transferee of any covered loan issued by an original lender.

(5) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

(6) SERVICER.—The term ''servicer'' means the person or entity responsible for the servicing of a covered loan, including the person or entity who makes or holds a covered loan if that person or entity also services the covered loan.

(7) SERVICING.—The term ''servicing'' has the meaning given the term in section 6(i) of the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 (12 U.S.C. 2605(i)).

(b) FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(A) energy costs for homeowners are a significant and increasing portion of their household budgets;

(B) household energy use can vary substantially depending on the efficiency and characteristics of the house;

(C) expected energy cost savings are important to the value of the house;

(D) the current test for loan affordability used by most covered agencies, commonly known as the ''debt-to-income'' test, is inadequate because it does not take into account the expected energy cost savings for the homeowner of an energy efficient home; and

(E) another loan limitation, commonly known as the ''loan-to-value'' test, is tied to the appraisal, which often does not adjust for efficiency features of houses.

(2) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section are to—

(A) improve the accuracy of mortgage underwriting by Federal mortgage agencies by ensuring that energy cost savings are included in the underwriting process as described below, and thus to reduce the amount of energy consumed by homes and to facilitate the creation of energy efficiency retrofit and construction jobs;

(B) require a covered agency to include the expected energy cost savings of a homeowner as a regular expense in the tests, such as the debt-to-income test, used to determine the ability of the loan applicant to afford the cost of homeownership for all loan programs; and

(C) require a covered agency to include the value home buyers place on the energy efficiency of a house in tests used to compare the mortgage amount to home value, taking precautions to avoid double-counting and to support safe and sound lending.

(c) ENHANCED ENERGY EFFICIENCY UNDERWRITING CRITERIA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall, in consultation with the advisory group established in subsection (f)(2), develop and issue guidelines for a covered agency to implement enhanced loan eligibility requirements, for use when testing the ability of a loan applicant to repay a covered loan, that account for the expected energy cost savings for a loan applicant at a subject property, in the manner set forth in paragraphs (2) and (3).

(2) REQUIREMENTS TO ACCOUNT FOR ENERGY COST SAVINGS.—The enhanced loan eligibility requirements under paragraph (1) shall require that, for all covered loans for which an energy efficiency report is voluntarily provided to the mortgagee by the mortgagor, the covered agency and the mortgagee shall take into consideration the estimated energy cost savings expected for the owner of the subject property in determining whether the loan applicant has sufficient income to service the mortgage debt plus other regular expenses. To the extent that a covered agency uses a test such as a debt-to-income test that includes certain regular expenses, such as hazard insurance and property taxes, the expected energy cost savings shall be included as an offset to these expenses. Energy costs to be assessed include the cost of electricity, natural gas, oil, and any other fuel regularly used to supply energy to the subject property.

(3) DETERMINATION OF ESTIMATED ENERGY COST SAVINGS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The guidelines to be issued under paragraph (1) shall include instructions for the covered agency to calculate estimated energy cost savings using—

(i) the energy efficiency report;

(ii) an estimate of baseline average energy costs; and

(iii) additional sources of information as determined by the Secretary.

(B) REPORT REQUIREMENTS.—For the purposes of subparagraph (A), an energy efficiency report shall—

(i) estimate the expected energy cost savings specific to the subject property, based on specific information about the property;

(ii) be prepared in accordance with the guidelines to be issued under paragraph (1); and

(iii) be prepared—

(I) in accordance with the Residential Energy Service Network's Home Energy Rating System (commonly known as ''HERS'') by an individual certified by the Residential Energy Service Network, unless the Secretary finds that the use of HERS does not further the purposes of this section; or

(II) by other methods approved by the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy and the advisory group established in subsection (f)(2), for use under this section, which shall include a third-party quality assurance procedure.

(C) USE BY APPRAISER.—If an energy efficiency report is used under paragraph (2), the energy efficiency report shall be provided to the appraiser to estimate the energy efficiency of the subject property and for potential adjustments for energy efficiency.

(4) REQUIRED DISCLOSURE TO CONSUMER FOR A HOME WITH AN ENERGY EFFICIENCY REPORT.—If an energy efficiency report is used under paragraph (2), the guidelines to be issued under paragraph (1) shall require the mortgagee to—

(A) inform the loan applicant of the expected energy costs as estimated in the energy efficiency report, in a manner and at a time as prescribed by the Secretary, and if practicable, in the documents delivered at the time of loan application; and

(B) include the energy efficiency report in the documentation for the loan provided to the borrower.

(5) REQUIRED DISCLOSURE TO CONSUMER FOR A HOME WITHOUT AN ENERGY EFFICIENCY REPORT.—If an energy efficiency report is not used under paragraph (2), the guidelines to be issued under paragraph (1) shall require the mortgagee to inform the loan applicant in a manner and at a time as prescribed by the Secretary, and if practicable, in the documents delivered at the time of loan application of—

(A) typical energy cost savings that would be possible from a cost-effective energy upgrade of a home of the size and in the region of the subject property;

(B) the impact the typical energy cost savings would have on monthly ownership costs of a typical home;

(C) the impact on the size of a mortgage that could be obtained if the typical energy cost savings were reflected in an energy efficiency report; and

(D) resources for improving the energy efficiency of a home.

(6) LIMITATIONS.—A covered agency shall not—

(A) modify existing underwriting criteria or adopt new underwriting criteria that intentionally negate or reduce the impact of the requirements or resulting benefits that are set forth or otherwise derived from the enhanced loan eligibility requirements required under this subsection; or

(B) impose greater buy back requirements, credit overlays, insurance requirements, including private mortgage insurance, or any other material costs, impediments, or penalties on covered loans merely because the loan uses an energy efficiency report or the enhanced loan eligibility requirements required under this subsection.

(7) APPLICABILITY AND IMPLEMENTATION DATE.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and before December 31, 2016, the enhanced loan eligibility requirements required under this subsection shall be implemented by each covered agency to—

(A) apply to any covered loan for the sale, or refinancing of any loan for the sale, of any home;

(B) be available on any residential real property (including individual units of condominiums and cooperatives) that qualifies for a covered loan; and

(C) provide prospective mortgagees with sufficient guidance and applicable tools to implement the required underwriting methods.

(d) ENHANCED ENERGY EFFICIENCY UNDERWRITING VALUATION GUIDELINES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall—

(A) in consultation with the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council and the advisory group established in subsection (f)(2), develop and issue guidelines for a covered agency to determine the maximum permitted loan amount based on the value of the property for all covered loans made on properties with an energy efficiency report that meets the requirements of subsection (c)(3)(B); and

(B) in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, issue guidelines for a covered agency to determine the estimated energy savings under paragraph (3) for properties with an energy efficiency report.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The enhanced energy efficiency underwriting valuation guidelines required under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) a requirement that if an energy efficiency report that meets the requirements of subsection (c)(3)(B) is voluntarily provided to the mortgagee, such report shall be used by the mortgagee or covered agency to determine the estimated energy savings of the subject property; and

(B) a requirement that the estimated energy savings of the subject property be added to the appraised value of the subject property by a mortgagee or covered agency for the purpose of determining the loan-to-value ratio of the subject property, unless the appraisal includes the value of the overall energy efficiency of the subject property, using methods to be established under the guidelines issued under paragraph (1).

(3) DETERMINATION OF ESTIMATED ENERGY SAVINGS.—

(A) AMOUNT OF ENERGY SAVINGS.—The amount of estimated energy savings shall be determined by calculating the difference between the estimated energy costs for the average comparable houses, as determined in guidelines to be issued under paragraph (1), and the estimated energy costs for the subject property based upon the energy efficiency report.

(B) DURATION OF ENERGY SAVINGS.—The duration of the estimated energy savings shall be based upon the estimated life of the applicable equipment, consistent with the rating system used to produce the energy efficiency report.

(C) PRESENT VALUE OF ENERGY SAVINGS.—The present value of the future savings shall be discounted using the average interest rate on conventional 30-year mortgages, in the manner directed by guidelines issued under paragraph (1).

(4) ENSURING CONSIDERATION OF ENERGY EFFICIENT FEATURES.—Section 1110 of the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989 (12 U.S.C. 3339) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and'' and inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

''(4) that State certified and licensed appraisers have timely access, whenever practicable, to information from the property owner and the lender that may be relevant in developing an opinion of value regarding the energy- and water-saving improvements or features of a property, such as—

''(A) labels or ratings of buildings;

''(B) installed appliances, measures, systems or technologies;

''(C) blueprints;

''(D) construction costs;

''(E) financial or other incentives regarding energy- and water-efficient components and systems installed in a property;

''(F) utility bills;

''(G) energy consumption and benchmarking data; and

''(H) third-party verifications or representations of energy and water efficiency performance of a property, observing all financial privacy requirements adhered to by certified and licensed appraisers, including section 501 of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6801).

Unless a property owner consents to a lender, an appraiser, in carrying out the requirements of paragraph (4), shall not have access to the commercial or financial information of the owner that is privileged or confidential.''.

(5) TRANSACTIONS REQUIRING STATE CERTIFIED APPRAISERS.—Section 1113 of the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989 (12 U.S.C. 3342) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting before the semicolon the following: '', or any real property on which the appraiser makes adjustments using an energy efficiency report''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting after ''atypical'' the following: '', or an appraisal on which the appraiser makes adjustments using an energy efficiency report.''.

(6) PROTECTIONS.—

(A) AUTHORITY TO IMPOSE LIMITATIONS.—The guidelines to be issued under paragraph (1) shall include such limitations and conditions as determined by the Secretary to be necessary to protect against meaningful under or over valuation of energy cost savings or duplicative counting of energy efficiency features or energy cost savings in the

valuation of any subject property that is used to determine a loan amount.

(B) ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY.—At the end of the 7-year period following the implementation of enhanced eligibility and underwriting valuation requirements under this section, the Secretary may modify or apply additional exceptions to the approach described in paragraph (2), where the Secretary finds that the unadjusted appraisal will reflect an accurate market value of the efficiency of the subject property or that a modified approach will better reflect an accurate market value.

(7) APPLICABILITY AND IMPLEMENTATION DATE.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and before December 31, 2016, each covered agency shall implement the guidelines required under this subsection, which shall—

(A) apply to any covered loan for the sale, or refinancing of any loan for the sale, of any home; and

(B) be available on any residential real property, including individual units of condominiums and cooperatives, that qualifies for a covered loan.

(e) MONITORING.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the enhanced eligibility and underwriting valuation requirements are implemented under this section, and every year thereafter, each covered agency with relevant activity shall issue and make available to the public a report that—

(1) enumerates the number of covered loans of the agency for which there was an energy efficiency report, and that used energy efficiency appraisal guidelines and enhanced loan eligibility requirements; and

(2) includes the default rates and rates of foreclosures for each category of loans.

(f) RULEMAKING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall prescribe regulations to carry out this section, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy and the advisory group established in paragraph (2), which may contain such classifications, differentiations, or other provisions, and may provide for such proper implementation and appropriate treatment of different types of transactions, as the Secretary determines are necessary or proper to effectuate the purposes of this section, to prevent circumvention or evasion thereof, or to facilitate compliance therewith.

(2) ADVISORY GROUP.—To assist in carrying out this section, the Secretary shall establish an advisory group, consisting of individuals representing the interests of—

(A) mortgage lenders;

(B) appraisers;

(C) energy raters and residential energy consumption experts;

(D) energy efficiency organizations;

(E) real estate agents;

(F) home builders and remodelers;

(G) State energy officials; and

(H) others as determined by the Secretary.

(g) ADDITIONAL STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall reconvene the advisory group established in subsection (f)(2), in addition to water and locational efficiency experts, to advise the Secretary on the implementation of the enhanced energy efficiency underwriting criteria established in subsections (c) and (d).

(2) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The advisory group established in subsection (f)(2) shall provide recommendations to the Secretary on any revisions or additions to the enhanced energy efficiency underwriting criteria deemed necessary by the group, which may include alternate methods to better account for home energy costs and additional factors to account for substantial and regular costs of homeownership such as location-based transportation costs and water costs. The Secretary shall forward any legislative recommendations from the advisory group to Congress for its consideration.

SA 1845. Mr. UDALL, of Colorado (for himself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3_____. COORDINATION OF ENERGY RETROFITTING ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOLS.

Section 392 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6371a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) COORDINATION OF ENERGY RETROFITTING ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOLS.—

''(1) DEFINITION OF SCHOOL.—In this subsection, the term 'school' means—

''(A) an elementary school or secondary school (as defined in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801));

''(B) an institution of higher education (as defined in section 102(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002(a));

''(C) a school of the defense dependents' education system under the Defense Dependents' Education Act of 1978 (20 U.S.C. 921 et seq.) or established under section 2164 of title 10, United States Code;

''(D) a school operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs;

''(E) a tribally controlled school (as defined in section 5212 of the Tribally Controlled Schools Act of 1988 (25 U.S.C. 2511)); and

''(F) a Tribal College or University (as defined in section 316(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1059c(b))).

''(2) DESIGNATION OF LEAD AGENCY.—The Secretary, acting through the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, shall act as the lead Federal agency for coordinating and disseminating information on existing Federal programs and assistance that may be used to help initiate, develop, and finance energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects for schools.

''(3) REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out coordination and outreach under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall—

''(A) in consultation and coordination with the appropriate Federal agencies, carry out a review of existing programs and financing mechanisms (including revolving loan funds and loan guarantees) available in or from the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Energy, the Department of Education, the Department of the Treasury, the Internal Revenue Service, the Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate Federal agencies with jurisdiction over energy financing and facilitation that are currently used or may be used to help initiate, develop, and finance energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects for schools;

''(B) establish a Federal cross-departmental collaborative coordination, education, and outreach effort to streamline communication and promote available Federal opportunities and assistance described in subparagraph (A), for energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects that enables States, local educational agencies, and schools—

''(i) to use existing Federal opportunities more effectively; and

''(ii) to form partnerships with Governors, State energy programs, local educational, financial, and energy officials, State and local government officials, nonprofit organizations, and other appropriate entities, to support the initiation of the projects;

''(C) provide technical assistance for States, local educational agencies, and schools to help develop and finance energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects—

''(i) to increase the energy efficiency of buildings or facilities;

''(ii) to install systems that individually generate energy from renewable energy resources;

''(iii) to establish partnerships to leverage economies of scale and additional financing mechanisms available to larger clean energy initiatives; or

''(iv) to promote—

''(I) the maintenance of health, environmental quality, and safety in schools, including the ambient air quality, through energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofit projects; and

''(II) the achievement of expected energy savings and renewable energy production through proper operations and maintenance practices;

''(D) develop and maintain a single online resource Web site with contact information for relevant technical assistance and support staff in the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy for States, local educational agencies, and schools to effectively access and use Federal opportunities and assistance described in subparagraph (A) to develop energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects; and

''(E) establish a process for recognition of schools that—

''(i) have successfully implemented energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects; and

''(ii) are willing to serve as resources for other local educational agencies and schools to assist initiation of similar efforts.

''(4) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report describing the implementation of this subsection.''.

SA 1846. Mr. UDALL, of Colorado (for himself and Mr. RISCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 301 and insert the following:

SEC. 301. ENERGY-EFFICIENT AND ENERGY-SAVING INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGIES.

Section 543 of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8253) is amended—

(1) by redesignating the second subsection (f) (relating to large capital energy investments) as subsection (g); and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(h) FEDERAL IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY FOR ENERGY-EFFICIENT AND ENERGY-SAVING INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, each Federal agency shall collaborate with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (referred to in this subsection as the 'Director') to develop an implementation strategy (including best-practices and measurement and verification techniques) for the maintenance, purchase, and use by the Federal agency of energy-efficient and energy-saving information and communications technologies and practices.

''(2) CONTENT.—Each implementation strategy shall be flexible, cost-effective, and based on the specific operating requirements and statutory mission of the agency.

''(3) ADMINISTRATION.—In developing an implementation strategy, each Federal agency shall—

''(A) consider information and communications technologies (referred to in this subsection as 'ICT') and related infrastructure and practices, such as—

''(i) advanced metering infrastructure;

''(ii) ICT services and products;

''(iii) efficient data center strategies and methods of increasing ICT asset and related infrastructure utilization;

''(iv) ICT and related infrastructure power management;

''(v) building information modeling, including building energy management; and

''(vi) secure telework and travel substitution tools; and

''(B) ensure that the agency realizes the savings and rewards brought about through increased efficiency and utilization.

''(4) PERFORMANCE GOALS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Director, in consultation with the Secretary, shall establish performance goals for evaluating the efforts of Federal agencies in improving the maintenance, purchase, and use of energy-efficient and energy-saving information and communications technology systems and practices.

''(B) BEST PRACTICES.—The Director shall supplement the performance goals established under this paragraph with recommendations on best practices for the attainment of the performance goals, to include a requirement for agencies to evaluate the use of energy savings performance contracting and utility energy services contracting as preferred acquisition methods.

''(C) ADMINISTRATION.—The performance goals established under this paragraph shall—

''(i) measure information technology costs over a specific time period of 3 to 5 years;

''(ii) measure cost savings attained via the use of energy-efficient and energy-saving information and communications solutions during the same time period; and

''(iii) provide, to the maximum extent practicable, a complete picture of all costs and savings, including energy costs and savings.

''(5) REPORTS.—

''(A) AGENCY REPORTS.—Each Federal agency subject to the requirements of this subsection shall include in the report of the agency under section 527 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17143) a description of the efforts and results of the agency under this subsection.

''(B) OMB GOVERNMENT EFFICIENCY REPORTS AND SCORECARDS.—Effective beginning not later than October 1, 2013, the Director shall include in the annual report and scorecard of the Director required under section 528 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17144) a description of the efforts and results of Federal agencies under this subsection.

''(C) USE OF EXISTING REPORTING STRUCTURES.—The Director may require Federal agencies to submit any information required to be submitted under this subsection though reporting structures in use as of the date of enactment of the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act of 2013.''.

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 304. ENERGY EFFICIENT DATA CENTERS.

Section 453 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17112) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act of 2013, the Secretary and the Administrator shall—

''(A) designate an established information technology industry organization to coordinate the program described in subsection (b); and

''(B) make the designation public, including on an appropriate website.'';

(2) by striking subsections (e) and (f) and inserting the following:

''(e) STUDY.—The Secretary, with assistance from the Administrator, shall—

''(1) not later than December 31, 2013, make available to the public an update to the Report to Congress on Server and Data Center Energy Efficiency published on August 2, 2007, under section 1 of Public Law 109–431 (120 Stat. 2920), that provides—

''(A) a comparison and gap analysis of the estimates and projections contained in the original report with new data regarding the period from 2007 through 2012;

''(B) an analysis considering the impact of information and communications technologies asset and related infrastructure utilization solutions, to include virtualization and cloud computing-based solutions, in the public and private sectors; and

''(C) updated projections and recommendations for best practices; and

''(2) collaborate with the organization designated under subsection (c) in preparing the report.

''(f) DATA CENTER ENERGY PRACTITIONER PROGRAM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in collaboration with the organization designated under subsection (c) and in consultation with the Administrator for the Office of E-Government and Information Technology within the Office of Management and Budget, shall maintain a data center energy practitioner program that leads to the certification of energy practitioners qualified to evaluate the energy usage and efficiency opportunities in data centers.

''(2) EVALUATIONS.—Each Federal agency shall have the data centers of the agency evaluated every 4 years by energy practitioners certified pursuant to the program, whenever practicable using certified practitioners employed by the agency.'';

(3) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (j); and

(4) by inserting after subsection (f) the following:

''(g) OPEN DATA INITIATIVE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in collaboration with the organization designated under subsection (c) and in consultation with the Administrator for the Office of E-Government and Information Technology within the Office of Management and Budget, shall establish an open data initiative for Federal data center energy usage data, with the purpose of making the data available and accessible in a manner that empowers further data center innovation while protecting United States national security interests.

''(2) ADMINISTRATION.—In establishing the initiative, the Secretary shall consider use of the online Data Center Maturity Model.

''(h) INTERNATIONAL SPECIFICATIONS AND METRICS.—The Secretary, in collaboration with the organization designated under subsection (c), shall actively participate in efforts to harmonize global specifications and metrics for data center energy efficiency.

''(i) ICT ASSET UTILIZATION METRIC.—The Secretary, in collaboration with the organization designated under subsection (c), shall assist in the development of an efficiency metric that measures the energy efficiency of the overall data center, including information and communications technology systems and related infrastructure.''.

SA 1847. Mr. BENNET (for himself and Ms. AYOTTE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1392, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

Subtitle C—Energy Efficiency Measures in Commercial Buildings

SEC. 121. SEPARATE SPACES WITH HIGH-PERFORMANCE ENERGY EFFICIENCY MEASURES.

Subtitle B of title IV of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17081 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 424. SEPARATE SPACES WITH HIGH-PERFORMANCE ENERGY EFFICIENCY MEASURES.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) HIGH-PERFORMANCE ENERGY EFFICIENCY MEASURE.—The term 'high-performance energy efficiency measure' means a technology, product, or practice that will result in substantial operational cost savings by reducing energy consumption and utility costs.

''(2) SEPARATE SPACES.—The term 'separate spaces' means areas within a commercial building that are leased or otherwise occupied by a tenant or other occupant for a period of time pursuant to the terms of a written agreement.

''(b) STUDY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary, acting through the Assistant Secretary of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, shall complete a study on the feasibility of—

''(A) significantly improving energy efficiency in commercial buildings through the design and construction, by owners and tenants, of separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures; and

''(B) encouraging owners and tenants to implement high-performance energy efficiency measures in separate spaces.

''(2) SCOPE.—The study shall, at a minimum, include—

''(A) descriptions of—

''(i) high-performance energy efficiency measures that should be considered as part of the initial design and construction of separate spaces;

''(ii) processes that owners, tenants, architects, and engineers may replicate when designing and constructing separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures;

''(iii) standards and best practices to achieve appropriate energy intensities for lighting, plug loads, pipe loads, heating, cooling, cooking, laundry, and other systems to satisfy the needs of the commercial building tenant;

''(iv) return on investment and payback analyses of the incremental cost and projected energy savings of the proposed set of high-performance energy efficiency measures, including consideration of tax and other available incentives;

''(v) models and simulation methods that predict the quantity of energy used by separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures and that compare that predicted quantity to the quantity of energy used by separate spaces without high-performance energy efficiency measures but that otherwise comply with applicable building code requirements;

''(vi) measurement and verification platforms demonstrating actual energy use of

high-performance energy efficiency measures installed in separate spaces, and whether the measures generate the savings intended in the initial design and construction of the separate spaces;

''(vii) best practices that encourage an integrated approach to designing and constructing separate spaces to perform at optimum energy efficiency in conjunction with the central systems of a commercial building; and

''(viii) any impact on employment resulting from the design and construction of separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures; and

''(B) case studies reporting economic and energy saving returns in the design and construction of separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures.

''(3) PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall publish a notice in the Federal Register requesting public comments regarding effective methods, measures, and practices for the design and construction of separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures.

''(4) PUBLICATION.—The Secretary shall publish the study on the website of the Department of Energy.''.

SEC. 122. TENANT STAR PROGRAM.

Subtitle B of title IV of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17081 et seq.) (as amended by section 121) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 425. TENANT STAR PROGRAM.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) HIGH-PERFORMANCE ENERGY EFFICIENCY MEASURE.—The term 'high-performance energy efficiency measure' has the meaning given the term in section 424.

''(2) SEPARATE SPACES.—The term 'separate spaces' has the meaning given the term in section 424.

''(b) TENANT STAR.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Secretary shall develop a voluntary program within the Energy Star program established by section 324A of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6294a), which may be known as Tenant Star, to promote energy efficiency in separate spaces leased by tenants or otherwise occupied within commercial buildings.

''(c) AGREEMENTS.—Responsibilities under the program developed under subsection (b) shall be divided between the Secretary and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency in accordance with the terms of applicable agreements between the Secretary and the Administrator.

''(d) EXPANDING SURVEY DATA.—The Secretary, acting through the Administrator of the Energy Information Administration, shall—

''(1) collect, through each Commercial Building Energy Consumption Survey of the Energy Information Administration that is conducted after the date of enactment of this section, data on—

''(A) categories of building occupancy that are known to consume significant quantities of energy, such as occupancy by law firms, data centers, trading floors, restaurants, retail outlets, and financial services firms; and

''(B) other aspects of the property, building operation, or building occupancy determined by the Administrator of the Energy Information Administration, in consultation with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, to be relevant in lowering energy consumption; and

''(2) make data collected under paragraph (1) available to the public in aggregated form and provide the data, and any associated results, to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency for use in accordance with subsection (e).

''(e) RECOGNITION OF OWNERS AND TENANTS.—

''(1) OCCUPANCY-BASED RECOGNITION.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the data described in subsection (d) is received, the Secretary and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall, following an opportunity for public notice and comment—

''(A) in a manner similar to the Energy Star rating system for commercial buildings, develop voluntary policies and procedures to recognize tenants that voluntarily achieve high levels of energy efficiency in separate spaces;

''(B) establish building occupancy categories eligible for Tenant Star recognition based on the data collected under subsection (d)(1) and any associated results; and

''(C) consider other forms of recognition for commercial building tenants or other occupants that lower energy consumption in separate spaces.

''(2) DESIGN- AND CONSTRUCTION-BASED RECOGNITION.—After the study required under section 424(b) is completed and following an opportunity for public notice and comment, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection and the Secretary may develop a voluntary program to recognize commercial building owners and tenants that use high-performance energy efficiency measures in the design and construction of separate spaces.''.

SA 1848. Mr. REID (for Mr. PRYOR (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mr. COBURN)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1344, to amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to provide expedited air passenger screening to severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Helping Heroes Fly Act''.

SEC. 2. OPERATIONS CENTER PROGRAM FOR SEVERELY INJURED OR DISABLED MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND SEVERELY INJURED OR DISABLED VETERANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 449 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 44927. Expedited screening for severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans

''(a) PASSENGER SCREENING.—The Assistant Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and organizations identified by the Secretaries of Defense and Veteran Affairs that advocate on behalf of severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans, shall develop and implement a process to support and facilitate the ease of travel and to the extent possible provide expedited passenger screening services for severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans through passenger screening. The process shall be designed to offer the individual private screening to the maximum extent practicable.

''(b) OPERATIONS CENTER.—As part of the process under subsection (a), the Assistant Secretary shall maintain an operations center to provide support and facilitate the movement of severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans through passenger screening prior to boarding a passenger aircraft operated by an air carrier or foreign air carrier in air transportation or intrastate air transportation.

''(c) PROTOCOLS.—The Assistant Secretary shall—

''(1) establish and publish protocols, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and the organizations identified under subsection (a), under which a severely injured or disabled member of the Armed Forces or severely injured or disabled veteran, or the family member or other representative of such member or veteran, may contact the operations center maintained under subsection (b) and request the expedited passenger screening services described in subsection (a) for that member or veteran; and

''(2) upon receipt of a request under paragraph (1), require the operations center to notify the appropriate Federal Security Director of the request for expedited passenger screening services, as described in subsection (a), for that member or veteran.

''(d) TRAINING.—The Assistant Secretary shall integrate training on the protocols established under subsection (c) into the training provided to all employees who will regularly provide the passenger screening services described in subsection (a).

''(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall affect the authority of the Assistant Secretary to require additional screening of a severely injured or disabled member of the Armed Forces, a severely injured or disabled veteran, or their accompanying family members or nonmedical attendants, if intelligence, law enforcement, or other information indicates that additional screening is necessary.

''(f) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, and annually thereafter, the Assistant Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the implementation of this section. Each report shall include each of the following:

''(1) Information on the training provided under subsection (d).

''(2) Information on the consultations between the Assistant Secretary and the organizations identified under subsection (a).

''(3) The number of people who accessed the operations center during the period covered by the report.

''(4) Such other information as the Assistant Secretary determines is appropriate.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter I of chapter 449 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 44926 the following new item:

''44927. Expedited screening for severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans.''.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on August 1, 2013, at 9:30 a.m., in room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on August 1, 2013, at 10:15 a.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on August 1, 2013, at 9:30 a.m. in SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct an executive business meeting.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL AND CONTRACTING OVERSIGHT

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs' Subcommittee on Financial and Contracting Oversight be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on August 1, 2013, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Mismanagement of POW/MIA Accounting.''

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT, FEDERAL RIGHTS, AND AGENCY ACTION

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Oversight, Federal Rights, and Agency Action, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on August 1, 2013, at 2 p.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Justice Delayed: The Human Cost of Regulatory Paralysis.''

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

FOREIGN TRAVEL FINANCIAL REPORTS

In accordance with the appropriate provisions of law, the Secretary of the Senate herewith submits the following reports for standing committees of the Senate, certain joint committees of the Congress, delegations and groups, and select and special committees of the Senate, relating to expenses incurred in the performance of authorized foreign travel:

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION AND FORESTRY FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2013

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Jonathan Cordone:									
United States	Dollar				8,641.70				8,641.70
Australia	Dollar		800.00						800.00
New Zealand	Dollar		1,281.64						1,281.64
Vietnam	Dong		1,028.01						1,028.01
* Delegation Expenses:									
Australia	Dollar						576.63		576.63
New Zealand	Dollar						160.65		160.65
Vietnam	Dong						67.32		67.32
Senator William Cowan:									
Israel	New Shekel		476.00						476.00
Turkey	Lira		426.00						426.00
Jordan	Dinar		382.52						382.52
Valerie Young:									
Israel	New Shekel		476.00						476.00
Turkey	Lira		426.00						426.00
Jordan	Dinar		382.52						382.52
* Delegation Expenses:									
Israel	New Shekel						638.20		638.20
Turkey	Lira						1,615.61		1,615.61
Jordan	Dinar						586.70		586.70
Total			5,678.69		8,641.70		3,645.11		17,965.50

* Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State and the Department of Defense under the authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR DEBBIE STABENOW,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry, July 29, 2013.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2013

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator John Hoeven:									
Jordan	Dinar		382.52						382.52
Israel	Shekel		476.00						476.00
Turkey	Lira		426.00						426.00
Don Larson:									
Jordan	Dinar		382.52						382.52
Israel	Shekel		476.00						476.00
Turkey	Lira		426.00						426.00
Timothy Rieser:									
Cuba	Peso				449.00		20.00		469.00
United States	Dollar				599.80		25.00		624.80
Senator Thad Cochran:									
Israel	Shekel		1,092.00						1,092.00
Oman	Rial		837.67						837.67
Azerbaijan	Manat		782.76						782.76
Romania	Leu		286.44						286.44
Czech Republic	Koruna		457.19						457.19
Kay Webber:									
Israel	Shekel		1,092.00						1,092.00
Oman	Rial		837.67						837.67
Azerbaijan	Manat		782.76						782.76
Romania	Leu		286.44						286.44
Czech Republic	Koruna		457.19						457.19
Paul Grove:									
Iraq	Dinar		35.00						35.00
Turkey	Lira		759.30						759.30
United States	Dollar				3,622.00				3,622.00
Adam Yezerski:									
Iraq	Dinar		35.00						35.00

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2013—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Turkey	Lira		759.30						759.30
United States	Dollar				3,976.00				3,976.00
Paul Grove:									
Afghanistan	Afghani		84.00		300.00				384.00
Pakistan	Rupee		200.00						200.00
United States	Dollar				6,860.40				6,860.40
Adam Yezerski:									
Afghanistan	Afghani		84.00		300.00				384.00
Pakistan	Rupee		200.00						200.00
United States	Dollar				6,860.40				6,860.40
Senator Richard Shelby:									
England	Pound Sterling		2,687.10						2,687.10
France	Euro		1,907.74						1,907.74
United States	Dollar				13,114.80				13,114.80
Senator Thad Cochran:									
England	Pound Sterling		1,230.00						1,230.00
France	Euro		1,120.00						1,120.00
United States	Dollar				13,114.80				13,114.80
Stewart Holmes:									
England	Pound Sterling		1,343.56						1,343.56
France	Euro		899.57						899.57
United States	Dollar				13,323.80				13,323.80
William Duhnke:									
England	Pound Sterling		1,395.15						1,395.15
France	Euro		1,747.55						1,747.55
United States	Dollar				13,114.80				13,114.80
Anne Caldwell:									
England	Pound Sterling		1,395.15						1,395.15
France	Euro		1,747.55						1,747.55
United States	Dollar				13,114.80				13,114.80
Kay Webber:									
England	Pound Sterling		1,230.00						1,230.00
France	Euro		1,120.00						1,120.00
United States	Dollar				13,114.80				13,114.80
Senator Richard Shelby:									
France	Euro		4,681.34						4,681.34
United States	Dollar				10,706.10				10,706.10
Senator Thad Cochran:									
France	Euro		4,548.00						4,548.00
United States	Dollar				11,474.10				11,474.10
Senator Barbara Mikulski:									
France	Euro		4,548.00						4,548.00
United States	Dollar				10,706.10				10,706.10
Senator Tom Harkin:									
France	Euro		948.00						948.00
United States	Dollar				11,794.54				11,794.54
Gabrielle Batkin:									
France	Euro		4,548.00						4,548.00
United States	Dollar				10,706.10				10,706.10
Stewart Holmes:									
France	Euro		4,548.00						4,548.00
United States	Dollar				10,706.10				10,706.10
Brian Potts:									
France	Euro		4,548.00						4,548.00
United States	Dollar				11,474.10				11,474.10
Jacqui Russell:									
France	Euro		4,548.00						4,548.00
United States	Dollar				10,706.10				10,706.10
Jeremy Weirich:									
France	Euro		4,548.00						4,548.00
United States	Dollar				10,706.10				10,706.10
Anne Caldwell:									
France	Euro		4,548.00						4,548.00
United States	Dollar				10,722.70				10,722.70
Kay Webber:									
France	Euro		4,548.00						4,548.00
United States	Dollar				10,706.10				10,706.10
*Delegation Expenses:									
France	Euro				21,757.30		22,093.40		43,850.70
Iraq	Dinar				2,050.00				2,050.00
Israel	Shekel				241.70		396.50		638.20
Jordan	Dinar				86.10		70.20		156.30
Turkey	Lira				865.20		1,072.90		1,938.10
Total			76,022.47		247,273.84		23,678.00		346,974.31

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under the authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR BARBARA MIKULSKI,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, July 30, 2013.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2013

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Michael J. Kuiken:									
United States	Dollar				9,507.72				9,507.72
Germany	Euro		245.00						245.00
Mali	Franc		478.14						478.14
Djibouti	Franc		614.08		8.48		281.21		903.77
Thomas W. Goffus:									
United States	Dollar				9,417.72				9,417.72
Germany	Euro		270.00						270.00
Mali	Franc		498.17						498.17
Djibouti	Franc		614.08						614.08
Senator Kirsten Gillibrand:									
United States	Dollar		111.27				9.60		120.87
Jordan	Dinar		154.35				7.36		161.71

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2013—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Israel	Shekel		133.05						133.05
Turkey	Lira		140.37						140.37
Elana Broitman:									
United States	Dollar		111.27				7.36		118.63
Jordan	Dinar		141.09						141.09
Israel	Shekel		133.05						133.05
Turkey	Lira		152.64				10.59		163.23
Jess Fassler:									
United States	Dollar		118.18				7.36		125.54
Jordan	Dinar		133.18						133.18
Israel	Shekel		133.05						133.05
Turkey	Lira		155.87						155.87
Senator Lindsey Graham:									
United States	Dollar		111.27				7.36		118.63
Jordan	Dinar		133.18						133.18
Israel	Shekel		156.77						156.77
Turkey	Lira		130.00						130.00
Matthew Rimkunas:									
United States	Dollar		111.27				22.36		133.63
Jordan	Dinar		133.18						133.18
Israel	Shekel		156.77						156.77
Turkey	Lira		130.00						130.00
Andrew King:									
United States	Dollar		111.27				22.36		133.63
Jordan	Dinar		133.18						133.18
Israel	Shekel		156.77						156.77
Turkey	Lira		130.00						130.00
* Delegation Expenses:									
Jordan	Dinar				258.24		210.67		468.91
Turkey	Lira				900.15		1,384.66		2,284.81
Israel	Shekel				725.09		1,189.51		1,914.60
William G. P. Monahan:									
United States	Dollar				5,497.80				5,497.80
Turkey	Lira		196.31						196.31
Jordan	Dinar		255.69						255.69
Iraq	Dinar		111.00				15.00		126.00
Thomas W. Goffus:									
United States	Dollar				3,155.48				3,155.48
Turkey	Lira		707.86						707.86
Jordan	Dinar		285.96						285.96
Iraq	Dinar		111.00						111.00
Senator Joe Donnelly:									
Turkey	Lira		313.00						313.00
Pakistan	Rupee		180.00						180.00
Afghanistan	Afghani		78.00						78.00
Germany	Euro		194.00						194.00
Marta McLellan Ross:									
Turkey	Lira		313.00						313.00
Pakistan	Rupee		180.00						180.00
Afghanistan	Afghani		78.00						78.00
Germany	Euro		180.00						180.00
* Delegation Expenses:									
Turkey	Lira				181.16		761.13		942.29
Pakistan	Rupee				78.32		167.11		245.43
Senator John McCain:									
United States	Dollar				10,573.20				10,573.20
Germany	Euro		206.00						206.00
Senator Roger Wicker:									
France	Euro		729.91		20.99				750.90
Joseph G. Lai:									
France	Euro		613.10						613.10
Senator James M. Inhofe:									
France	Euro		298.68						298.68
* Delegation Expenses:									
France	Euro				4,242.90		4,588.20		8,831.10
Senator John McCain:									
Jordan	Dinar		25.80						25.80
Turkey	Lira		395.94						395.94
Yemen	Rial		130.00						130.00
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		273.26						273.26
United States	Dollar				20,733.20				20,733.20
Christian D. Brose:									
Jordan	Dinar		897.90						897.90
Turkey	Lira		458.74						458.74
Yemen	Rial		290.00						290.00
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		465.26						465.26
United States	Dollar				18,112.70				18,112.70
Margaret Goodlander:									
Jordan	Dinar		868.83						868.83
Turkey	Lira		458.74						458.74
Yemen	Rial		290.00						290.00
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		431.48						431.48
United States	Dollar				18,112.70				18,112.70
* Delegation Expenses:									
United Arab Emirates	Dirham				209.92		734.00		943.92
Turkey	Lira				350.00		4,876.71		5,226.71
Jordan	Dinar				571.12		4,834.89		5,406.01
Senator John McCain:									
United States	Dollar				11,399.20				11,399.20
Mali	Franc		215.64						215.64
Tunisia	Dinar		445.36						445.36
Christian D. Brose:									
United States	Dollar				12,259.20				12,259.20
Mali	Franc		162.00						162.00
Tunisia	Dinar		149.00						149.00
Libya	Dinar		149.00						149.00
Margaret Goodlander:									
United States	Dollar				11,173.80				11,173.80
Mali	Franc		385.00						385.00
Tunisia	Dinar		220.00						220.00
* Delegation Expenses:									
Tunisia	Dinar				311.60		1,101.67		1,413.27
Mali	Franc				583.79				583.79

Total		17,673.96		138,384.48		20,239.11		176,297.55	

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State and the Department of Defense under the authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR CARL LEVIN,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, July 25, 2013.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2013

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Isaiah Akin:									
Angola	Kwanza		604.00						604.00
Gabon	Dollar		904.79						904.79
Republic of Congo	Dollar		1,070.00						1,070.00
United States	Dollar				16,752.12				16,752.12
John Dickas:									
Angola	Kwanza		476.00						476.00
Gabon	Dollar		787.79						787.79
Republic of Congo	Dollar		971.00						971.00
United States	Dollar				16,752.12				16,752.12
Clayton Allen:									
Angola	Kwanza		614.00						614.00
Gabon	Dollar		805.75						805.75
Republic of Congo	Dollar		1,080.00						1,080.00
United States	Dollar				16,752.12				16,752.12
*Delegation Expenses:									
Gabon	Dollar						352.82		352.82
Republic of Congo	Dollar						540.00		540.00
Total		7,313.33		50,256.36		892.82			58,462.51

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State and the Department of Defense under the authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR RON WYDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, July 18, 2013.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FINANCE FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2013

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Bruce Hirsh:									
Australia	Dollar		744.43						744.43
New Zealand	Dollar		553.05						533.05
Vietnam	Dong		1,017.18						1,017.18
United States	Dollar				23,532.20				23,532.20
Hun Quach:									
Australia	Dollar		663.17						663.17
New Zealand	Dollar		636.34						636.34
Vietnam	Dong		904.54						904.54
United States	Dollar				40,427.30				40,427.30
Chelsea Thomas;									
Australia	Dollar		732.05						732.05
New Zealand	Dollar		624.53						624.53
Vietnam	Dong		1,043.00						1,043.00
United States	Dollar				21,666.30				21,666.30
Paul Poteet:									
Australia	Dollar		753.70						753.70
New Zealand	Dollar		504.77						504.77
Vietnam	Dong		876.75						876.75
United States	Dollar				38,792.30				38,792.30
Erin Gulick:									
Australia	Dollar		766.85						766.85
New Zealand	Dollar		568.59						568.59
Vietnam	Dong		993.43						993.43
United States	Dollar				21,857.30				21,857.30
Mark Libell:									
Australia	Dollar		651.78						651.78
New Zealand	Dollar		523.83						523.83
Vietnam	Dong		981.50						981.50
United States	Dollar				23,507.20				23,507.20
Chris Slevin:									
Australia	Dollar		701.31						701.31
New Zealand	Dollar		558.20						558.20
Vietnam	Dong		852.25						852.25
United States	Dollar				33,475.40				33,475.40
Ann Hawks:									
Australia	Dollar		746.19						746.19
New Zealand	Dollar		587.30						587.30
United States	Dollar				5,630.00				5,630.00
Chris Sullivan:									
Australia	Dollar		795.84						795.84
New Zealand	Dollar		479.88						479.88
Vietnam	Dong		951.30						951.30
United States	Dollar				32,562.40				32,562.40
Amber Sechrist:									
Australia	Dollar		744.08						744.08
New Zealand	Dollar		594.54						594.54
Vietnam	Dong		925.29						925.29
United States	Dollar				27,588.20				27,588.20
Eric Toy:									
Australia	Dollar		696.04						696.04
New Zealand	Dollar		524.50						524.50
Vietnam	Dong		984.82						984.82
United States	Dollar				31,324.50				31,324.50
William Ghent:									
Australia	Dollar		682.24						682.24
New Zealand	Dollar		568.81						568.81
Vietnam	Dong		881.58						881.58
United States	Dollar				23,532.20				23,532.20
Katherine Monge:									
Australia	Dollar		757.02						757.02

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FINANCE FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2013—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
New Zealand	Dollar		593.20						593.20
Vietnam	Dong		975.80						975.80
United States	Dollar				23,597.30				23,597.30
Gregory Kalbaugh:									
Australia	Dollar		737.14						737.14
New Zealand	Dollar		538.64						538.64
Vietnam	Dong		863.27						863.27
United States	Dollar				34,785.30				34,785.30
Jennifer McClosky:									
Australia	Dollar		759.12						759.12
New Zealand	Dollar		610.17						610.17
Vietnam	Dong		933.85						933.85
United States	Dollar				27,581.50				27,581.50
*Delegation Expenses:									
United States	Dollar				9,506.22		3,299.88		12,806.10
Total			32,581.87		419,365.62		3,299.88		455,247.37

*Delegation expenses include, transportation, security, embassy overtime, official functions, as well as other official expenses in accordance with the responsibilities of the host country.

SENATOR MAX BAUCUS,
Chairman, Committee on Finance, June 17, 2013.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2013

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator John Barrasso:									
Israel	Shekel		1,108.29						1,108.29
Oman	Rial		627.36						627.36
Azerbaijan	New Manat		544.63						544.63
Romania	New Leu		151.22						151.22
Republic of Czechoslovakia	Koruna		352.76						352.76
*Delegation Expenses:									
Israel	Shekel						500.63		500.63
Oman	Rial						431.84		431.84
Azerbaijan	New Manat						390.89		390.89
Romania	New Leu						443.84		443.84
Republic of Czechoslovakia	Czech Koruna						294.16		294.16
Senator Benjamin Cardin:									
China	Yuan		1,013.83						1,013.83
Korea	Won		498.52						498.52
Japan	Yen		918.66						918.66
United States	Dollar				17,719.70				17,719.70
Algene Sajery:									
China	Yuan		1,318.20						1,318.20
Korea	Won		651.36						651.36
Japan	Yen		760.86						760.86
United States	Dollar				17,719.70				17,719.70
*Delegation Expenses:									
China	Yuan						3,561.93		3,561.93
Korea	Won						667.71		667.71
Japan	Yen						4,479.69		4,479.69
Senator Robert Casey:									
Turkey	Lira		521.51						521.51
Egypt	Pound		185.88						185.88
Israel	Shekel		824.00						824.00
United States	Dollar				11,591.97				11,591.97
Damian Murphy:									
Turkey	Lira		475.26						475.26
Egypt	Pound		174.00						174.00
Israel	Shekel		824.00						824.00
United States	Dollar				12,763.97				12,763.97
*Delegation Expenses:									
Turkey	Lira						3,132.09		3,132.09
Egypt	Pound						339.00		339.00
Israel	Shekel						6,873.17		6,873.17
Senator Robert Menendez:									
El Salvador	Dollar		341.00						341.00
Honduras	Lempira		273.90						273.90
Guatemala	Quetzal		397.08						397.08
United States	Dollar				2,641.13				2,641.13
Daniel O'Brien:									
El Salvador	Dollar		531.00						531.00
Honduras	Lempira		240.90						240.90
Guatemala	Quetzal		547.57						547.57
United States	Dollar				1,285.13				1,285.13
Jodi Herman:									
El Salvador	Dollar		396.80						396.80
Honduras	Lempira		223.90						223.90
Guatemala	Quetzal		175.93						175.93
United States	Dollar				1,590.13				1,590.13
Emily Mendrala:									
El Salvador	Dollar		411.00						411.00
Honduras	Lempira		273.90						273.90
Guatemala	Quetzal		471.54						471.54
United States	Dollar				1,285.13				1,285.13
*Delegation Expenses:									
El Salvador	Dollar						1,845.61		1,845.61
Honduras	Lempira						1,046.06		1,046.06
Guatemala	Quetzal						2,627.00		2,627.00
Senator Robert Menendez:									
Jordan	Dinar		896.73						896.73
Israel	Shekel		1,950.19						1,950.19
United States	Dollar				9,131.97				9,131.97
Daniel O'Brien:									
Jordan	Dinar		913.42						913.42
Israel	Shekel		2,252.00						2,252.00
United States	Dollar				9,329.97				9,329.97

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2013—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Ilan Goldenberg:									
Jordan	Dinar		913.42						913.42
Israel	Shekel		2,049.00						2,049.00
United States	Dollar				9,329.97				9,329.97
Jodi Herman:									
Jordan	Dinar		882.73						882.73
Israel	Shekel		2,014.87						2,014.87
United States	Dollar				9,329.97				9,329.97
*Delegation Expenses:									
Jordan	Dinar						5,406.01		5,406.01
Israel	Shekel						9,701.97		9,701.97
Senator Christopher Murphy:									
Turkey	Lira		340.20						340.20
Afghanistan	Dollar		36.00						36.00
Pakistan	Rupee		36.00						36.00
Germany	Euro		89.25						89.25
Jessica Elledge:									
Turkey	Lira		531.20						531.20
Pakistan	Rupee		127.00						127.00
Afghanistan	Dollar		27.00						27.00
Germany	Euro		180.25						180.25
*Delegation Expenses:									
Turkey	Dollar						942.29		942.29
Pakistan	Rupee						184.51		184.51
Jamil Jaffer:									
Saudi Arabia	Riyal		861.00						861.00
Yemen	Rial		392.00						392.00
Qatar	Riyal		503.62						503.62
United States	Dollar				4,825.10				4,825.10
Tamara Klajn:									
Saudi Arabia	Riyal		748.00						748.00
Yemen	Rial		420.00						420.00
Qatar	Riyal		606.00						606.00
United States	Dollar				4,205.10				4,205.10
*Delegation Expenses:									
Saudi Arabia	Riyal						374.59		374.59
Qatar	Riyal						147.24		147.24
Caleb McCarry:									
Guatemala	Dollar		841.00						841.00
United States	Dollar				754.50				754.50
Caroline Vik:									
Guatemala	Dollar		882.00						882.00
United States	Dollar				754.50				754.50
*Delegation Expenses:									
Guatemala	Dollar						3,248.00		3,248.00
Stacie Oliver:									
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		976.99						976.99
Republic of Czechoslovakia	Dinar		100.00						100.00
United States	Dollar				4,091.40				4,091.40
*Delegation Expenses:									
United Arab Emirates	Dirham						467.31		467.31
Michael Schiffer:									
Taiwan	TWD		596.71						596.71
Philippines	PHP		422.48						422.48
Singapore	Dollar		1,912.13						1,912.13
Indonesia	IDR		773.12						773.12
United States	Dollar				4,922.10				4,922.10
Carolyn Leddy:									
Taiwan	TWD		393.69						393.69
Philippines	PHP		313.74						313.74
Singapore	Dollar		1,602.40						1,602.40
Indonesia	IDR		562.37						562.37
United States	Dollar				6,016.30				6,016.30
*Delegation Expenses:									
Taiwan	TWD						408.08		408.08
Indonesia	IDR						389.00		389.00
Total			41,381.37		129,287.74		47,902.62		218,571.73

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State and the Department of Defense under the authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR ROBERT MENENDEZ,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, July 25, 2013.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2013

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
*Senator Heidi Heitkamp:									
Turkey	Lira		378.20						378.20
Pakistan	Rupee		81.17						81.17
Afghanistan	Afghani		6.00						6.00
Germany	Euro		127.61						127.61
Senator Tammy Baldwin:									
Turkey	Lira		517.20						517.20
Pakistan	Rupee		200.31						200.31
Afghanistan	Afghani		64.00						64.00
Germany	Euro		188.00						188.00
Rory Steele:									
Turkey	Lira		317.20						317.20
Pakistan	Rupee		140.31						140.31
Afghanistan	Afghani		6.00						6.00
Germany	Euro		117.18						117.18
Will Hansen:									
Turkey	Lira		517.20						517.20
Pakistan	Rupee		200.31						200.31
Afghanistan	Afghani		38.00						38.00
Germany	Euro		94.40						94.40

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2013—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Total			2,993.09						2,993.09

*The CODEL traveled via military air.

SENATOR THOMAS R. CARPER,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs,
July 29, 2013.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY FOR TRAVEL FROM APRIL 1 TO JUNE 30, 2013

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Amy Klobuchar:									
Jordan	Dinar		355.72						355.72
Israel	Shekel		487.76						487.76
Turkey	Lira		517.73						517.73
Brian Burton:									
Jordan	Dinar		342.46						342.46
Israel	Shekel		449.35						449.35
Turkey	Lira		517.73						517.73
*Delegation Exprenses:									
Jordan	Dinar		156.30						156.30
Israel	Shekel		1,656.86						1,656.86
Turkey	Dinar		652.81						652.81
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse:									
United States	Dollar				12,233.20				12,233.20
Mali	Franc		211.64						211.64
Tunisia	Dinar		751.30						751.30
*Delegation Expenses:									
Mali	Franc		194.60						194.60
Tunisia	Dinar		471.09						471.09
Libya	Dinar		273.01						273.01
Total			7,038.36		12,233.20				19,271.56

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State and the Department of Defense under the authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR PATRICK J. LEAHY,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, July 25, 2013.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2013

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Dianne Feinstein			65.00						65.00
Senator Saxby Chambliss			750.50						750.50
	Dollar				9,126,50				9,126.50
David Grannis			499.30						499.30
	Dollar				11,212,27				11,212.27
Martha Scott Poindexter			1,649.82						1,649.82
	Dollar				10,713,27				10,713.27
Senator Saxby Chambliss			3,456.06						3,456.06
Senator Richard Burr			3,456.06						3,456.06
Martha Scott Poindexter			3,456.06						3,456.06
Kate Vickers			3,456.06						3,456.06
Tyler Stephens			3,456.06						3,456.06
Christian Cook			3,456.06						3,456.06
Brian Miller			1,289.26						1,289.26
Total			24,990.24		31,052.04				56,042.28

SENATOR DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
Chairman, Committee on Intelligence, July 11, 2013.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2013

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Shelly Han:									
Australia	Dollar		2,180.00						2,180.00
United States	Dollar				1,907.10				1,907.10
Ukraine	Hryvnia		1,467.35						1,467.35
United States	Dollar				2,474.30				2,474.30
Janice Helwig:									
Austria	Euro		4,580.53						4,580.53
Allison Hollabaugh:									
Ukraine	Hryvnia		926.01						926.01
United States	Dollar				2,481.10				2,481.10
Alex Johnson:									
Albania	Lek		858.00						858.00
United States	Dollar				1,266.90				1,266.90
Albania	Lek		1,340.00						1,340.00
United States	Dollar				1,266.90				1,266.90
Austria	Euro		22,092.71						22,092.71

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2013—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
United States	Dollar				3,785.90				3,785.90
Winsome Packer:									
Austria	Euro		2,320.00						2,320.00
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Mark		585.00						585.00
Serbia	Dinar		216.00						216.00
United States	Dollar				3,653.50				3,653.50
France	Euro		1,728.09						1,728.09
United States	Dollar				3,782.10				3,782.10
Erika Schlager:									
Austria	Euro		1,011.24						1,011.24
Bulgaria	Lev		1,012.00						1,012.00
United States	Dollar				3,094.90				3,094.90
Mischa Thompson:									
Belgium	Euro		649.63						649.63
France	Euro		324.82						324.82
United States	Dollar				1,873.80				1,873.80
Total			41,291.38		25,586.50				66,877.88

SENATOR BENJAMIN L. CARDIN,
Chairman, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe,
July 17, 2013.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), OFFICE OF THE REPUBLICAN LEADER FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2013

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Thomas Hawkins:									
Israel	Shekel		356.00				720.00		1,076.00
Oman	Rial		261.93				459.64		721.57
Azerbaijan	Manat		278.00				499.87		777.87
Romania	Leu		140.00				148.31		288.31
Czech Republic	Crown		186.00				275.00		461.00
Dr. Brian Monahan:									
Israel	Shekel		69.00				720.00		789.00
Oman	Rial		91.02				459.64		550.66
Azerbaijan	Manat		278.00				499.87		777.87
Romania	Leu		140.00				148.31		288.31
Czech Republic	Crown		186.00				275.00		461.00
Total			1,985.95				4,205.64		6,191.59

SENATOR MITCH McCONNELL,
Republican Leader, July 23, 2013.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, September 9, 2013, at 5 p.m., the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 184 and 185; that there be 30 minutes for debate equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nominations in the order listed; the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

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

Mr. REID. Madam President, an example of the work done by others, I will read this material—I will read it and people see me making this consent request. But people have spent weeks arriving at this. That is what I talked about a few minutes ago. It is remarkable, the work done for us by others.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 199, 200, 202, 210 through 218, 222, 225 through 240, 243 through 247, 249 through 302, 304, 305, 306, 308 through 326, and all nominations on the Secretary's desk in the Air Force, Army, Navy; that the nominations be confirmed en bloc, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid on the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to any of the nominations; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that President Obama be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Janet Lorraine LaBreck, of Massachusetts, to be Commissioner of the Rehabilitation Services Administration, Department of Education.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

Cynthia L. Attwood, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission for a term expiring April 27, 2019.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Stuart F. Delery, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION

Richard T. Metsger, of Oregon, to be a Member of the National Credit Union Administration Board for a term expiring August 2, 2017.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Jason Furman, of New York, to be a Member and Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Mary Jo White, of New York, to be Member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for a term expiring June 5, 2019.

Kara Marlene Stein, of Maryland, to be Member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for a term expiring June 5, 2017.

Michael Sean Piwowar, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for a term expiring June 5, 2018.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES

Gerald Lyn Early, of Missouri, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2018.

Daniel Iwao Okimoto, of California, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2018.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Daniel Brooks Baer, of Colorado, to be U.S. Representative to the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, with the rank of Ambassador.

Douglas Edward Lute, of Indiana, to be United States Permanent Representative on the Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

Catherine M. Russell, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador at Large for Global Women's Issues.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

Katherine H. Tachau, of Iowa, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2018.

UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE

Stephen J. Hadley, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the United States institute of Peace for a term of four years.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

John Unsworth, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2016.

Dorothy Kosinski, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2016.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

Davita Vance-Cooks, of Virginia, to be Public Printer.

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

F. Scott Kieff, of Illinois, to be a Member of the United States International Trade Commission for the term expiring June 16, 2020.

UNITED STATES TAX COURT

Joseph W. Nega, of Illinois, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court for a term of fifteen years.

Michael B. Thornton, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court for a term of fifteen years.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Robert Bonnie, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture for Natural Resources and Environment.

Krysta L. Harden, of Georgia, to be Deputy Secretary of Agriculture.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF BUILDING SCIENCES

Timothy Hyungrock Haahs, of Pennsylvania, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the National Institute of Building Sciences for a term expiring September 7, 2014.

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

Jannette Lake Dates, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2016.

Bruce M. Ramer, of California, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2018.

Brent Franklin Nelsen, of South Carolina, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2016.

Howard Abel Husock, of New York, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2018.

Loretta Cheryl Sutliff, of Nevada, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2018.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Mark E. Schaefer, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere.

AMTRAK BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Thomas C. Carper, of Illinois, to be a Director of the Amtrak Board of Directors for a term of five years.

IN THE COAST GUARD

Pursuant to the authority of Section 271(d), Title 14, U.S. Code, the following officers for appointment to the grade indicated in the U.S. Coast Guard:

To be rear admiral

Bruce D. Baffer
Mark E. Butt
David R. Callahan
Stephen P. Metruck
Joseph A. Servidio

Pursuant to the authority of Section 12203(a), Title 10, U.S. Code, the following officers for appointment to the grade indicated in the U.S. Coast Guard Reserve:

To be rear admiral

Kurt B. Hinrichs

The following officer for appointment to the grade indicated in the U.S. Coast Guard pursuant to the authority of Section 271(d), Title 14, U.S. Code:

To be rear admiral

Richard T. Gromlich

Susan J. Rabern, of Kansas, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

Dennis V. McGinn, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

ARMY

The following named officer for reappointment as the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and appointment to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 152 and 601:

To be general

Gen. Martin E. Dempsey

NAVY

The following named officer for reappointment as the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and appointment to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., sections 601 and 154:

To be admiral

Adm. James A. Winnefeld, Jr.

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be admiral

Adm. Cecil E.D. Haney

ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Curtis M. Scaparrotti

AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Stephen W. Wilson

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10 U.S.C., section 601:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Robin Rand

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Russell J. Handy

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 brigadier general

Col. Roger L. Nye

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C. section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. David L. Mann

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Raymond A. Thomas, III

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be brigadier general

Col. Marion Garcia

The following Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be brigadier general

Col. John W. Lathrop

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Edward C. Cardon

The following named officer for appointment as the Deputy Judge Advocate General, United States Army, and for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated in accordance with title 10, U.S.C., sections 3037 and 3064:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Thomas E. Ayres

The following named officer for appointment as the Judge Advocate General, United States Army and for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while serving as the Judge Advocate General in accordance with title 10, U.S.C., sections 3037 and 3064:

To be lieutenant general

Brig. Gen. Flora D. Darpino

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Michael S. Tucker

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade

indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 624, 3037, and 3064:

To be Brigadier General, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Col. Charles N. Pede

The following named officers for appointment to the grade indicated in the United States Army under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be brigadier general

Colonel Carl A. Alex
Colonel Christopher F. Bentley
Colonel James R. Blackburn
Colonel William M. Burleson, III
Colonel Christopher G. Cavoli
Colonel Paul A. Chamberlain
Colonel William E. Cole
Colonel Richard B. Dix
Colonel Jeffrey A. Farnsworth
Colonel Bryan P. Fenton
Colonel Patricia A. Frost
Colonel Douglas M. Gabram
Colonel Jeffrey A. Gabbert
Colonel John A. George
Colonel Randy A. George
Colonel Maria R. Gervais
Colonel David P. Glaser
Colonel Thomas C. Graves
Colonel John F. Haley
Colonel Peter L. Jones
Colonel Richard G. Kaiser
Colonel John S. Kem
Colonel Robert L. Marion
Colonel Dennis S. McKean
Colonel Frank M. Muth
Colonel Leopoldo A. Quintas, Jr.
Colonel Kurt J. Ryan
Colonel Mark C. Schwartz
Colonel Scott A. Spellmon
Colonel John P. Sullivan
Colonel Clarence D. Turner
Colonel Michael J. Warmack
Colonel Eric J. Wesley

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Kenneth E. Tovo

The following named officer appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Robert B. Abrams

The following Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Kevin L. McNeely

MARINE CORPS

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Marine Corps to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Thomas D. Waldhauser

NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Deborah P. Haven

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601; and for appointment as a Senior Member of the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations under title 10, U.S.C., Section 711:

To be vice admiral

Vice Adm. Frank C. Pandolfe

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be admiral

Vice Adm. Harry B. Harris, Jr.

The following named officer for appointment as Chief of Naval Personnel, United States Navy, and appointment to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., sections 601 and 5141:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. William F. Moran

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. James F. Caldwell, Jr.

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) David F. Baucom
Rear Adm. (lh) Vincent L. Griffith

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Colin G. Chinn
Rear Adm. (lh) Elaine C. Wagner

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Paul B. Becker
Rear Adm. (lh) Matthew J. Kohler
Rear Adm. (lh) Jan E. Tighe

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) David H. Lewis
Rear Adm. (lh) Thomas J. Moore
Rear Adm. (lh) James D. Syring

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) John C. Aquilino
Rear Adm. (lh) Peter J. Fanta
Rear Adm. (lh) David J. Gale
Rear Adm. (lh) Philip G. Howe
Rear Adm. (lh) William K. Lescher
Rear Adm. (lh) Mark C. Montgomery
Rear Adm. (lh) Frank A. Morneau
Rear Adm. (lh) Jeffrey R. Penfield
Rear Adm. (lh) Frederick J. Roegge
Rear Adm. (lh) Phillip G. Sawyer
Rear Adm. (lh) Michael S. White

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Russell E. Allen
Capt. William M. Crane
Capt. Thomas W. Marotta

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Vice Adm. Kurt W. Tidd

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Kenneth J. Iverson

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Morrell John Berry, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Australia.

Patricia Marie Haslach, of Oregon, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia.

Reuben Earl Brigety, II, of Florida, to be Representative of the United States of America to the African Union, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

Daniel A. Clune, of Maryland, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Lao People's Democratic Republic.

Patrick Hubert Gaspard, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of South Africa.

Stephanie Sanders Sullivan, of New York, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of the Congo.

Joseph Y. Yun, of Oregon, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Malaysia.

Linda Thomas-Greenfield, of Louisiana, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (African Affairs), vice Johnnie Carson.

James F. Entwistle, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federal Republic of Nigeria.

David D. Pearce, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Greece.

John B. Emerson, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federal Republic of Germany.

John Rufus Gifford, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Denmark.

Denise Campbell Bauer, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Belgium.

James Costos, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Spain.

James Costos, of California, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Andorra.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Avi Garbow, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

James J. Jones, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Administrator for Toxic Substances of the Environmental Protection Agency.

FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

Robert F. Cohen, Jr., of West Virginia, to be a Member of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission for a term of six years expiring August 30, 2018.

William Ira Althen, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission for a term of six years expiring August 30, 2018.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Catherine Elizabeth Lhamon, of California, to be Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, Department of Education.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

John H. Thompson, of the District of Columbia, to be Director of the Census for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 2016.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Harry R. Hoglander, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the National Mediation Board for a term expiring July 1, 2014.

Linda A. Puchala, of Maryland, to be a Member of the National Mediation Board for a term expiring July 1, 2015.

Nicholas Christopher Geale, of Virginia, to be a Member of the National Mediation Board for a term expiring July 1, 2016.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Matthew Winthrop Barzun, of Kentucky, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

David Hale, of New Jersey, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Lebanon.

Liliana Ayalde, of Maryland, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federative Republic of Brazile.

Kirk W.B. Wagar, of Florida, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Singapore.

Terence Patrick McCulley, of Washington, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Cote d'Ivoire.

James C. Swan, of California, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

John R. Phillips, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Italian Republic, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of San Marino.

Kenneth Francis Hackett, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Holy See.

Alexa Lange Wesner, of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Austria.

Daniel A. Sepulveda, of Florida, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Communications and Information Policy in the Bureau of Economic, Energy, and Business Affairs and U.S. Coordinator for International Communications and Information Policy.

BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Ryan Clark Crocker, of Washington, to be a Member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors for a term expiring August 13, 2013.

Ryan Clark Crocker, of Washington, to be a Member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors for a term expiring August 13, 2016.

Matthew C. Armstrong, of Illinois, to be a Member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors for a term expiring August 13, 2015.

Jeffrey Shell, of California, to be Chairman of the Broadcasting Board of Governors.

Jeffrey Shell, of California, to be a Member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors for a term expiring August 13, 2015.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE

PN278 AIR FORCE nominations (192) beginning WENDY J. BEAL, and ending JARED K. YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 9, 2013.

PN617 AIR FORCE nomination of Peter C. Rhee, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 26, 2013.

PN698 AIR FORCE nomination of Joseph M. Markusfeld, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24, 2013.

PN699 AIR FORCE nominations (15) beginning DEONDRA P. ASIKE, and ending GREGORY C. TROLLEY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24, 2013.

IN THE ARMY

PN580 ARMY nomination of Ronald E. Beresky, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 20, 2013.

PN581 ARMY nomination of James B. Collins, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 20, 2013.

PN584 ARMY nominations (2) beginning JONATHAN H. CODY, and ending JUSTIN M. MARCHESI, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 20, 2013.

PN609 ARMY nominations (4) beginning JOSEPH L. BIEHLER, and ending BIENVENIDO SERRANOCASTRO, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 24, 2013.

PN652 ARMY nomination of Dean C. Anderson, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9, 2013.

PN653 ARMY nomination of Christopher D. Perrin, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9, 2013.

PN654 ARMY nominations (61) beginning SHEENA L. ALLEN, and ending MIAO X. ZHOU, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9, 2013.

PN655 ARMY nominations (305) beginning COURTNEY L. ABRAHAM, and ending D011476, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9, 2013.

PN656 ARMY nominations (309) beginning CHRISTOPHER L. AARON, and ending NATHAN P. ZWINTSCHER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9, 2013.

PN657 ARMY nominations (333) beginning RICHARD R. ABELKIS, and ending G001407, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9, 2013.

PN658 ARMY nominations (536) beginning JOSEPH H. ALBRECHT, and ending D011309, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9, 2013.

PN700 ARMY nomination of Karl F. Meyer, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24, 2013.

PN701 ARMY nomination of Stephanie M. Price, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24, 2013.

PN702 ARMY nomination of Gregory C. Pedro, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24, 2013.

PN703 ARMY nomination of John H. Seok, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24, 2013.

PN704 ARMY nomination of Frederick C. Lough, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24, 2013.

PN705 ARMY nominations (2) beginning ADMIRADO A. LUZURIAGA, and ending JON KIEV, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24, 2013.

PN706 ARMY nominations (5) beginning WILLIAM G. HUBER, and ending MARK L. LEITSCHUH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24, 2013.

PN707 ARMY nomination of Curtis J. Alitz, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24, 2013.

PN709 ARMY nominations (5) beginning GUY R. BEAUDOIN, and ending REBECCA A. YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24, 2013.

IN THE NAVY

PN610 NAVY nomination of Jackie S. Fantes, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 24, 2013.

PN625 NAVY nomination of Doran T. Kelvington, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 27, 2013.

PN626 NAVY nominations (30) beginning ORENTHAL G. ADDERSON, and ending JOHN F. WARNER, III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 27, 2013.

PN659 NAVY nominations (17) beginning PHILIP B. BAGROW, and ending DAVID M. TODD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9, 2013.

PN660 NAVY nominations (20) beginning TANYA CRUZ, and ending JEANINE B. WOMBLE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9, 2013.

PN661 NAVY nominations (21) beginning RENE J. ALOVA, and ending JOYCE Y. TURNER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9, 2013.

PN662 NAVY nominations (28) beginning JAMES ALGER, and ending JASON N. WOOD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9, 2013.

PN663 NAVY nominations (33) beginning CHRISTOPHER W. ABBOTT, and ending LORENZO TARPLEY, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9, 2013.

PN664 NAVY nominations (46) beginning MARY R. ANKER, and ending GEORGINA L. ZUNIGA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9, 2013.

PN665 NAVY nominations (47) beginning LILLIAN A. ABUAN, and ending CHRISTOPHER R. ZEGLEY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9, 2013.

PN666 NAVY nominations (144) beginning ERIN G. ADAMS, and ending LUKE A. ZABROCKI, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9, 2013.

PN710 NAVY nomination of Timothy C. Moore, Jr., which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24, 2013.

PN711 NAVY nomination of Pierre A. Pelletier, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24, 2013.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the Senate consider the following nominations under the Privileged section of the Executive Calendar: Nominations PN 631, PN 632, and PN 667; that the nominations be confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid on the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nominations; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

PRIVILEGED NOMINATIONS

Ellen C. Herbst, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce, vice Scott Boyer Quehl, resigned.

Ellen C, Herbst, of Virginia, to be Chief Financial Officer, Department of Commerce, vice Scott Boyer Quehl, resigned.

Margaret Louise Cummisky, of Hawaii, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce, vice April S. Boyd, resigned.

NOMINATION OF SAMANTHA POWER TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SESSIONS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS DURING HER TENURE OF SERVICE AS REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination: Calendar No. 221; that the Senate proceed to vote with no intervening action or debate; the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Nomination of Samantha Power to be Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations during her tenure of service as Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Hearing no further debate, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Samantha Power to be Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations during her tenure of service as Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations?

The nomination was confirmed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

IMPROVE HYDROPOWER ACT AND HYDROPOWER DEVELOPMENT UNDER FEDERAL RECLAMATION

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consideration of the following bills en bloc: Calendar No. 71, H.R. 267, and Calendar No. 72, H.R. 678.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bills by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 267) to approve hydropower, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 678) to authorize all Bureau of Reclamation conduit facilities for hydropower development under Federal Reclamation law, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the bills en bloc.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the bills be read a third time and passed en bloc, and that the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

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

The bills (H.R. 267 and H.R. 678) were ordered to a third reading, were read the third time, and passed.

FOR VETS ACT of 2013

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to Calendar No. 155, H.R. 1171.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the title of the bill.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1171) to amend title 40, United States Code, to improve veterans service organizations access to Federal surplus personal property.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

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

The bill (H.R. 1171) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

HELPING HEROES FLY ACT

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Commerce Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1344, and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1344) to amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to provide expedited air passenger screening to severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. I further ask that the Pryor substitute amendment which is at the desk be agreed to, and the bill, as amended, be read the third time and passed, and that any motions to reconsider be considered made, with no intervening action or debate.

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

The amendment (No. 1848) was agreed to, as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Helping Heroes Fly Act''.

SEC. 2. OPERATIONS CENTER PROGRAM FOR SEVERELY INJURED OR DISABLED MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND SEVERELY INJURED OR DISABLED VETERANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 449 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 44927. Expedited screening for severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans

''(a) PASSENGER SCREENING.—The Assistant Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and organizations identified by the Secretaries of Defense and Veteran Affairs that advocate on behalf of severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans, shall develop and implement a process to support and facilitate the ease of travel and to the extent possible provide expedited passenger screening services for severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans through passenger screening. The process shall be designed to offer the individual private screening to the maximum extent practicable.

''(b) OPERATIONS CENTER.—As part of the process under subsection (a), the Assistant Secretary shall maintain an operations center to provide support and facilitate the movement of severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans through passenger screening prior to boarding a passenger aircraft operated by an air carrier or

foreign air carrier in air transportation or intrastate air transportation.

''(c) PROTOCOLS.—The Assistant Secretary shall—

''(1) establish and publish protocols, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and the organizations identified under subsection (a), under which a severely injured or disabled member of the Armed Forces or severely injured or disabled veteran, or the family member or other representative of such member or veteran, may contact the operations center maintained under subsection (b) and request the expedited passenger screening services described in subsection (a) for that member or veteran; and

''(2) upon receipt of a request under paragraph (1), require the operations center to notify the appropriate Federal Security Director of the request for expedited passenger screening services, as described in subsection (a), for that member or veteran.

''(d) TRAINING.—The Assistant Secretary shall integrate training on the protocols established under subsection (c) into the training provided to all employees who will regularly provide the passenger screening services described in subsection (a).

''(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall affect the authority of the Assistant Secretary to require additional screening of a severely injured or disabled member of the Armed Forces, a severely injured or disabled veteran, or their accompanying family members or nonmedical attendants, if intelligence, law enforcement, or other information indicates that additional screening is necessary.

''(f) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, and annually thereafter, the Assistant Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the implementation of this section. Each report shall include each of the following:

''(1) Information on the training provided under subsection (d).

''(2) Information on the consultations between the Assistant Secretary and the organizations identified under subsection (a).

''(3) The number of people who accessed the operations center during the period covered by the report.

''(4) Such other information as the Assistant Secretary determines is appropriate.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter I of chapter 449 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 44926 the following new item:

''44927. Expedited screening for severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans.''.

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

The bill (H.R. 1344), as amended, was read the third time and passed.

PIPELINE SAFETY REGULATORY DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2576.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2576) to amend title 49, United States Code, to modify requirements relating to the availability of pipeline safety regulatory documents, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (H.R. 2576) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ENCOURAGING PEACE AND REUNIFICATION ON THE KOREAN PENINSULA

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to H. Con. Res. 41.

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

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 41) encouraging peace and reunification on the Korean Peninsula.

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

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent 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 concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 41) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

AMENDING PUBLIC LAW 93–435

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to Calendar No. 109, S. 256.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 256) to amend Public Law 93–435 with respect to the Northern Mariana Islands, providing parity with Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment, as follows:

SECTION 1. AMENDMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The first section and section 2 of Public Law 93–435 (48 U.S.C. 1705, 1706) are amended by inserting ''the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands,'' after ''Guam,'' each place it appears.

Section 8103(b)(1)(B) of the Fair Minimum Wage Act of 2007 (29 U.S.C. 206 note; Public Law 110–28) is amended by striking ''2011'' and inserting ''2011, 2013, and 2015''.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendment be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed; and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

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

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill (S. 256), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 256

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. AMENDMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The first section and section 2 of Public Law 93–435 (48 U.S.C. 1705, 1706) are amended by inserting ''the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands,'' after ''Guam,'' each place it appears.

(b) REFERENCES TO DATE OF ENACTMENT.—For the purposes of the amendment made by subsection (a), each reference in Public Law 93–435 to the ''date of enactment'' shall be considered to be a reference to the date of the enactment of this section.

SEC. 2. ADJUSTMENT OF SCHEDULED WAGE INCREASES IN THE COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS.

Section 8103(b)(1)(B) of the Fair Minimum Wage Act of 2007 (29 U.S.C. 206 note; Public Law 110–28) is amended by striking ''2011'' and inserting ''2011, 2013, and 2015''.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Madam President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Nos. 156 through 160, all post office naming bills en bloc.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bills en bloc.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the bills be read a third time and passed en bloc, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc, with no intervening action or debate.

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

SPECIALIST CHRISTOPHER SCOTT POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (S. 233), to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 815 County Road 23 in Tyrone, New York, as the ''Specialist Christopher Scott Post Office Building,'' was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 233

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SPECIALIST CHRISTOPHER SCOTT POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 815 County Road 23 in Tyrone, New York, shall be known and designated as the ''Specialist Christopher Scott Post Office Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Specialist Christopher Scott Post Office Building''.

SECTION 1. SPECIALIST CHRISTOPHER SCOTT POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 815 County Road 23 in Tyrone, New York, shall be known and designated as the ''Specialist Christopher Scott Post Office Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Specialist Christopher Scott Post Office Building''.

STAFF SERGEANT NICHOLAS J. REID POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (S. 668), to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14 Main Street in Brockport, New York, as the ''Staff Sergeant Nicholas J. Reid Post Office Building,'' was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 668

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. STAFF SERGEANT NICHOLAS J. REID POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14 Main Street in Brockport, New York, shall be known and designated as the ''Staff Sergeant Nicholas J. Reid Post Office Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Staff Sergeant Nicholas J. Reid Post Office Building''.

JAMES R. BURGESS JR. POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (S. 796), to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 302 East Green Street in Champaign, Illinois, as the ''James R. Burgess Jr. Post Office Building,'' was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 796

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. JAMES R. BURGESS JR. POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 302 East Green Street in Champaign, Illinois, shall be known and designated as the ''James R. Burgess Jr. Post Office Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''James R. Burgess Jr. Post Office Building''.

THADDEUS STEVENS POST OFFICE

The bill (S. 885), to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 35 Park Street in Danville, Vermont, as the ''Thaddeus Stevens Post Office,'' was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 885

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. THADDEUS STEVENS POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 35 Park Street in Danville, Vermont, shall be known and designated as the ''Thaddeus Stevens Post Office''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Thaddeus Stevens Post Office''.

FIRST LIEUTENANT ALVIN CHESTER COCKRELL, JR. POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (S. 1093), to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 130 Caldwell Drive in Hazlehurst, Mississippi, as the ''First Lieutenant Alvin Chester Cockrell, Jr. Post Office Building,'' was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1093

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. FIRST LIEUTENANT ALVIN CHESTER COCKRELL, JR. POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 130 Caldwell Drive in Hazlehurst, Mississippi, shall be known and designated as the ''First Lieutenant Alvin Chester Cockrell, Jr. Post Office Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''First Lieutenant Alvin Chester Cockrell, Jr. Post Office Building''.

CELEBRATING THE 200TH AUGUST QUARTERLY FESTIVAL IN WILMINGTON, DELAWARE

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 199, and the Senate proceed to its consideration.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 199) celebrating the 200th August Quarterly Festival taking place from August 18, 2013, through August 25, 2013, in Wilmington, Delaware.

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

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 199) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of July 25, 2013, under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

ELECTING LAURA C. DOVE AS SECRETARY FOR THE MINORITY OF THE SENATE

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 216.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cherk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 216) electing Laura C. Dove, of Virginia, as Secretary for the Minority of the Senate.

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

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 216) was agreed to.

(The resolution is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

AMERICAN COLLEGE OF SURGEONS DAYS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 217.

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

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 217) expressing support for the designation of October 6, 2013, through October 10, 2013 as ''American College of Surgeons Days'' and recognizing the 100th anniversary of the founding of the organization.

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

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid on the table, with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 217) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES—H.R. 2642

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I understand the Chair, as previously authorized, is now ready to appoint the conferees to H.R. 2642.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Under the order of July 18, 2013, the Chair appoints Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BROWN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BENNET, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. HOEVEN conferees on the part of the Senate.

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, pursuant to Public Law 99–498, as amended by Public Law 110–315, appoints the following individuals to the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance: Michael Poliakoff of Virginia, vice David Gruen and Andrew Gillen of Washington, DC, vice William Luckey.

APPOINTMENTS AUTHORITY

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the upcoming recess or adjournment of the Senate, the President of the Senate, the President pro tempore and the majority and minority leaders be authorized to make appointments to commissions, committees, boards, conferences or interparliamentary conferences authorized by law, by concurrent action of the two Houses or by order of the Senate.

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

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO REPORT

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the Senate's recess, committees be authorized to report legislative matters and executive matters on Wednesday, September 4, from 11 a.m. to 1 p.m.

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

SIGNING AUTHORITY

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment or recess of the Senate Thursday, August 1, through Monday, September 9, Senators CARDIN and LEVIN be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills or joint resolutions.

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

EXPRESSIONS OF APPRECIATION

Mr. REID. Madam President, there are two things I wish to mention before we close.

First, the Presiding Officer has worked for years on an energy efficiency bill. We are finally going to be able to get to that. This is the first Energy bill we have had in, I think, 5 years.

It is a bipartisan piece of legislation, but the impetus behind this legislation is this Presiding Officer. I commend her, applaud her, and recognize how fortunate the people of New Hampshire are to have her as a Senator.

I also wish to mention the pages. This is their last day here. They have done a wonderful job. They do so much for us. There isn't a day goes by that they don't do something for me. I am sure the Senate feels the same way. I hope it has been a good experience for them.

I have had three grandchildren who have been pages, and it a great experience for them. I am confident the others feel the same way.

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, AUGUST 2, 2013, THROUGH MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 2013

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn and convene for pro forma sessions only with no business conducted on the following dates and times, and that following each pro forma session the Senate adjourn until the next pro forma session: Friday, August 2 at 11:45 a.m.; Tuesday, August 6 at 10:30 a.m.; Friday, August 9 at 12 p.m.; Tuesday, August 13 at 12 p.m.; Friday, August 16 at 12 p.m.; Tuesday, August 20 at 11:00 a.m.; Friday, August 23 at 12 p.m.; Tuesday, August 27 at 9 a.m.; Friday August 30 at 2 p.m.; Tuesday, September 3 at 9:15 a.m.; and Friday, September 6 at 5 p.m; and that the Senate adjourn on Friday, September 6, until 2 p.m.; that on Monday, September 9, 2013, unless the Senate receives a message from the House that it has adopted S. Con. Res. 22, the adjournment resolution, and that if the Senate receives such a message, the Senate adjourn until 12 p.m. on Monday, August 12, for a pro forma session only with no business conducted, pursuant to S. Con Res. 22, and that following the pro forma session, the Senate adjourn until 2:00 p.m. on Monday, September 9, 2013; that on Monday, following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; and that following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business until 5 p.m. with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each; that following morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar Nos. 184 and 185, under the previous order.

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

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. The next rollcall vote will be 5:30 p.m. on Monday, September 9, 2013.

CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT UNTIL FRIDAY, AUGUST 2, 2013, AT 11:45 A.M.

Mr. REID. 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 8:45 p.m., conditionally adjourned until Friday, August 2, at 11:45 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

THE JUDICIARY

MICHELLE T. FRIEDLAND, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT, VICE RAYMOND C. FISHER, RETIRED.

NANCY L. MORITZ, OF KANSAS, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT, VICE DEANELL REECE TACHA, RETIRED.

JOHN B. OWENS, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT, VICE STEPHEN S. TROTT, RETIRED.

CHRISTOPHER REID COOPER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, VICE ROYCE C. LAMBERTH, RETIRED.

DANIEL D. CRABTREE, OF KANSAS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS, VICE JOHN W. LUNGSTRUM, RETIRED.

SHERYL H. LIPMAN, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE, VICE JON P. MCCALLA, RETIRED.

GERALD AUSTIN MCHUGH, JR., OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, VICE HARVEY BARTLE, III, RETIRED.

M. DOUGLAS HARPOOL, OF MISSOURI, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI, VICE RICHARD E. DORR, DECEASED.

EDWARD G. SMITH, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, VICE BERLE M. SCHILLER, RETIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

GARY BLANKINSHIP, OF TEXAS, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE RUBEN MONZON, RESIGNED.

ROBERT L. HOBBS, OF TEXAS, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE JOHN LEE MOORE, TERM EXPIRED.

AMOS ROJAS, JR., OF FLORIDA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE CHRISTINA PHARO, TERM EXPIRED.

PETER C. TOBIN, OF OHIO, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE CATHY JO JONES, RESIGNED.

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

J. CHRISTOPHER GIANCARLO, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE A COMMISSIONER OF THE COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING APRIL 13, 2014, VICE JILL SOMMERS, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

DEBORAH LEE JAMES, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE, VICE MICHAEL BRUCE DONLEY, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

FRANK G. KLOTZ, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY FOR NUCLEAR SECURITY, VICE THOMAS P. D'AGOSTINO, RESIGNED.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

CHRISTOPHER A. HART, OF COLORADO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2017. (REAPPOINTMENT)

DEBORAH A. P. HERSMAN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD FOR A TERM OF TWO YEARS. (REAPPOINTMENT)

DEBORAH A. P. HERSMAN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2018. (REAPPOINTMENT)

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

MICHAEL P. O'RIELLY, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING JUNE 30, 2014, VICE ROBERT M. MCDOWELL, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

KATHRYN D. SULLIVAN, OF OHIO, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR OCEANS AND ATMOSPHERE, VICE JANE LUBCHENCO, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

STEVEN CROLEY, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, VICE GREGORY HOWARD WOODS.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

KAREN DYNAN, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, VICE JANICE EBERLY.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

R. GIL KERLIKOWSKE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE COMMISSIONER OF CUSTOMS, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, VICE ALAN D. BERSIN, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

JOHN ANDREW KOSKINEN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE FOR THE TERM EXPIRING NOVEMBER 12, 2017, VICE DOUGLAS H. SHULMAN, TERM EXPIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MATTHEW T. HARRINGTON, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE KINGDOM OF LESOTHO.

ANNE W. PATTERSON, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER AMBASSADOR, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (NEAR EASTERN AFFAIRS), VICE JEFFERY D. FELTMAN RESIGNED.

PAMELA K. HAMAMOTO, OF HAWAII, TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE OFFICE OF THE UNITED NATIONS AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS IN GENEVA, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR, VICE BETTY E. KING.

SARAH SEWALL, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE AN UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (CIVILIAN SECURITY, DEMOCRACY, AND HUMAN RIGHTS), VICE MARIA OTERO, RESIGNED.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

RICHARD F. GRIFFIN, JR., OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE RONALD E. MEISBURG, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

STEVAN EATON BUNNELL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, VICE IVAN K. FONG, RESIGNED.

FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS AUTHORITY

PATRICK PIZZELLA, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS AUTHORITY FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS EXPIRING JULY 1, 2015, VICE THOMAS M. BECK, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

SUZANNE ELEANOR SPAULDING, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, VICE RAND BEERS.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

PETER JOSEPH KADZIK, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL, VICE RONALD H. WEICH, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

LINDA A. SCHWARTZ, OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS, VICE RAUL PEREA–HENZE, RESIGNED.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 1, 2013:

THE JUDICIARY

RAYMOND T. CHEN, OF MARYLAND, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

JANET LORRAINE LABRECK, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE COMMISSIONER OF THE REHABILITATION SERVICES ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

CYNTHIA L. ATTWOOD, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING APRIL 27, 2019.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

STUART F. DELERY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL.

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION

RICHARD T. METSGER, OF OREGON, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING AUGUST 2, 2017.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

JASON FURMAN, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER AND CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

MARY JO WHITE, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JUNE 5, 2019.

KARA MARLENE STEIN, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JUNE 5, 2017.

MICHAEL SEAN PIWOWAR, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JUNE 5, 2018.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

GERALD LYN EARLY, OF MISSOURI, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2018.

DANIEL IWAO OKIMOTO, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2018.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DANIEL BROOKS BAER, OF COLORADO, TO BE U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO THE ORGANIZATION FOR SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR.

DOUGLAS EDWARD LUTE, OF INDIANA, TO BE UNITED STATES PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE ON THE COUNCIL OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION, WITH THE RANK AND STATUS OF AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY.

SAMANTHA POWER, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED NATIONS, WITH THE RANK AND STATUS OF AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY, AND THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN THE SECURITY COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

SAMANTHA POWER, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SESSIONS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS DURING HER TENURE OF SERVICE AS REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED NATIONS.

CATHERINE M. RUSSELL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR AT LARGE FOR GLOBAL WOMEN'S ISSUES.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

KATHERINE H. TACHAU, OF IOWA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2018.

UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE

STEPHEN J. HADLEY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

JOHN UNSWORTH, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2016.

DOROTHY KOSINSKI, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2016.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

DAVITA VANCE–COOKS, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE PUBLIC PRINTER.

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

F. SCOTT KIEFF, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION FOR THE TERM EXPIRING JUNE 16, 2020.

UNITED STATES TAX COURT

JOSEPH W. NEGA, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES TAX COURT FOR A TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS.

MICHAEL B. THORNTON, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES TAX COURT FOR A TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

ROBERT BONNIE, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE FOR NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT.

KRYSTA L. HARDEN, OF GEORGIA, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF BUILDING SCIENCES

TIMOTHY HYUNGROCK HAAHS, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF BUILDING SCIENCES FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 7, 2014.

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

JANNETTE LAKE DATES, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 31, 2016.

BRUCE M. RAMER, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 31, 2018.

BRENT FRANKLIN NELSEN, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 31, 2016.

HOWARD ABEL HUSOCK, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 31, 2018.

LORETTA CHERYL SUTLIFF, OF NEVADA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 31, 2018.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

MARK E. SCHAEFER, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR OCEANS AND ATMOSPHERE.

AMTRAK BOARD OF DIRECTORS

THOMAS C. CARPER, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A DIRECTOR OF THE AMTRAK BOARD OF DIRECTORS FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS.

IN THE COAST GUARD

PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF SECTION 271(D), TITLE 14, U.S. CODE, THE FOLLOWING OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE U.S. COAST GUARD:

To be rear admiral

BRUCE D. BAFFER
MARK E. BUTT
DAVID R. CALLAHAN
STEPHEN P. METRUCK
JOSEPH A. SERVIDIO

PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF SECTION 12203(A), TITLE 10, U.S. CODE, THE FOLLOWING OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE U.S. COAST GUARD RESERVE:

To be rear admiral

KURT B. HINRICHS

THE FOLLOWING OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE U.S. COAST GUARD PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF SECTION 271(D), TITLE 14, U.S. CODE:

To be rear admiral

RICHARD T. GROMLICH

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

SUSAN J. RABERN, OF KANSAS, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.

DENNIS V. MCGINN, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REAPPOINTMENT AS THE CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF AND APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 152 AND 601:

To be general

GEN. MARTIN E. DEMPSEY

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REAPPOINTMENT AS THE VICE CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF AND APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 154:

To be admiral

ADM. JAMES A. WINNEFELD, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be admiral

ADM. CECIL E.D. HANEY

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. CURTIS M. SCAPARROTTI

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. STEPHEN W. WILSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. ROBIN RAND

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. RUSSELL J. HANDY

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 brigadier general

COL. ROGER L. NYE

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. DAVID L. MANN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. RAYMOND A. THOMAS III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. MARION GARCIA

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. JOHN W. LATHROP

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. EDWARD C. CARDON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS THE DEPUTY JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL, UNITED STATES ARMY, AND FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN ACCORDANCE WITH TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 3037 AND 3064:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. THOMAS E. AYRES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL, UNITED STATES ARMY AND FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE SERVING AS THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL IN ACCORDANCE WITH TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 3037 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant general

BRIG. GEN. FLORA D. DARPINO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. MICHAEL S. TUCKER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624, 3037, AND 3064:

To be brigadier general, judge advocate general's corps

COL. CHARLES N. PEDE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COLONEL CARL A. ALEX
COLONEL CHRISTOPHER F. BENTLEY
COLONEL JAMES R. BLACKBURN
COLONEL WILLIAM M. BURLESON III
COLONEL CHRISTOPHER G. CAVOLI
COLONEL PAUL A. CHAMBERLAIN
COLONEL WILLIAM E. COLE
COLONEL RICHARD B. DIX
COLONEL JEFFREY A. FARNSWORTH
COLONEL BRYAN P. FENTON
COLONEL PATRICIA A. FROST
COLONEL DOUGLAS M. GABRAM
COLONEL JEFFREY A. GABBERT
COLONEL JOHN A. GEORGE
COLONEL RANDY A. GEORGE
COLONEL MARIA R. GERVAIS
COLONEL DAVID P. GLASER
COLONEL THOMAS C. GRAVES
COLONEL JOHN F. HALEY
COLONEL PETER L. JONES
COLONEL RICHARD G. KAISER
COLONEL JOHN S. KEM
COLONEL ROBERT L. MARION
COLONEL DENNIS S. MCKEAN
COLONEL FRANK M. MUTH
COLONEL LEOPOLDO A. QUINTAS, JR.
COLONEL KURT J. RYAN
COLONEL MARK C. SCHWARTZ
COLONEL SCOTT A. SPELLMON
COLONEL JOHN P. SULLIVAN
COLONEL CLARENCE D. TURNER
COLONEL MICHAEL J. WARMACK
COLONEL ERIC J. WESLEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. KENNETH E. TOVO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. ROBERT B. ABRAMS

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. KEVIN L. MCNEELY

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. THOMAS D. WALDHAUSER

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. DEBORAH P. HAVEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601; AND FOR APPOINTMENT AS A SENIOR MEMBER OF THE MILITARY STAFF COMMITTEE OF THE UNITED NATIONS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 711:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. FRANK C. PANDOLFE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be admiral

VICE ADM. HARRY B. HARRIS, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS CHIEF OF NAVAL PERSONNEL, UNITED STATES NAVY, AND APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 5141:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. WILLIAM F. MORAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. JAMES F. CALDWELL, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) DAVID F. BAUCOM
REAR ADM. (LH) VINCENT L. GRIFFITH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) COLIN G. CHINN
REAR ADM. (LH) ELAINE C. WAGNER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) PAUL B. BECKER
REAR ADM. (LH) MATTHEW J. KOHLER
REAR ADM. (LH) JAN E. TIGHE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) DAVID H. LEWIS
REAR ADM. (LH) THOMAS J. MOORE
REAR ADM. (LH) JAMES D. SYRING

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN C. AQUILINO
REAR ADM. (LH) PETER J. FANTA
REAR ADM. (LH) DAVID J. GALE
REAR ADM. (LH) PHILIP G. HOWE
REAR ADM. (LH) WILLIAM K. LESCHER
REAR ADM. (LH) MARK C. MONTGOMERY
REAR ADM. (LH) FRANK A. MORNEAU
REAR ADM. (LH) JEFFREY R. PENFIELD
REAR ADM. (LH) FREDERICK J. ROEGGE
REAR ADM. (LH) PHILLIP G. SAWYER
REAR ADM. (LH) MICHAEL S. WHITE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. RUSSELL E. ALLEN
CAPT. WILLIAM M. CRANE
CAPT. THOMAS W. MAROTTA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. KURT W. TIDD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. KENNETH J. IVERSON

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MORRELL JOHN BERRY, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO AUSTRALIA.

PATRICIA MARIE HASLACH, OF OREGON, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER–COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE FEDERAL DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ETHIOPIA.

REUBEN EARL BRIGETY, II, OF FLORIDA, TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE AFRICAN UNION, WITH THE RANK AND STATUS OF AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY.

DANIEL A. CLUNE, OF MARYLAND, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER–COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE LAO PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC.

PATRICK HUBERT GASPARD, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA.

STEPHANIE SANDERS SULLIVAN, OF NEW YORK, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER–COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO.

JOSEPH Y. YUN, OF OREGON, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER–COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO MALAYSIA.

LINDA THOMAS–GREENFIELD, OF LOUISIANA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (AFRICAN AFFAIRS).

JAMES F. ENTWISTLE, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER–COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF NIGERIA.

DAVID D. PEARCE, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO GREECE.

JOHN B. EMERSON, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY.

JOHN RUFUS GIFFORD, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO DENMARK.

DENISE CAMPBELL BAUER, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO BELGIUM.

JAMES COSTOS, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO SPAIN.

JAMES COSTOS, OF CALIFORNIA, TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AND WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO ANDORRA.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

AVI GARBOW, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY.

JAMES J. JONES, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR FOR TOXIC SUBSTANCES OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY.

FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

ROBERT F. COHEN, JR., OF WEST VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION FOR A TERM OF SIX YEARS EXPIRING AUGUST 30, 2018.

WILLIAM IRA ALTHEN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION FOR A TERM OF SIX YEARS EXPIRING AUGUST 30, 2018.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

CATHERINE ELIZABETH LHAMON, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR CIVIL RIGHTS, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

JOHN H. THOMPSON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE CENSUS FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2016.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

HARRY R. HOGLANDER, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 1, 2014.

LINDA A. PUCHALA, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 1, 2015.

NICHOLAS CHRISTOPHER GEALE, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 1, 2016.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MATTHEW WINTHROP BARZUN, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND.

DAVID HALE, OF NEW JERSEY, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER–COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF LEBANON.

LILIANA AYALDE, OF MARYLAND, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE FEDERATIVE REPUBLIC OF BRAZIL.

KIRK W.B. WAGAR, OF FLORIDA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE.

TERENCE PATRICK MCCULLEY, OF WASHINGTON, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER–COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF COTE D'IVOIRE.

JAMES C. SWAN, OF CALIFORNIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO.

JOHN R. PHILLIPS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE ITALIAN REPUBLIC, AND TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AND WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF SAN MARINO.

KENNETH FRANCIS HACKETT, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE HOLY SEE.

ALEXA LANGE WESNER, OF TEXAS, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF AUSTRIA.

DANIEL A. SEPULVEDA, OF FLORIDA, FOR THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR DURING HIS TENURE OF SERVICE AS DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION POLICY IN THE BUREAU OF ECONOMIC, ENERGY, AND BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND U.S. COORDINATOR FOR INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION POLICY.

BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS

RYAN CLARK CROCKER, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS FOR A TERM EXPIRING AUGUST 13, 2013.

RYAN CLARK CROCKER, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS FOR A TERM EXPIRING AUGUST 13, 2016.

MATTHEW C. ARMSTRONG, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS FOR A TERM EXPIRING AUGUST 13, 2015.

JEFFREY SHELL, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS.

JEFFREY SHELL, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS FOR A TERM EXPIRING AUGUST 13, 2015.

IN THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH WENDY J. BEAL AND ENDING WITH JARED K. YOUNG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 9, 2013.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF PETER C. RHEE, TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF JOSEPH M. MARKUSFELD, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DEONDRA P. ASIKE AND ENDING WITH GREGORY C. TROLLEY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 24, 2013.

IN THE ARMY

ARMY NOMINATION OF RONALD E. BERESKY, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JAMES B. COLLINS, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JONATHAN H. CODY AND ENDING WITH JUSTIN M. MARCHESI, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 20, 2013.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOSEPH L. BIEHLER AND ENDING WITH BIENVENIDO SERRANOCASTRO, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 24, 2013.

ARMY NOMINATION OF DEAN C. ANDERSON, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF CHRISTOPHER D. PERRIN, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SHEENA L. ALLEN AND ENDING WITH MIAO X. ZHOU, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 9, 2013.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH COURTNEY L. ABRAHAM AND ENDING WITH D011476, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 9, 2013.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHRISTOPHER L. AARON AND ENDING WITH NATHAN P. ZWINTSCHER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 9, 2013.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RICHARD R. ABELKIS AND ENDING WITH G001407, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 9, 2013.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOSEPH H. ALBRECHT AND ENDING WITH D011309, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 9, 2013.

ARMY NOMINATION OF KARL F. MEYER, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF STEPHANIE M. PRICE, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF GREGORY C. PEDRO, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JOHN H. SEOK, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF FREDERICK C. LOUGH, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ADMIRADO A. LUZURIAGA AND ENDING WITH JON KIEV, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 24, 2013.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH WILLIAM G. HUBER AND ENDING WITH MARK L. LEITSCHUH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 24, 2013.

ARMY NOMINATION OF CURTIS J. ALITZ, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GUY R. BEAUDOIN AND ENDING WITH REBECCA A. YOUNG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 24, 2013.

IN THE NAVY

NAVY NOMINATION OF JACKIE S. FANTES, TO BE COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF DORAN T. KELVINGTON, TO BE COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ORENTHAL G. ADDERSON AND ENDING WITH JOHN F. WARNER III, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 27, 2013.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH PHILIP B. BAGROW AND ENDING WITH DAVID M. TODD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 9, 2013.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH TANYA CRUZ AND ENDING WITH JEANINE B. WOMBLE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 9, 2013.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RENE J. ALOVA AND ENDING WITH JOYCE Y. TURNER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 9, 2013.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JAMES ALGER AND ENDING WITH JASON N. WOOD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 9, 2013.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHRISTOPHER W. ABBOTT AND ENDING WITH LORENZO TARPLEY, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 9, 2013.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARY R. ANKER AND ENDING WITH GEORGINA L. ZUNIGA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 9, 2013.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LILLIAN A. ABUAN AND ENDING WITH CHRISTOPHER R. ZEGLEY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 9, 2013.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ERIN G. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH LUKE A. ZABROCKI, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 9, 2013.

NAVY NOMINATION OF TIMOTHY C. MOORE, JR., TO BE COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF PIERRE A. PELLETIER, TO BE CAPTAIN.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

ELLEN C. HERBST, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE.

ELLEN C. HERBST, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE.

MARGARET LOUISE CUMMISKY, OF HAWAII, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive message transmitted by the President to the Senate on August 1, 2013 withdrawing from further Senate consideration the following nomination:

LAFE E. SOLOMON, OF MARYLAND, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE RONALD E. MEISBURG, RESIGNED, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON MAY 23, 2013.