United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 21, 2013 *No. 72*

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable WILLIAM M. COWAN, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Our Father, we honor Your wonderful Name. The angels bow before You; Heaven and Earth adore You. Your voice echoes over the oceans and thunders above the roar of the raging sea.

We pray today, O God, for the families of the dozens killed in the massive tornado in Oklahoma. Bring healing to the injured and comfort to those who mourn.

Today, may our Senators honor You with worthy service. By their words and actions, empower them to glorify Your Name. Lord, guide them with Your loving providence, as they trust in Your wisdom and might. May they commit themselves to Your will and leave the results to You.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable WILLIAM M. COWAN led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, May 21, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable WILLIAM M. COWAN, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

OKLAHOMA TORNADOES

Mr. REID. Mr. President, yesterday afternoon I called home to check to see how things were going, visited with my wife a little bit.

She said: You can't imagine what I am watching on TV. It is hard to watch.

She was talking about the terrible storm that hit Oklahoma, the devastation and deaths, the injuries. She tried to explain to me. It was hard to relate even though she was watching it on TV. Homes were destroyed, schools were destroyed, even elementary schools were destroyed.

I think what Landra did was she described how all of America feels and felt upon watching it. Our hearts go out to the families whose loved ones were lost. The extent of that we don't know. We are still waiting. Those missing in the devastating tornadoes in Oklahoma, we feel so sad for them. Our thoughts are with those who were affected by this tragedy, and so many people have been affected. Families are still searching for their family members, their children.

I recognize and commend the heroic efforts of the first responders who rushed to the scene and have been working tirelessly to help those who were injured. They worked all night. Of course, they are still searching for the missing. I commend the efforts of neighbors, everyday citizens, young and old, who have been heroic in helping.

Although we may not know the extent of the damage now, we will continue to do everything in our power to help the people of Oklahoma as they recover from these terrible tornadoes, these acts of nature. I will stand vigilant today and tomorrow, ready to help as more storms threaten the region.

Every Federal resource will be made available to help the communities affected by this tragedy. I look forward to hearing the President—his speech will start momentarily—on the disaster. I am pleased that FEMA Administrator Craig Fugate is already in Oklahoma assessing the extent of the damage and deciding how the Federal Government can best assist.

I will continue to monitor the search and rescue efforts. Whenever tragedy strikes any part of our Nation, it really strikes us all. I pledge to the people of Oklahoma my continued support, our continued support, as they begin to recover from this awful storm.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Following leader remarks today the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour. The majority will control the first half, the Republicans the final half. Upon conclusion of morning business, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 954, the farm bill. I spoke to Chairman STABENOW last night. She indicated that she believes there is an opportunity to finish the bill, even this week. I certainly hope that is the case. The Senate will recess from 12:30 to 2:15 today to allow for our weekly caucus meetings.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

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

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

OKLAHOMA DISASTER

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, we are all thinking today about the tragic loss of life in Oklahoma yesterday, so this morning I would like to take a moment to express my condolences to all who lost family and friends in this horrible disaster. It has been a truly heartbreaking loss of life—dozens injured and killed yesterday, including many children. The tornado that tore through Moore flattened entire neighborhoods and destroyed at least two elementary schools—Briarwood and Plaza Towers—just as students were about to be released for their last week of school before the summer recess. I don't think any of us can comprehend the searing grief of their parents. I am told that two crews from the Louisville Red Cross recently left for Oklahoma to help those who are now suffering.

Kentuckians understand the terrible toll these storms can take. Just last March I toured the wreckage after a deadly tornado in West Liberty, KY, where churches, businesses, and schools were reduced to rubble and where several Kentuckians lost their life. I remember full well the tornado that went through my hometown of Louisville back in the 1970s. It knocked down every house on my parents' street. My mother was in the basement, and mercifully it skipped over our house for some reason but leveled all the houses across the street and the ones next door. It is very hard to accurately describe the devastation a storm such as this leaves in its wake.

As first responders continue to dig through the rubble in Moore, I fear we will hear a lot more bad news in the days ahead. That said, I am sure we will also hear stories of hope and self-sacrifice, as we almost always do when tragedies such as this strike—of strangers shielding strangers, of neighbors helping others rebuild, of volunteers working through the night to sift through the debris to find survivors.

As we have seen time and time again in recent years, Americans are at their best when called upon to help each other in tragic circumstances, and this circumstance can hardly be more tragic. So we in the Senate offer our heartfelt prayers to those affected by this terrible storm. We offer our gratitude to the first responders. We offer our encouragement to Governor Fallin and the many Federal, State, and local officials who are working hard to assist in the recovery and who will aid in the rebuilding of homes and schools and families and lives.

WELCOMING BURMA'S PRESIDENT

Later this morning the majority leader and I will welcome the leader of Burma, Thein Sein. He will be here to discuss the reform in that country and our bilateral relationship. Later today I will have more to say about the reform movement in Burma.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the majority controlling the first half.

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

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

AGRICULTURE REFORM, FOOD, AND JOBS ACT OF 2013

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 954, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

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

Pending:

Stabenow (for Cantwell) amendment No. 919, to allow Indian tribes to participate in certain soil and water conservation programs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. We are now going to resume discussion on the farm bill, but before doing that I see one of the distinguished members of our committee on the floor who I know would like to make some other comments. But I just wish to thank her in advance for her leadership. We are so excited and pleased to have the Senator from North Dakota on the Agriculture Committee.

Having had a chance to be in North Dakota—and she has said it to me a thousand times, so it is burned into my memory—90 percent of the land in North Dakota is in agriculture, and so she reminds me of that every day. She has been a key person in helping us bring this farm bill to the floor. So before proceeding on the Agriculture Reform, Food and Jobs Act, I would ask that Senator HEITKAMP be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

TRIBUTE TO BRAD HEJTMANEK

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, on the floor of the Senate Senators often come to praise a local university football team that just won a championship or a famous coach who is retiring or maybe even a famous politician who has passed away. Today I come to the floor of the Senate to thank a man who will never be written about in the history books or even known outside of my small hometown of Mantador, ND. Brad Hejtmanek's life and his accomplishments were pretty modest by national standards, but nevertheless, for the people of my small hometown, Brad was something special.

Brad was a standout high school athlete, a veteran, a softball coach, a National Guardsman, a coworker, a husband, a father, a gardener, and a friend. For most of his adult life, Brad was the mayor of Mantador—not exactly the most glamorous of jobs. Mantador runs exclusively on volunteer labor.

For years he made sure the city water and sewer were working, the Christmas tree got decorated, that barking dogs were attended to, that the garbage got picked up, the roads got fixed, and abandoned lots did not get overrun with weeds and junk.

For years Brad got to do the great ceremonies incumbent of a small-town mayor. For example, after I was elected attorney general of North Dakota, Brad presented me with the key to the city. This was no ceremonial key; it was the real deal. I wondered for months after getting that key what that key actually opened, until one day I got a call from Brad asking me if I could send the key back. You see, the key was actually to the town dump and spring cleaning was coming. But that was Brad.

You can't look anywhere in Mantador and not see his impact. One can go to the small ballpark and remember that Brad organized the National Guard to come and clean out the old grove of trees, look to the large VFW and remember that Brad recruited folks to come and help build it, look to the fire hall and remember the games of pickup baseball we played when we were kids, look to the Mantador grade school and remember that Brad was the kid who always took the dare, the kid who always organized the pickup football games, and that every kid in grade school knew the lyrics to the ''Marine Corps Hymn'' because Brad made sure at every choir practice we sang it not only once but twice.

Men and women such as Brad Hejtmanek are the unsung heroes of our democracy. They step up and volunteer when their country and their community need them. They are friends when a person needs a friend, and they never forget where they came from. So even though he will never have a chapter in a history book, he will always have a place in the hearts of the people of Mantador. In my book that is an honor unequalled.

Thank you, Brad, for all you did for your country and your small town. Godspeed, my friend. I and all of Mantador will miss you.

I ask unanimous consent to have his obituary printed in the RECORD.

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

BRADLEY C. HEJTMANEK

Bradley C. Hejtmanek, 59, of Mantador, ND passed away Thursday, May 16, 2013 at Sanford Health in Fargo, ND, surrounded by his family and friends. Funeral mass will be Tuesday, May 21, 2013 at 10:30 a.m. at Sts. Peter & Paul Catholic Church in Mantador, ND with Fr. Peter Anderl officiating and burial in Calvary Cemetery, Mantador with military honors by the Hankinson American Legion Post #88 and the Mantador VFW Post #9317 and the North Dakota National Guard. Visitation will be Monday from 3:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. with a prayer service at 7:00 p.m. all at the church, and Tuesday morning one hour prior to the service at the church.

Brad was born on April 14, 1954 in Breckenridge, MN, the son of Joseph & Marcella (Havlena) Hejtmanek. He attended school in Mantador and graduated from Hankinson in 1972. He earned his associate degree from Chaminade University, Honolulu, Hawaii in 1976.

Brad was very active in Mantador & the surrounding area. He enjoyed all sports, especially the Twins, Vikings, Wild & UND hockey. He enjoyed time spent with family & friends, reading, t.v. & of course, popcorn.

He is survived by his wife, Karen, 2 sons, Doug (Chaska Guemmer) & Jason (Bri Huotari), granddaughter, Aubrey, 2 brothers, Richard (Ann), Jay (Denise), a sister, Joy (Mike) Schreder, several nieces & nephews, father-in-law, George Thompson, 2 brothers-in-law, Terry (Kathy) Thompson & Brian Thompson.

He was preceded in death by his parents, brother, Douglas, nephew, Joseph & mother-in-law, Janice Thompson.

Frank Family Funeral Home, Hankinson, ND is in charge of the arrangements.

In-line guestbook: www.frankfamilyfuneralhome.com

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

ORDER FOR MOMENT OF SILENCE

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, first, I would I ask unanimous consent that at 12 noon today the Senate observe a moment of silence for the victims of the tornado in Oklahoma.

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

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, we know we have other colleagues who will be coming to the floor to talk about the very important jobs bill, reform bill, and food bill we have in front of us—a conservation bill as well—but I just wish to take a moment to say to our colleagues, if there are amendments they have, as we are moving through the bill—and we are doing our best to finish this by the end of the week or certainly get as close as we can—we are very interested in working with colleagues to get to their amendments. We would appreciate it if they would let us know what they are and bring them down so we can be working with them on any of their amendments.

We are very proud of the product we have in front of the Senate right now. There are 16 million people who work in agriculture. I would say that is a jobs bill. I think it is probably the biggest jobs bill we will have in front of the Senate—agricultural jobs directly with those who are producing the food, who are producing the equipment for our food, and who are doing all the pieces around food production and processing and the efforts in trade around the globe, where we are proud to say agriculture is No. 1 in creating a trade surplus for our country. Other countries are looking to us. There are 7 billion mouths to feed in the world today, and American agriculture is at the front of the line feeding families and supporting efforts around the globe. We know that number is growing every day and the leadership of American agriculture is going to be even more important in that process.

We also know this is a bill that conserves our land, our water, our air, and our forests. This is the piece of legislation that focuses on conservation for working lands—lands that are owned by someone in this country, which is the majority of land, and there are incredibly important partnership efforts that go on. The farm bill improves 1.9 million acres of fish and wildlife habitat. That is why our conservation title is supported by over 650 conservation and environmental groups all across the country.

We have the same conservation title we had last year, and I am very pleased to say the House also has adopted the structure of reform we have in our bill. It is very similar in the House and Senate bills on conservation, and so this is a real landmark piece of legislation as it relates to preserving our soil, our land, our water, our air, and our forests, and it is a commitment we make as Americans to future generations.

We have also added in this legislation a commitment brought to us by the commodity farm groups and environmental and conservation groups to make sure, when farmers are using critically needed tools such as crop insurance—which is the mainstay for farmers now, buying crop insurance and hoping, in fact, they do not have to get a payout because it means they have had a loss or a disaster; that it is now the foundation of what we are doing to support farmers across the country—they have agreed to tie compliance for conservation practices to crop insurance, which is a very important policy. This is a historic agreement between agricultural groups and conservation and environmental groups. As a result of their agreement and their urging, we have added that to this bill, which is a very significant addition and strengthens what we are already doing on conservation.

We make a strong nutrition commitment to families. We make sure every family who currently qualifies for nutrition assistance in our country continues to receive that assistance. We create savings by looking at areas where there has been abuse or misuse by a few States on one policy and by individuals or retailers in other areas and we tighten that up so we have more integrity in the process. We make it clear we stand with families who need help; we stand with families who find their own personal disaster because of the economy, just as we stand with farmers for a strong crop insurance program when a farmer has a disaster as well, but we do make sure there is integrity in the programs, which is very important.

We have had at least two cases in Michigan where two people won the lottery and continued on food assistance—pretty outrageous. And we make sure that cannot happen again. There have been abuses in other areas, where retailers have allowed people to turn in their food assistance cards for money for drugs or other illegal activities, and we make sure we clamp down on that. We have gone through the bill and we address misuse, waste, fraud, and abuse in every part of the farm programs but certainly in this area as well. So we can stand before our colleagues and say this is about making sure folks who have worked all their lives, who have paid taxes all their lives, who suddenly find themselves, through no fault of their own, in a situation where they need some temporary food help are able to get that help for their family.

The good news is those dollars—that part of the farm bill—are actually decreasing. The costs are going down and not because we are cutting back on support for families but because the economy is improving, so more people are going back to work and don't need the temporary help. That is the way we should be reducing the costs, and that is in fact what we do.

I am also very pleased with the fact we focus on rural development and reforms that are very significant and very important. Right now, there are actually 11 different definitions of the term ''rural.'' We had local mayors and county supervisors and village residents come to us and say: We appreciate the fact that rural development funds allow us to provide financing for our businesses and water and sewer projects and housing projects and road projects, but could you just give us one definition, rather than trying to figure out 11 different ways to define rural. It may sound simple, but it wasn't simple. But we did actually get it down to one definition, and we have streamlined the process and the paperwork so communities, small towns, and folks who support and need rural economic development help can get that with a minimal amount of paperwork.

We have done that through this entire bill. Frankly, I truly believe that if, in every part of government, we did what we have done in agricultural programs, we would not only be doing what the public wants but we would balance the budget. We have 100 different programs or authorizations we have eliminated because they didn't make sense anymore. They were duplicative, not wise spending for taxpayers—things such as direct subsidy payments for farmers that did not make sense, cutting from 23 conservation programs to 13 and putting them

in 4 different subject areas with a lot of flexibility so we can stretch it out and get more bang for our buck and do a better job without in any way reducing the commitment to conservation.

We have gone through the entire farm bill and made tough decisions, smart decisions. We have saved about $24 billion—more than even we did last year—while having a set of policies that is broadly supported in the conservation community and the agricultural community and the energy community and those who represent small towns across this country. We did it, again, by making tough decisions and by working together on a bipartisan basis.

I am proud that even though these arbitrary, across-the-board cuts called sequester, cuts that make no sense—even though those cuts would require $6 billion in cuts in agricultural programs, we have been willing, voluntarily, to come up with four times that level of cuts. We ask for your support for a set of policies that works better, that streamlines the system, that cuts back on that which does not make sense to do but strengthens the priorities that are important for economic growth, for families, for conservation, for communities all across this country.

We are willing and have done our part to step up and meet the challenges of deficit reduction, of balancing our Federal budget, but keeping our commitment to our farmers and ranchers who have the most risky jobs in the world. As I said yesterday, nobody else has to worry about whether it is going to rain or not rain—too much rain, no rain; whether it is going to freeze, as it did in northern Michigan after the cherry blossoms came on the trees and the freeze wiped everything out.

Nobody else is in a business where they cannot control the most important factor, which is the weather. We have certainly seen the havoc the weather has played on families across this country, including what happened yesterday in Oklahoma.

We stand here proudly to say we support an effort that is creating reform, that is saving money, that is standing up for the folks who have helped create the most affordable and safest food supply in the world—America's farmers and ranchers. We stand here supporting American families who need to make sure that when times are tough the very best of America's values are in place, which is to make sure they have the ability to put food on the table for their families.

I believe we have others who will be coming to the floor. At the moment 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.

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

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

Ms. STABENOW. I ask unanimous consent that following a moment of silence at noon today, the Senate proceed to a vote in relation to Cantwell amendment No. 919; that upon disposition of the Cantwell amendment, Senator GILLIBRAND be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. STABENOW. We are also working on a Sessions amendment No. 945, which we had hoped to line up as well. I understand there is an additional modification being made. If that modification is agreeable to both sides, it is our intention to adopt that amendment, as modified, prior to the caucus meetings.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill 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.

MOMENT OF SILENCE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a moment of silence for the victims of the tornadoes in Oklahoma.

(Moment of silence.)

AMENDMENT NO. 919

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 919, offered by the Senator from Washington, Ms. CANTWELL.

The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Let me indicate that this amendment would require tribes to be included in the development of Resource Conservation Act appraisals. It is something that is supported by Senator COCHRAN and me.

I ask for 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 clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

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

The result was announced—yeas 87, nays 8, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 129 Leg.]

YEAS—87

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

NAYS—8

Cornyn	Kirk	Rubio
Cruz	Lee	Toomey
Johnson (WI)	Paul	

NOT VOTING—5

Coburn	Inhofe	Vitter
Heinrich	Lautenberg	

The amendment (No. 919) was agreed to.

Ms. STABENOW. I move to reconsider the vote and to lay that motion upon the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 931

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Madam President, I call up my amendment No. 931 for a vote at a time to be determined by the manager of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mrs. GILLIBRAND], for herself, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. COWAN, Mr. REED, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. KING, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. MENENDEZ, proposes an amendment numbered 931.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To strike a reduction in the supplemental nutrition assistance program, with an offset that limits crop insurance reimbursements to providers)

Beginning on page 355, strike line 8 and all that follows through page 357, line 15.

On page 1065, after line 25, add the following:

SEC. 11011. ANNUAL LIMITATION ON DELIVERY EXPENSES AND REDUCED RATE OF RETURN.

(a) ANNUAL LIMITATION ON DELIVERY EXPENSES.—Section 508(k)(4) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(k)(4)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(G) ANNUAL LIMITATION ON DELIVERY EXPENSES.—Beginning with the 2014 reinsurance year, the amount paid by the Corporation to reimburse approved insurance providers and agents for the administrative and

operating costs of the approved insurance providers and agents shall not exceed $924,000,000 per year.''.

(b) REDUCED RATE OF RETURN.—Section 508(k)(8) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(k)(8)) (as amended by section 11011) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(G) REDUCED RATE OF RETURN.—Beginning with the 2014 reinsurance year, the Standard Reinsurance Agreement shall be adjusted to ensure a projected rate of return for the approved insurance producers not to exceed 12 percent, as determined by the Corporation.''.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. I yield to the chairman of the committee for other business.

Ms. STABENOW. I thank the Senator.

Madam President, we have a great start here with our first vote.

AMENDMENT NO. 945, AS MODIFIED

Ms. STABENOW. Before proceeding with Senator GILLIBRAND's amendment, I ask unanimous consent that the Sessions amendment No. 945, with the changes at the desk, as modified, be agreed to.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To clarify eligibility criteria for agricultural irrigation assistance)

On page 263, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

''(iii) IRRIGATION.—In States where irrigation has not been used significantly for agricultural purposes, as determined by the Secretary, the Secretary shall not limit eligibility under section 1271B or this section on the basis of prior irrigation history.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

AMENDMENT NO. 931

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. I rise today to urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join my effort to fight off the proposed $4 billion worth of cuts to SNAP, better known as food stamps.

I ask that my amendment, No. 931, be called up for a vote at a time determined by the manager of the bill.

When Congress proposes to cut the food stamp program, it is not a nameless, faceless person looking for a handout who suffers—it is hungry children, hardworking adults, seniors on fixed incomes, veterans, active-duty servicemembers fighting our wars, and the families who stand by them.

I heard from a single mom in Queens, working full time at a supermarket, doing all she could to make ends meet but still struggles in this very tough economy. Her son came home one day from school with a bag in his hand and told her he saved his lunch for their dinner, and that he asked his best friend if he could have his sandwich to bring home for his brother. Obviously that mother broke down in tears. She needs food stamp assistance.

I heard from a senior in Washington Heights in New York City. She receives a limited fixed income, not enough to live on. She relies on SNAP to pay for food and for some peace of mind. Without that help, putting food on the table will become impossible.

I have heard from veterans all across the country who are making their voices heard to prevent these cuts, such as one very brave veteran from Colorado Springs. He served in Iraq, but was declared medically unfit to continue his service. He was released from the military and returned home. As he was looking for a job and waited for the VA to activate his benefits, he relied on SNAP to help his family make ends meet. Going from active duty to food stamps, he described, was a culture shock. It was never his plan to go on food stamps. Without that little bit of support, this veteran, his wife, and his children would have needlessly suffered. Today he is back on his feet working full time, but the program was there for him when he needed it, as it should be.

These are the people who rely on this critically needed assistance to put food on the table and who stand to lose if Congress follows through with these deep cuts to SNAP. Half of all food stamp recipients are children, 8 percent are seniors, and 1.4 million veteran households receive food stamps. There are some of you here who would have us believe that these children, seniors, and veterans are gaming the system just to take advantage of taxpayers. The fact is, it is less than 1 percent of every dollar that goes into this program that is wasted, less than 1 percent is evidence of fraud. Imagine if we had that level of efficiency anywhere else in government.

In fact, SNAP keeps our economy moving. This money goes straight to the grocery stores, the store clerks, the truckers who haul the food, and producers all across the country. Sixteen cents of every SNAP dollar actually goes right back to the farmer who grew the crop, according to the USDA. When we cut $4 billion from SNAP, it means there is $90 less a month going to half a million households. To folks in this Chamber, $90 a month may not seem like a lot of money, but for a struggling family that is a week's worth of groceries. Imagine telling your children they can't eat the last week of every month. Imagine telling your child at night when he says to you: Mommy, I am still hungry, that there is nothing you can do about it.

As a mother, as a lawmaker, watching a child, a senior, and a brave veteran going hungry is something I will not stand for, and neither should anyone else in this body. Clearly we have to reduce the debt and the deficit, but hardworking parents, their children, seniors, troops, and veterans are just trying to keep the lights on, trying to make ends meet, trying to put food on the table. They did not spend this Nation into debt, and we should not be trying to balance the budget on their back. They deserve better from us. These are the wrong priorities for America.

Instead, the amendment I am proposing would reduce a real source of waste in this budget, and that is corporate welfare for large corporations that do not need it, including insurance companies that are based in Bermuda, Australia, and Switzerland.

My amendment already has the support and advocacy of a third of this body. Thirty-three Senators have signed a letter saying do not cut food stamps, because it protects half a million struggling Americans who too often do not have a voice in Washington when they desperately need it. It makes modest cuts to an already overgenerous corporate welfare system. It is common sense. Standing by those who are suffering is the core. It is a core value of who we are as Americans.

If it is in your heart, and if you believe feeding hungry children is the right thing to do, then stand with us. Stand with America's veterans. Stand with the AARP and America's seniors. Stand with struggling families and children all across this Nation. Let's keep food on the tables of people who need it. When we do, America will be stronger, and this body will be stronger.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

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

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:41 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. BALDWIN).

AGRICULTURE REFORM, FOOD, AND JOBS ACT OF 2013—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

COST OF GASOLINE

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I will hold off asking that the pending amendment be set aside until the manager is here. At this time I will address an enormously important national issue, an issue even more important to rural America; that is, the skyrocketing cost of gasoline at the pump, and oil in general, which is causing enormous hardship for the American consumer, small businesses, truckers, airlines, and fuel dealers.

The bottom line is in Vermont and all over this country people are paying an arm and a leg for a gallon of gas and for home heating oil, and it is a very serious economic problem for the individual consumer and for the entire economy at large. In fact, as we continue to struggle to get out of this terrible recession, high oil and gas prices are enormously detrimental to the entire economic recovery process.

These rapidly increasing prices are particularly harmful to rural America where working people often are forced to travel 50 to 100 miles to their jobs and back. If people are paying $3.80 for a gallon of gas, that adds up, and it is money coming right out of their wallets.

Over the last 5 months the national average price for a gallon of gasoline

has gone up by more than 41 cents at the pump, even—and this is the important point to make—as U.S. oil inventories reach a three-decade high, and demand for gasoline is lower than it was 4 years ago when prices averaged less than $2.30 a gallon. In other words, what we learned in elementary school about supply and demand and pricing—the foundation of capitalism, if you like—is when there is a lot of supply and limited demand, prices should go down. Right now, there is a lot of supply, less demand, and prices are going up, and I think we need to know why because this impacts our entire economy and millions and millions of consumers.

Our goal must be to do everything we can to make sure oil and gas prices are transparent and free from fraud, manipulation, abuse, and excessive speculation. Let the principles of supply and demand work. Let's eliminate fraud, manipulation, abuse, and excessive speculation, which is exactly what we are experiencing right now.

That is why I will be offering two important amendments that deal with these issues. Both of these amendments are within the jurisdiction of the Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Committee, which is obviously why I am offering them on this bill.

The first amendment, No. 963, requires the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, CFTC, and the Oil and Gas Price Fraud Working Group to conduct a 6-month investigation to determine whether any company or individual in the United States has manipulated the price of gasoline, crude oil, heating oil, diesel fuel, or jet fuel. Such an investigation is already taking place by regulators in Europe.

On May 14, 2013, just 1 week ago, the European Commission announced it was investigating allegations that several companies—including BP, Shell and Statoil—''may have colluded in reporting distorted prices to a Price Reporting Agency to manipulate the published prices for a number of oil and biofuel products.''

I know RON WYDEN, chairman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, is also looking at this issue—perhaps in a slightly different way—and I applaud him for doing that. But this amendment basically says right now the European Commission believes there may be fraud among the major oil companies. If that is true in Europe, it may well be true in the United States. So I want the CFTC to investigate that as well.

Amendment No. 963 requires the CFTC to work with European regulators to determine if any company or individual in the United States provided inaccurate information to a price reporting agency for the purpose of manipulating the published prices of gasoline or oil; secondly, to refer any illegal activities to the proper authorities for prosecution; third, to report its findings within 6 months; and lastly, to publish recommendations on its Web site on how to make sure the pricing of gasoline, crude oil, heating oil, diesel fuel, and jet fuel becomes more transparent, open, and free from manipulation, fraud, abuse, or excessive speculation.

The third largest oil company in Europe has estimated that as much as 80 percent of all crude oil product transactions are linked to prices published by Platts, a private price reporting agency, while just 20 percent are linked to trades on the New York Mercantile Exchange or ICE Futures in Europe. In order to calculate prices, Platts depends on oil companies and Wall Street speculators to voluntarily provide details on bids, offers, and transactions for various crude oil and petroleum commodities.

So that is one of the issues we want to take a hard look at to make sure we end those manipulations. The other issue I want to take a hard look at is the issue of speculation on the oil futures market. What we know right now is, according to the CFTC, approximately 80 percent of the oil futures market is controlled not by end users—not by fuel dealers, not by airline companies, not by people who actually use fuel—but by Wall Street speculators. So that is the issue my second amendment deals with.

This amendment addresses an issue that was not satisfactorily addressed in Dodd-Frank, where we attempted to deal with the issue of excessive speculation on the oil futures market. Amendment No. 964 requires the CFTC to use all of its authority, including its emergency powers, within 30 days to address this very important issue.

Once again the American people are at their wits end in trying to understand why oil prices go up despite the fact we have sufficient supply and lack of demand. I am not just speaking for myself but many economists also when I say I believe one of the major reasons for this significantly high price has to do with speculation—speculation on Wall Street.

This amendment requires the CFTC to use all its authority—again, including its emergency powers, which is not what we have done in the past—within 30 days to do the following: to implement position limits to eliminate, prevent, or diminish excessive oil speculation as required by the Dodd-Frank Act, and to immediately curb excessive oil speculation to ensure that oil and gas prices are based on the fundamentals of supply and demand.

As I mentioned earlier, price is supposed to be determined by the amount of supply and the amount of demand. Supply now is very high, demand is relatively low, and so we should be seeing a decline in oil prices rather than an increase. Further, the International Energy Agency recently projected the global supply of oil will surge by 8.4 million barrels a day over the next 5 years, significantly faster than demand, and nearly two-thirds of the increase in oil supply will be in North America. So if you are looking at an abundance of supply and limited demand, we have every reason in the world to believe gas prices at the pump, oil prices in general, should go down. If they are not going down, we have to ask why. Many of us believe this has to do with excessive Wall Street speculation on the oil futures market.

While we cannot ignore the fact that big oil companies have been gouging consumers at the pump for years and have made over $1 trillion in profit over the past decade, there is mounting evidence that high gasoline prices have less to do with supply and demand and more to do with Wall Street speculation jacking up oil and gas prices in the energy futures market. Ten years ago—and this is a very important point for people to understand—10 years ago speculators only controlled—''only'' is probably the wrong word, but they controlled about 30 to 40 percent of the oil futures market. Today Wall Street speculators control at least 80 percent of the market. In a 10-year period, we have seen Wall Street speculation double on the energy futures market.

What does this mean in terms of oil prices? Everything in the world. The function of Wall Street speculation has nothing to do with using oil, everything to do with making a profit, driving prices higher. This is not just BERNIE SANDERS talking. There is now a growing consensus that excessive speculation on the oil futures market is driving up oil prices. ExxonMobil, Goldman Sachs, the IMF, the St. Louis Federal Reserve, the American Trucking Association, Delta Airlines, the Petroleum Marketers Association of America, the New England Fuel Institute and many other groups—the Consumer Federation of America—have all agreed that excessive oil speculation significantly increases oil and gas prices.

Interestingly enough, Goldman Sachs—not one of my favorite institutions but perhaps the largest speculator on Wall Street—came out with a report indicating that excessive oil speculation is costing Americans 56 cents a gallon at the pump. Goldman Sachs, speculator, they themselves estimating that excessive speculation is costing 56 cents a gallon at the pump for the average consumer, and that may be a conservative estimate.

A few years ago the CEO of ExxonMobil, again not one of my favorite companies, testified at a Senate hearing that excessive speculation contributed as much as 40 percent to the cost of a barrel of oil.

Saudi Arabia, the largest exporter of oil in the world, told the Bush administration back in 2008 during the last major spike in oil prices that speculation has contributed as much as 40 percent to a barrel of oil.

Gary Gensler, the chairman of the CFTC, has stated publicly that oil speculators now control between 80 to

87 percent of the energy futures market, a figure that has more than doubled over the past decade. In other words, the vast majority of oil on the futures market is not controlled by people who actually use the product but people whose only function in life being in the oil futures market is to make as much quick profit as they possibly can.

Let me give just a list of a few of the oil speculators and how much oil they were trading on June 30, 2008, when the price of oil was over $140 a barrel and gas prices were over $4 a gallon. Goldman Sachs bought and sold over 863 million barrels of oil, Morgan Stanley bought and sold over 632 million barrels of oil, Bank of America bought and sold over 112 million barrels of oil, Lehman Brothers, Merrill Lynch, et cetera.

What we have to understand is that to a very significant degree, pricing of oil has nothing to do with supply and demand, nothing to do with end users who actually buy the product, and everything to do with Wall Street speculation. Sadly, the spike in oil and gasoline prices was totally avoidable. The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act required the Commodity Futures Trading Commission to impose strict limits on the amount of oil that Wall Street speculators could trade in the energy futures market by January 17, 2011, 2½ years ago.

Unfortunately, the CFTC has been unable to implement position limits due to opposition on Wall Street and a ruling of the DC district court which is now under appeal.

This amendment directs the CFTC to utilize all its authority, including its emergency powers, to curb excessive oil speculation within 30 days. We are not going to drag this on for another 5 years. The emergency directive in this amendment is virtually identical to bipartisan legislation that overwhelmingly passed the House of Representatives by a vote of 402 to 19, during a similar crisis in 2008.

Let me conclude by saying that millions of consumers are hurting as a result of excessive speculation. People are paying much more at the pump than they should for gasoline. This issue impacts our entire economy. It is time that we did something to that. I say to my colleagues: I call up amendments numbers 963 and 964, and ask for their immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Ms. STABENOW. Reserving the right to object, Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, first, I thank the Senator from Vermont for raising all these issues that are so important for the American people. At this point in time, we do have an amendment that is pending, the amendment of Senator GILLIBRAND. We do not have unanimous consent in order to set that aside so I would have to, at the moment, object to setting it aside, but I assure the Senator I wish to have an opportunity to talk to him about these issues.

Mr. SANDERS. I look forward to talking to the Senator from Michigan, but I do want her to know this is an enormously important amendment for the people of Vermont and the people of America. We want action. I think we have brought forth an amendment which, in fact, can end up substantially lowering the price of oil and gas at the pump and I will pursue this vigorously.

Ms. STABENOW. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Madam President, I rise to speak on the farm bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. HOEVEN. I rise to speak on behalf of the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013, a 5-year farm bill. This bill saves more than $24 billion to help reduce our deficit and our debt, it streamlines farm programs to make them more efficient, and it ensures that our farmers and ranchers continue to have good risk management tools, particularly crop insurance.

It is vitally important to so many facets of our national interests. It is important to food, of course, but also to fuel, to fiber, to rural development, agriculture research, and many other areas. It touches the life of every single American in some of the most basic ways.

This year the farm bill is moving through the Senate because we have already debated and passed more than 90 percent of this bill in the last session. A lot of this bill we worked on very hard in the last session and passed it through this body with a big bipartisan vote.

Unfortunately, the House was not able to pass their version so we were not able to go to conference and finish the job. This year we need to do that.

This farm bill, again, 90 percent-plus we voted on in this body last session. We had a big bipartisan vote to pass it. We need to do that again. We need to get into conference with the House, and we need to get this done for farmers and ranchers and for the benefit of all Americans.

Last week we passed a bill out of the Senate Agriculture Committee, on which I serve, where I had the opportunity to help craft it—again, building on the product that we put together last year when we voted it out of committee with a big bipartisan vote. The House also passed its version of a farm bill out of their Agriculture Committee last week. They are looking to bring their bill to the House floor in June. We are hopeful they will pass it in June, but we need to be ready. We need to have ours done. I think we can show real leadership on this issue and be ready to get into conference with the House and get this important work done.

The Senate version we passed supports our farmers and ranchers in substantive and sensible ways. It gives them the necessary risk management tools and ensures that Americans, all Americans, continue to enjoy the highest quality, lowest cost food supply, not just in the world but in the history of the world.

Among the provisions of the commodity title is the no-cost Sugar Program. I wish to take just a few minutes to talk about the Sugar Program and its importance in the context of this farm bill. The Sugar Program warrants discussion because some Members—I believe certainly with the best of intentions—want to actually weaken this vitally important program. But weakening our current sugar policy would accomplish nothing. In fact, it would subject our producers, consumers, and industries to a distorted world market. Further, it would threaten more than 140,000 jobs in 22 States that depend on a vibrant, competitive sugar industry.

The world's sugar market is not a free market. Make no mistake, it is not a free market in any conventional sense of the term. I can tell you now, foreign governments heavily protect and subsidize their sugar producers. For example, Brazil spends between $2 and $3 billion per year to subsidize its producers. Mexico literally owns one-fifth of its industry and subsidizes the rest.

Our sugar farmers, along with the rest of America's farmers and ranchers, have told foreign competitors, time and again, we are ready to compete in a truly freely market, but we will not and must not unilaterally disarm, nor will dismantling the Sugar Program result in lower costs to consumers and American businesses. Once you factor in transportation costs, the world price of sugar is higher than the price in the United States.

Sugar prices are not only higher in Brazil and Mexico, they are higher worldwide. If we do away with sugar policy altogether and subject producers strictly to a distorted global market, what we will see is not lower prices but rather extreme volatility in the global sugar market.

Not only are sugar prices lower in the United States and elsewhere, but the cost of sugar in most products is tiny. For example, in a Hershey's chocolate bar it is less than 2 percent of the cost. Further, it should be noted that sugar prices have fallen by more than 50 percent in the last 2 years, but candy prices at the store are not seeing the same level of reduction at all.

The truth is, if consumers are paying higher costs, it is because of labor and health care costs in the United States, not because of the cost of sugar.

For 10 years now, sugar policy has operated at zero cost to the American taxpayer because our farmers are efficient and competitive and because American sugar policy has always made sure they were playing on a level playing field. As a result, consumers in

this country enjoy more affordable sugar than elsewhere in the world and American consumers enjoy a safe and reliable homegrown source. The bottom line is that sugar policy is cost-effective and fair and it should be retained in the commodity title of the farm bill.

But I would like to turn, again, to the broader legislation. Good farm policy benefits every single American. As I said, we have the lowest cost, highest quality food supply in the world thanks to our farmers and ranchers and thanks to good farm policy. How do we put a value on our safe, abundant, nutritious, dependable food supply? It is invaluable. By any standard it is invaluable. Just consider the benefits that this farm bill provides.

The farm bill is a job creator and it helps our economy. Agriculture supports 16 million jobs in the United States and contributes billions of dollars to the national economy. Year in and year out we sell more food and fiber than we buy from abroad. Further, American agriculture produces a financial surplus. Through relentless innovation, best practices, and good stewardship of the land, American agriculture creates a positive balance of trade.

The farm bill saves money to help reduce the deficit and the debt. Think how important that is.

The 2013 farm bill, like the farm bill we passed last year, provides more than $24 billion in savings—more than is required by sequestration—to help address the Nation's deficit and debt. Farmers and ranchers are stepping up and doing their part.

The farm bill also provides a strong market-based safety net for the producers. The safety net in the 2013 farm bill focuses on enhanced crop insurance; that is what they have asked for and that is the focus—not direct payments. Direct payments are limited. It enhances crop insurance with the inclusion of a new product called the supplemental coverage option, SCO. The SCO enables purchasers to purchase a supplemental policy beyond their individual farm-based policy, thereby creating an additional level of risk management.

The bill also includes the Agriculture Risk Coverage or ARC Program that provides assistance for shallow loss or multiple-year losses, which again helps our farmers to better manage risk. They are business people and they need to manage their risks.

Let's not forget the farm bill strengthens our national security. Our country doesn't have to depend on other countries for our food supply—countries that don't necessarily share our interests or values—and that makes us safer. The fact is we are secure in that most basic, vital necessity—our food supply.

The farm bill is about so many things that are important to the people of America. This is about all Americans. Again, I say good farm policy benefits every single American. We have the highest quality, lowest cost food supply in the world thanks to our farmers, ranchers, and good farm policy.

This is about 16 million jobs in this country which are supported by agriculture. This is about a positive balance of trade which helps build our economy. This is about $24 billion in savings where agriculture is stepping up and not only doing its share but more than its share to help with the deficit and debt. In the most fundamental ways, a good farm bill makes America stronger, safer, and more secure. We need to pass this farm bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, I am pleased to congratulate my friend from North Dakota for his statement and his discussion of the content of this farm bill. He was one of the active members of our committee who participated in the markup sessions, attended the hearings in preparation for writing a farm bill, and helped to shape the consensus that is reflected in the final work product. Senator HOEVEN is a very valuable member of our committee, and I commend and thank my colleague from North Dakota for his contributions to this process.

He very accurately describes that this is a consensus product. It is not a partisan bill; it is not meant to make anybody or any section or any commodity group look good or feel good because of favors done in this bill. This is truly to serve the interests of our good and great country and help improve our trading opportunities in agricultural commodities that are produced on our farms throughout the United States.

I think it is going to serve the interests of not only agriculture but the American citizen and, broadly speaking, much of this success is due to the contributions made by the Senator from North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Madam President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Mississippi for his kind comments and also for his leadership on the Agriculture Committee as our ranking member. I wanted to express my appreciation.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, it should come as no surprise that two Senators from the great State of North Dakota stand today and talk about the importance of American agriculture. Ninety percent of the land we have in North Dakota is engaged in production agriculture. As much as we have heard—and it is all true—about this great economic renaissance we are having in our State, agriculture is still No. 1.

Every year American farmers—North Dakota farmers—bet. They bet on good weather, good prices, that the crop will grow, and they spend millions of dollars on that bet. They are the biggest gamblers in the history of the world, and they are asking for a farm bill that gives them a little bit of risk help and makes sure when they plant, they know that maybe they have a chance to get cost of production back out.

Why is that important? It is important because who is going to take that risk on behalf of the American people, on behalf of a global and worldwide supply of food? Who is going to take that risk if we don't help a little bit?

Today in America almost every State which has an agricultural base is doing a little bit better because agriculture has led the way. Agriculture has aided this economy. States with an agriculture base have a much lower rate of unemployment, and they have been leading the way on our trade deficit.

It cannot be overstated how significant this farm bill is not only to States such as North Dakota but to every State and every economy in this Union. There are 16 million jobs which hang in the balance. They are waiting for this body—the Congress—to give some assurance, to pass a farm bill.

I applaud both the ranking member and the committee chair for their excellent work. No bill which comes out of a committee with diverse opinions is absolutely perfect where everyone will agree on everything in the bill, but it is part of the great American compromise we have been talking about and striving for in this body. We are working to move the issues forward and do what Americans sent us here to do. We are here to deliberate, discuss, debate, and compromise, and that is what this bill is about.

Every piece of this bill is important. Every piece is a linchpin to make sure we pass a farm bill. We are going to hear a lot in the next couple of days about the Sugar Program. I will talk broadly about the other provisions of the bill tomorrow on this floor, but I want to spend today talking a little bit about the Sugar Program within the farm bill because it is absolutely significant and important.

I know Senator HOEVEN outlined some of the statistics we talk about when we talk about sugar. The U.S. sugar policy defends more than 142,000 jobs—not just in North Dakota, Minnesota, Florida, and Hawaii, but in 22 States. It defends those jobs from unfair foreign competition, and it results in nearly $20 billion in annual economic activity in the United States.

Of course, many of these jobs are in North Dakota. We grow a lot of sugar beets in the Red River Valley, we process a lot of sugar beets in the Red River Valley, and those processing jobs are the value-added jobs that led the way to a value-added economy in our State. We are pretty protective of our sugar economy.

In many rural communities sugar is the linchpin of the local economy. Make no mistake that if we bend to the

reforms we will hear talked about or bend to the ideas some have today about the Sugar Program, we will lose our domestic sugar industry. Why? Because we cannot compete. Make no mistake about that.

I am not saying our producers cannot produce or compete with producers from other parts of the world if the playing field is level. In fact, not only can we compete, we can best them. However, the sugar playing field is not level. Other countries have subsidized their sugar programs for years. More than 120 countries actually produce sugar. Every one of them intervenes to defend their producers from global crisis where surplus sugar is dumped. No one could survive at historic world-level prices without these government interventions. If our farmers could go head to head with their foreign counterparts, they would robustly compete and, I believe, capture much of the market. Unfortunately, with Federal subsidization and protections in place, a fair fight is not available to our American sugar beet and sugar cane growers. Opponents of the Sugar Program would have us do one thing: Unilaterally disarm and surrender our market to foreign producers.

For over two decades, from 1989 to 2008—and I want everyone to remember the date of 2008—the average world cost of sugar production averaged about 51 percent more than the world price.

Let me say that again: The world average cost of sugar production averaged 51 percent more than the sugar price. How does that happen? How does anyone produce a product that costs more than they sell it for? They are subsidized, which means sugar producers have received support from governments that allow them to stay in business even when their production costs exceed the price.

In order for those sugar industries to survive, governments in foreign countries provide some buffer to the world market with a wide variety of import tariffs, nontariff import barriers, price and income supports, and direct and indirect subsidies.

We have heard that sugar prices are too high, and if we eliminate the Sugar Program—the risk program for our sugar growers—that sugar prices would drop. Food corporation opponents say the U.S. sugar price is too high. They further argue that high sugar prices threaten their competitiveness given foreign competition for processed foods.

The truth is that sugar prices have held relatively stable over the course of the last three decades. This cannot be said about most other agricultural commodities. Imagine if we were debating today about $2-a-bushel corn.

U.S. raw sugar prices have dropped by more than half since the fall of 2011. Prices are now below the average price of the 1980s, below the average of the 1990s, and below the average of the decade of 2000.

Our sugar farmers have struggled for decades and many have not have survived. Since 1985, more than half of the sugar beet and sugar cane operations shut down. It is hard to survive in 2013 when the price they get for their product is the same price they would have received in 1980.

The amendment we are going to be debating here will drive the U.S. sugar price down even further, which will allow more subsidized sugar to flow into our market and put our sugar farmers out of business.

If we look at all of the commodities that are in the farm bill—look at every piece of that compromised bill—and start singling out one commodity for special treatment—let's forget for a minute we are talking about sugar. Let's talk about dairy. Would a sugar bill survive if we were to eliminate the dairy program? Would a farm bill survive if we were to eliminate the dairy program?

Our concern today is that this industry is critical to our food security but also, importantly, it is critical to the compromise of the farm bill itself. This is a farm bill that supports over 16 million jobs in an economy that struggles except on the farm. These programs have worked.

As someone who is from North Dakota, I have lived through bad farm bills. My producers have lived through bad farm bills. The last 5 to 6 years have been an enormous improvement, not only to market-driven techniques but it has been an enormous improvement in allowing our producers to make the market decisions they are going to make, but also get the help that is going to give them surety.

When a small North Dakota producer—and I am not exaggerating—spends $1 million putting a crop in the ground, they do that for their family, they do that for their State, but they also do it for the country and for the world because they know the American farmer feeds the world and it is a pretty important job.

So I say, let the compromise stay. Let the bill stay intact. Let's move this bill forward, let's get it into conference with the House, and for once let's tell the American people we can get something done in Congress. Let's tell them we can respond to the needs of this country and move our country forward.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, we appreciate the comments of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota. Also, it is a pleasure to welcome her as a new member of our committee. She took an active part in the development of this bill, and we appreciate her contributions.

I see no other Senators seeking recognition at this time, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 948

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment to call up amendment No. 948.

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

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS], for himself, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. JOHANNS, proposes an amendment numbered 948.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To improve and extend certain nutrition programs)

On page 355, between lines 7 and 8, insert the following:

SEC. 40___. RESTORING PROGRAM INTEGRITY TO CATEGORICAL ELIGIBILITY FOR THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The second sentence of section 5(a) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2014(a)) is amended by striking ''receives benefits under a State program'' and inserting ''receives assistance (as defined in section 260.31 of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on January 1, 2013) under a State program''.

(b) RESOURCES.—Section 5(j) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2014(j)) is amended by striking ''receives benefits under a State program'' and inserting ''receives assistance (as defined in section 260.31 of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on January 1, 2013) under a State program''.

Beginning on page 355, strike line 8 and all that follows through page 357, line 15, and insert the following:

SEC. 4002. ELIMINATING THE LOW-INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE LOOPHOLE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2014) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)(11)(A), by striking ''(other than'' and all that follows through ''et seq.))'' and inserting ''(other than payments or allowances made under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) or any payments under any other State program funded with qualified State expenditures (as defined in section 409(a)(7)(B)(i) of that Act (42 U.S.C. 609(a)(7)(B)(1))))'';

(2) in subsection (e)(6)(C), by striking clause (iv); and

(3) in subsection (k)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking subparagraph (C);

(ii) by redesignating subparagraphs (D) through (G) as subparagraphs (C) through (F), respectively; and

(iii) by striking paragraph (4).

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 2605(f) of the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8624(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''(1)''; and

(2) by striking paragraph (2).

Beginning on page 379, strike line 15 and all that follows through page 380, line 15, and insert the following:

SEC. 4011. ELIMINATING STATE BONUSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 16 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025) is amended by striking subsection (d).

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 16 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the first sentence of paragraph (4), by striking ''payment error rate'' and all that follows through ''subsection (d)'' and inserting ''liability amount or new investment amount under paragraph (1) or payment error rate''; and

(B) in the first sentence of paragraph (5), by striking ''payment error rate'' and all that follows through ''subsection (d)'' and inserting ''liability amount or new investment amount under paragraph (1) or payment error rate''; and

(2) in subsection (i)(1), by striking ''subsection (d)(1)'' and inserting ''subsection (c)(2)''.

SEC. 4012. ELIMINATING DUPLICATIVE EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING.

(a) FUNDING OF EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAMS.—Section 16 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025) is amended by striking subsection (h).

(b) ADMINISTRATIVE COST-SHARING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 16(a) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025(a)) is amended in the first sentence, in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting ''(other than a program carried out under section 6(d)(4))'' after ''supplemental nutrition assistance program''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 17(b)(1)(B)(iv)(III)(hh) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2026(b)(1)(B)(iv)(III)(hh)) is amended by striking ''(g), (h)(2), or (h)(3)'' and inserting ''or (g)''.

(B) Section 22(d)(1)(B)(ii) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2031(d)(1)(B)(ii)) is amended is amended by striking '', (g), (h)(2), and (h)(3)'' and inserting ''and (g)''.

(c) WORKFARE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 20 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2029) is amended by striking subsection (g).

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 17(b)(1)(B)(iv)(III)(jj) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2026(b)(1)(B)(iv)(III)(jj)) is amended by striking ''or (g)(1)''.

On page 385, strike lines 19 through 22 and insert the following:

SEC. 4016. ELIMINATING THE NUTRITION EDUCATION GRANT PROGRAM.

Section 28 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2036a) is repealed.

On page 390, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 4019. TERMINATING AN INCREASE IN BENEFITS.

Section 101(a) of division A of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–5; 123 Stat. 120; 124 Stat. 2394; 124 Stat. 3265) is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(2) TERMINATION.—The authority provided by this subsection shall terminate after September 1, 2013.''.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, this is Roberts amendment No. 948. This amendment would help rein in the largest expenditure within the Department of Agriculture budget—the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, SNAP, more commonly known as food stamps.

The Senate Agriculture Committee included minimal savings under food stamps—around $4 billion over the 10-year budget window. I know people have different views, but I would say that it is certainly minimal. I think we could have done more in committee last week. I introduced an amendment at that time. I withdrew it to make sure we could get this to the floor. We must do much more in a responsible manner. Look at the House Agriculture Committee, which marked up a farm bill with over $20 billion in savings from SNAP. That bill was marked up and passed with bipartisan support as of last week.

We can restore integrity to the program while providing benefits to those truly in need and save approximately an additional $30 billion. Note that I say ''while providing benefits to those truly in need.'' I am not proposing a dramatic change in the policy of nutrition programs, such as block-granting programs to States. That would represent a dramatic change. Instead, this amendment enforces the principles of good government and restores SNAP and spending to much more responsible levels.

Also, SNAP was exempted from the across-the-board cuts known as sequestration. However, it is clear there are several areas within the program that could provide significant savings that were left untouched.

First, the amendment eliminates the LIHEAP loophole. Let me be clear. Eliminating the LIHEAP loophole does not affect SNAP eligibility for anyone using SNAP; it only decreases SNAP benefits for those who would not otherwise qualify for the higher SNAP benefit amounts.

But at least 17 States, with all due respect, are gaming the system by designing their Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program—LIHEAP—to exploit SNAP. Let me explain. The LIHEAP loophole works like this: Participating State agencies annually issue extremely low LIHEAP benefits to qualify otherwise ineligible households for standard utility allowances, which result in increased monthly SNAP benefits. For example, today a State agency can issue $1—only $1—annually in LIHEAP benefits to increase monthly SNAP benefits an average of $90—that is $1,080 per year—for households that do not otherwise pay out-of-pocket utility bills.

If you completely eliminate the LIHEAP loophole, as my legislation does, it will save taxpayers a total of $12 billion—$8 billion additional compared to the current version of the farm bill.

We also tie categorical eligibility to cash assistance, eliminating a loophole that States are exploiting by offering TANF-provided informational brochures and informational 1–800 numbers to maximize SNAP enrollment and the corresponding increase in Federal food benefits.

Categorical eligibility, simply known as Cat-El, was designed to help streamline the administration of SNAP by allowing households to be certified as eligible for SNAP food benefits without evaluating household assets or gross income. 42 States are exploiting an unintended loophole of the TANF-provided informational brochures and informational 1–800 numbers to maximize SNAP enrollment and the corresponding increase in Federal food benefits and the cost. These States, with all due respect, are also gaming the system to bring otherwise ineligible SNAP participants into the program.

In an ongoing effort to streamline government programs, we should eliminate the duplicative SNAP Employment and Training Program and the SNAP Nutrition Education Grants Program. Combined, these two programs cost over $8 billion and do not represent any direct food benefits—any direct food benefits.

This amendment also ends the Department of Agriculture practice of giving $48 million in awards every year to State agencies for basically doing their job. Currently, bonuses are given to States for best program access—signing up as many people for SNAP as possible; most improved program access—how many more people signed up for SNAP compared to the previous year; and best application processing timelines—handling applications within required guidelines. The bonuses are not even required to be used for SNAP administration. A recipient State may choose to use the funding for any State priority.

Finally, the amendment terminates the ongoing stimulus, enacted by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, which provided extra funding to increase monthly SNAP food benefits. I really understand the importance of domestic food assistance programs for many hard-working Americans, including many Kansans. As chairman of the House Agriculture Committee some years ago, we worked very hard to save the Food Stamp Program and prevent any kinds of efforts to simply do away with it or send it back to States because of the very things I have talked about.

My goal is simple: to restore integrity to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program in a commonsense and comprehensive manner. Enacting this package of reforms will allow the Federal Government to continue to help those who truly need SNAP food benefits and assistance. I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment and these reforms for the benefit of all Americans.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I inquire of the chairwoman if I might be able to speak for about 5 or 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Thank you, Mr. President.

Certainly we want to hear from the distinguished Senator from Montana. I

know the Senator from South Dakota has been waiting for some time as well, and we had asked him to wait until Senator ROBERTS had offered his amendment. I am not sure of the time the Senator from South Dakota is requesting right now, but certainly we want to hear from both of the Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, does the Senator from Michigan want to lock in a time agreement on the votes?

Ms. STABENOW. It appears at this moment we are going to have to have a little bit more time before we do that, but I thank the Senator.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

TRAGEDY IN OKLAHOMA

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I first want to start with just a word about the tragedy in Oklahoma. Our thoughts and prayers are with the families impacted by yesterday's devastating storms, as well as the first responders and volunteers who rushed to the scene. I hope all Americans will continue to keep them in their thoughts and prayers and be looking for ways in which they can pitch in and help in this very tragic situation.

LONG-TERM BUDGET CHALLENGES

Mr. President, I come to the floor today to talk about the long-term budget challenges facing the country and the impact those challenges are going to have on jobs, economic growth, and future generations if we do not control spending.

Last week the Congressional Budget Office released its updated budget projections, and in conjunction with that they released an analysis of the President's 2014 budget.

Once again, the CBO report underscores the long-term budget challenges facing this country. If you listen to many of the politicians here in Washington, DC, and commentators on the Democratic side reacting to the Congressional Budget Office report, you would have heard claims that the deficit and debt crisis facing this country is solved and that no further deficit reduction is needed. In fact, President Obama took to the airwaves recently in his radio address and boasted about the deficits ''shrinking at the fastest rate in decades.''

These claims about last week's Congressional Budget Office report strike me as odd, particularly because the details of the report tell a different story. According to the CBO, the deficit for 2013 is projected to be $642 billion or 4 percent of the Nation's gross domestic product.

While the deficit may be down from its record trillion dollar-plus levels, the national debt, which is already at $16.7 trillion, continues to grow at an alarming rate—$642 billion this year alone. While it is encouraging that the deficit this year will be smaller than it was originally projected, part of those savings are due to unexpected repayments from Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac and the revenue increases from January's fiscal cliff agreement.

The fact of the matter is a deficit 4 percent the size of the economy is nearly double the historic average. Over the next 10 years covered in the CBO's baseline projections, the national debt will grow by nearly $9 trillion to over $25 trillion.

To put that number in perspective, the country is projected to rack up over $2 billion in debt every single day over the next decade, at which point our national debt will exceed $25 trillion. This assumes the sequester remains in place. Publicly held debt will remain above 70 percent of GDP, which is much higher than the historic average of 39 percent. CBO projects that publicly held debt will continue on an upward path beyond the next decade.

This growth is driven by spending, not revenue. The CBO report confirms that revenues are projected to grow by 45.9 percent in the 8 years after the year 2015, while overall spending will grow at 55 percent during that time period, despite the fact that inflation will be 19.5 percent and economic growth 24.9 percent during that time period. Those are CBO estimates about economic growth, inflation, spending, and debt over the course of the next decade.

In other words, revenues are going up but spending is projected to grow at nearly three times the rate of inflation, meaning we have a spending problem, not a revenue problem. In fact, revenues will reach 19.1 percent of GDP by the year 2023, which is well above the historic average of 17.9 percent since the end of World War II. Spending, on the other hand, will continue to grow even with the sequester, driven largely by increases in mandatory spending. Mandatory spending on programs such as Medicare is projected to grow by 79 percent from today's level over the next 10 years. Federal health care programs, including ObamaCare, are driving the surge in mandatory spending. Federal health care spending is projected to double over the next decade as the health insurance exchange subsidies kick in beginning next year. Medicare and other programs continue to grow without needed reforms to save and strengthen them.

Spending on mandatory programs and interest on the debt will consume nearly three-quarters of all Federal spending over the next 10 years, leaving little room to pay for all discretionary programs including, I might add, national defense.

To slow the rapid rise in debt this country is experiencing, we have to control the largest driver of that debt, which is spending and, in particular, mandatory entitlement spending. The alternative is a crippling national debt that is bad for the economy, bad for jobs, bad for our national security, and bad for our children and grandchildren.

According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, ''Such high and rising debt later in the coming decade would have serious negative consequences.'' The report goes on to say: ''Moreover, because Federal borrowing reduces national saving, over time the capital stock would be smaller and total wages would be lower . . . ''

The CBO also warns that such high levels of debt increase the risk of a fiscal crisis. The threat the rising national debt poses to our economy is real. It will impact the American people, and it will impact our economy in very real ways. It will slow economic growth, meaning fewer jobs. It will drive up interest rates, making it more expensive to borrow money to pay for a college education or to buy a home.

It is inevitable that the national debt is going to have to be addressed at some point. The question is whether we address it directly or continue kicking the can down the road, which will only make our problems much more difficult to solve.

The Congressional Budget Office also projected in their update last week that interest spending—the amount we spend to finance our debt—is going to increase dramatically over the next several years. In fact, interest costs on prior deficit spending are going to grow from $223 billion today to $823 billion in 2023, an increase of 369 percent. Net interest costs will surpass the base defense budget in 2019, 6 years from now. Think about that. We are going to spend more in interest on the debt 6 years from now than we spend on national security, on our national defense. That is how fast the interest is going to eat up every other area of the budget.

I would hope we will be able to take this CBO report and not greet it with great fanfare and be slapping high fives because for 1 year the deficit was reduced by a couple of hundred billion over what it was supposed to be, but, rather, recognize that with $642 billion this year and a Federal debt that is going to be at $25 trillion at the end of this decade and interest payments that will exceed the amount we spend on national security, we have a serious debt crisis in this country that needs to be addressed.

It is my wish that Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle and our Democratic colleagues will work with us and that the President will step forward and acknowledge we have a debt crisis. It is not a debt crisis somewhere out there in the future, it is a debt crisis today that needs to be dealt with. The CBO update, rather than alleviating that concern, puts the fine point that we need to act, and we need to act now.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, Thomas Jefferson once said: ''Far and away the best prize that life offers is the chance to work hard at work worth doing.''

I know many Montana farmers and ranchers who understand that exactly. They know what Jefferson meant. They work the soils and tend their herds month after month, often through natural disasters such as the drought we had in 2012. It is hard work, but they do it because it is work worth doing. The dirt under their nails and the sweat on their brow puts food on our tables every day. The farm bill supports that effort, the bill before us this afternoon. It is work worth doing.

Make no mistake, the farm bill is a jobs bill. It supports 16 million American jobs every year. In my State of Montana, one in every five jobs is tied to agriculture. Those jobs are counting on us to get this bill done.

As we work to tackle the debt, it is important to remember the farm bill cuts spending by $23 billion. The farm bill is part of the solution, not part of the problem. Under the leadership of Chairwoman STABENOW and Ranking Member COCHRAN, we have crafted a true reform farm bill. We worked with farmers and ranchers across the country to create a farm policy that works for producers and taxpayers both. It provides support that is needed when they actually experience a loss.

As Will Rogers notably said: ''The farmer has to be an optimist or he wouldn't still be a farmer.''

Farming is capital intensive. Farmers work with paper-thin profit margins. Even the best farmer is left at the mercy of weather and chance.

The drought last year is an example of the risk farmers face. USDA predicts that 80 percent of agricultural land experienced drought in 2012, making it one of the most expensive droughts in a generation. In Montana that means 48 of 56 counties with parched crops and empty fields. The revenue program in this bill, combined with the crop insurance products we have fine-tuned over the decades, will help farmers survive disasters such as this and prepare to put food on America's tables when weather or market conditions improve.

Anyone who has been to Montana knows we have the best-tasting beef in the world too—or at least we think so. For the last year our ranchers have weathered this drought with no support. With hay and water in short supply, they have been forced to thin their herds. Thinning herds means lost jobs in Montana, because 50 percent of our economy is tied to agriculture, and about 35 percent of our total agriculture proceeds come from cattle and calf sales.

Livestock disaster assistance keeps our ranchers in business until the rain starts falling again. That is why I created these programs in 2008, and that is why I fought so hard to make them permanent in this bill—to finally provide our ranchers with certainty they can take to the bank. In the last farm bill they were not permanent and caused almost another disaster. I thank the chairman and ranking member for working with me to extend that livestock disaster with limited funds.

We did not stop there. We did not stop with reforming the farm bill. We saved $6 billion from in the conservation title without compromising the policy. We did this by consolidating 23 existing programs, bringing a tight network of efficient and streamlined conservation programs.

I made sure we protected the working lands programs, which contribute to substantial conservation improvements but still allow for productive use of the land.

In the forestry title, we permanently authorized stewardship contracting. This is so important to the western one-third of our State. This will help the timber industry sustainably harvest more trees. Anyone in western Montana will tell you that means jobs.

We also included support to combat the bark beetle epidemic that has killed over 6 million acres of Montana forests. Senator BENNET and I worked together to make sure those dead trees can be harvested more quickly before the wood wastes or burns. With fire season already well underway in Montana, this investment is more important than ever.

I was also extremely proud of our work to help veterans find jobs in farming. Forty-five percent of our servicemembers come from rural areas. This is a national statistic, so farming is a natural fit for veterans looking to return home to a rural way of life.

In the nutrition title, I am proud to say we kept the fundamentals of the food stamp program intact so low-income families have their safety net in place as the economy continues to improve. We even found a way to trump up spending for TEFAP, which provides emergency food for needy families.

In Montana, agriculture is a way of life. It is our biggest industry. Our 29,300 farms produce billions of dollars worth of quality wheat, barley, peas, and lentils—to say nothing of our livestock. Our ranchers have 2.5 million head of cattle, which means there are more cows in Montana than people.

The farm bill is not just for producers. It also provides funding for rural businesses, from Miles City, to Glendive, to Libby. The farm bill offers opportunities for Montanans of all walks of life.

The same is true all across America. Our farm policy contributes to security in American agriculture, and that is why we spend less on food than any other country in the world. We spend less than any other developed country in the world. Americans spend less than 7 percent of their disposable income to feed their families. That compares with almost 25 percent in 1930.

Our producers put food on tables around the world. In 2012, agricultural exports reached $136 billion, with a surplus of $32 billion—literally growing wealth from our fertile soils.

Like any small business owner, farmers and ranchers all across Montana tell me the No. 1 thing they want is certainty. Operating under short-term extensions leaves millions of Americans' agricultural jobs stuck in limbo. Farmers and ranchers need certainty they can take to the bank. That is why they need this 5-year farm bill. If we can get this bill passed, we are on the road to moving away from these short-term extensions—which do no one any good—and moving to longer term legislation which does everybody a lot more good. I hope we can get this bill passed, it is so important.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I am going to proceed on my leader time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

BURMESE SANCTIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. For the past two decades, I have been coming to the Senate floor to condemn acts of the Burmese regime against its own people. For the past decade, for these same reasons, I have sponsored legislation to impose sanctions on the Burmese Government.

Beginning in 2003, import sanctions have been renewed annually through the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act. This act was later enhanced in 2008 through the Tom Lantos Block Burmese JADE Act, a measure I also cosponsored.

Today, however, I come to the floor with a different message. After having given the matter a great deal of thought and review, I do not believe Congress should reauthorize these import sanctions.

Let me repeat that. I do not believe the Burma sanctions should be renewed for another year. There are several reasons why.

First, the objective of the sanctions effort is to change the behavior of the Burmese Government. To a significant extent that has actually taken place. As a result of the new Burmese Government's actions in the past 2½ years, Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, the Nobel Peace Prize Laureate, has been freed from house arrest, has been permitted to travel abroad, and has been elected to office as a member of Parliament.

A free and fair by-election was held in Burma last year. Scores of political prisoners have been released. A freer form of government has begun to take root. I strongly believe the import sanctions we previously enacted were instrumental in promoting these reforms. They helped deny the previous military junta the legitimacy it had craved.

These positive changes, many of which I saw for myself during my visit to Burma in January 2012, should be acknowledged, and we do acknowledge them. As Suu Kyi herself said last fall during her visit to the United States, ''the sanctions need to be removed.''

Second, I believe renewing sanctions would be a slap in the face to Burmese reformers and would embolden those within Burma who want to slow or reverse the reform movement. We should

be strengthening the hand of these reformists to show the ''fence sitters'' that reform will be met with positive action by the United States. The administration has extended an olive branch to the new Burmese Government, and I believe it is time for Congress to do the same. Burmese citizens should not be made to feel that Congress will maintain sanctions no matter what they do.

Third, after renewal of the import ban last year, the administration waived most of the sanctions in response to the recent reforms. So as a practical matter—as a practical matter—even if the ban were renewed, its effect would be largely nullified through an administration waiver—a waiver, by the way, I support.

Let me emphasize a few points. By choosing not to renew the import ban, no one should fall under the misimpression that Congress would be giving up its leverage with respect to Burma. The current restrictions on importation of Burmese jade and rubies are likely to remain in place even without the renewal of sanctions. This is because the administration enjoys authority under other statutes to continue to limit the importation of Burmese gems. So, again, as a practical matter, the restrictions on Burma would be little different without the sanctions than they are right now under the sanctions we renewed last year, considering the fact the sanctions were waived last year anyway.

Moreover, there are other sanctions, apart from the law I was just talking about, which would remain permanent. They include the authority to freeze assets and the authority to deny visas to bad Burmese actors. Even if the import ban is not reauthorized, these provisions remain on the books.

In addition, a variety of other sanctions that expressly name Burma remain in effect and still require outright repeal or modification. They include provisions within the fiscal year 1997 foreign operations appropriations bill, the Customs and Trade Act of 1990, and the Foreign Assistance Act.

If the Burmese Government continues to support political and economic reform, then at a later date Congress can consider whether these permanent restrictions warrant removal or modification.

Beyond the realm of trade, there are other statutes of general application that sanction Burma due to concerns over human trafficking, counternarcotics, and religious freedom, to name just a few such issues. Burma must take positive action in order to no longer qualify for sanctions under those measures as well. So, again, legislative leverage would remain even without the renewal of this law.

There also remains the annual appropriations process as Congress considers how much and what types of aid Burma should receive in the first place. For instance, there is some indication that Burma wants to improve its military-to-military relationship with us. Frankly, I think that is a good idea, and such programs and contacts provide additional tools for congressional oversight and action.

The European Union and Australia have also removed most of their sanctions against Burma. Congress, in choosing not to renew trade sanctions, would ensure that American companies remain on equal footing with their western competitors and bring greater certainty to those U.S. firms which are considering investment in Burma.

Finally, if Burma backslides, Congress can always reconsider the sanctions.

As a Congress, we need to be realistic about the fundamental challenges facing Burma on its road to reform. The country faces major challenges on many fronts stemming from a half century of bad governance and economic mismanagement. In this post-junta period the Burmese people need our help, and bilateral trade can do just that. It can help improve Burmese lives and show the people of Burma that a move toward greater political openness under a new government brings with it tangible benefits in their daily lives.

A Burmese Government that is more representative of its people and reforming economically will be positioned to contribute to ASEAN regional stability and grow increasingly independent within the region.

While I am pleased with the progress we have already seen, I would note I am not—repeat, not—fully satisfied with the progress Burma has made so far. Much more needs to be done. The 2015 elections will be a vital indicator of how strong the reform movement is within Burma.

In my view there are several other important benchmarks we will need to see achieved going forward. For example, all parties within Burma must work to reduce the clashes between the military and ethnic minority groups and begin political dialogue toward peaceful reconciliation. All parties within Burma need to work to diminish sectarian strife between Buddhists and Muslims. Any arms trade between North Korea and Burma needs to stop—now.

The Burmese constitution also needs amending in several areas. For example, provisions specifically designed to exclude Suu Kyi from running for President need to be changed. Complete and unconditional release of political prisoners needs to be undertaken. The military should increasingly be brought under civilian control. Finally, other reforms in progress involving enhanced rule of law, protection of private property, and government accountability need to take place.

I make this appeal to my colleagues in light of the visit of Burmese President Thein Sein to Washington this week. This is an important visit reflecting many of the dramatic changes that have taken place in Burma. It follows on the heels of Daw Aung Suu Kyi's landmark visit last fall and President Obama's visit to Burma last year.

Many of us who have followed Burma for years—in my case, two decades—never thought we would see this reform come to this troubled country. This is an important moment. I believe it is time for Congress to take responsible action to continue to promote progress by encouraging those who are risking much—very much—within Burma while still leaving in place other sanctions in order to encourage further reform. A decision not to renew the sanctions is an important step in that direction. To do otherwise could send the wrong signal to the wrong people.

So as a Congress, let's continue to vigorously support democracy and peaceful reconciliation in Burma, but let's do so by taking a positive step forward with regard to our sanctions policy.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I see my friend from Louisiana wishing to speak, but I have a unanimous consent request first.

I ask unanimous consent that at 4:05—5 minutes after 4—the Senate proceed to a vote in relation to the Roberts amendment, No. 948; that there be no second-degree amendments in order to the amendment prior to the vote; that the time until 4:05 be divided with 10 minutes for Senator VITTER and the remaining time to be equally divided on the amendment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I rise to present two amendments I have filed on this farm bill, and I will be pushing hard for votes on them right now. I hope these get a full and extensive debate and a vote. They are relevant and related to the farm bill in significant ways.

The first amendment is with regard to the free government cell phone program, and of course that uses as criteria for eligibility the food stamp program and other benefit programs, so it is directly related to that aspect of the farm bill.

Mr. President, as you know, this program has been exploding almost without limit, and I have some fundamental concerns about it. My fundamental concerns are pretty simple and pretty basic. They come down to two things: First of all, I think the whole program is an entitlement mentality gone wild; that we have started the notion that folks are entitled to the government, the taxpayer, providing them almost everything under the sun; and, secondly, and not unrelated, there has been widespread fraud and abuse in this program, and I am convinced it is at the core of this program and can't be scrubbed out.

What is the program we are talking about? Well, it is the free government cell phone program. It was started in 2008, and in just those few years since then it has grown from $143 million that year, which itself is a significant amount of money, to nearly $2 billion now—an elevenfold increase. This program is paid for by you and by me. It is paid for through our land line and cell phone bills. We all get a charge on our bills. So if you actually pay your phone bill, land line, and/or cell phone, you get a charge and you pay that charge and that is what funds this program. So ratepayers, taxpayers, citizens, millions upon millions around the country pay for this program.

The FCC itself—and the FCC is in charge of the program—estimates that about 270,000 beneficiaries have more than one of these free government cell phones. That is interesting, that is important because that is completely against the law and against the rules—completely prohibited. The FCC also says the top five companies that benefit from the program could not confirm the eligibility of 41 percent of the folks they signed up. This is from a report in 2011. The FCC did some spot-checking and found that 41 percent of the folks these companies signed up couldn't be confirmed as eligible.

This has led one of my colleagues, CLAIRE MCCASKILL, Democrat of Missouri, to say the program is rife for fraud, with a ''history of extreme waste and abuse.'' That is what my objections are all about—rampant waste and abuse and a general entitlement mentality that I think has gone too far.

The amendment I offer on this bill, which is at the desk, would simply and completely end the program with regard to free government cell phones. Someone might argue: Oh, these programs are being fixed. We are making great strides.

Well, I was interested in seeing how far we have come, so this very weekend I was talking to a friend of mine back in Louisiana, Clarence, and he was interested in that too. So Monday—yesterday—he decided to go to one of these outlets that advertises free government cell phones and just see what his experience was.

So he walked in and simply told the truth; that he was interested in getting a free government cell phone. He was asked: Are you now on any government benefit program, such as food stamps?

He answered truthfully: No. He said: I have a job. I don't make a lot of money. That was the truth.

He was asked to produce two things: a driver's license and a pay stub. He showed the people at the counter both of those things. They looked at them. Interestingly, they certainly didn't make any copies. They certainly didn't create any documentation because that could potentially get them in trouble.

They looked at his documents and gave him a form he had to sign once, and then they immediately gave him a free government cell phone. The phone was on, it worked immediately, it had minutes on it that he could immediately use. He walked out of that storefront in less than 10 minutes with a free government cell phone.

He then looked up the precise eligibility criteria of the program, which he did not know before. Guess what. Surprise, surprise. He did not qualify. He should never have gotten one. So he is returning it today. It will also be interesting to see how long that phone is kept on even after he returns it because the provider gets $9.25 from the ratepayer and the taxpayer and the FCC every month for that account.

This is his, Clarence's, free government cell phone. This is his receipt. The charge is zero, absolutely free, and completely contrary to all of the rules of the program, which is why he is returning it today.

We have serious spending and fiscal challenges in this country, but we have an even greater challenge, which is we have lost the faith and confidence of the American people. We have lost it because of this. We have lost it because there are tents popping out on every street corner. They are handing out these free government cell phones like candy. And why is that happening? Because the people handing out the phones have a vested interest in doing that, have a vested interest in not worrying about whether eligibility criteria are met because every time they hand out a phone they get $9.25 per phone per month as long as they can sustain that gravy train.

They are the biggest welfare abusers of this—rich owners of companies who milk the system to get richer, whom I would call government welfare kings.

This abuse needs to stop. We need to recapture the confidence of the American people. My amendment would help do that.

I will also be presenting and pushing for a vote on an amendment to limit and bar certain people from receiving any food stamp benefits. Those are folks who have been convicted of violent and serious crimes such as violent rapists, pedophiles, and murderers. There is a misconception that ban is already in the law. In fact, it is not. In fact, the only ban that exists is for drug felons and in the law is an opt-out for States so the State can opt out of even that ban.

My second amendment is simple and straightforward. It would establish a complete ban in the program for anyone who has committed a violent rape, a crime of pedophilia or a murder. There would be no opt-out for States.

I hope we can form a bipartisan consensus around this basic idea and put that basic fundamental limitation in the law. I urge my colleagues to look at both of these amendments and support both of these amendments.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 1 minute remaining. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, will the distinguished Presiding Officer please inform the Senator on how much time we have divided equally.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 40 seconds.

Mr. ROBERTS. I ask unanimous consent that 2 minutes be granted.

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

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, this is an amendment I have worked on considerably, along with Senator THUNE, Senator JOHANNS, others on the Agriculture Committee, and others as well. We can restore integrity to the SNAP program while providing benefits to those truly in need. Let me emphasize that—while providing benefits to those truly in need. We are not touching those while we will save an additional $31 billion; $31 billion as compared to what? Compared to $800 billion over 10 years. If we cannot at least make those kinds of savings, $31 billion to $800 billion, we have problems. I am not proposing a dramatic change in the policy of nutrition programs, such as block granting programs to States would represent; instead, this amendment would enforce the principles of good government and return SNAP spending to more responsible levels.

SNAP was exempted from across-the-board cuts known as sequestration. However, it is clear there are areas within the program that could provide significant savings that were left untouched. Enacting these reforms would allow the Federal Government to continue to help those who truly need Federal benefits and assistance but also enact needed reforms. Otherwise, food stamps and SNAP will continue to be a target. I don't want that. I think we can restore integrity to the program. I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. This goes way beyond what we have done in the committee, which is to focus on waste, fraud, and abuse and make sure there is integrity in the program, to make sure supplemental nutrition assistance goes to families who have been working hard all their lives, paying taxes, who fall on hard times and need some temporary help. This, in fact, would have a nine times higher cut than what we reported out of the committee on a bipartisan vote. It would undercut what we are trying to do in employment and training, which is so critical.

We all want people to have the opportunity to get back to work. We are seeing now, in the area of nutrition, the costs are now going down the way they should be, which is people are getting back to work and no longer needing the help. That is the way we should reduce it, in addition to tackling waste, fraud, and abuse, as we do in this bill.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote no on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the Roberts amendment.

Ms. STABENOW. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be. There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

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

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) would have voted ''yea.''

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

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 58, as follows;

[Rollcall Vote No. 130 Leg.]

YEAS—40

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

NAYS—- 58

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	Landrieu	Shaheen
Casey	Lautenberg	Stabenow
Cochran	Leahy	Tester
Collins	Levin	Udall (CO)
Coons	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Cowan	McCaskill	Warner
Donnelly	Menendez	Warren
Durbin	Merkley	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Mikulski	Wyden
Franken	Murkowski	
Gillibrand	Murphy	

NOT VOTING—2

Coburn	Inhofe

The amendment (No. 948) was rejected.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

AMENDMENT NO. 931

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be 5 minutes equally divided prior to a vote in relation to the Gillibrand amendment No. 931; that there be no second-degree amendments in order to the amendment prior to the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I rise in support of this amendment because when Congress proposes to cut the Food Stamp Program, it is not nameless, faceless people looking for a handout who suffer. It is children. It is veterans. It is Active-Duty servicemembers. It is hard-working adults. We have to stand by them in the way they have stood by us. The reality of this amendment is that half of the recipients of food stamps are children, 8 percent are seniors, and 1.4 million veteran households receive food stamps.

Some of my colleagues believe this is some loophole we are closing, but the fact is these programs were designed for efficiency as part of welfare reform. When we put this LIHEAP program in place—the ''heat and eat'' program—it was to say families living in cold weather States that have high heating bills need extra money to put food on the table. This particular provision is for people in rental apartments who do not have a heating bill but are also having their heat included in their rent. These Governors in ''heat and eat'' States have said we want to make sure our recipients of food stamps are eligible for this benefit because they need it. Children, seniors, veterans, Active-Duty servicemembers deserve to have food on their table.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I thank the Presiding Officer.

No, no, no, no; we are not cutting anybody's benefits that the distinguished Senator from New York is talking about. This amendment would effectively shield over 80 percent of the farm bill from any deficit reduction and prevent the bill from addressing a serious breach in the nutrition program. The distinguished chairperson of the Agriculture Committee, the Senator from Michigan, already has included the provision in the bill. To say the chairperson is against food stamps for needy people is ridiculous.

It is important to note this amendment does more than create in a State what is called the LIHEAP loophole which we don't want; this amendment also cuts crop insurance. That is the No. 1 priority of American farmers today. It is one of the great success stories. It was developed as a way to help farmers manage their own risks, have skin in the game, and head off the need for costly, inefficient, ad hoc disaster programs. These types of cuts can be difficult to absorb. When we are in the third year of drought is not the time to change them.

I also wish to add the Senator from New York has been a champion of expanding crop insurance coverage for specialty crops, organic crops in her home State. I just think that perhaps she is misinformed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Is there time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 1 minute 9 seconds remaining.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I reluctantly rise in opposition. I am a full supporter of this program to make sure families who find themselves in a situation beyond their control because of the economy, because of what has been happening to so many around the country, get the temporary help they need. What we have done in the farm bill is focus on those areas where there has been fraud or abuse or, in this case, misuse of actually a very good program to be able to provide assistance in terms of heat and food. But there are a few States—mine is one of them—that have gone beyond and are misusing a well-intended program.

I believe in fighting for the integrity of these programs so we can continue to fight for increased help for people who truly need it, and I believe what we have done in the bill meets the test of integrity and is defensible and addresses legitimate concerns raised about the misuse and fraud of programs.

So I ask my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I ask for 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 on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) would vote ''yea.''

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) would have voted ''nay.''

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

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 70, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 131 Leg.]

YEAS—26

Baldwin	Hirono	Reed
Begich	King	Reid
Blumenthal	Lautenberg	Sanders
Boxer	Leahy	Schatz
Brown	Levin	Schumer
Cantwell	Menendez	Udall (NM)
Casey	Merkley	Warren
Cowan	Murphy	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murray	

NAYS—70

Alexander	Carper	Cruz
Ayotte	Chambliss	Donnelly
Barrasso	Coats	Durbin
Baucus	Cochran	Enzi
Bennet	Collins	Feinstein
Blunt	Coons	Fischer
Boozman	Corker	Flake
Burr	Cornyn	Franken
Cardin	Crapo	Graham

Grassley	Landrieu	Rubio
Hagan	Lee	Scott
Harkin	Manchin	Sessions
Hatch	McCain	Shaheen
Heinrich	McCaskill	Shelby
Heitkamp	McConnell	Stabenow
Heller	Mikulski	Tester
Hoeven	Moran	Thune
Isakson	Nelson	Toomey
Johanns	Paul	Udall (CO)
Johnson (SD)	Portman	Vitter
Johnson (WI)	Pryor	Warner
Kaine	Risch	Wicker
Kirk	Roberts	
Klobuchar	Rockefeller	

NOT VOTING—4

Coburn	Murkowski
Inhofe	Whitehouse

The amendment (No. 931) was rejected.

Mr. REID. I move to reconsider the vote and move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time until 5:30 p.m. be for a period of morning business, with Senators allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes each during that time, and that at 5:30 p.m. Senator STABENOW be recognized.

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

The Senator from Washington.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H. CON. RES. 25

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, it has now been 59 days since the Senate and the House passed our budget resolutions. The American people are now expecting us to get together and do everything possible to bridge the partisan divide and come to a bipartisan deal. On this side the Senate Democrats are ready to get to work. Unfortunately, despite their focus over the past 2 years on the need to return to regular order, Republicans have been refusing to allow us to move to a bipartisan budget conference.

Many Republicans, including the ranking member on the Budget Committee, Senator SESSIONS, had been very clear up until recently that after the Senate engages in an open and fair budget markup process—and these are his words—''the work of conferencing must begin.''

Minority Leader MCCONNELL said in January that if the Senate budget is different from the House budget, then ''send it off to conference. That's how things used to work around here. We used to call it legislating.'' I could not agree more with Minority Leader MCCONNELL's words from back in January. Over the past few weeks we have tried to move to conference eight times, and each time Senate Republicans have stood and said no.

They have managed to stall for weeks now, but their excuses for not wanting to move to conference are changing. At first Republicans told us that we needed ''a framework'' before they would allow us to move to conference, although they never explained what that meant. And, frankly, a budget is a framework. Then the story changed, and they told us they would only let us move to conference if we made certain guarantees about the outcome. Then last week the story changed again, and Senate Republicans claimed that despite the fact that we engaged in a fair and open budget process in the Senate less than 2 months ago, they think we need a do-over, with another 50 hours of debate on top of the 50 hours we have already done and another round of unlimited amendments on top of the unlimited amendments that were moved already.

This is absurd. First of all, to claim that regular order involves a second full Senate budget debate is simply not true. The Senate has never been forced to go through a full debate and open amendment process twice just to get to conference—not one case. Completely unprecedented. In fact, every single time since 1994 that the Senate moved to conference, it was done by unanimous consent, with bipartisan support, which is the way it ought to be done.

Second of all, the Senate engaged in a full and open debate in which any Member could offer any budget amendment they wanted to. We did that a few months ago. I know all of my colleagues remember this. I certainly remember this.

I would be happy to quote some of what was said about the process if any reminders are needed because as that debate came to a close in the wee hours of the morning, Minority Leader MCCONNELL said the Senate had just engaged in ''an open and complete and full debate.'' He continued and said, ''I know everyone is exhausted, and people may not feel it at the moment, but this is one of the Senate's finest days in recent years, and I commend everyone who has participated in this extraordinary debate.''

My ranking member, Senator SESSIONS, said the Budget Committee markup was ''an open process'' where ''everybody had the ability to offer amendments.''

Senator SESSIONS said on the floor, as debate was wrapping up, he was thankful that the Republicans had ''free ability to speak and debate'' and for ''helping us move a lot of amendments fairly and equitably tonight.''

There is no question the Senate engaged in a fair and open and lengthy debate about the budget before we passed it. There is absolutely no good reason to ask that we do this all over unless the intention is to simply stall the process and push us closer to a crisis.

Instead of scrambling to find new excuses for their budget conference flipflops, I hope Senate Republicans realize their opposition to bipartisan negotiations is not sustainable and will not allow us to get to the table and move on this matter.

I know there are Members who do not agree with the budget that was passed. They will have another opportunity to fight for changes in a bipartisan conference, which is how we do this. That is the responsible and appropriate path forward, and I hope the Senate Republican leaders decide to move back to the position they maintained just a few months ago. I know a number of our colleagues on the Republican side have said to me privately and in public that they believe we should move to conference. I hope we can do that. The challenges before our country in terms of our debt and deficit and the investments that need to be made and the certainty that Americans are looking to us for cannot be completed until we go to conference and work out our differences and come back and move this forward.

I hope this time when I ask for unanimous consent to go to conference Senate Republicans will join with us so the American people can see an open conference move to a debate and solve this very challenging problem we have in front of us.

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 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 that the chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate, all with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). Is there objection?

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Reserving the right to object, it has now been 59 days that the opposition has been trying to orchestrate a backroom deal to raise the debt ceiling. Raising the debt ceiling is an incredibly important debate and shouldn't be done in the back room by a few people. It shouldn't be done through parliamentary trickery or chicanery. It should be done out in the full and open and under the ordinary rules of the Senate.

We are now borrowing $40,000 every second, $4 billion a day. We must borrow from China to run the ordinary functions of our government. In fact, it is worse. We borrow from China to send money to China. We borrow money from China to send money to Pakistan. We build bridges in Pakistan with money borrowed from China. It can't go on. No American family can continue to spend money endlessly that they don't have.

All we are asking is for a commonsense resolution that says we can't keep borrowing.

What I ask is unanimous consent that the Senator modify her request so

that it not be in order for the Senate to consider a conference report that includes reconciliation instructions to raise the debt limit. I ask that as a unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. I will reserve the right to object to the modification, and I will object in just a moment.

I would like to point out to my colleagues on this side of the aisle that for 4 years—for 4 years—we complained about the fact that the majority leader, whom I see on the floor, refused to bring a budget to the floor of the Senate. Then, in what most of us believe was a proud moment—I thought it was a pretty tiring experience at my age, voting all night—we approved or disapproved of 70 meaningless amendments.

The fact is, we did a budget. All of us patted ourselves on the back, and we were so proud that we did the budget. By golly, now we will move with the House of Representatives and we will have a budget and, hopefully, at least begin negotiations with the House of Representatives, in which the majority is Republicans—not Democrats, Republicans. We would decide we were going to do that. Now we are going to, according to the objection and the unanimous consent that was just asked for, in an unprecedented way, put restrictions on the conferees.

The way we usually do it is what I am about to do; that is, we instruct the conferees. We don't require the conferees because that is why we appoint conferees, and that is why we approve or disapprove of the result of that conference. That is how our laws are made, and that is how our budgets are made.

What do we keep doing? What do we on my side of the aisle keep doing? We don't want a budget unless we put requirements on the conferees that are absolutely out of line and unprecedented.

All I say to my colleagues is, can't we, after all those hours—I forget what hour in the morning it was—after all those votes, after all that debate and all that discussion, we came up with a budget and now we will not go to conference, why is that?

I will object to the modification the Senator from Kentucky just asked for in a moment, but I would first ask consent that the original request by the Senator from Washington include two motions: to instruct the conferees, one related to the debt limit, and one related to taxes. That is the way we should do business in the Senate. It is instructions to the conferees.

The Senator from Washington may not like those instructions, but the fact is that is the way we do business, not require the conferees to take certain measures. If my colleagues on this side of the aisle think we are helping our cause as fiscal conservatives by blocking going to a conference on the budget—which every family in America has to be on because of certain requirements they demand—then we are not helping ourselves with the American people at all.

I will object to the modification proposed by the Senator from Kentucky.

I would first ask consent that the original request by the Senator from Washington include two motions to instruct the conferees: one related to the debt limit and one related to taxes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request for further modification?

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Reserving the right to object, we are talking about two different issues. We have passed budgets year in and year out. We continue to pass budgets. Of course, the budgets on our side don't raise taxes; the budgets on the other side raise taxes by $1 trillion. There are parliamentary rules for how we address separate issues such as the debt ceiling.

What we are concerned about, and all we are asking the opposition to do—including opposition within both parties to do—is that the debt ceiling vote be a separate vote and that it not be stuck in the dead of night in a conference committee with very few people, selected by very few people. We have a big party on our side that can include people with many different opinions, some who are very concerned about the debt ceiling and the direction of our country and some who are concerned very much about the debt, so much so that our resilience will not flag. We will maintain the position that throwing our country into further debt is wrong for the country. I think most Americans can understand that.

We are $16 trillion in debt. We are passing this debt on to our children. It is inexcusable. Somebody must make a stand. Several of us are making a stand—not against a budget but in saying we cannot keep raising the debt ceiling; we cannot keep adding debt to our country. This burden is going to be passed on to our kids and grandkids. We are making a stand, and so I object to a modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. PAUL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I just want to associate myself with the comments of the Senator from Arizona. It is accurate that no one on our side of the aisle supported the final budget.

The fact is, for the first time in years, a budget was brought to the Senate floor. Senator MURRAY presided over a very open process with debate and with plenty of opportunity for amendments to be offered. There is simply no reason the very reasonable approach suggested by Senator MCCAIN that would allow us to go to conference should not be adopted.

We have called repeatedly for a return to regular order in this body. Regular order is going to conference. Both the House and the Senate have passed budget resolutions, and it is important that there be a conference committee to work out the differences, which are considerable, so that we will have a framework with binding allocations for the Appropriations Committees.

Mr. MCCAIN. Will the Senator yield for a question, just one question?

Ms. COLLINS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. MCCAIN. Isn't it true that the people with whom the conference would be held on the other side of the Capitol happen to be a majority of our party? So we don't trust the majority party on the other side of the aisle to come to conference and not hold to the fiscal discipline we want to see happen; isn't that a little bit bizarre?

Ms. COLLINS. It certainly is ironic at the least. It is an opportunity for the Republican House to argue for its budget.

I voted against the final version of the Senate budget, but I think we should go to conference and try to work out an agreement. The instructions suggested by the Senator from Arizona are entirely reasonable.

Let's get on with the process. Let's do what the American people expect us to do; that is, to negotiate a conference report that then would be brought back to both Houses for consideration. That is what I urge my colleagues to do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. I, of course, admire—and have for many years now—the chairman of the Budget Committee. She is a renowned Senator. She is very good at what she does. We are very proud of her.

We have just heard something that is unusual. We heard my friend from Arizona—the Senator and I came together to Congress some 30-odd years ago—and another outstanding Senator, Ms. COLLINS from Maine, come up with a novel idea. It is kind of old-fashioned, but it is called regular order.

What they are saying we should do is go to conference. We have had in years past many motions to instruct. That is the way we used to do things around here. To get off-base on a debt ceiling matter has nothing to do with what we are doing. Let's go to conference. I don't know if when we go to conference we will get anything out of it, but we are sure going to try.

That is what this is all about. I can't imagine why after 2 months—after 2 months—we can't go to conference and work something out.

The Republican leader has told me for a couple of years: Why don't we do our appropriations bills? We have the former chair of the Appropriations Committee, who is now the ranking member on the Agriculture Committee, he knows as much as anyone here about financial matters. He is a man who is a humble man, doesn't talk a lot—and I don't want to speak for him—but I think everyone here wants this institution to continue, wants us to do regular order.

I have heard this hue and cry for quite some time on the other side. I admire and appreciate very much the Senator from Arizona instigating old-fashioned regular order, which we need to do in this body a lot.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Reserving the right to object.

Mr. REID. There is nothing to object to.

Mr. CRUZ. The issue before this body is not a budget. The issue before this body is not going to conference. The issue before this body is one thing in particular: It is the debt ceiling and whether the Senate will be able to raise the debt ceiling using a procedural back door that would allow only 51 votes.

My friend from Nevada, my friend from Washington State, both of them could go to conference on the budget right now today if they would simply agree this budget would not be used as a back door to use a procedural trick to raise the debt limit—not on 60 votes but on 50 votes.

I commend their candor, because neither one of them is willing to make that representation, and that is commendable. But I would point out that nothing in the budget we debated raised the debt ceiling. I would suggest the American people are not interested in procedural games. I think they are tired of games by the Democrats and tired of games by the Republicans. What they are interested in is leadership in this body to address the enormous fiscal and economic challenges facing this country.

Our national debt is nearly $17 trillion. It is larger than the size of our entire economy. In the last 4 years our economy has grown 0.9 percent a year, with 23 million people struggling to find jobs. This body should be debating every day how we get the economy moving, how we get people back to work, how we stop our unsustainable debt. Instead of doing that, 2 weeks ago we spent a week voting to add $23 billion in new taxes to small retailers online, creating an Internet sales tax—going backwards, killing economic growth and killing jobs.

This issue is very simple: Will the Senate allow a procedural back door to raise the debt ceiling and doing so while not fixing any of the problems?

My friends on the Democratic side of the aisle believe we should raise the debt ceiling with no conditions, with no changes, with no spending reforms, with no progrowth reforms, with nothing to stop this unsustainable spending. The President likewise has said: Raise the debt ceiling with no conditions. That is why, I would submit, the majority leader is not willing to agree: No, this budget conference report will not be used to raise the debt ceiling, because it is precisely the hope to do so. This body may well vote to raise the debt ceiling. But if this body votes to raise the debt ceiling, we should do so after a fair and open debate, where the issue is considered and where the threshold is the traditional 60-vote threshold and we can address what I think is imperative—that we fix the problem.

When I travel across the State of Texas, men and women stop me all the time and say: Enough of the games. Go up there, roll up your sleeves, work with each other and fix the problem. Getting a new credit card—jacking up the debt ceiling—with no spending reforms, no structural reforms, no progrowth reforms is a mistake and it is the wrong path.

Mr. PAUL. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I will be happy to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Here is the problem. The people in my State are saying the same thing: Roll up your sleeves and attack the problems. Because, guess what. I remember when this budget was balanced, when Bill Clinton was President. It took literally a few months before George W. Bush gave a tax break and put it on the credit card, two wars on the credit card, and the debt was off and running.

But put that aside, we are where we are. Does my friend not think if we could get into a conference—and I know a lot of us here have been in tough conferences—that is where we would roll up our sleeves? I say PATTY MURRAY and PAUL RYAN are ready to roll up their sleeves and get to work. Why would my friend want to give instructions—of course, I would love to give instructions. I would like to give instructions the richest of Americans pay the same effective tax rate as their secretaries. I would love to do that. I would love to order that, but I wouldn't do that.

Let PATTY MURRAY and PAUL RYAN and the respective committees get in there, in an open process, and come back. Doesn't my friend understand what he is calling for, when he says roll up your sleeves and get to work, is exactly what Senators MURRAY, MCCAIN, COLLINS, and lots of us want to do, those of us who believe we need to use regular order? Can my friend comment on that?

Mr. CRUZ. I thank my friend from California for that question. She may well be right, that one of the reasons spending is out of control is that we no longer have Bill Clinton as President and a Republican Congress. Instead we have President Obama who has expanded spending more than any other President in modern times.

Mrs. BOXER. The Senator skipped over George W. Bush, who caused the deficits. But let's not argue that.

Mr. CRUZ. I thank my friend from California, but I have been quite vocal that both Democrats and Republicans have contributed to getting us in this mess, and we need leadership from both parties to turn it around.

I would note in the question the Senator from California raised, she did not say one word about not raising the debt ceiling using 51 votes. And everything else about this debate is all smoke. It is all about one thing, which is do we give an unlimited credit card to the Federal Government to raise the debt ceiling $1 trillion, $2 trillion, $5 trillion, $10 trillion.

If the result of reconciliation was raising the debt ceiling $10 trillion, it would come back——

Mr. PAUL. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Senator yield for one more question? Then I will yield the floor.

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield as soon as I finish this point. I will be happy to yield after that.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank my friend.

Mr. CRUZ. If we went to a conference committee and it came back on reconciliation to raise the debt ceiling by $10 trillion, then under reconciliation rules, 51 Senators—only the Democrats—could vote to do so, and the Republicans would be utterly silenced from participating in anything there. It may well be——

Mrs. MURRAY. Will the Senator yield for a question? Does the Senator expect the House of Representatives, a Republican majority in the House of Representatives, would not participate in that vote?

Mr. CRUZ. What I expect is that each of us is obliged to carry out our responsibility to defend the interests of our States. I have 26 million Texans who I am not willing to go to and say, if they ask me: Why did you go along with the procedural game to raise the debt ceiling, to allow Republicans in the Senate to be shut out, to give up any ability to force progrowth reforms, to get jobs back, to get the economy back, to get people working, why did you give up——

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Does the Senator expect he would not have a vote at the end of a day after a conference comes back from the House of Representatives?

Mr. CRUZ. We may well have a vote, but if we had a vote——

Mrs. MURRAY. And isn't that a democratic process?

Mr. CRUZ. The vote would be a 51-vote threshold, which would mean—and my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle have been very explicit that in their collective judgment the debt ceiling should be raised with no conditions. Given that——

Mrs. MURRAY. Can the Senator answer my question? Does the Senator from Texas understand the House of Representatives also would have to pass this? They are a Republican majority.

And, by the way, we are not talking about whether we should pay the bills this country is already obliged to pay. We are talking about putting a budget framework forward for the next 10

years. We had a terrific debate about that and the Senator from Texas participated in that and offered amendments. He had an opportunity to do that.

The House of Representatives did the exact same thing. At the end of the day, the way a legislative democratic process works is the two bodies come together and it will have to pass whatever our conference agrees to with a majority of Republicans in the House and a majority in the Senate with Democrats. That is going to be where the Senator from Texas will have an opportunity to say yes or no to a conference.

So I don't understand the Senator saying he would not participate. He has a vote. That is how the Senate works.

Mr. CRUZ. I appreciate the efforts of my friend from Washington to defend the prerogative of the Republican House. What I would suggest is that each of us has a responsibility to our States.

Mrs. MURRAY. With your vote.

Mr. CRUZ. With our vote, but also to defend the ability to have our vote matter, to have it make a difference. Because if this procedural trick is allowed to go forward, what it would mean—this fight right now is the fight over the debt ceiling. Because what it would mean, if we go to a conference committee, as sure as night follows day, we would find ourselves in a month or two with a debt ceiling increase coming back and the Democrats in this body voting to raise the debt ceiling with no conditions whatsoever, which is what the President has asked for.

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Senator yield for a question? And I thank him so much.

Listen, let's cut through what is happening and tell me where I am wrong, and I would respect the Senator's answer. The Senator represents a lot of folks, I represent 38 million, so we are two big States and we owe a lot to our people. That is for sure. What is happening here today is very clear. The Republicans, except for Senator MCCAIN and Senator COLLINS, who were here, are stopping us—this Nation—from having a budget, and they are saying their reason is that something might happen in the conference. Well, that is not the way we work in a democracy. Anything can happen at any moment.

Let's get into that conference. PAUL RYAN has a budget that I think is apocalyptic and that the Senator from Texas may well support. PATTY MURRAY has a budget that the Senator probably thinks is apocalyptic. They want to get into that conference and they want to work together. That is called democracy.

I will close with this and ask my friend to respond. Ronald Reagan supported raising the debt ceiling about 18 times. He put out a number of statements that were totally counter to my friend's. Ronald Reagan said—and I am paraphrasing, and I will get the exact quote and put it in the RECORD, as I have done in the past—even thinking about defaulting on the government's bills is enough to send shock waves through the country.

The last time the Republicans played that game it cost us $19 billion. We cannot afford that. My friends say they are conservatives, but they are leading us down that road. I beg them to think about what they are doing. I beg them to have faith and trust in this democracy. I beg them to let the people who are very responsible in the House and in the Senate, who are on different wavelengths when it comes to this budget, get to work. And to quote my friend, let them get to the place where they can roll up their sleeves and get the job done.

I think by my friend's continuing presence to stop us from having a budget, he is doing a great disservice not only to this country but to his party.

That is it for me.

Mr. PAUL. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. PAUL. This is a debate, and it is a good debate, because it is a debate about the debt ceiling. I am actually in favor of allowing the debt ceiling to go up under certain conditions where we reform things. I think it is unconscionable not to do anything, to simply say: Here is a blank check, keep doing what you have been doing.

We are running the country into the ground. We are borrowing $40,000 a second. Should we not talk about reform in the process? Many of us supported last time around raising the debt ceiling in exchange for a balanced budget amendment. Seventy-five to 80 percent of the public thinks we should balance our budget. They have to, why shouldn't we?

I would ask the Senator: Is he not hearing from his people at home that the debt ceiling should not be done in secret, that it should be done, and if it is going to be done, it should be attached to significant budgetary reform?

Mr. CRUZ. I thank my friend from Kentucky, and that is exactly what I am hearing from men and women throughout Texas.

I would note for the Senator from California and the Senator from Washington that I respect the sincerity of their beliefs, that they genuinely believe the Democratic budget passed by this body is the proper course for this country; that the proper course is to raise taxes yet another $1 trillion on top of the $1.7 trillion that taxes have already increased. They genuinely believe the proper course is never to balance the budget and allow massive deficits to extend into perpetuity.

I respect the sincerity of their views, but at the same time I believe those views are inconsistent with the best interests of this country; that the best interests of this country are to restore economic growth, are to get back to historic levels of growth that allow small businesses to thrive and, in particular, allow the most vulnerable among us to work and to achieve the American dream.

In the last 4 years, under President Obama, we have had 4 consecutive years of less than 1 percent average growth in the economy. I refer to this period as the ''great stagnation.'' The people who have been hurt the most during the great stagnation have been young people, have been Hispanics, African Americans, and single moms. Right now, if we look at unemployment, unemployment for those without a high school degree is over 11 percent, for Hispanics it is nearly 10 percent, for African Americans it is nearly 14 percent, and for young people it is over 25 percent.

When this country has massive spending, massive debt, massive regulation, and massive taxes, the result is that small businesses are strangled and die, and the people who lose their jobs are the single moms who are struggling to provide for their kids at home, like so many moms now seeing their hours forcibly reduced to 29 hours a week because of the burdens of ObamaCare. I believe we have an obligation to the American people to focus every day on turning the economy around, on getting jobs back, and stopping our unsustainable debt.

My friend from California made reference to the prospect of a default. I absolutely agree the United States should never, ever, ever default on its debt, and that is the reason why I strongly support the legislation introduced by the Senator from Pennsylvania, PAT TOOMEY, the Default Prevention Act, which says: In the event the debt ceiling is not raised, the United States will always pay its debts, pay the interest on its debts, so we never default.

I would note my friends on the other side of the aisle right now could join together in taking default off the table entirely.

(Several Senators addressed the Chair.)

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask the Senator to yield for one final question. I know they want to keep talking.

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. The irony of this is really astounding. By objecting to us going to conference, the Senate Republicans who are objecting are actually putting us right in the position of being in the place where the debt ceiling, by virtue of timing, will have to—may be part of the budget conference because the House of Representatives wants to appoint conferees and have a budget done fairly quickly once they appoint conferees because they have told us they do not want to go through a series of votes as we all did. I think it is 20 days. If my colleagues object to going to conference at this point——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Now 5:30 having arrived——

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. MURRAY. By objecting to going to conference right now, what Senate Republicans who are objecting are doing is pushing us to a place where the debt limit, by virtue of timing, may be a part of the discussion. I ask the Senators to think about what they are doing by their objection, in forcing us into that position, and suggest that by allowing us to go to conference—we will have a better chance of not——

AGRICULTURE REFORM, FOOD, AND JOBS ACT OF 2013—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 5:30 having arrived, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Michigan.

AMENDMENT NO. 998

Ms. STABENOW. I call for regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. S. 954 is the pending business.

Ms. STABENOW. On behalf of Senator LEAHY, I call up amendment No. 998.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Michigan [MS. STABENOW], for Mr. LEAHY, proposes an amendment numbered 998.

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

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

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Text of Amendments.'')

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, we have made great progress today. I thank colleagues for their work today bringing forth amendments. We will continue to work with Members as we go forward tomorrow, putting together a number of votes to bring before the body. We are working hard to do everything possible to complete this legislation by the end of the week. I think we are on a good track.

I announce on behalf of the two leaders that there will be no more votes this evening.

MORNING BUSINESS

Ms. STABENOW. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business until 6:30, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

The Senator from Louisiana.

TRAGEDY IN OKLAHOMA

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, I really appreciate the hard work of the Senators from Michigan and Mississippi, moving a farm bill through the Senate. It is one of the most important bills we will take up this year. Action on this bill is long overdue. I am very hopeful we can continue to make progress and produce a bill that is excellent for every region of our country. Of course, representing the South, we always like to have special attention given to our agricultural needs. The Senator from Michigan certainly has been attuned to the farmers in rural communities in Louisiana. We appreciate her leadership.

I come to the floor today, though, just for a few moments to speak about the tragedy unfolding in Oklahoma, in Moore, OK, a city that was devastated—portions of the city in the suburban areas—by a horrible tornado, one of the largest to hit our Nation in quite some time. While I do not know all of the details, I understand that it was a very high level tornado that stayed on the ground for almost 40 minutes. This was miles wide and created a terrible path of destruction. There are, of course, adults and children who lost their lives. Recovery and rescue is still underway as I speak. I am certain that the delegations—both the Senate and House Members from Oklahoma—are doing everything they can, working with the Governor and local officials, to provide as much support as they will need.

I come to the floor as the chair of the Subcommittee on Homeland Security and I come to the floor as a Senator who unfortunately has had a lot of experience in disasters to say how proud I am that there is about $11 billion available, without the requirement or necessity of an offset, for the people of Oklahoma. This was a battle that was fought over a year ago, led by Senator HARRY REID and me and others. This arrangement was made in the Budget Control Act so that there would be a significant pot of money set aside in the event that disasters such as this happened, whether it was a tornado or an earthquake or a fire or a flood. It has happened again.

We don't know exactly when these disasters are going to happen. We don't know the exact nature of them. But we most certainly know from past experience and everything that our science tells us about the changes in the atmosphere that they are going to happen and that they are likely going to get worse. That is why I have been very focused on this issue.

I am proud of this Senate, Republicans and Democrats, but I am very proud of the support of the Democratic leaders on this bill to say now is not the time—not this afternoon, not tomorrow morning, not Friday, not Monday—to be debating offsets for victims of the Oklahoma tornado. After a disaster, our citizens do not need or want a debate on funding. What they want is help, and they are going to get it from the committee I chair.

Our people suffered so much in Katrina, Rita, and Gustav. I have watched the east coast have to recover from Irene and from Sandy. I have seen horrible tornadoes in Missouri. The last thing people want when they are digging their loved ones out of rubble and preparing, unfortunately, for funerals that are going to have to occur after what happened—the last thing they want to see Congress do is debate about how and when we are going to pay for this disaster. We are going to send them the money they need to recover.

I want to say this to Senator COBURN, my good friend who is not on the floor—I do respect his consistency on this issue. Even when a tornado hit his State, he is still calling for offsets. He has been consistent, but in my view he has been consistently wrong. There will be no offsets. There is no need for offsets. I will not support offsets. The majority of Democrats, if not the entire Democratic caucus, will not support offsets for Americans in need in disasters. What we are going to do is support appropriate help and sufficient help for them.

Let me say for the record that because of the Sandy supplemental—which I also fought for with my colleagues from the Northeast—we were able to put some reforms in that bill. It was not just ''send the money and do what you will with it.'' We sent money to the Northeast. We also sent them new tools in a bigger, stronger toolbox to help them with a better recovery.

We have a lot more to do in the Northeast. That is a subject for another day. I realize they are in lots of difficulty. But we did send some new tools that will help, even with Oklahoma.

First, we sent them the ability to quickly establish mutually agreed upon estimates for project costs. That has been a real problem with recovery in the past, with local governments arguing one thing, the Feds offering something else. We now have a better, quicker process to agree on what the project costs to get it built more quickly. The project cost will be validated by an independent panel of experts protecting the taxpayer, which is important. Applicants are now allowed to consolidate projects in a commonsense way to build back smarter, reducing future recovery costs.

Most important for this disaster—we fought hard for this in Sandy—finally, there are some provisions in the recovery bill that will allow children to be the center of attention. Sadly, we have lost some children in this disaster. Sadly, many children were injured and probably thousands of children have been traumatized. But because of the new bill we passed under Sandy, there are some provisions to help.

In addition, families can receive daycare now through their supplemental, so the parents who are going to have to figure out a way to get back to work and rebuild their businesses and their communities and their houses can have some additional Federal childcare, which will help.

In addition, I think there are going to be more counselors on the ground helping children than in past disasters.

I see colleagues on the floor, so let me finish quickly.

We have implemented an automated family reunification database to ensure children are returned to parents. This is a relatively small place, well known. We do not believe there are any children whose whereabouts are unknown to their parents. All of the statistics, however, are not in of people missing, et cetera. But there are provisions right now at work with FEMA helping with family reunification. Coordinators are already on the ground specialized in looking out for the specific needs of children in disasters. I thank the coalition that worked with me for years to put that into place.

Again, there will be no offset. There is no reason to need an offset. We have the $11 billion, thanks to the good work of many people in this Chamber and on the other side of this Capitol, to provide this funding for these disasters. I know FEMA is on the ground. They will do the best they can.

In this case, with tornado insurance, which is carried by many people in this area—I am doing a little bit more research into whether it is mandatory or voluntary—with a combination of local help and State help and Federal help and private insurance and, of course, the great spirit of voluntarism, I am confident that after we finish this very sad recovery and shock this community is going through, that we will be able to help them build a stronger and more vibrant community of Moore, OK, in the future.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

BUDGET CONFERENCE

Mr. LEE. Madam President, earlier today we were asked to give our consent to go to conference on the budget resolution. This is an important matter because we have now gone more than 4 years without a budget. This has been of great concern to many of us. I do not think there is one Member of this body who would not want Congress to pass a budget this year. We would like to see that happen. We need that.

We do, however, have a concern—some of us—with the request that we go to conference without certain assurances. Most important, we want a very simple assurance that any conference report that results from this conference will not be used to raise the debt limit. The reason for this is simple. This is an important matter. At a time when we have racked up about $17 trillion in debt, we want some assurances that this important decision will be made under the regular order of the Senate; that the normal rules of the Senate will apply; that this will not be negotiated behind closed doors in a backroom deal. The American people deserve more. They demand more.

Those who may have questioned our motives in connection with this, I ask them a very simple question: Will you give us an assurance that you are not going to use the conference report to raise the debt limit? If they can answer that question to our satisfaction, if they can simply give me an assurance that is not what they are going to use it for, then I will gladly give my consent. So I invite that to be the topic of discussion.

All this begs the question. Why would they not give that assurance? What on Earth is wrong with the regular order? What on Earth is wrong with giving an assurance that, in connection with a conference report on a budget resolution, they would not be willing to say: If we are going to raise the debt limit, we are going to do it under the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, I was going to talk about the tornadoes, but I will take a moment to respond to my colleague from Utah.

There are Members objecting to going to regular order on the budget, and he is one of them. The Senator from Utah himself is objecting to regular order, which would allow us to go to conference on the budget. He was one of the critics when he was running for office. He made numerous statements while he was on his way to becoming a Senator by saying that the Senate and the House needed to have a budget.

Well, the House has passed a budget, the Senate has passed a budget. Yet the Senator from Utah is the one—along with the Senator from Kentucky, and I understand earlier today, the Senator from Arizona, Senator MCCAIN—objecting to going to conference to resolve the differences.

I know the Senator from Utah has read the Constitution, just as I have. The Constitution and the laws that created the Senate of the United States give great strength to the minority—and he is in the minority. However, nowhere in the Constitution does it say one Senator from one State has the right to write the rules and laws for the whole country. I read it lots of times, and I have never seen that. Evidently that is what the Senator from Utah wants. He said if we would just do what he wants, we could proceed.

Well, I have news for him and the Senators who are objecting. It is not about what they individually want. It is collectively what we want. We represent all the people of our country: Republicans, Democrats, conservatives, and liberals.

For 4 years this same group yelled and screamed about not having a budget. Now that we have a budget, they are yelling and screaming that they don't want to work out the differences. I honestly don't know how to please colleagues like this. We had to literally listen to them ranting and raving for years about how we didn't have a budget. We worked extra hard. At the time we said—and I was one of them—that technically they're right, we did not have a budget. As the Presiding Officer knows, we had something that was stronger than a budget. We had spending limits that had the real teeth of law.

What people might not realize is budgets are aspirations. Just as when someone does a budget at home, they can say: My budget this year is going to be set at $25,000. It is an aspiration. They might spend a little more or a little less. There is no mechanism for control; it is just an outline, and that is important.

We thought what we had, as the Democratic leadership, is better than a budget. We had actual spending controls, but that wasn't enough for the Republicans. They knew we had spending controls, but they still went on ''Fox News'' and everywhere else explaining to people that we had no budget and inferred there were no controls. And that is patently false. We had spending controls. We have spending controls now. We have spending limits which are agreed to by Republicans and Democrats, except there are a handful of Republicans who don't agree with those limits. They decided because they represent half of four States that they want their way or the highway, and now the whole Congress cannot go to a conference on a budget.

I don't understand this. I understand minority rights need to be protected. I understand it is important to make sure everyone's voice is heard. I understand everybody cannot get everything they want. I don't understand when my colleagues—the Senator from Utah, the Senator from Kentucky, and the Senator from Arizona—say: No, we can't go to a conference to work out the differences on the budget so the United States can move more quickly to a balanced budget. They have complained year after year that we didn't have a budget. It is the height of hypocrisy, and their position is completely unexplainable and unacceptable.

I am glad I was on the floor. I came to talk about the tornado, but I am glad I had a chance to make a statement for the RECORD about why not many—but there are a few—Republican leaders have stopped the entire budget process until they get their way exactly the way they want it. That is not the way our government works. We don't have kings anymore. We don't have dictators anymore. We don't have people with special powers. We are all humans, and we are all on equal footing. We are all elected to represent our constituents. No one in this Chamber is entitled to write the budget exactly the way they want it.

If I wanted to do something, I could say just as easily as he could: Well, I am going to object unless you promise me that X, Y, and Z are going to be in the budget. I could say that, as could

the Senators who sit next to me, Senator SANDERS and Senator CARPER. Every Senator could say that. We all have things which are very important to us and our constituency, but if we act like that and we don't act in a mature and sensible way, we will never get anything done, and that is where we are now.

We have a handful of Republican Senators—maybe less than five, I don't know—who are objecting every day so we cannot take our budget to conference and have it reconciled. They have yelled at everybody for 4 years about how we didn't have a budget.

The only way we are going to get a budget is to go to conference, have regular order, and work out the differences in a public meeting with public votes. It cannot happen behind closed doors or in some back room somewhere. It has to take place in a public meeting, during a conference so we can talk about what programs or what levels of funding should be reduced, such as what revenues could potentially be raised. Then, according to our process, those directions are given to appropriations committees. At that point we can do our work on building an appropriation for defense, building an appropriation for education, building an appropriation for health, and for our veterans.

If we don't have a budget, we cannot even go to regular order on appropriations. As an appropriator, it is getting frustrating around here to not be able to go to a regular appropriations meeting and sit down as we used to do before this new crew showed up and talked about meeting our budget caps and how we wanted to allocate the taxpayer money in a public, open meeting instead of cramming things in an omnibus bill and doing deals in the middle of the night.

If they would let us get back to regular order and do the people's business, I promise that the people of Utah would be happy, the people of Arizona would be happy, and the people of Kentucky would be happy. They want us to get back to regular order so we can try to negotiate a budget that the majority—and not even the regular majority. We have to have 60 votes to do anything around here. Before a conference committee can come back, there has to be a broad understanding of what was going to be in that conference.

I have one final argument. I could understand a little trepidation on the part of the minority if they were not in control of the House, but the Republicans have control of the House, and the Democrats have control of the Senate. I mean, I could understand their concern if one party had the majority in both the Senate and the House. They might be concerned that what comes out of conference could get rammed down and the minority could be caught off balance. The minority controls the House. This is as fair a fight as they are going to have with one party controlling one and one party controlling the other.

Yes, the President is a Democrat, but he has indicated what I think is very open-minded support for entitlement reform when it is appropriate and additional revenues that are being raised. The President has not put any particular line in the sand that I am aware of. He has been quite reasonable, but he cannot sign a budget unless we can get it to his desk.

We have three or four Senators, if they can't get it exactly the way they want it, who are going to hold up everything. I don't think that is what the American people want, and I am disappointed in our colleagues.

I yield the floor.

TRIBUTE TO MARIE C. JOHNS

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, next Friday, May 31, is my friend's—Marie C. Johns—last day as the Deputy Administrator of the U.S. Small Business Administration. She has served the SBA and our country's small businesses with distinction since 2010, and I will miss working with her.

Her appointment to serve as the Deputy Administrator came at a critical time for U.S. small businesses, when the economy was recovering from the worst economic downturn since the Great Depression. The SBA needed great leadership, and she brought to the agency an impressive family history of entrepreneurship and professional accomplishments.

As she said during her confirmation hearing on May 19, 2010, '' the spirit of entrepreneurship has been at the core of my professional and personal life.'' She described the landscaping business her grandfather owned in Indianapolis, IN. And then later, after her uncle earned his degree in pharmacy at Howard University, her grandfather built a community pharmacy so that her uncle could practice as a pharmacist and serve the African-American community in Indianapolis. Marie built her own career in DC, starting as a first-level manager in telecommunications and retiring as the president of Verizon DC. During her 20 years in communications, she held numerous leadership positions, helping small businesses and entrepreneurs. To name just one, she served as the chair of the Small Business Committee for the DC Chamber of Commerce, helping small businesses obtain technical assistance and mentoring from larger firms.

During her time as the SBA Deputy Administrator, Marie and I have enjoyed a strong working relationship, which has allowed us, alongside Administrator Karen Mills, to achieve a number of substantial accomplishments. Most significantly, we passed the landmark Small Business Jobs Act of 2010 that provided billions of dollars of loans and investment capital to America's entrepreneurs. In 2011 and 2012, the SBA issued its first and second rounds of State Trade and Export Promotion, STEP, grants to 47 States and four territories. These STEP grants have maximized the Federal, State, and local resources to help small businesses export, which in turn has contributed to both business growth and job creation. And finally, we persevered and improved the women's contracting program to put women-owned small businesses on the same playing field with other contracting programs so that contracts to women are no longer capped at artificially low amounts. Recently, on May 8, marking her last time to testify before the Senate Small Business Committee, Marie testified on the important issue of minority women entrepreneurs and how essential they are to the larger economy. The testimony from that hearing was moving and educational and helped raise awareness of this growing segment of job creators.

It has been an honor to work with Marie to provide help and support to the more than 28 million small businesses in this country. During her tenure, the SBA became a more effective Federal champion of small businesses by assisting these businesses to secure financing, technical assistance, training, and Federal contracts.

Ms. Johns now leaves the SBA with a strong performance record. This Nation's small businesses are in a better position because of her work. Her dedication to the improvement of the health of small businesses in the United States will always be appreciated. I thank her for her work and wish her well as she returns to her many civic duties.

RETIREMENT OF ADMIRAL JAMES STAVRIDIS

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, today I honor a superb leader, scholar, and warrior. After a lifetime of service to our Nation, ADM James G. Stavridis is retiring from the U.S. Navy and his position as Commander of the United States European Command. On this occasion, I believe it is fitting to recognize Admiral Stavridis' years of distinguished uniformed service to our Nation.

The admiral is a 1976 distinguished graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy. He has led at every level from command-at-sea to theater command. Admiral Stavridis has also served as a strategic planner for the Chief of Naval Operations and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and as the senior military assistant to the Secretary of Defense. Prior to assuming command of the United States European Command, he commanded the U.S. Southern Command, focused on Latin America and the Caribbean. Admiral Stavridis assumed command of European Command on June 30, 2009, the first naval officer to hold this command.

Admiral Stavridis' contributions to scholarship are also notable. He has graduated with distinction from the Naval Academy, the Naval War College, the National War College, and the

Fletcher School at Tufts University, where he earned a doctorate of philosophy in international relations. He has been frequently published by many publications, including Foreign Affairs, and the United States Naval Institute's Proceedings. Admiral Stavridis was even featured in a 2012 TED Global where he spoke about the future of global security.

His leadership has been consistently recognized formally and informally, to include the Battenberg Cup for the top ship in the Atlantic Fleet, and the John Paul Jones Award for inspirational leadership. Admiral Stavridis' impact on the sailors and the fleet has been indelible. He is the author or coauthor of seminal works on naval leadership, including ''Command At Sea.'' His impact on soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines will continue well into the future.

Our Navy and our Nation will feel his absence. I join many past and present members of the Senate Armed Services Committee in my gratitude to ADM James Stavridis for his outstanding leadership and his unwavering support of servicemembers. I wish him and his wife Laura ''fair winds and following seas.''

REMEMBERING DR. ELBERT B. SMITH

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, with the recent death of Dr. Elbert B. Smith—known to his friends simply as ''E.B.''—I lost a much beloved mentor, advisor, and friend.

Obituaries in the Washington Post and elsewhere have captured the essential facts of his life. Since 1990, he was professor emeritus at the University of Maryland. He served in the Navy in World War II, earned his master's degree and Ph.D. at the University of Chicago, and taught at Iowa State University, among other colleges, before joining the faculty at Maryland in 1968. Over the years, he also served as a Fulbright professor at the University of Tokyo and at Moscow State University, and elsewhere. He ran unsuccessfully for the U.S. Senate as a Democrat in Iowa in 1962 and again in 1966.

What those factual obituaries fail to capture is the spirit of this remarkable man—his personal warmth, his talent for friendship, his great love of history and scholarship, and his passion for progressive causes.

He was one of the most influential people in my life, beginning in my years as an undergraduate at Iowa State University, where he was a history professor. He inspired me to get involved in politics and public service. When he ran for the U.S. Senate in 1962, I got involved in his campaign. And what a campaign it was—an unconventional, insurgent, student-run campaign against the status quo. This was 6 years before Senator Eugene McCarthy ran a similar campaign for President.

While working on his campaign, I was also president of Young Democrats at Iowa State, and we had just passed a resolution urging the admission of Communist China to the United Nations. Of course, this could have been an embarrassment to the Smith campaign. But to his great credit, E.B. said: ''That is your call, Tom, stick to your guns, I'll stand by you.'' That is the kind of principled person he was.

During the campaign, E.B. went to Washington to have his endorsement photograph taken with President Kennedy. There is a picture of E.B. presenting JFK with a copy of his scholarly biography of Senator Thomas Hart Benton, titled ''Magnificent Missourian.'' The reason E.B. chose this gift, of course, was that Thomas Hart Benton was one of the eight Senators that Kennedy included in his book ''Profiles in Courage.''

E.B. lost that 1962 election, but only very narrowly, against the longtime incumbent Senator Bourke B. Hickenlooper. But that campaign was revealing of the kind of man he was: a straight-shooter, a person of great integrity, serious but with a sense of humor, a fighter for the little guy, standing up for civil rights and economic justice.

Fast forward a decade. In 1972, I was fresh out of law school. Ruth and I moved back to Ames, and, frankly, we were flat broke. E.B. allowed us to live rent free in a house that he owned in Ames. With that house as campaign headquarters, I ran for Congress again in 1972, with a student-run, insurgent campaign modeled after E.B.'s 1962 effort. I lost, but we did well enough to run again in 1974, and win.

When I arrived in Washington in late 1974 as a newly elected Representative, E.B. and his wife Jean were living in College Park, where he was teaching at the University of Maryland. My wife Ruth was serving then as Story County attorney, and had to stay back in Iowa. The Smiths generously allowed me to live with them for the next 3 years. I commuted back to Iowa on weekends.

From his days in the Navy, E.B. loved to sail and was an expert sailor. Many a time he took me out on the Chesapeake Bay on his boat. I always felt that he liked it best when the weather was cold and foul, with the rain pouring down. The rest of us would be huddled down below, and E.B. would be up top, steering the boat, having a great time. It reminded him fondly of his days as a Navy deck officer in the Atlantic during the war. Over the decades during my time here in Washington, one of my great joys has been my sailing outings with E.B.

Of course, the other great joy of E.B.'s life was Jean, his wife of 58 years, their five children, nine grandchildren, and eight great-grandchildren. After Jean died in 2002, E.B. found another wonderful partner—coincidentally, also named Jean—who filled his last years with much happiness.

E.B. Smith was a dear friend and an invaluable mentor. He imbued me with the ideal that politics and public service are honorable callings. He always said to me: Don't worry about losing, do what is right, stick up for your principles.

I feel truly blessed to have had the friendship and counsel of E.B. Smith for so many years. He touched not only my life, but the lives of so many others all across the globe. He died one day short of his 93rd birthday, after a full, active, and accomplished life. Through his scholarship, generosity, and simple human decency, he made the world a better place.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

OBSERVING POLYNESIAN FLAG DAY

● Mr. BEGICH. Madam President, I would like to take the time to recognize Polynesian Flag Day. This day commemorates the first raising of the American Flag on the Tutuila Island in American Samoa by the United States Navy on April 17, 1900.

An annual Polynesian Flag Day event was established to bring Polynesian elders, children families, friends, and communities together across Alaska to celebrate, respect, and share their culture and history together. Polynesian Flag Day is a time to recognize the Polynesian community's years of nationality, freedom, and honor, and to commend the service of Polynesian Americans who have fought and are fighting for the freedoms that we all hold dear.

This year marks the 8th Annual Polynesian Flag Day celebration in Alaska, highlighting a proud cultural exchange between Alaska and the Polynesian Islands. The Polynesian Association of Alaska promotes community building, fosters leadership skills for Alaskan youth, and helps cultivate an exchange of ideas and respect between elders and youth, further strengthening our communities.

I join the Alaska Polynesian community in celebrating the 8th Annual Polynesian Flag Day in Alaska.

Thank you for allowing me to take a moment to recognize this year's Polynesian Flag Day.●

TRIBUTE TO JOSEPH CARTER CORBIN

● Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, it is with the greatest pleasure that I wish to pay tribute to Professor Joseph Carter Corbin, founder and first president of the University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff.

Joseph Carter Corbin, an African-American educator, was born in 1833 in the town of Chillicothe, OH, to free parents, William and Susan Corbin. After earning two master's degrees from Ohio University, Joseph Corbin moved his family to Little Rock, AR in 1872, where he worked as a reporter for the Arkansas Republican.

Corbin quickly became a leader and strong advocate for public education in Arkansas. Within a year of moving to Little Rock, he was elected State superintendent of public instruction, becoming the highest elected African-American official in Arkansas during Reconstruction. As State superintendent, he signed the contract for construction of University Hall, which would become the first building at the University of Arkansas and known today as Old Main.

Joseph Corbin was instrumental in the adoption of legislation in the Arkansas State Assembly to establish Branch Normal College, the first African-American institution of higher education in Arkansas. He was appointed the first president of Branch Normal College in 1875, a position he would hold until his retirement in 1902.

Professor Corbin died on January 11, 1911, in Pine Bluff, AR. His dedication to improving education standards and higher learning in Arkansas continues to have a positive impact on our State. The University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff currently enrolls more than 3,100 students in undergraduate and postgraduate programs and continues to be one of Arkansas's premiere colleges. Arkansas has been fortunate to have had an educator of the caliber of Joseph Carter Corbin.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:35 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 258. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to fraudulent representations about having received military decorations or medals.

H.R. 1073. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for protection of maritime navigation and prevention of nuclear terrorism, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 1073. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for protection of maritime navigation and prevention of nuclear terrorism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bills were read the first time:

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

S. 1003. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to reset interest rates for new student loans.

S. 1004. A bill to permit voluntary economic activity.

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–1549. A communication from the Secretary of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Dual and Multiple Associations of Persons Associated with Swap Dealers, Major Swap Participants and Other Commission Registrants'' (RIN3038–AD66) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 15, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1550. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Streptomycin; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions'' (FRL No. 9385–3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 15, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1551. A communication from the Chairman of the Nuclear Weapons Council, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the President's budget requests for the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1552. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs), transmitting legislative proposals and accompanying reports relative to the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1553. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the continuation of the national emergency that was originally declared in Executive Order 13405 of June 16, 2006, with respect to Belarus; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1554. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12170 on November 14, 1979; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1555. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to material violations or suspected material violations of regulations relating to Treasury auctions and other Treasury securities offerings for the period of January 1, 2012 through December 31, 2012; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1556. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Heavy-Duty Engine and Vehicle, and Nonroad Technical Amendments'' (FRL No. 9772–3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 15, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1557. 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; Georgia; State Implementation Plan Miscellaneous Revisions'' (FRL No. 9813–8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 15, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1558. 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; Tennessee; Transportation Conformity Revisions'' (FRL No. 9814–5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 15, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1559. 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; Tennessee; Revisions to Volatile Organic Compound Definition'' (FRL No. 9814–3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 15, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1560. 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 ''State Medicaid Fraud Control Units; Data Mining'' (42 CFR Parts 1007.1, 1007.17, 1007.19 (e)(2)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 16, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1561. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification, transmittal number: DDTC 13–057, of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country regarding any possible affects such a sale might have relating to Israel's Qualitative Military Edge over military threats to Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1562. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a Determination and Certification under Section 40A of the Arms Export Control Act relative to countries not cooperating fully with United States antiterrorism efforts; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1563. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Visas: Documentation of Immigrants Under the Immigration and Nationality Act, as Amended'' (RIN1400–AC86) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 15, 2013; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1564. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to loan guarantees to Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1565. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2013–0074—2013–0083); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1566. A communication from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administration's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Semiannual Management Report on the Status of Audits for the period from October 1, 2012 through March 31, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1567. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Agency, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Schedules of Controlled Substances: Temporary

Placement of Three Synthetic Cannabinoids Into Schedule I'' (Docket No. DEA–373) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 16, 2013; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1568. 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 ''Tentative Eligibility Determinations; Presumptive Eligibility for Psychosis and Other Mental Illness'' (RIN2900–AN87) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 15, 2013; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–1569. A communication from the Deputy Chief of the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Implementation of Section 716 and 717 of the Communications Act of 1934, as Enacted by the Twenty-First Century Communications and Video Accessibility Act of 2010; et. al'' (FCC 13–57) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 16, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1570. A communication from the Deputy Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Connect America Fund, High-Cost Universal Service Report'' ((RIN3060–AF85) (DA 13–807)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 16, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1571. A communication from the Associate Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Telecommunications Carriers Eligible for Support; Lifeline and Link Up Reform'' ((RIN3060–AF85) (FCC 13–44)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 16, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1572. 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–AJ92) (DA 13–598)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 16, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1573. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery Management; Framework Adjustment 50'' (RIN0648–BC97) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 16, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1574. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Biennial Specifications and Management Measures for the 2013 Tribal and Non-Tribal Fisheries for Pacific Whiting'' (RIN0648–BC93) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 16, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1575. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Bluefish Fishery; 2013 and 2014 Atlantic Bluefish Specifications'' (RIN0648–XC432) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 16, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1576. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Framework Adjustment 48'' (RIN0648–BC27) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 16, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1577. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 630 in the Gulf of Alaska'' (RIN0648–XC581) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 16, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HARKIN, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 330. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish safeguards and standards of quality for research and transplantation of organs infected with human immunodeficiency virus (HIV).

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. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 992. A bill to provide for offices on sexual assault prevention and response under the Chiefs of Staff of the Armed Forces, to require reports on additional offices and selection of sexual assault prevention and response personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CORNYN:

S. 993. A bill to authorize and request the President to award the Medal of Honor to James Megellas, formerly of Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, and currently of Colleyville, Texas, for acts of valor on January 28, 1945, during the Battle of the Bulge in World War II; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 994. A bill to expand the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 to increase accountability and transparency in Federal spending, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. DONNELLY):

S. 995. A bill to authorize the National Desert Storm Memorial Association to establish the National Desert Storm and Desert Shield Memorial as a commemorative work in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. LANDRIEU:

S. 996. A bill to improve the National Flood Insurance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself, Mr. CARDIN, and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 997. A bill to establish the Social Work Reinvestment Commission to provide independent counsel to Congress and the Secretary of Health and Human Services on policy issues associated with recruitment, retention, research, and reinvestment in the profession of social work, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. FRANKEN (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 998. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to establish a Home Care Consumer Bill of Rights, to establish State Home Care Ombudsman Programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. KIRK, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mr. NELSON):

S. 999. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide social service agencies with the resources to provide services to meet the urgent needs of Holocaust survivors to age in place with dignity, comfort, security, and quality of life; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WARNER:

S. 1000. A bill to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to prepare a crosscut budget for restoration activities in the Chesapeake Bay watershed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. RISCH, Mr. COATS, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. VITTER):

S. 1001. A bill to impose sanctions with respect to the Government of Iran; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 1002. A bill to enable Federal and State chartered banks and thrifts to meet the credit needs of home builders in the United States, and to provide liquidity and ensure stable credit in order to meet the need for new homes in the United States; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. COBURN (for himself, Mr. BURR, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 1003. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to reset interest rates for new student loans; read the first time.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 1004. A bill to permit voluntary economic activity; read the first time.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. Res. 150. A resolution to designate the year 2013 as the ''International Year of Statistics''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. Res. 151. A resolution urging the Government of Afghanistan to ensure transparent and credible presidential and provincial elections in April 2014 by adhering to internationally accepted democratic standards, establishing a transparent electoral

process, and ensuring security for voters and candidates; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 287

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 287, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the definition of homeless veteran for purposes of benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 309

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 309, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the Civil Air Patrol.

S. 351

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 351, a bill to repeal the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of providing for the Independent Payment Advisory Board.

S. 403

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

S. 420

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) were added as cosponsors 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 longstanding regulatory rule.

S. 450

At the request of Mr. SHELBY, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 450, a bill to require enhanced economic analysis and justification of regulations proposed by certain Federal banking, housing, securities, and commodity regulators, and for other purposes.

S. 453

At the request of Mrs. HAGAN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 453, a bill to require that certain Federal job training and career education programs give priority to programs that lead to an industry-recognized and nationally portable credential.

S. 462

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) were added as cosponsors of S. 462, a bill to enhance the strategic partnership between the United States and Israel.

S. 475

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 475, a bill to reauthorize the Special Olympics Sport and Empowerment Act of 2004, to provide assistance to Best Buddies to support the expansion and development of mentoring programs, and for other purposes.

S. 501

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors 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. 577

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 577, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the distribution of additional residency positions, and for other purposes.

S. 579

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 579, a bill to direct the Secretary of State to develop a strategy to obtain observer status for Taiwan at the triennial International Civil Aviation Organization Assembly, and for other purposes.

S. 650

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 650, a bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to preserve consumer and employer access to licensed independent insurance producers.

S. 674

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

S. 709

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

S. 754

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 754, a bill to amend the Specialty Crops Competitiveness Act of 2004 to include farmed shellfish as specialty crops.

S. 772

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 772, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to clarify the Food and Drug Administration's jurisdiction over certain tobacco products, and to protect jobs and small businesses involved in the sale, manufacturing and distribution of traditional and premium cigars.

S. 774

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added as cosponsors of S. 774, a bill to require the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to Congress on the effectiveness of the Federal Communications Commission's universal service reforms.

S. 809

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 809, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require that genetically engineered food and foods that contain genetically engineered ingredients be labeled accordingly.

S. 833

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 833, a bill to amend subtitle B of title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act to provide education for homeless children and youths, and for other purposes.

S. 871

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

S. 892

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 892, a bill to amend the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 to impose

sanctions with respect to certain transactions in foreign currencies, and for other purposes.

S. 895

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 895, a bill to improve the ability of the Food and Drug Administration to study the use of antimicrobial drugs in food-producing animals.

S. 919

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 919, a bill to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to provide further self-governance by Indian tribes, and for other purposes.

S. 942

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 942, a bill to eliminate discrimination and promote women's health and economic security by ensuring reasonable workplace accommodations for workers whose ability to perform the functions of a job are limited by pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition.

S. 946

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 946, a bill to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions, and for other purposes.

S. 955

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 955, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide liability protections for volunteer practitioners at health centers under section 330 of such Act.

S. 962

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 962, a bill to prohibit amounts made available by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 from being transferred to the Internal Revenue Service for implementation of such Acts.

S. 963

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 963, a bill preventing an unrealistic future Medicaid augmentation plan.

S. 979

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 979, a bill to amend chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, to condition the receipt of certain highway funding by States on the enactment and enforcement by States of certain laws to prevent repeat intoxicated driving.

S. 980

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 980, a bill to provide for enhanced embassy security, and for other purposes.

S. 983

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 983, a bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from enforcing the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010.

S. 987

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) and the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) were added as cosponsors of S. 987, a bill to maintain the free flow of information to the public by providing conditions for the federally compelled disclosure of information by certain persons connected with the news media.

S. CON. RES. 12

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 12, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that our current tax incentives for retirement savings provide important benefits to Americans to help plan for a financially secure retirement.

S. RES. 75

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 75, a resolution condemning the Government of Iran for its state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights.

S. RES. 128

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 128, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that supporting seniors and individuals with disabilities is an important responsibility of the United States, and that a comprehensive approach to expanding and supporting a strong home care workforce and making long-term services and supports affordable and accessible in communities is necessary to uphold the right of seniors and individuals with disabilities in the United States to a dignified quality of life.

AMENDMENT NO. 922

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 922 intended to be proposed to S. 954, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 923

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 923 intended to be proposed to S. 954, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 925

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 925 intended to be proposed to S. 954, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 926

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 926 intended to be proposed to S. 954, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 927

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 927 intended to be proposed to S. 954, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 930

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 930 intended to be proposed to S. 954, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 931

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 931 proposed to S. 954, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 936

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 936 intended to be proposed to S. 954, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 939

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 939 intended to be proposed to S. 954, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 940

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Oregon

(Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 940 intended to be proposed to S. 954, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 943

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 943 intended to be proposed to S. 954, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 992. A bill to provide for offices on sexual assault prevention and response under the Chiefs of Staff of the Armed Forces, to require reports on additional offices and selection of sexual assault prevention and response personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Ms. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, today, Senator FISCHER and I, rise today to speak about the alarming crisis of sexual assault within our nation's military.

Three particularly disturbing cases have arisen in recent weeks. First, an Air Force Lieutenant Colonel was arrested for sexual battery, and an Army first sergeant is alleged to have engaged in sexual misconduct at Fort Flood. Finally, the Army also relieved a lieutenant colonel from his post for a domestic dispute that violated a stalking protection order. What is most concerning is that all were responsible for either handling sexual assault cases or managing policies pertaining to military sexual assault.

We have seen three incidents of this kind in a period of two weeks. The fact that the cases involved multiple services speaks volumes to the need to elevate all Sexual Assault Prevention Response, SAPR, jobs to the level of importance that they deserve. Given the challenge of addressing the sexual assault crisis, we need the best and brightest taking on these jobs in our military today.

We should take steps to ensure that these jobs are on par with those that the military values most. This will address one of the primary factors at the heart of the issue—the need for cultural change in the military. It starts with increasing the value of Sexual Assault Prevention and Response positions and enforcing a rigorous application, intense record review and an interview process that screens applicants prior to selection for those duties.

While we appreciate Secretary Hagel's efforts to ensure that candidates for these jobs are rescreened, retrained and recertified, the bigger issue is making sure that there is a robust process in place to get the highest caliber candidates into all Sexual Assault Prevention and Response jobs at the start. We firmly believe that changes to the military justice system are critical, but we also believe that changing military culture will require transforming the process by which we fill these positions. It will also require holding the leadership accountable for selecting those individuals.

That is why, today, we are introducing legislation that will make the highest-level Sexual Assault Prevention and Response positions nominative ones.

Nominative jobs, also referred to as ''high visibility,'' are given that designation because of the caliber of person needed to fill them. These are some of the most significant, challenging and highly desired positions in the military. Transitioning SAPR jobs to a nominative process enables direct leadership involvement from the commander, who would now hand-pick the person to fill the role. Furthermore, there is a level of prestige that comes with taking nominative jobs because they are recognized as premiere jobs within the organization. Applicants know up front that these jobs will be challenging and career-enhancing. As such, only the best of the best need apply.

This crisis has reached a breaking point that requires more than the traditional process for filling military positions. We can no longer be comfortable placing the service member in a SAPR position solely based upon individual career paths and personal aspirations. As proven over the last several weeks, there are holes in that process. We need to enact a stringent application, record review and interview process that holds leaders accountable for SAPR job selection and increases the likelihood of getting the best possible applicants.

There is a sense of urgency surrounding military sexual assault that requires answers now. Secretary Hagel was correct in saying, ''Sexual assault has no place in the United States military'' and that ''the American people, including our service members, should expect a culture of absolutely no tolerance for this deplorable behavior.'' We could not agree more, but we are also of the belief that the change in culture with respect to sexual assault will require more than education and awareness training. Our military needs to develop a culture that gives preeminence to jobs related to sexual assault prevention.

We know that military leaders share our concerns and appreciate the leadership demonstrated thus far. We trust that they will also acknowledge the benefits of making SAPR jobs nominative positions. We hope my colleagues in the Senate will take up and pass this legislation as we attempt to address the scourge that is sexual assault in our military.

By Mr. CORNYN:

S. 993. A bill to authorize and request the President to award the Medal of Honor to James Megellas, formerly of Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, and currently of Colleyville, Texas, for acts of valor on January 28, 1945, during the Battle of the Bulge in World War II; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. CORNYN. 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. 993

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

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION AND REQUEST FOR AWARD OF MEDAL OF HONOR TO JAMES MEGELLAS FOR ACTS OF VALOR DURING BATTLE OF THE BULGE.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The President is authorized and requested to award the Medal of Honor under section 3741 of title 10, United States Code, to James Megellas, formerly of Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, and currently of Colleyville, Texas, for the acts of valor described in subsection (b).

(b) ACTION DESCRIBED.—The acts of valor referred to in subsection (a) are the actions of James Megellas on January 28, 1945, in Herresbach, Belgium, during the Battle of the Bulge, during World War II, when, as a first lieutenant in the 82d Airborne Division, he led a surprise and devastating attack on a much larger advancing enemy force, killing and capturing a large number and causing others to flee, single-handedly destroying an attacking German Mark V tank with two hand-held grenades, and then leading his men in clearing and seizing Herresbach.

(c) WAIVER OF TIME LIMITATIONS.—The award under subsection (a) may be made without regard to the time limitations specified in section 3744(b) of title 10, United States Code, or any other time limitation established by law or regulation with respect to the awarding of certain medals to persons who served in the Army.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. DONNELLY):

S. 995. A bill to authorize the National Desert Storm Memorial Association to establish the National Desert Storm and Desert Shield Memorial as a commemorative work in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, there is currently no national memorial dedicated to the valor and sacrifices made by those members of our Armed Forces who honorably fought, and in some cases made the ultimate sacrifice, in Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm. For this reason, I am joining with Senator JOE DONNELLY to introduce the National Desert Storm and Desert Shield War Memorial Act.'' This legislation will authorize the establishment of a National Desert Storm and Desert Shield Memorial to honor the service and sacrifice of those who fought in Operations Desert Storm and Desert Shield.

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. 995

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 ''National Desert Storm and Desert Shield War Memorial Act''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ASSOCIATION.—The term ''Association'' means the National Desert Storm Memorial Association, a corporation that is—

(A) organized under the laws of the State of Arkansas; and

(B)(i) described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; and

(ii) exempt from taxation under 501(a) of that Code.

(2) MEMORIAL.—The term ''memorial'' means the National Desert Storm and Desert Shield Memorial authorized to be established under section 3.

SEC. 3. NATIONAL DESERT STORM AND DESERT SHIELD MEMORIAL.

(a) AUTHORIZATION TO ESTABLISH COMMEMORATIVE WORK.—The Association may establish the National Desert Storm and Desert Shield Memorial as a commemorative work, on Federal land in the District of Columbia to commemorate and honor the members of the Armed Forces that served on active duty in support of Operation Desert Storm or Operation Desert Shield.

(b) COMPLIANCE WITH STANDARDS FOR COMMEMORATIVE WORKS ACT.—The establishment of the memorial under this section shall be in accordance with chapter 89 of title 40, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Commemorative Works Act'').

(c) USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS PROHIBITED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Federal funds may not be used to pay any expense of the establishment of the memorial under this section.

(2) RESPONSIBILITY OF ASSOCIATION.—The Association shall be solely responsible for acceptance of contributions for, and payment of the expenses of, the establishment of the memorial.

(d) DEPOSIT OF EXCESS FUNDS.—If, on payment of all expenses for the establishment of the memorial (including the maintenance and preservation amount required by section 8906(b)(1) of title 40, United States Code), or on expiration of the authority for the memorial under section 8903(e) of title 40, United States Code, there remains a balance of funds received for the establishment of the memorial, the Association shall transmit the amount of the balance to the Secretary of the Interior for deposit in the account provided for in section 8906(b)(3) of title 40, United States Code.

By Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself, Mr. CARDIN, and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 997. A bill to establish the Social Work Reinvestment Commission to provide independent counsel to Congress and the Secretary of Health and Human Services on policy issues associated with recruitment, retention, research, and reinvestment in the profession of social work, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Dorothy I. Height and Whitney M. Young, Jr. Social Work Reinvestment Act. As a social worker, I understand the critical role social workers have in the overall care of our population. Social workers can be found in every facet of community life—in hospitals, mental health clinics, senior centers, schools, and private agencies that serve individuals and families in need. They play a crucial role combating the social problems facing our nation and are essential providers in our health care system. Yet, there are not enough social workers to meet these needs.

The Dorothy I. Height and Whitney M. Young, Jr. Social Work Reinvestment Act provides research grants to social workers to train the next generation of social workers; creates a Social Work Reinvestment Commission; authorizes workplace improvement grants to identify workplace safety issues and workforce shortage challenges that need to be addressed to improve the services social workers provide in our communities; and makes grants available to community based programs of excellence to identify, test, and replicate effective social work interventions. I am honored to introduce this bill named after two social visionaries, Dorothy I. Height and Whitney M. Young. Dorothy Height was a pioneer of the civil rights movement. Like me, she began her career as a case worker and continued to fight for social justice. Whitney Young, another trailblazer of the civil rights movement, also began his career transforming our social landscape as a social worker. He helped create President Johnson's War on Poverty and served as President of the National Association of Social Workers.

I believe that social work is full of great opportunities, both to serve and to lead. Social work is about puffing our values into action. Social workers are among our best and brightest, our most committed and compassionate. They are at the frontlines of providing care, often putting themselves in dangerous and violent situations. Social workers have the ability to provide psychological, emotional, and social support. Quite simply, the ability to change lives. As a social worker, I have been on the frontlines of helping people cope with issues in their everyday lives. I started off fighting for abused children, making sure they were placed in safe homes. I will continue to fight every day for our children, seniors, military personnel, and families on the floor of the United States Senate.

The Dorothy I. Height and Whitney M. Young, Jr. Social Work Reinvestment Act is supported by the National Association of Social Workers. I thank Senators STABENOW and CARDIN for cosponsoring this bill.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. RISCH, Mr. COATS, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. VITTER):

S. 1001. A bill to impose sanctions with respect to the Government of Iran; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. CORNYN. 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. 1001

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 ''Iran Export Embargo Act''.

SEC. 2. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN.

The Iran Freedom and Counter-Proliferation Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8801 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 1245 the following:

''SEC. 1245A. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN.

''(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

''(1) The Government of Iran stands in violation of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted at Paris December 10, 1948, by denying its citizens basic freedoms, including the freedoms of expression, religion, and peaceful assembly and movement, and for flagrantly abusing the rights of minorities and women.

''(2) The Government of Iran remains the leading state sponsor of terrorism in the world. That Government's sponsorship of terrorism includes recent involvement in a terrorist attack in Bulgaria, a plot to blow up a cafe in Washington, D.C., a plot to assassinate United States officials in the Republic of Azerbaijan, and attempted terrorist attacks in Canada and the Republic of Georgia.

''(3) The Government of Iran stands in violation of United Nations Security Council Resolutions 1737 (2006), 1747 (2007), 1803 (2008), and 1929 (2010) by refusing to suspend proliferation-sensitive nuclear activities, including all enrichment-related and reprocessing activities and work on all heavy water-related projects.

''(4) The Government of Iran continues to develop ballistic missiles capable of threatening the interests and allies of the United States.

''(5) The Government of Iran stands in violation of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1701 (2006) by its continued transfer of arms to terrorist groups in southern Lebanon.

''(6) The Government of Iran continues to provide arms to terrorist groups in the Gaza Strip.

''(7) The Government of Iran continues to support the Government of Syria in carrying out human rights abuses and crimes against humanity against the people of Syria.

''(b) BLOCKING OF PROPERTY.—On and after the date that is 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of a person described in subsection (f) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

''(c) FACILITATION OF CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS.—The President shall prohibit the opening, and prohibit or impose strict conditions on the maintaining, in the United States of a correspondent account or a payable-through account by a foreign financial

institution that the President determines has knowingly, on or after the date that is 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, conducted or facilitated a significant transaction with respect to the importation, sale, or transfer of goods or services from Iran on behalf of a person described in subsection (f).

''(d) IMPORTATION, SALE, OR TRANSFER OF GOODS AND SERVICES FROM IRAN.—The President shall impose sanctions pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) with respect to a person if the President determines that the person knowingly, on or after the date that is 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, imports, purchases, or transfers goods or services from a person described in subsection (f).

''(e) INSURANCE AND REINSURANCE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall impose sanctions pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) with respect to a person if the President determines that the person knowingly, on or after the date that is 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, provides underwriting services or insurance or reinsurance to a person described in subsection (f).

''(2) EXCEPTION FOR UNDERWRITERS AND INSURANCE PROVIDERS EXERCISING DUE DILIGENCE.—The President may not impose sanctions under paragraph (1) with respect to a person that provides underwriting services or insurance or reinsurance if the President determines that the person has exercised due diligence in establishing and enforcing official policies, procedures, and controls to ensure that the person does not underwrite or enter into a contract to provide insurance or reinsurance for a person described in subsection (f).

''(f) PERSONS DESCRIBED.—A person described in this subsection is any of the following:

''(1) The state and the Government of Iran, or any political subdivision, agency, or instrumentality of that Government, including the Central Bank of Iran.

''(2) Any person owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, by that Government.

''(3) Any person acting or purporting to act, directly or indirectly, for or on behalf of that Government.

''(4) Any other person determined by the President to be described in paragraph (1), (2), or (3).

''(g) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—A person described in subsection (f) is subject to sanctions under this section without regard to whether the name of the person is published in the Federal Register or incorporated into the list of specially designated nationals and blocked persons maintained by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the Department of the Treasury.

''(h) APPLICABILITY TO EXPORTS OF CRUDE OIL FROM IRAN.—Subsections (c) and (d) shall apply with respect to the exportation, importation, sale, or transfer of crude oil from Iran on and after the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.''.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 150—TO DESIGNATE THE YEAR 2013 AS THE ''INTERNATIONAL YEAR OF STATISTICS''

Mrs. HAGAN submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 150

Whereas more than 2,000 organizations worldwide have recognized 2013 as the International Year of Statistics, a global celebration and recognition of the contributions of statistical science to the well-being of humankind;

Whereas the science of statistics is vital to the improvement of human life because of the power of statistics to improve, enlighten, and understand;

Whereas statistics is the science of collecting, analyzing, and understanding data that permeates and bolsters all sciences;

Whereas statisticians contribute to the vitality and excellence of myriad aspects of United States society, including the economy, health care, security, commerce, education, and research;

Whereas rapidly increasing numbers of students in grades K through 16 and educators are recognizing the many benefits of statistical literacy as a collection of skills to intelligently cope with the requirements of citizenship, employment, and family;

Whereas statisticians contribute to smart and efficient government through the production of statistical data that informs on all aspects of our society, including population, labor, education, economy, transportation, health, energy, and crime;

Whereas the goals of the International Year of Statistics are to increase public awareness of the power and impact of statistics on all aspects of society, nurture statistics as a profession, especially among young people, and promote creativity and development in the sciences of probability and statistics; and

Whereas throughout the year, organizations in countries across the world will reach out to adults and children through symposia, conferences, demonstrations, workshops, contests, school activities, exhibitions, and other public events to increase awareness of the history and importance of statistics: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the year 2013 as the ''International Year of Statistics'';

(2) supports the goals and ideals of the International Year of Statistics;

(3) recognizes the necessity of educating the public on the merits of the sciences, including statistics, and promoting interest in the sciences among the youth of the United States; and

(4) encourages the people of the United States to participate in the International Year of Statistics through participation in appropriate programs, activities, and ceremonies that call attention to the importance of statistics to the present and future well-being of the people of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 151—URGING THE GOVERNMENT OF AFGHANISTAN TO ENSURE TRANSPARENT AND CREDIBLE PRESIDENTIAL AND PROVINCIAL ELECTIONS IN APRIL 2014 BY ADHERING TO INTERNATIONALLY ACCEPTED DEMOCRATIC STANDARDS, ESTABLISHING A TRANSPARENT ELECTORAL PROCESS, AND ENSURING SECURITY FOR VOTERS AND CANDIDATES

Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 151

Whereas Afghanistan's Independent Election Commission has affirmed that Afghanistan will hold presidential and provincial elections in April 2014 and parliamentary elections in 2015;

Whereas Afghanistan's current electoral process was established in 2004 by the Constitution of Afghanistan;

Whereas the Tokyo Mutual Accountability Framework conditions some international assistance to Afghanistan on the holding of credible, inclusive, and transparent elections in 2014 and 2015, among other measures to improve governance;

Whereas Afghanistan lacks a comprehensive and accurate voter registry, and previous voter registration drives have resulted in duplicate or fraudulent registrations, according to a report by the National Democratic Institute;

Whereas security concerns and voter intimidation have impeded the ability of people in Afghanistan to cast votes reliably and safely in past elections;

Whereas Afghan women in particular are prevented from meaningful participation in the electoral process due to the security environment, the scarcity of female poll workers, and lack of awareness of women's political rights and opportunities, according to the Free and Fair Election Foundation of Afghanistan;

Whereas Afghanistan's 2009 presidential election was characterized by inadequate security for voters and candidates, low voter turnout, and widespread fraud, according to the National Democratic Institute;

Whereas Afghan officials, including President Karzai and Attorney General Mohammad Ishaq Aloko, disputed the results of Afghanistan's 2010 parliamentary elections and established a Special Election Tribunal to investigate allegations of fraud;

Whereas, following the 2010 parliamentary elections, Democracy International's Afghanistan Election Observation Mission concluded that comprehensive electoral reform is necessary to ensure a free, fair, and credible election process in 2014;

Whereas the Honorable Hamid Karzai is the first democratically elected president of modern Afghanistan and has served two terms in that position;

Whereas the Constitution of Afghanistan states, ''No one can be elected as president for more than two terms.'';

Whereas President Karzai stated on January 11, 2013, alongside President Barack Obama, ''The greatest of my achievements [. . .] will be a proper, well-organized, interference-free election in which the Afghan people can elect their next president.'';

Whereas, on several occasions since the late 1970s, civil war has broken out in Afghanistan over the legitimacy of the Afghan government;

Whereas United States taxpayers have invested more than $89,500,000,000 in reconstruction and humanitarian assistance to Afghanistan since October 2001, according to the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction (SIGAR);

Whereas a democratically-elected and legitimate government that reflects the will of the Afghan people is in the vital security interests of Afghanistan, the United States, its partners in the NATO International Security Assistance Force (ISAF), and Afghanistan's neighbors; and

Whereas the most critical milestone for Afghanistan's future stability is a peaceful and credible transition of power through presidential elections in 2014: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) affirms that the electoral process in Afghanistan should be determined and led by

Afghan actors, with support from the international community, and should not be subject to internal and external interference;

(2) expresses its strong support for credible, inclusive, and transparent presidential and provincial elections in April 2014;

(3) urges the Government of Afghanistan to conduct the elections in full accordance with the Constitution of Afghanistan, to include maintaining the quota for women's parliamentary participation;

(4) honors the sacrifice of United States, coalition, and Afghan service members who have been killed or injured since October 2001 in defense of the democratic rights of the Afghan people;

(5) recognizes the substantial investment made by the United States taxpayers in support of stability and democracy in Afghanistan;

(6) recognizes the contributions made by the government of President Hamid Karzai to the democratic progress of Afghanistan, including statements by President Karzai committing to hold presidential elections in 2014 and not seek a third term;

(7) recognizes that transparent and credible elections will safeguard the legitimacy of the next Afghan government and will help prevent future violence by groups that may be ready to contest a process perceived as rigged or dishonest;

(8) recognizes that a democratically-elected and legitimate government is as important to ensuring the long term stability of Afghanistan as the successful training and fielding of the Afghan National Security Forces;

(9) urges the Government of Afghanistan to recognize the independence and impartiality of the Independent Electoral Commission (IEC) and an elections complaints mechanism with clear jurisdiction over the final results, and urges all parties not to interfere with their deliberations;

(10) urges the Parliament of Afghanistan to pass legislation that will establish a consultative and inclusive process for appointing elections commissioners and allowing election disputes to be resolved transparently and fairly;

(11) urges the IEC to adopt measures to better mitigate fraud, include marginalized groups, and improve electoral transparency of the polling and counting process and communicate these measures clearly and consistently to the people of Afghanistan;

(12) urges the Government of Afghanistan to support a credible and effective electoral complaints mechanism whereby its members are perceived as impartial, it is given the ultimate authority on deciding whether a ballot or candidate is disqualified, and it has the time and resources to do its work;

(13) urges close and continuing communication between the IEC and the Afghan National Security Forces to identify and provide security for vulnerable areas of the country during the election period;

(14) urges the Afghan National Security Forces to make every necessary effort to ensure the safety of voters and candidates;

(15) expresses its support for the full participation of Afghan civil society in the election process; and

(16) urges the Secretary of State to condition financial, logistical, and political support for Afghanistan's 2014 elections based on the implementation of reforms in Afghanistan including—

(A) increased efforts to encourage women's participation in the electoral process, including provisions to ensure their full access to and security at polling stations;

(B) the implementation of measures to prevent fraudulent registration and manipulation of the voting or counting processes, including—

(i) establishment of processes to better control ballots;

(ii) vetting of and training for election officials; and

(iii) full accreditation of and access for international and domestic election observers; and

(C) prompt passage of legislation through the Parliament of Afghanistan that codifies the authorities and independence of the IEC and an independent and impartial election complaints mechanism.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 954. Mr. BEGICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 955. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 956. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. COBURN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. WARNER, Mr. RISCH, Mr. KIRK, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. LAUTENBERG) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 957. Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mrs. BOXER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 958. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 959. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 960. Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. GRAHAM) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 961. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 962. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 963. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 964. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 965. Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Mr. BEGICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 966. Mr. FRANKEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 967. Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 968. Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. BROWN, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. JOHANNS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 969. Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 970. Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mrs. FISCHER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 971. Mr. TESTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 972. Mr. TESTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 973. Mr. TESTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 974. Mr. BEGICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 975. Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. SCHATZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 976. Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. HARKIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 977. Mr. COWAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 978. Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mrs. BOXER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 979. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 980. Mr. COWAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 981. Mr. ENZI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 982. Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. TESTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 983. Mr. ENZI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 984. Mrs. FISCHER (for herself, Mr. CARPER, and Mr. JOHANNS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 985. Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. JOHANNS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 986. Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. HARKIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 987. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 988. Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. KING) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 989. Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. JOHANNS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 990. Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. JOHANNS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 991. Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. JOHANNS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 992. Mr. FRANKEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 993. Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 994. Mr. VITTER (for himself and Mr. CORNYN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 995. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 996. Mr. PRYOR (for himself and Mr. WICKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 997. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 998. Mr. LEAHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra.

SA 999. Mr. COBURN (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. MCCAIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1000. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1001. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1002. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1003. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1004. Mr. COBURN (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1005. Mr. COBURN (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1006. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1007. Mr. COBURN (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1008. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1009. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1010. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1011. Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. DONNELLY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1012. Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mrs. MCCASKILL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1013. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1014. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1015. Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CHAMBLISS, and Mr. ISAKSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1016. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1017. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1018. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1019. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1020. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1021. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1022. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1023. Mr. COWAN (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. REED, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. KING) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1024. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1025. Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. TESTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1026. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1027. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1028. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1029. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1030. Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. COWAN, and Mr. REED) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1031. Mrs. HAGAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1032. Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. TESTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1033. Mr. KING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1034. Mr. KING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1035. Mr. KING (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1036. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1037. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1038. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1039. Mr. CRAPO (for himself and Mr. RISCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1040. Mr. ENZI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 925 submitted by Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. CORKER, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. COATS, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. COONS, Mr. COBURN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. HELLER) and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1041. Mr. ENZI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1042. Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. TESTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1043. Mr. PRYOR (for himself, Mr. COONS, and Mr. CHAMBLISS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1044. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1045. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1046. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1047. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1048. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1049. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1050. Mr. BEGICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1051. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1052. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1053. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1054. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1055. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1056. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1057. Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. CARDIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1058. Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 954. Mr. BEGICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1150, after line 15, add the following:

SEC. 12213. DENALI COMMISSION REAUTHORIZATION.

The first section 310 of the Denali Commission Act of 1998 (42 U.S.C. 3121 note; Public Law 105–277) (relating to authorization of appropriations)—

(1) is redesignated as section 312; and

(2) is amended by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Commission such sums as are necessary to carry out this title, in accordance with the purposes of this title, for fiscal year 2014 and each fiscal year thereafter.''.

SA 955. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1001, strike line 13 and insert the following:

''cal years 2014 through 2018.

''(6) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the amounts made available to carry out this section shall be used to construct, fund, install, or operate an ethanol blender pump or ethanol storage facility.''.

SA 956. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. COBURN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. WARNER, Mr. RISCH, Mr. KIRK, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. LAUTENBERG) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1150, after line 15, insert the following:

SEC. 12____. REPEAL OF DUPLICATIVE CATFISH INSPECTION PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Effective on the date of enactment of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8701 et seq.), section 11016 of such Act (Public Law 110–246; 122 Stat. 2130) and the amendments made by such section are repealed.

(b) APPLICATION.—The Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621 et seq.) and the Federal Meat Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) shall be applied and administered as if section 11016 (Public Law 110–246; 122 Stat. 2130) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8701 et seq.) and the amendments made by such section had not been enacted.

SA 957. Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mrs. BOXER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of part IV of subtitle D of title I, add the following:

SEC. 1482. INCLUSION OF CALIFORNIA AS SEPARATE MILK MARKETING ORDER.

(a) INCLUSION AUTHORIZED.—On the petition and approval of California dairy producers in the manner provided in section 8c of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (7 U.S.C. 608c), reenacted with amendments by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, the Secretary shall designate the State of California as a separate Federal milk marketing order.

(b) SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS.—If designated under subsection (a), the order covering California shall have the right to reblend and distribute order receipts to recognize quota value.

SA 958. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 122____. LISTING OF LESSER PRAIRIE CHICKENS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, shall not make a decision on listing, or list, Lesser Prairie Chickens under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) earlier than March 31, 2015.

SA 959. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 363, strike lines 7 through 12, and insert ''(a)(1), by striking '; and (C)' and inserting''.

SA 960. Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. GRAHAM) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 351, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

PART I—REAUTHORIZATION OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

On page 390, between line 17 and 18, insert the following:

PART II—NUTRITION ASSISTANCE BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM

SEC. 4001A. NUTRITION ASSISTANCE BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For each of fiscal years 2015 through 2022, the Secretary shall establish a nutrition assistance block grant program under which the Secretary shall make annual grants to each participating State that establishes a nutrition assistance program in the State and submits to the Secretary annual reports under subsection (d).

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—As a requirement of receiving grants under this section, the Governor of each participating State shall certify that the State nutrition assistance program includes—

(1) work requirements;

(2) mandatory drug testing;

(3) verification of citizenship or proof of lawful permanent residency of the United States; and

(4) limitations on the eligible uses of benefits that are at least as restrictive as the limitations in place for the supplemental nutrition assistance program established under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.) as of May 31, 2013.

(c) AMOUNT OF GRANT.—For each fiscal year, the Secretary shall make a grant to each participating State in an amount equal to the product of—

(1) the amount made available under section 4002A for the applicable fiscal year; and

(2) the proportion that—

(A) the number of legal residents in the State whose income does not exceed 100 percent of the poverty line (as defined in section 673(2) of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9902(2), including any revision required by such section)) applicable to a family of the size involved; bears to

(B) the number of such individuals in all participating States for the applicable fiscal year, based on data for the most recent fiscal year for which data is available.

(d) ANNUAL REPORT REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than January 1 of each year, each State that receives a grant under this section shall submit to the Secretary a report that shall include, for the year covered by the report—

(A) a description of the structure and design of the nutrition assistance program of the State, including the manner in which residents of the State qualify for the program;

(B) the cost the State incurs to administer the program;

(C) whether the State has established a rainy day fund for the nutrition assistance program of the State; and

(D) general statistics about participation in the nutrition assistance program.

(2) AUDIT.—Each year, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(A) conduct an audit on the effectiveness of the nutritional assistance block grant program and the manner in which each participating State is implementing the program; and

(B) not later than June 30, submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report describing—

(i) the results of the audit; and

(ii) the manner in which the State will carry out the supplemental nutrition assistance program in the State, including eligibility and fraud prevention requirements.

(e) USE OF FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A State that receives a grant under this section may use the grant in any manner determined to be appropriate by the State to provide nutrition assistance to the legal residents of the State.

(2) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Grant funds made available to a State under this section shall—

(A) remain available to the State for a period of 5 years; and

(B) after that period, shall—

(i) revert to the Federal Government to be deposited in the Treasury and used for Federal budget deficit reduction; or

(ii) if there is no Federal budget deficit, be used to reduce the Federal debt in such manner as the Secretary of the Treasury considers appropriate.

SEC. 4002A. FUNDING.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this part—

(1) for fiscal year 2015, $45,500,000,000;

(2) for fiscal year 2016, $46,600,000,000;

(3) for fiscal year 2017, $47,800,000,000;

(4) for fiscal year 2018, $49,000,000,000;

(5) for fiscal year 2019, $50,200,000,000;

(6) for fiscal year 2020, $51,500,000,000;

(7) for fiscal year 2021, $52,800,000,000; and

(8) for fiscal year 2022, $54,100,000,000.

(b) ADJUSTMENTS TO DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(c)) is amended by striking paragraphs (5) through (10) and inserting the following:

''(5) with respect to fiscal year 2016, for the discretionary category, $1,131,500,000,000 in new budget authority;

''(6) with respect to fiscal year 2017, for the discretionary category, $1,178,800,000,000 in new budget authority;

''(7) with respect to fiscal year 2018, for the discretionary category, $1,205,000,000,000 in new budget authority;

''(8) with respect to fiscal year 2019, for the discretionary category, $1,232,200,000,000 in new budget authority;

''(9) with respect to fiscal year 2020, for the discretionary category, $1,259,500,000,000 in new budget authority; and

''(10) with respect to fiscal year 2021, for the discretionary category, $1,286,800,000,000 in new budget authority.''.

(2) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901A) is amended—

(A) by striking the matter preceding paragraph (1) and inserting the following: ''Discretionary appropriations and direct spending accounts shall be reduced in accordance with this section as follows:'';

(B) by striking paragraphs (1) and (2);

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (11) as paragraphs (1) through (9), respectively;

(D) in paragraph (2), as redesignated, by striking ''paragraph (3)'' and inserting ''paragraph (1)'';

(E) in paragraph (3), as redesignated, by striking ''paragraph (4)'' each place it appears and inserting ''paragraph (2)'';

(F) in paragraph (4), as redesignated, by striking ''paragraph (4)'' each place it appears and inserting ''paragraph (2)'';

(G) in paragraph (5), as redesignated—

(i) by striking ''paragraph (5)'' each place it appears and inserting ''paragraph (3)''; and

(ii) by striking ''paragraph (6)'' each place it appears and inserting ''paragraph (4)'';

(H) in paragraph (6), as redesignated—

(i) by striking ''paragraph (4)'' and inserting ''paragraph (2)''; and

(ii) by striking ''paragraphs (5) and (6)'' and inserting ''paragraphs (3) and (4)'';

(I) in paragraph (7), as redesignated—

(i) by striking ''paragraph (8)'' and inserting ''paragraph (6)''; and

(ii) by striking ''paragraph (6)'' each place it appears and inserting ''paragraph (4)''; and

(J) in paragraph (9), as redesignated, by striking ''paragraph (4)'' and inserting ''paragraph (2)''.

SEC. 4003A. REPEALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Effective September 30, 2014, the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.) is repealed.

(b) REPEAL OF MANDATORY FUNDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, effective September 30, 2014, the supplemental nutrition assistance program established under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.) (as in effect prior to that date) shall cease to be a program funded through direct spending (as defined in section 250(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900(c)) prior to the amendment made by paragraph (2)).

(2) DIRECT SPENDING.—Effective September 30, 2014, section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900(c)(8)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by adding ''and'' at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''; and'' at the end and inserting a period; and

(C) by striking subparagraph (C).

(3) ENTITLEMENT AUTHORITY.—Effective September 30, 2014, section 3(9) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 622(9)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''means—'' and all that follows through ''the authority to make'' and inserting ''means the authority to make'';

(B) by striking ''; and'' and inserting a period; and

(C) by striking subparagraph (B).

(c) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAW.—Any reference in this Act, an amendment made by this Act, or any other Act to the supplemental nutrition assistance program shall be considered to be a reference to the nutrition assistance block grant program under this part.

SEC. 4004A. BASELINE.

Notwithstanding section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 907), the baseline shall assume that, on and after September 30, 2014, no benefits shall be provided under the supplemental nutrition assistance program established under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.) (as in effect prior to that date).

SA 961. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1150, after line 15, add the following:

SEC. 12_____. STATE OPTION OF NON-PARTICIPATION IN RENEWABLE FUEL STANDARD.

Section 211(o)(2)(B) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(2)(B)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(vi) ELECTION OF NON-PARTICIPATION BY STATE GOVERNMENT.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the applicable volume of renewable fuel as determined under this subparagraph shall be adjusted in accordance with this clause.

''(II) REQUIREMENTS.—On passage by a State legislature and signature by the Governor of the State of a law that elects to not participate in the applicable volume of renewable fuel in accordance with this clause, the Administrator shall allow a State to not participate in the applicable volume of renewable fuel determined under clause (i).

''(III) REDUCTION.—On the election of a State under subclause (II), the Administrator shall reduce the applicable volume of renewable fuel determined under clause (i) by the percentage that reflects the national gasoline consumption of the non-participating State that is attributable to that State.

''(IV) CREDITS TO HOLD FUEL SALES HARMLESS.—On the election of a State under subclause (II), the Administrator shall provide for the generation of credits for all gasoline (regardless of whether the gasoline is blended) provided through a fuel terminal in the State to be calculated as though the gasoline were blended with the maximum allowable ethanol content of gasoline allowed in that State to apply toward the applicable volume of renewable fuel determined under clause (i).''.

SA 962. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 169, strike line 17 and all that follows through page 170, line 16, and insert the following:

''(c) DIRECTION, CONTROL, AND SUPPORT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall be free from the direction and control of any person other than the Secretary or the Deputy Secretary of Agriculture.

''(2) ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT.—The Division shall not receive administrative support (except on a reimbursable basis) from any agency other than the Office of the Secretary.

''(3) PROHIBITION ON DELEGATION.—The Secretary may not delegate to any other officer or employee of the Department, other than the Deputy Secretary of Agriculture or the Director, the authority of the Secretary with respect to the Division.''.

SA 963. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1150, after line 15, add the following:

SEC. 122_____. CFTC INVESTIGATION ON ENERGY FUTURES AND SWAPS MARKETS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, in coordination with the Oil and Gas Price Fraud Working Group, shall carry out an investigation and submit to Congress a report on whether any United States participant in the energy futures or swaps markets has engaged in price-fixing or has provided inaccurate information to a price reporting agency for the purpose of manipulating the published prices of gasoline, crude oil, heating oil, diesel fuel, or jet fuel.

(b) COORDINATION.—In carrying out the investigation under subsection (a), the Commodity Futures Trading Commission shall coordinate with appropriate Federal agencies and European Union agencies.

(c) REPORT CONTENTS.—The report under subsection (a) shall—

(1) include recommendations on how to make the pricing of gasoline, crude oil, heating oil, diesel fuel, and jet fuel more transparent, open, and free from manipulation, fraud, abuse, or excessive speculation; and

(2) be published on a publicly accessible Internet site of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

(d) REFERRAL TO AUTHORITIES.—If the Commodity Futures Trading Commission finds that illegal price-fixing has occurred, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission shall report those findings, along with any evidence, to the proper authorities.

SA 964. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1150, after line 15, add the following:

SEC. 122____. COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION REGULATION OF ENERGY MARKETS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) in 1974, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission was established as an independent agency with a mandate—

(A) to enforce and administer the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 1 et seq.);

(B) to ensure market integrity;

(C) to protect market users from fraud and abusive trading practices; and

(D) to prevent and prosecute manipulation of the price of any commodity in interstate commerce;

(2) Congress declared in section 4a of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 6a) that excessive speculation imposes an undue and unnecessary burden on interstate commerce;

(3) title VII of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (15 U.S.C. 8301 et seq.) required the Commission to establish position limits ''to diminish, eliminate, or prevent excessive speculation'' for trading in crude oil, gasoline, heating oil, diesel fuel, jet fuel, and other physical commodity derivatives by January 17, 2011;

(4) according to an article published in Forbes on February 27, 2012, excessive oil speculation ''translates out into a premium for gasoline at the pump of $.56 a gallon'' based on a 2012 report from Goldman Sachs;

(5) on May 10, 2013—

(A) the supply of finished motor gasoline in the United States was higher than the supply was on May 15, 2009, when the national average price for a gallon of regular unleaded gasoline was less than $2.30; and

(B) demand for finished motor gasoline in the United States was lower than demand was on May 15, 2009;

(6) on May 17, 2013, the national average price of regular unleaded gasoline was $3.62 a gallon, an increase of more $1.30 per gallon as compared to 2009, when finished motor gasoline supplies were lower and demand was higher;

(7) the International Energy Agency forecast on May 14, 2013, that the global supply of oil will surge by 8,400,000 barrels per day over the subsequent 5-year period, a pace that is significantly faster than demand, with nearly ⅔ of that increase occurring in North America;

(8) on November 3, 2011, Gary Gensler, the Chairman of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission testified before the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations that ''80 to 87 percent of the [oil futures] market'' is dominated by ''financial participants, swap dealers, hedge funds, and other financials,'' a figure that has more than doubled over the prior decade;

(9) excessive oil and gasoline speculation is creating major market disturbances that prevent the market from accurately reflecting the forces of supply and demand; and

(10) the Commodity Futures Trading Commission has a responsibility—

(A) to ensure that the price discovery for oil and gasoline accurately reflects the fundamentals of supply and demand; and

(B) to take immediate action to implement strong and meaningful position limits to regulated exchange markets to eliminate excessive oil speculation.

(b) ACTIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission shall use the authority of the Commission (including emergency powers, if necessary)—

(1) to implement position limits that diminish, eliminate, or prevent excessive speculation in the trading of crude oil, gasoline, heating oil, diesel fuel, jet fuel, and other physical commodity derivatives, as required under title VII of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (15 U.S.C. 8301 et seq.); and

(2) to curb immediately the role of excessive speculation in any contract market within the jurisdiction and control of the Commission, on or through which energy futures or swaps are traded.

SA 965. Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Mr. BEGICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1150, after line 15, add the following:

SEC. 12213. CONSUMERS RIGHT TO KNOW ABOUT GENETICALLY ENGINEERED FOOD ACT.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Consumers Right to Know About Genetically Engineered Food Act''.

(b) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) surveys of the American public consistently show that 90 percent or more of the people of the United States want genetically engineered to be labeled as such;

(2) a landmark public health study in Canada found that—

(A) 93 percent of pregnant women had detectable toxins from genetically engineered foods in their blood; and

(B) 80 percent of the babies of those women had detectable toxins in their umbilical cords;

(3) the tenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States clearly reserves powers in the system of Federalism to the States or to the people; and

(4) States have the authority to require the labeling of foods produced through genetic engineering or derived from organisms that have been genetically engineered.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) GENETIC ENGINEERING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''genetic engineering'' means a process that alters an organism at the molecular or cellular level by means that are not possible under natural conditions or processes.

(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term ''genetic engineering'' includes—

(i) recombinant DNA and RNA techniques;

(ii) cell fusion;

(iii) microencapsulation;

(iv) macroencapsulation;

(v) gene deletion and doubling;

(vi) introduction of a foreign gene; and

(vii) changing the position of genes.

(C) EXCLUSIONS.—The term ''genetic engineering'' does not include any modification to an organism that consists exclusively of—

(i) breeding;

(ii) conjugation;

(iii) fermentation;

(iv) hybridization;

(v) in vitro fertilization; or

(vi) tissue culture.

(2) GENETICALLY ENGINEERED INGREDIENT.—The term ''genetically engineered ingredient'' means any ingredient in any food, beverage, or other edible product that—

(A) is, or is derived from, an organism that is produced through the intentional use of genetic engineering; or

(B) is, or is derived from, the progeny of intended sexual reproduction, asexual reproduction, or both of 1 or more organisms described in subparagraph (A).

(d) RIGHT TO KNOW.—Notwithstanding any other Federal law (including regulations), a State may require that any food, beverage, or other edible product offered for sale in that State have a label on the container or package of the food, beverage, or other edible product, indicating that the food, beverage, or other edible product contains a genetically engineered ingredient.

(e) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commissioner of Food and Drugs and the Secretary of Agriculture shall promulgate such regulations as are necessary to carry out this section.

(f) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, shall submit a report to Congress detailing the percentage of food and beverages sold in the United States that contain genetically engineered ingredients.

SA 966. Mr. FRANKEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 993, line 20, strike ''$2,000,000'' and insert ''$4,000,000''.

On page 994, line 1, strike ''$3,000,000'' and insert ''$4,000,000''.

On page 996, strike lines 14 and 15 and insert the following:

''(ii) $69,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2018.

On page 1001, line 7, strike ''$20,000,000'' and insert ''$70,000,000''.

On page 1001, line 12, strike ''$68,200,000'' and insert ''$70,000,000''.

On page 1002, line 6, strike ''$26,000,000'' and insert ''$30,000,000''.

On page 1019, line 9, strike ''$38,600,000'' and insert ''$75,000,000''.

On page 1019, strike line 17 and insert the following:

under subsection (d)(2).

''(3) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $75,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

On page 1022, between lines 4 and 5, insert the following:

(e) MANDATORY FUNDING.—Section 9013 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8113) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f) MANDATORY FUNDING.—Of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Secretary shall use to carry out this section $10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SA 967. Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which

was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1022, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

SEC. 90___. DOWNWARD ADJUSTMENT OF RENEWABLE FUEL VOLUME.

Section 211(o)(7)(D)(i) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(7)(D)(i)) is amended in the second sentence—

(1) by striking ''may also'' and inserting ''shall''; and

(2) by striking ''or a lesser''.

SA 968. Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. BROWN, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. JOHANNS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 159, lines 23 and 24, strike ''PEANUTS AND OTHER''.

On page 160, beginning on line 3, strike ''for—'' and all that follows through ''1 or more other'' on line 5 and insert ''for 1 or more''.

SA 969. Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1150, after line 15, add the following:

SEC. 12___. SPECIAL COUNSEL FOR COMPETITION MATTERS.

Subtitle I of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 7005) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 286. OFFICE OF COMPETITION AND FAIR PRACTICES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—There is established within the Department of Agriculture the Office of Competition and Fair Practices, headed by a Special Counsel for Competition Matters.

''(b) DUTIES.—The Special Counsel shall—

''(1) analyze mergers within the food and agricultural sectors, in consultation with the Chief Economist of the Department of Agriculture, the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, and the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission; and

''(2) investigate and prosecute violations of the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921 (7 U.S.C. 181 et seq.).

''(c) AUTHORIZATION FOR ADDITIONAL STAFF AND FUNDING.—

''(1) ADDITIONAL STAFF.—The Special Counsel shall hire sufficient employees (including antitrust and litigation attorneys, economists, and investigators) to appropriately carry out the responsibilities of the Office of Competition and Fair Practices under this Act.

''(2) AUTHORIZATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out paragraph (1).''.

SA 970. Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mrs. FISCHER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1125, after line 23, insert the following:

SEC. 12108. LIVESTOCK INFORMATION DISCLOSURE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) United States livestock producers supply a vital link in the food supply of the United States, which is listed as a critical infrastructure by the Secretary of Homeland Security;

(2) domestic terrorist attacks have occurred at livestock operations across the United States, endangering the lives and property of people of the United States;

(3) livestock operations in the United States are largely family owned and operated with most families living at the same location as the livestock operation;

(4) State governments and agencies are the primary authority in almost all States for the protection of water quality under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.);

(5) State agencies maintain records on livestock operations and have the authority to address water quality issues where needed; and

(6) there is no discernible environmental or scientifically research-related need to create a database or other system of records of livestock operations in the United States by the Administrator.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ''Administrator'' means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(2) AGENCY.—The term ''Agency'' means the Environmental Protection Agency.

(3) LIVESTOCK OPERATION.—The term ''livestock operation'' includes any operation involved in the raising or finishing of livestock and poultry.

(c) PROCUREMENT AND DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION.—

(1) PROHIBITION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Administrator, any officer or employee of the Agency, or any contractor or cooperator of the Agency, shall not disclose the information of any owner, operator, or employee of a livestock operation provided to the Agency by a livestock producer or a State agency in accordance with the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) or any other law, including—

(i) names;

(ii) telephone numbers;

(iii) email addresses;

(iv) physical addresses;

(v) Global Positioning System coordinates; or

(vi) other identifying information regarding the location of the owner, operator, or employee.

(2) EFFECT.—Nothing in paragraph (1) affects—

(A) the disclosure of information described in paragraph (1) if—

(i) the information has been transformed into a statistical or aggregate form at the county level or higher without any information that identifies the agricultural operation or agricultural producer; or

(ii) the livestock producer consents to the disclosure; or

(B) the authority of any State agency to collect information on livestock operations.

(3) CONDITION OF PERMIT OR OTHER PROGRAMS.—The approval of any permit, practice, or program administered by the Administrator shall not be conditioned on the consent of the livestock producer under paragraph (2)(A)(ii).

SA 971. Mr. TESTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 122___. ANNUAL REPORT ON AGRICULTURAL CONSOLIDATION.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) MARKET SIZE.—The term ''market size'' includes the volume of the appropriate unit measurement of—

(A) slaughter volume (in head);

(B) purchasing volume (in bushels or hundredweight);

(C) processing volume (in metric tons or millions of pounds); and

(D) sales (in millions of pounds or dollars).

(2) NAICS CODE.—The term ''NAICS code'' means the appropriate code of the North American Industrial Classification System, including any subset of the code.

(3) NATIONAL MARKET SHARE.—The term ''national market share'', in terms of the appropriate agricultural sector or subsector, means total national sales and purchases of agricultural and food products.

(4) PARENT COMPANY.—The term ''parent company'' includes all subsidiaries and joint ventures of the parent company.

(b) ANNUAL REPORTS.—Not later than June 31, 2014, and each June 31 thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate an annual report that includes statistics related to the 4 largest firms in each of the agricultural sectors and subsectors described in subsection (c).

(c) CONTENTS.—Each report under subsection (b) shall include, with respect to the prior calendar year, the parent company name, national market size, and national market share of the 4 largest firms in the following sectors and subsectors:

(1) Beef slaughter and packing (NAICS code 311611 for plants that solely slaughter beef cattle).

(2) Hog slaughter and packing (NAICS code 311611 for plants that solely slaughter hogs).

(3) Pork processing (NAICS code 311612 for plants that solely process swine meat).

(4) Broiler slaughter and processing (NAICS code 311615 for plants that solely slaughter and process broiler chickens for meat).

(5) Turkey slaughter and processing (NAICS code 311615 for plants that solely slaughter and process turkeys).

(6) Fluid milk processing (NAICS code 311511).

(7) Fluid milk handling (NAICS code 484220 for milk hauling and NAICS code 424430 for milk, fluid (except canned), merchant wholesalers).

(8) Grain and oilseed handling (NAICS code 424510 for grain elevators merchant wholesalers grain and soybeans merchant wholesalers).

(9) Wet corn milling (NAICS code 311221).

(10) Soybean crushing (NAICS code 311222).

(11) Wheat flour milling (NAICS code 311211).

(12) Ethanol production (fuel ethanol, wet mill process NAICS code 32519301).

(13) Commodity seed manufacturing and trait ownership for corn, soybeans, wheat and cotton, including—

(A) seed manufacturing (NAICS code 115114 for seed processing, post-harvest for propagation); and

(B) seed trait licensing (biotechnology research and development laboratories or services in agriculture NAICS code 541711 and agriculture research and development laboratories or services (except biotechnology research and development) NAICS code 541712).

(14) Fertilizer manufacturers, including—

(A) phosphatic fertilizer manufacturing (NAICS code 325312); and

(B) nitrogenous fertilizer manufacturing (NAICS code 325311).
(15) Herbicide manufacturers (NAICS code 325320).
(16) Frozen fruit and vegetable manufacturers (NAICS code 311411).
(17) Canned fruit and vegetable manufacturers (NAICS code 311421).
(18) Grocery retailers (NAICS code 445110).
(19) Hog stations or hog merchant wholesalers (NAICS code 424520 for firms that solely buy and sell hogs).
(20) Cattle sale barns or merchant wholesalers (NAICS code 424520 for firms that solely buy and sell cattle).

SA 972. Mr. TESTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 934, strike lines 5 through 12, and insert the following:
(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following:
''(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:
''(A) CONVENTIONAL BREEDING.—The term 'conventional breeding' means the development of new varieties of an organism through controlled mating and selection without the use of transgenic methods.
''(B) PUBLIC BREED.—The term 'public breed' means a breed that is the commercially available uniform end product of a publicly funded breeding program that—
''(i) has been sufficiently tested to demonstrate improved characteristics and stabile performance; and
''(ii) remains in the public domain for research purposes.
''(C) PUBLIC CULTIVAR.—The term 'public cultivar' means a cultivar that is the commercially available uniform end product of a publicly funded breeding program that—
''(i) has been sufficiently tested to demonstrate improved characteristics and stabile performance; and
''(ii) remains in the public domain for research purposes.'';
(2) in subsection (b)—
(A) in paragraph (2)—
(i) in subparagraph (A)(iii), by striking ''conventional breeding, including cultivar and breed development,'' and inserting ''public cultivar development through conventional breeding with no requirement or preference for the use of marker-assisted or genomic selection methods, including''; and
(ii) in subparagraph (B)(iv), by striking ''conventional breeding, including breed development,'' and inserting ''public breed development through conventional breeding with no requirement or preference for the use of marker-assisted or genomic selection methods, including'';
(B) in paragraph (4)(A), by inserting '', including by conducting each fiscal year at least 1 separate request for applications for grants for research on public cultivar development through conventional breeding as described in paragraph (2)'' before the semicolon at the end; and
(C) in paragraph (11)(A)—
(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''; and
(ii) in clause (i), by striking ''integrated research'' and all that follows through ''; and'' and inserting ''integrated research, extension, and education activities; and''; and
(3) by adding at the end the following:

SA 973. Mr. TESTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 177, strike line 15 and insert the following:
during each fiscal year.
''(3) RESERVATION.—Effective beginning in fiscal year 2015, the Secretary, to the maximum extent feasible, shall manage the conservation reserve to ensure that, on an annual basis, not less than 20.5 percent of land maintained in the program shall be—
''(A) described in subparagraphs (B) through (F) of subsection (b)(4); and
''(B) enrolled under—
''(i) the special conservation reserve enhancement program authority under section 1234(f)(4); or
''(ii) the pilot program for the enrollment of wetland and buffer acreage under section 1231B.''.

SA 974. Mr. BEGICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 421, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:
SEC. 42____. SERVICE OF TRADITIONAL FOODS IN PUBLIC FACILITIES.
(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:
(1) FOOD SERVICE PROGRAM.—The term ''food service program'' includes—
(A) food service at a residential child care facility with a license from an appropriate State agency;
(B) a child nutrition program (as defined in section 25(b) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1769f (b));
(C) food service at a hospital or clinic; and
(D) a senior meal program.
(2) INDIAN; INDIAN TRIBE.—The terms ''Indian'' and ''Indian tribe'' have the meanings given those terms in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b).
(3) TRADITIONAL FOOD.—
(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''traditional food'' means food that has traditionally been prepared and consumed by an Indian tribe.
(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term ''traditional food'' includes—
(i) wild game meat;
(ii) fish;
(iii) seafood; and
(iv) plants.
(b) PROGRAM.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, on the request of a Governor of a State, the Secretary shall allow the donation to and serving of traditional food through a food service program at a public facility or a nonprofit that primarily serves Indians if the operator of the food service program—
(1) ensures that the food is received whole, gutted, gilled, as quarters, or as a roast, without further processing;
(2) makes a reasonable determination that—
(A) the animal was not diseased;
(B) the food was butchered, dressed, transported, and stored to prevent contamination, undesirable microbial growth, or deterioration; and
(C) the food will not cause a significant health hazard or potential for human illness;
(3) carries out any further preparation or processing of the food at a different time or in a different space from the preparation or processing of other food for the applicable program to prevent cross-contamination;
(4) cleans and sanitizes food-contact surfaces of equipment and utensils after processing the traditional food; and
(5) labels donated traditional food with the name of the food and stores the traditional food separately from other food for the applicable program, including through storage in a separate freezer or refrigerator or in a separate compartment or shelf in the freezer or refrigerator.

SA 975. Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. SCHATZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 902, line 13, strike ''subsections (j) and (k)'' and insert ''subsections (k) and (l)''.
On page 918, strike line 7 and insert the following:
''2014 through 2018.
''(j) COFFEE PLANT HEALTH INITIATIVE.—
''(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a coffee plant health initiative to address the critical needs of the coffee industry by—
''(A) developing and disseminating science-based tools and treatments to combat the coffee berry borer (*Hypothenemus hampei*); and
''(B) establishing an area-wide integrated pest management program in areas affected by or areas at risk of being affected by the coffee berry borer.
''(2) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—The Secretary may carry out the coffee plant health initiative through—
''(A) Federal agencies, including the Agricultural Research Service and the National Institute of Food and Agriculture;
''(B) National Laboratories;
''(C) institutions of higher education;
''(D) research institutions or organizations;
''(E) private organizations or corporations;
''(F) State agricultural experiment stations;
''(G) individuals; or
''(H) groups consisting of 2 or more entities or individuals described in subparagraphs (A) through (G).
''(3) PROJECT GRANTS AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary shall—
''(A) enter into cooperative agreements with eligible entities, as appropriate; and
''(B) award grants on a competitive basis.
''(4) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection $2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.'';
On page 918, line 8, strike ''subsection (j)'' and insert ''subsection (k)''.
On page 918, line 11, strike ''subsection (k)'' and insert ''subsection (l)''.

SA 976. Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. HARKIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title XII, add the following:

Subtitle D—Student Loan Affordability Act

SEC. 12301. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''Student Loan Affordability Act''.

SEC. 12302. INTEREST RATE EXTENSION.

Section 455(b)(7)(D) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087e(b)(7)(D)) is amended—
(1) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''and before July 1, 2013,'' and inserting ''and before July 1, 2015,''; and
(2) in clause (v), by striking ''and before July 1, 2013,'' and inserting ''and before July 1, 2015,''.

SEC. 12303. MODIFICATIONS OF REQUIRED DISTRIBUTION RULES FOR PENSION PLANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 401(a)(9)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(B) REQUIRED DISTRIBUTIONS WHERE EMPLOYEE DIES BEFORE ENTIRE INTEREST IS DISTRIBUTED.—

''(i) 5-YEAR GENERAL RULE.—A trust shall not constitute a qualified trust under this section unless the plan provides that, if an employee dies before the distribution of the employee's interest (whether or not such distribution has begun in accordance with subparagraph (A)), the entire interest of the employee will be distributed within 5 years after the death of such employee.

''(ii) EXCEPTION FOR ELIGIBLE DESIGNATED BENEFICIARIES.—If—

''(I) any portion of the employee's interest is payable to (or for the benefit of) an eligible designated beneficiary,

''(II) such portion will be distributed (in accordance with regulations) over the life of such eligible designated beneficiary (or over a period not extending beyond the life expectancy of such beneficiary), and

''(III) such distributions begin not later than 1 year after the date of the employee's death or such later date as the Secretary may by regulations prescribe,

then, for purposes of clause (i) and except as provided in clause (iv) or subparagraph (E)(iii), the portion referred to in subclause (I) shall be treated as distributed on the date on which such distributions begin.

''(iii) SPECIAL RULE FOR SURVIVING SPOUSE OF EMPLOYEE.—If the eligible designated beneficiary referred to in clause (ii)(I) is the surviving spouse of the employee—

''(I) the date on which the distributions are required to begin under clause (ii)(III) shall not be earlier than the date on which the employee would have attained age 70½, and

''(II) if the surviving spouse dies before the distributions to such spouse begin, this subparagraph shall be applied as if the surviving spouse were the employee.

''(iv) RULES UPON DEATH OF ELIGIBLE DESIGNATED BENEFICIARY.—If an eligible designated beneficiary dies before the portion of an employee's interest described in clause (ii) is entirely distributed, clause (ii) shall not apply to any beneficiary of such eligible designated beneficiary and the remainder of such portion shall be distributed within 5 years after the death of such beneficiary.''.

(b) DEFINITION OF ELIGIBLE DESIGNATED BENEFICIARY.—Section 401(a)(9)(E) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(E) DEFINITIONS AND RULES RELATING TO DESIGNATED BENEFICIARY.—For purposes of this paragraph—

''(i) DESIGNATED BENEFICIARY.—The term 'designated beneficiary' means any individual designated as a beneficiary by the employee.

''(ii) ELIGIBLE DESIGNATED BENEFICIARY.—The term 'eligible designated beneficiary' means, with respect to any employee, any designated beneficiary who, as of the date of death of the employee, is—

''(I) the surviving spouse of the employee,

''(II) subject to clause (iii), a child of the employee who has not reached majority (within the meaning of subparagraph (F)),

''(III) disabled (within the meaning of section 72(m)(7)),

''(IV) a chronically ill individual (within the meaning of section 7702B(c)(2), except that the requirements of subparagraph (A)(i) thereof shall only be treated as met if there is a certification that, as of such date, the period of inability described in such subparagraph with respect to the individual is an indefinite one that is reasonably expected to be lengthy in nature), or

''(V) an individual not described in any of the preceding subparagraphs who is not more than 10 years younger than the employee.

''(iii) SPECIAL RULE FOR CHILDREN.—Subject to subparagraph (F), an individual described in clause (ii)(II) shall cease to be an eligible designated beneficiary as of the date the individual reaches majority and the requirement of subparagraph (B)(i) shall not be treated as met with respect to any remaining portion of an employee's interest payable to the individual unless such portion is distributed within 5 years after such date.''.

(c) REQUIRED BEGINNING DATE.—Section 401(a)(9)(C) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new clause:

''(v) EMPLOYEES BECOMING 5-PERCENT OWNERS AFTER AGE 70½.—If an employee becomes a 5-percent owner (as defined in section 416) with respect to a plan year ending in a calendar year after the calendar year in which the employee attains age 70½, then clause (i)(II) shall be applied by substituting the calendar year in which the employee became such an owner for the calendar year in which the employee retires.''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in this subsection, the amendments made by this section shall apply to distributions with respect to employees who die after December 31, 2013.

(2) REQUIRED BEGINNING DATE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The amendment made by subsection (c) shall apply to employees becoming a 5-percent owner with respect to plan years ending in calendar years beginning before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(B) SPECIAL RULE.—If—

(i) an employee became a 5-percent owner with respect to a plan year ending in a calendar year which began before January 1, 2013, and

(ii) the employee has not retired before calendar year 2014,

such employee shall be treated as having become a 5-percent owner with respect to a plan year ending in 2013 for purposes of applying section 401(a)(9)(C)(v) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as added by the amendment made by subsection (c)).

(3) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN BENEFICIARIES.—If a designated beneficiary of an employee who dies before January 1, 2014, dies after December 31, 2013—

(A) the amendments made by this section shall apply to any beneficiary of such designated beneficiary, and

(B) the designated beneficiary shall be treated as an eligible designated beneficiary for purposes of applying section 401(a)(9)(B)(iv) of such Code (as in effect after the amendments made by this section).

(4) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN EXISTING ANNUITY CONTRACTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall not apply to a qualified annuity which is a binding annuity contract in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and at all times thereafter.

(B) QUALIFIED ANNUITY CONTRACT.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ''qualified annuity'' means, with respect to an employee, an annuity—

(i) which is a commercial annuity (as defined in section 3405(e)(6) of such Code) or payable by a defined benefit plan,

(ii) under which the annuity payments are substantially equal periodic payments (not less frequently than annually) over the lives of such employee and a designated beneficiary (or over a period not extending beyond the life expectancy of such employee or the life expectancy of such employee and a designated beneficiary) in accordance with the regulations described in section 401(a)(9)(A)(ii) of such Code (as in effect before such amendments) and which meets the other requirements of this section 401(a)(9) of such Code (as so in effect) with respect to such payments, and

(iii) with respect to which—

(I) annuity payments to the employee have begun before January 1, 2014, and the employee has made an irrevocable election before such date as to the method and amount of the annuity payments to the employee or any designated beneficiaries, or

(II) if subclause (I) does not apply, the employee has made an irrevocable election before the date of the enactment of this Act as to the method and amount of the annuity payments to the employee or any designated beneficiaries.

SEC. 12304. LIMITATION ON EARNINGS STRIPPING BY EXPATRIATED ENTITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (j) of section 163 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (9) as paragraph (10), and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (8) the following new paragraph:

''(9) SPECIAL RULES FOR EXPATRIATED ENTITIES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a corporation to which this subsection applies which is an expatriated entity, this subsection shall apply to such corporation with the following modifications:

''(i) Paragraph (2)(A) shall be applied without regard to clause (ii) thereof.

''(ii) Paragraph (1)(B) shall be applied—

''(I) without regard to the parenthetical, and

''(II) by substituting 'in the 1st succeeding taxable year and in the 2nd through 10th succeeding taxable years to the extent not previously taken into account under this subparagraph' for 'in the succeeding taxable year'.

''(iii) Paragraph (2)(B) shall be applied—

''(I) without regard to clauses (ii) and (iii), and

''(II) by substituting '25 percent of the adjusted taxable income of the corporation for such taxable year' for the matter of clause (i)(II) thereof.

''(B) EXPATRIATED ENTITY.—For purposes of this paragraph—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—With respect to a corporation and a taxable year, the term 'expatriated entity' has the meaning given such term by section 7874(a)(2), determined as if such section and the regulations under such section as in effect on the first day of such taxable year applied to all taxable years of the corporation beginning after July 10, 1989.

''(ii) EXCEPTION FOR SURROGATES TREATED AS A DOMESTIC CORPORATION.—The term 'expatriated entity' does not include a surrogate foreign corporation which is treated as a domestic corporation by reason of section 7874(b).''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 12305. MODIFICATIONS RELATED TO THE OIL SPILL LIABILITY TRUST FUND.

(a) DEFINITION OF CRUDE OIL.—Paragraph (1) of section 4612(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(1) CRUDE OIL.—The term 'crude oil' includes crude oil condensates, natural gasoline, any bitumen or bituminous mixture, and any oil derived from a bitumen or bituminous mixture.''.

(b) REMOVING RESTRICTIONS RELATING TO OIL WELLS AND EXTRACTION METHODS.—Paragraph (2) of section 4612(a) of the Internal

Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''from a well located''.

(c) PERMANENT EXTENSION OF OIL SPILL LIABILITY TRUST FUND FINANCING RATE.—Section 4611(f) is amended by striking subsection (f).

(d) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—Subclause (I) of section 4612(e)(2)(B)(ii) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''tranferred'' and inserting ''transferred''.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall apply to crude oil and petroleum products received or entered during calendar quarters beginning more than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 12306. RESERVING RESULTING SURPLUSES FOR DEFICIT REDUCTION.

(a) PAYGO SCORECARD.—The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (2 U.S.C. 933(d)).

(b) SENATE PAYGO SCORECARD.—The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on any PAYGO scorecard maintained for purposes of section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress).

SA 977. Mr. COWAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 914, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following:

''(i) SOIL AMENDMENT STUDY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to assess which types of, and which practices associated with the use of, fertilizers, biostimulants, and soil amendments best achieve the goals described in paragraph (2).

''(2) GOALS.—The goals referred to in paragraph (1) are—

''(A) increasing organic matter content;

''(B) reducing atmospheric volatilization;

''(C) limiting or eliminating runoff or leaching into groundwater or other water sources; and

''(D) restoring beneficial bioactivity or healthy nutrients to the soil.

''(3) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of receipt of funds to carry out this subsection, the Secretary shall make publicly available and submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that—

''(A) describes the results of the study; and

''(B) identifies the types of, and practices using, fertilizers, biostimulants, and soil amendments that best achieve the goals identified in paragraph (2).''.

SA 978. Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mrs. BOXER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12____. PLANT PROTECTION ACT.

Division A of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113–6) is amended by striking section 735 (127 Stat. 231).

SA 979. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1150, after line 15, add the following:

SEC. 12____. STUDY ON THE ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF EXTREME WEATHER EVENTS AND CLIMATE CHANGE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall conduct a study of the economic impacts of extreme weather events and climate change on agriculture in the United States.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The study under subsection (a) shall—

(1) consider the economic impacts of extreme weather events and climate change during, as the Secretary determines to be appropriate—

(A) the initial short-term period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) a subsequent long-term period;

(2) include an analysis of the impacts of extreme weather events and climate change on—

(A) dairy, grain, meat and poultry, specialty crops (such as fruits, vegetables, wine, and maple syrup), forestry and forest products, and other agricultural products; and

(B) rural economies, including tourism and the ski industry; and

(3) use a range of sources for purposes of analyzing the economic impacts, including observations from, and the experience of, agriculture producers.

SA 980. Mr. COWAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 396, strike lines 8 through 12, and insert the following:

SEC. 4202. SENIOR FARMERS' MARKET NUTRITION PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4402(a) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 3007(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''$20,600,000'' and inserting ''$25,000,000''; and

(2) by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

(b) OFFSET.—Out of any unobligated amounts that remain available to the Secretary under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612c), the Secretary shall use to carry out the program under section 4402 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 3007) not more than $22,000,000 for fiscal years 2013 through 2018.

SA 981. Mr. ENZI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1125, after line 23, add the following:

SEC. 121___. ALTERNATIVE MARKETING ARRANGEMENTS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 221 of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1635d) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (8) as paragraphs (2) through (9), respectively; and

(2) by inserting before paragraph (2) (as so redesignated) the following:

''(1) ALTERNATIVE MARKETING ARRANGEMENT.—The term 'alternative marketing arrangement' means the advance commitment of cattle for slaughter by any means—

''(A) other than a negotiated purchase or forward contract; and

''(B) that does not use a method for calculating price in which the price is determined at a future date.''.

(b) MANDATORY REPORTING FOR LIVE CATTLE.—Section 222(d)(1) of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1635e(d)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(F) The quantity of cattle delivered under an alternative marketing arrangement that were slaughtered.''.

SA 982. Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. TESTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1084, strikes line 20 through 22 and insert the following:

SEC. 11_____. PACKERS AND POULTRY.

(a) LIMITATION ON USE OF ANTI-COMPETITIVE FORWARD CONTRACTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 202 of the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921 (7 U.S.C. 192), is amended—

(A) in subsection (g), by striking ''or (e)'' and inserting ''(e), or (f)'';

(B) by redesignating subsections (f) and (g) as subsection (g) and (h), respectively;

(C) by inserting after subsection (e) the following:

''(f)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), use, in effectuating any sale of livestock, a forward contract that—

''(A) does not contain a firm base price that may be equated to a fixed dollar amount on the day on which the forward contract is entered into; or

''(B) is based on a formula price.

''(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to—

''(A) a cooperative or entity owned by a cooperative, if a majority of the ownership interest in the cooperative is held by active cooperative members that—

''(B) own, feed, or control livestock; and

''(C) provide the livestock to the cooperative for slaughter;

''(D) a packer that is not required to report to the Secretary on each reporting day (as defined in section 212 of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1635a)) information on the price and quantity of livestock purchased by the packer; or

''(E) a packer that owns 1 livestock processing plant.''.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—Section 2(a) of the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921 (7 U.S.C. 182(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(15) FIRM BASE PRICE.—The term 'firm base price' means a transaction using a reference price from an external source.

''(16) FORMULA PRICE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'formula price' means any price term that establishes a base from which a purchase price is calculated on the basis of a price that will not be determined or reported until a date after the day the forward price is established.

''(B) EXCLUSION.—The term 'formula price' does not include—

''(i) any price term that establishes a base from which a purchase price is calculated on the basis of a futures market price; or

''(ii) any adjustment to the base for quality, grade, or other factors relating to the value of livestock or livestock products that are readily verifiable market factors and are outside the control of the packer.

''(17) FORWARD CONTRACT.—The term 'forward contract' means an oral or written contract for the purchase of livestock that provides for the delivery of the livestock to a

packer at a date that is more than 7 days after the date on which the contract is entered into, without regard to whether the contract is for—

''(A) a specified lot of livestock; or

''(B) a specified number of livestock over a certain period of time.''.

(b) POULTRY BUSINESS DISRUPTION INSURANCE POLICY AND CATASTROPHIC DISEASE PROGRAM.—Section 522(c) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7

SA 983. Mr. ENZI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 134, line 13, before the period insert ''using the weekly price reports of the Agricultural Marketing Service''.

SA 984. Mrs. FISCHER (for herself, Mr. CARPER, and Mr. JOHANNS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1050, after line 23, add the following:

SEC. 10013. IMPORTATION OF SEED.

Section 17(c) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136o(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''The Secretary'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) IMPORTATION OF SEED.—For purposes of this subsection, seed, including treated seed, shall not be considered to be a pesticide or device.

''(3) APPLICABILITY.—Nothing in this subsection precludes or limits the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to the importation or movement of plants, plant products, or seeds under—

''(A) the Plant Protection Act (7 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.); and

''(B) the Federal Seed Act (7 U.S.C. 1551 et seq.).''.

SA 985. Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. JOHANNS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 38, strike line 3 and all that follows through page 41, line 14, and insert the following:

SEC. 1107. AVAILABILITY OF ADVERSE MARKET PAYMENTS.

(a) PAYMENT REQUIRED.—For each of the 2014 through 2018 crop years for rice and peanuts, the Secretary shall make adverse market payments to producers on farms for which payment yields and base acres are established with respect to the rice and peanuts if the Secretary determines that the actual price for the rice or peanuts is less than the reference price for the rice or peanuts.

(b) ACTUAL PRICE.—

(1) PEANUTS.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), for purposes of subsection (a), the actual price for peanuts is equal to the higher of the following:

(A) The national average market price received by producers during the 12-month marketing year for the peanuts as determined by the Secretary.

(B) The national average loan rate for a marketing assistance loan for the peanuts in effect for the applicable period under subtitle B.

(2) RICE.—In the case of long grain rice and medium grain rice, for purposes of subsection (a), the actual price for each type or class of rice is equal to the higher of the following:

(A) The national average market price received by producers during the 12-month marketing year for the type or class of rice, as determined by the Secretary.

(B) The national average loan rate for a marketing assistance loan for the type or class of rice in effect for the applicable period under subtitle B.

(c) REFERENCE PRICE.—The reference price shall be—

(1) in the case of long and medium grain rice, $13.30 per hundredweight; and

(2) in the case of peanuts, $523.77 per ton.

(d) PAYMENT RATE.—The payment rate used to make adverse market payments with respect to rice and peanuts for a crop year shall be equal to the amount that—

(1) the reference price under subsection (c) for the rice or peanuts; exceeds

(2) the actual price determined under subsection (b) for the rice or peanuts.

(e) PAYMENT AMOUNT.—If adverse market payments are required to be paid under this section for any of the 2014 through 2018 crop years of rice or peanuts, the amount of the adverse market payment to be paid to the producers on a farm for that crop year shall be equal to the product of the following:

(1) The payment rate specified in subsection (d).

(2) The payment acres of the rice or peanuts on the farm.

(3) The payment yield for the rice or peanuts for the farm.

(f) TIME FOR PAYMENTS.—If the Secretary determines under subsection (a) that adverse market payments are required to be made under this section for the crop of rice or peanuts, beginning October 1, or as soon as practicable thereafter, after the end of the applicable marketing year for the rice or peanuts, the Secretary shall make the adverse market payments for the crop.

SA 986. Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. HARKIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 447, strike line 10 and all that follows through page 460, line 18, and insert the following:

''(2) EXCEPTIONS.—In this subsection, the term 'direct operating loan' does not include—

''(A) a loan made to a youth under subsection (d); or

''(B) a microloan made to a beginning farmer or rancher or a veteran farmer or rancher (as defined in section 2501(e) of the Food Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 2279(e)).

''(3) WAIVERS.—

''(A) FARM OPERATIONS ON TRIBAL LAND.—The Secretary shall waive the limitation under paragraph (1)(C) for a direct loan made under this chapter to a farmer whose farm land is subject to the jurisdiction of an Indian tribe and whose loan is secured by 1 or more security instruments that are subject to the jurisdiction of an Indian tribe if the Secretary determines that commercial credit is not generally available for such farm operations.

''(B) OTHER FARM OPERATIONS.—On a case-by-case determination not subject to administrative appeal, the Secretary may grant a borrower a waiver, 1 time only for a period of 2 years, of the limitation under paragraph (1)(C) for a direct operating loan if the borrower demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Secretary that—

''(i) the borrower has a viable farm operation;

''(ii) the borrower applied for commercial credit from at least 2 commercial lenders;

''(iii) the borrower was unable to obtain a commercial loan (including a loan guaranteed by the Secretary); and

''(iv) the borrower successfully has completed, or will complete within 1 year, borrower training under section 3419 (from which requirement the Secretary shall not grant a waiver under section 3419(f)).

''(d) YOUTH LOANS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsection (b), except for citizenship and credit requirements, a loan may be made under this chapter to a youth who is a rural resident to enable the youth to operate an enterprise in connection with the participation in a youth organization, as determined by the Secretary.

''(2) FULL PERSONAL LIABILITY.—A youth receiving a loan under this subsection who executes a promissory note for the loan shall incur full personal liability for the indebtedness evidenced by the note, in accordance with the terms of the note, free of any disability of minority.

''(3) COSIGNER.—The Secretary may accept the personal liability of a cosigner of a promissory note for a loan under this subsection, in addition to the personal liability of the youth borrower.

''(4) YOUTH ENTERPRISES NOT FARMING.—The operation of an enterprise by a youth under this subsection shall not be considered the operation of a farm under this subtitle.

''(5) RELATION TO OTHER LOAN PROGRAMS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if a borrower becomes delinquent with respect to a youth loan made under this subsection, the borrower shall not become ineligible, as a result of the delinquency, to receive loans and loan guarantees from the Federal government to pay for education expenses of the borrower.

''(e) PILOT LOAN PROGRAM TO SUPPORT HEALTHY FOODS FOR THE HUNGRY.—

''(1) DEFINITION OF GLEANER.—In this subsection, the term 'gleaner' means an entity that—

''(A) collects edible, surplus food that would be thrown away and distributes the food to agencies or nonprofit organizations that feed the hungry; or

''(B) harvests for free distribution to the needy, or for donation to agencies or nonprofit organizations for ultimate distribution to the needy, an agricultural crop that has been donated by the owner of the crop.

''(2) PROGRAM.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall establish, within the operating loan program established under this chapter, a pilot program under which the Secretary makes loans available to eligible entities to assist the entities in providing food to the hungry.

''(3) ELIGIBILITY.—In addition to any other person eligible under the terms and conditions of the operating loan program established under this chapter, gleaners shall be eligible to receive loans under this subsection.

''(4) LOAN AMOUNT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Each loan issued under the program shall be in an amount of not less than $500 and not more than $5,000.

''(B) REDISTRIBUTION.—If the eligible recipients in a State do not use the full allocation of loans that are available to eligible recipients in the State under this subsection, the Secretary may use any unused amounts to make loans available to eligible entities

in other States in accordance with this subsection.

''(5) LOAN PROCESSING.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall process any loan application submitted under the program not later than 30 days after the date on which the application was submitted.

''(B) EXPEDITING APPLICATIONS.—The Secretary shall take any measure the Secretary determines necessary to expedite any application submitted under the program.

''(6) PAPERWORK REDUCTION.—The Secretary shall take measures to reduce any paperwork requirements for loans under the program.

''(7) PROGRAM INTEGRITY.—The Secretary shall take such actions as are necessary to ensure the integrity of the program established under this subsection.

''(8) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—Of funds that are made available to carry out this chapter, the Secretary shall use to carry out this subsection a total amount of not more than $500,000.

''(9) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the maximum amount of funds are used to carry out this subsection under paragraph (8), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that describes the results of the pilot program and the feasibility of expanding the program.

''SEC. 3202. PURPOSES OF LOANS.

''(a) DIRECT LOANS.—A direct loan (including a microloan as defined by the Secretary) may be made under this chapter only—

''(1) to pay the costs incident to reorganizing a farm for more profitable operation;

''(2) to purchase livestock, poultry, or farm equipment;

''(3) to purchase feed, seed, fertilizer, insecticide, or farm supplies, or to meet other essential farm operating expenses, including cash rent;

''(4) to finance land or water development, use, or conservation;

''(5) to pay loan closing costs;

''(6) to assist a farmer in changing the equipment, facilities, or methods of operation of a farm to comply with a standard promulgated under section 6 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 655) or a standard adopted by a State under a plan approved under section 18 of that Act (29 U.S.C. 667), if the Secretary determines that without assistance under this paragraph the farmer is likely to suffer substantial economic injury in complying with the standard;

''(7) to train a limited-resource borrower receiving a loan under section 3106 in maintaining records of farming operations;

''(8) to train a borrower under section 3419;

''(9) to refinance the indebtedness of a borrower, if the borrower—

''(A) has refinanced a loan under this chapter not more than 4 times previously; and

''(B)(i) is a direct loan borrower under this subtitle at the time of the refinancing and has suffered a qualifying loss because of a natural or major disaster or emergency; or

''(ii) is refinancing a debt obtained from a creditor other than the Secretary;

''(10) to provide other farm or home needs, including family subsistence; or

''(11) to assist a farmer in the production of a locally or regionally produced agricultural food product (as defined in section 3601(e)(11)(A)), including to qualified producers engaged in direct-to-consumer marketing, direct-to-institution marketing, or direct-to-store marketing, business, or activities that produce a value-added agricultural product (as defined in section 231(a) of the Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000 (7 U.S.C. 1632a(a))).

''(b) GUARANTEED LOANS.—A loan may be guaranteed under this chapter only—

''(1) to pay the costs incident to reorganizing a farm for more profitable operation;

''(2) to purchase livestock, poultry, or farm equipment;

''(3) to purchase feed, seed, fertilizer, insecticide, or farm supplies, or to meet other essential farm operating expenses, including cash rent;

''(4) to finance land or water development, use, or conservation;

''(5) to refinance indebtedness;

''(6) to pay loan closing costs;

''(7) to assist a farmer in changing the equipment, facilities, or methods of operation of a farm to comply with a standard promulgated under section 6 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 655) or a standard adopted by a State under a plan approved under section 18 of that Act (29 U.S.C. 667), if the Secretary determines that without assistance under this paragraph the farmer is likely to suffer substantial economic injury due to compliance with the standard;

''(8) to train a borrower under section 3419; or

''(9) to provide other farm or home needs, including family subsistence.

''(c) HAZARD INSURANCE REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary may not make a loan to a farmer under this chapter unless the farmer has, or agrees to obtain, hazard insurance on the property to be acquired with the loan.

''(d) PRIVATE RESERVE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the Secretary may reserve a portion of any loan made under this chapter to be placed in an unsupervised bank account that may be used at the discretion of the borrower for the basic family needs of the borrower and the immediate family of the borrower.

''(2) LIMIT ON SIZE OF THE RESERVE.—The size of the reserve shall not exceed the lesser of—

''(A) 10 percent of the loan;

''(B) $5,000; or

''(C) the amount needed to provide for the basic family needs of the borrower and the immediate family of the borrower for 3 calendar months.

''(e) LOANS TO LOCAL AND REGIONAL FOOD PRODUCERS.—

''(1) TRAINING.—The Secretary shall ensure that loan officers processing loans under subsection (a)(11) receive appropriate training to serve borrowers and potential borrowers engaged in local and regional food production.

''(2) VALUATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall develop ways to determine unit prices (or other appropriate forms of valuation) for crops and other agricultural products, the end use of which is intended to be in locally or regionally produced agricultural food products, to facilitate lending to local and regional food producers.

''(B) PRICE HISTORY.—The Secretary shall implement a mechanism for local and regional food producers to establish price history for the crops and other agricultural products produced by local and regional food producers.

''(3) OUTREACH.—The Secretary shall develop and implement an outreach strategy to engage and provide loan services to local and regional food producers.

''SEC. 3203. RESTRICTIONS ON LOANS.

''(a) REQUIREMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), the Secretary may not make or guarantee a loan under this chapter—

''(A) that would cause the total principal indebtedness outstanding at any 1 time for loans made under this chapter to any 1 borrower to exceed—

''(i)(I) in the case of a loan made by the Secretary, $300,000; or

''(II) in the case of a loan guaranteed by the Secretary, $700,000 (as modified under paragraph (2)); or

''(B) for the purchasing or leasing of land other than for cash rent, or for carrying on a land leasing or land purchasing program.

''(2) MODIFICATION.—The amount specified in paragraph (1)(A)(ii) shall be—

''(A) increased, beginning with fiscal year 2000, by the inflation percentage applicable to the fiscal year in which the loan is guaranteed; and

''(B) reduced by the unpaid indebtedness of the borrower on loans under sections specified in section 3104 that are guaranteed by the Secretary.

''(3) MICROLOANS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the Secretary may establish a program to make or guarantee microloans.

''(B) LIMITATION.—The Secretary shall not make or guarantee any microloan (as defined by the Secretary) under this chapter—

''(i) for an amount that is greater than $35,000; or

''(ii) that would cause the total principal indebtedness outstanding at any 1 time for microloans made under this chapter to any 1 borrower to exceed $70,000.

''(C) APPLICATIONS.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall limit the administrative burdens and streamline the application and approval process for microloans under this paragraph.

''(D) COOPERATIVE LENDING PROJECTS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), the Secretary may contract with community-based and nongovernmental organizations, States, or other intermediaries, as the Secretary determines appropriate—

''(I) to make or guarantee a microloan under this paragraph; and

''(II) to provide business, financial, marketing, and credit management services to borrowers.

''(ii) REQUIREMENTS.—Before contracting with an entity described in clause (i), the Secretary shall—

''(I) review and approve—

''(aa) the loan loss reserve fund for microloans established by the entity; and

''(bb) the underwriting standards for microloans of the entity; and

''(II) establish such other requirements for contracting with the entity as the Secretary determines necessary.

''(iii) REVOLVING LOAN.—Under such conditions as the Secretary may require, an entity described in clause (i) that enters into a contract with the Secretary under this subparagraph may elect to convert the loan loss reserve fund for microloans established by the entity into a revolving loan fund to carry out the purposes of this subparagraph.

''(b) INFLATION PERCENTAGE.—For purposes of this section, the inflation percentage applicable to a fiscal year is the percentage (if any) by which—

''(1) the average of the Prices Paid By Farmers Index (as compiled by the National Agricultural Statistics Service of the Department) for the 12-month period ending on August 31 of the immediately preceding fiscal year; exceeds

''(2) the average of that index (as so defined) for the 12-month period ending on August 31, 1996.

''SEC. 3204. TERMS OF LOANS.

''(a) PERSONAL LIABILITY.—A borrower of a loan made under this chapter shall secure the loan with the full personal liability of

the borrower and such other security as the Secretary may prescribe.

''(b) INTEREST RATES.—

''(1) MAXIMUM RATE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), the interest rate on a loan made under this chapter (other than a guaranteed loan) shall be determined by the Secretary at a rate not to exceed the sum obtained by adding—

''(i) the current average market yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States with remaining periods to maturity comparable to the average maturity of the loan; and

''(ii) an additional charge not to exceed 1 percent, as determined by the Secretary.

''(B) ADJUSTMENT.—The sum obtained under subparagraph (A) shall be adjusted to the nearest ⅛ of 1 percent.

''(2) GUARANTEED LOAN.—The interest rate on a guaranteed loan made under this chapter shall be such rate as may be agreed on by the borrower and the lender, but may not exceed any rate prescribed by the Secretary.

''(3) LOW INCOME LOAN.—The interest rate on a microloan to a beginning farmer or rancher or a veteran farmer or rancher (as defined in section 2501(e) of the Food Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 2279(e)) or a direct loan made under this chapter to a low-income, limited-resource borrower shall be determined by the Secretary at a rate that is not—

''(A) greater than the sum obtained by adding—

''(i) an amount that does not exceed ½ of the current average market yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States with a maturity of 5 years; and

''(ii) an amount not to exceed 1 percent per year, as the Secretary determines is appropriate; or

''(B) less than 1.5 percent per year.

SA 987. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 11024, insert the following:

SEC. 110___. ALFALFA CROP INSURANCE POLICY.

Section 522(c) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1522(c)) (as amended by section 11024) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(25) ALFALFA CROP INSURANCE POLICY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation shall offer to enter into 1 or more contracts with qualified entities to carry out research and development regarding a policy to insure alfalfa.

''(B) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Corporation shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that describes the results of the study conducted under subparagraph (A).''.

SA 988. Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. KING) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title XII, insert the following:

SEC. 12____. TRANSPORT AND DISPENSING OF CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES IN THE USUAL COURSE OF VETERINARY PRACTICE.

Section 302(e) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 822(e)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(e)'' and inserting ''(e)(1)''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) Notwithstanding paragraph (1), a registrant who is a veterinarian shall not be required to have a separate registration in order to transport and dispense controlled substances in the usual course of veterinary practice at a site other than the registrant's registered principal place of business or professional practice, so long as the site of dispensing is located in a State where the veterinarian is licensed to practice veterinary medicine.''.

SA 989. Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. JOHANNS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 4003, insert the following:

SEC. 4004. WORKFARE REQUIREMENT WAIVER.

Section 6(o)(4)(A) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2015(o)(4)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking ''or'' at end; and

(2) by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following:

''(ii) is designated as a labor surplus area by the Employment and Training Administration of the Department of Labor;

''(iii) is determined by the Unemployment Insurance Services of the Department of Labor as qualifying for extended unemployment benefits; or

''(iv) has a 24-month average unemployment rate that is 20 percent above the national average for the same 24-month period.''.

SA 990. Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. JOHANNS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 4010 and insert the following:

SEC. 4010. QUALITY CONTROL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 16(c) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (D)(i)(II), by inserting ''except as provided in subparagraph (H),'' before ''require''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(H) STATES IN LIABILITY STATUS FOR A THIRD CONSECUTIVE FISCAL YEAR.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—If a liability amount has been established for a State agency under subparagraph (C) for 3 or more consecutive fiscal years, the Secretary shall require the State to pay the entire liability amount for those fiscal years.

''(ii) ALTERNATIVES TO FULL PAYMENT NOT AVAILABLE.—Subparagraph (D) shall not apply to a State agency described in clause (i).''; and

(2) by redesignating paragraph (9) as paragraph (10); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (8) the following:

''(9) PENALTY FOR NEGATIVE ERROR RATE.—

''(A) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

''(i) AFFECTED STATE AGENCY.—The term 'affected State agency' means a State agency that maintains, for 2 or more consecutive fiscal years, a negative error rate that is more than 50 percent higher than the national average negative error rate, as determined by the Secretary.

''(ii) AVERAGE NEGATIVE ERROR RATE.—The term 'average negative error rate' means the product obtained by multiplying—

''(I) the negative error rate of a State agency; and

''(II) the proportion of the total negative caseload of that State agency for the fiscal year, as calculated under the quality control sample at the time of the notifications issued under subparagraph (C), as determined by the Secretary.

''(iii) NEGATIVE ERROR RATE.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—The term 'negative error rate' means, for a State agency, the proportion that—

''(aa) the total number of actions erroneously taken by the State agency to deny applications or suspend or terminate benefits of a household participating in the supplemental nutrition assistance program established under this Act, as determined by the Secretary, in that fiscal year; bears to

''(bb) the total number of actions taken by the State agency to deny applications or suspend or terminate benefits of households participating in the supplemental nutrition assistance program established under this Act in that fiscal year.

''(II) EXCLUSIONS.—The term 'negative error rate' does not include—

''(aa) an error resulting from the application of regulations promulgated under this Act during the period—

''(AA) beginning on the date of enactment of this clause; and

''(BB) ending on the date that is 121 days after the date on which the regulation is implemented; and

''(bb) an error resulting from—

''(AA) the use by a State agency of correctly processed information concerning households or individuals received under a Federal program; or

''(BB) an action that is based on policy information that is approved or disseminated, in writing, by the Secretary or a designee of the Secretary.

''(B) PENALTY AMOUNT.—For fiscal year 2012 and each subsequent fiscal year, the amount of the penalty for an affected State agency shall be equal to 5 percent of the amount otherwise payable under subsection (a).

''(C) INFORMATION REPORTING BY STATES.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—For each fiscal year, each State agency shall expeditiously submit to the Secretary data concerning the operations of the State agency sufficient for the Secretary to establish the negative error rate and penalty amount of the State agency.

''(ii) RELEVANT INFORMATION.—The Secretary may require a State agency to report any factors necessary to determine the negative error rate of the State agency.

''(iii) INFORMATION NOT REPORTED.—If a State agency fails to report information required by the Secretary, the Secretary may use any information, as the Secretary considers appropriate, to establish the negative error rate of the State agency for the applicable year.

''(iv) NATIONAL AVERAGE ERROR RATE.—If a State agency fails to report information required by the Secretary, the Secretary may use the national average negative error rate to establish the negative error rate for the State agency.

''(D) ANNOUNCEMENT OF ERROR RATES.—

''(i) CASE REVIEW.—Not later than May 31 of each fiscal year, the case review and all arbitration of State-Federal differences on negative error rates for the previous fiscal year shall be completed.

''(ii) DETERMINATION AND ANNOUNCEMENT.—Not later than June 30 of each fiscal year, the Secretary shall, for the previous fiscal year—

''(I) determine—

''(aa) final negative error rates;

''(bb) the national average negative error rate; and

''(cc) penalty amounts;

''(II) notify affected State agencies of the penalty amounts;

''(III) provide a copy of the notification under subclause (II) to the chief executive officer and the legislature of the affected State; and

''(IV) establish a claim against the State agency for the monetary penalty amount assessed against the State agency.

''(E) REVIEW.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—For any fiscal year, if the Secretary imposes a penalty amount against a State agency under subparagraph (D)(ii), the following determinations of the Secretary shall be subject to administrative and judicial review:

''(I) The final negative error rate of the State agency.

''(II) A determination of the Secretary that the negative error rate of the State agency exceeds 50 percent of the national average negative error rate.

''(III) The monetary penalty amount assessed against the State agency.

''(ii) DETERMINATION NOT REVIEWABLE.—The national average negative error rate under this paragraph shall not be subject to administrative or judicial review.

''(F) PAYMENT OF PENALTY AMOUNT.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—On completion of administrative and judicial review under subparagraph (E), an affected State agency shall pay to the Secretary the penalty amount designated under subparagraph (D)(ii), subject to the findings of the administrative or judicial review, not later than September 30 of the fiscal year for which the claim has been issued to the State agency.

''(ii) ALTERNATIVE METHOD OF COLLECTION.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—If a State agency fails to make a payment under clause (i) by September 30 of the fiscal year for which the claim has been issued to the State agency, the Secretary may reduce any amount due to the State agency under any other provision of this Act by the amount of the monetary penalty established under subparagraph (D)(ii).

''(II) ACCRUAL OF INTEREST.—Interest on the amount owed shall not accrue until after September 30 of the applicable fiscal year.''.

SA 991. Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. JOHANNS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 4016, strike ''Section 28(b)'' and inserting the following:

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 28(b)

In section 4016, add at the end the following:

(2) FUNDING.—Section 28 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2036a) is amended by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following:

''(d) FUNDING.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Of funds made available each fiscal year under section 18(a)(1), the Secretary shall make available to each State agency to carry out the nutrition education and obesity prevention grant program under this section—

''(A) for fiscal year 2013, an amount equal to $5 per individual in the State enrolled in the supplemental nutrition assistance program; and

''(B) for fiscal year 2014 and each subsequent fiscal year, the applicable amount during the preceding fiscal year, as adjusted to reflect any increases for the 12-month period ending the preceding June 30 in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor, per individual in the State enrolled in the supplemental nutrition assistance program.

''(2) TIMING OF DETERMINATION.—At the end of each fiscal year, the Secretary shall determine the total number of individuals in each State enrolled in the supplemental nutrition assistance program so as to determine appropriate funding levels for the coming fiscal year.''.

SA 992. Mr. FRANKEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 351, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

SEC. 4001. ACCESS TO GROCERY DELIVERY FOR HOMEBOUND SENIORS AND INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES ELIGIBLE FOR SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE BENEFITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3(p) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2012(p)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

''(5) a public or private nonprofit food purchasing and delivery service that—

''(A) purchases food for, and delivers the food to, individuals who are—

''(i) unable to shop for food; and

''(ii)(I) not less than 60 years of age; or

''(II) individuals with disabilities;

''(B) clearly notifies the participating household at the time the household places a food order—

''(i) of any delivery fee associated with the food purchase and delivery provided to the household by the service; and

''(ii) that a delivery fee cannot be paid with benefits provided under the supplemental nutrition assistance program; and

''(C) sells food purchased for the household at the price paid by the service for the food without any additional cost markup.''.

(b) ISSUANCE OF REGULATIONS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue regulations that—

(1) establish criteria to identify a food purchasing and delivery service described in section 3(p)(5) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (as added by subsection (a)(3)); and

(2) establish procedures to ensure that the service—

(A) does not charge more for a food item than the price paid by the service for the food item;

(B) offers food delivery service at no or low cost to households under that Act;

(C) ensures that benefits provided under the supplemental nutrition assistance program are used only to purchase food, as defined in section 3 of that Act (7 U.S.C. 2012);

(D) limits the purchase of food, and the delivery of the food, to households eligible to receive services described in section 3(p)(5) of that Act (as added by subsection (a)(3));

(E) has established adequate safeguards against fraudulent activities, including unauthorized use of electronic benefit cards issued under that Act; and

(F) such other requirements as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(c) LIMITATION.—Before the issuance of regulations under subsection (b), the Secretary may not approve more than 20 food purchasing and delivery services described in section 3(p)(5) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (as added by subsection (a)(3)) to participate as retail food stores under the supplemental nutrition assistance program.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section and the amendments made by this section take effect on the date that is 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 993. Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1150, after line 15, add the following:

SEC. 12____. UNLAWFUL RETALIATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle A of title II of the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921 (7 U.S.C. 191 et seq.), is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 211. UNLAWFUL RETALIATION.

''(1) IN GENERAL.—No packer, swine contractor, or live poultry dealer shall take retaliatory action in response to any lawful spoken or written expression, association, or action of a livestock producer, swine production contract grower, or poultry grower.

''(2) TYPES OF LAWFUL EXPRESSION.—The lawful expression referred to in paragraph (1) shall include communication with officials of a Federal agency or Members of Congress.''.

(b) DEFINITION OF RETALIATORY ACTION.—Section 2(a) of the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921 (7 U.S.C. 182(a)), is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(15) RETALIATORY ACTION.—The term 'retaliatory action' means coercion, intimidation, or any other action carried out to achieve the disadvantage of any livestock producer, swine production contract grower, or poultry grower in the execution, termination, extension, or renewal of a contract involving livestock or poultry.''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 411 of the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921 (7 U.S.C. 228b–2) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), in the first sentence, by inserting '', section 211,'' after ''section 207''; and

(2) in subsection (b), in the first sentence, by inserting '', section 211,'' after ''section 207''.

SA 994. Mr. VITTER (for himself and Mr. CORNYN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1150, after line 15, add the following:

SEC. 122____. MINIMIZATION OF IMPACT OF ENDANGERED SPECIES LISTINGS AND DESIGNATIONS ON AGRICULTURAL LAND.

Section 4 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(j) MINIMIZATION OF IMPACT OF ENDANGERED SPECIES LISTINGS AND DESIGNATIONS ON AGRICULTURAL LAND.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Before any action is taken to list a species or designate critical habitat under this Act, the Secretary shall—

''(A) consult with the Secretary of Agriculture to identify all private agricultural land and land maintained by the Forest Service that could be adversely impacted by the listing or designation; and

''(B) prepare a report that describes the economic impacts of the listing or designation on land used for agricultural activities.

''(2) ECONOMIC ANALYSES.—In conducting economic analyses on the impact of the listing of species, or designation of critical habitat, described in paragraph (1), the Secretary of Agriculture, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, shall—

''(A) conduct, and make available to the Secretary of the Interior and the public, separate economic analyses for—

''(i) private agricultural land; and

''(ii) land maintained by the Forest Service;

''(B) give landowners an opportunity for comment on the proposed listing or designation—

''(i) to obtain the input of the landowners; and

''(ii) to provide landowners the same opportunity to comment as other affected parties;

''(C) use sound and proven economic analysis tools in conducting the analyses, listing species, and designating habitat under this Act; and

''(D) make available on a public website—

''(i) a description of the total economic impact on agricultural land from all actual and potential listings and designations under this Act; and

''(ii) a map of all locations in the United States that are proposed for critical habitat designations.

''(3) ACTUAL NOTICE.—In listing species or designating habitat under this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall, to the maximum extent practicable, provide actual notice to affected landowners and other parties.

''(4) APPEALS.—Before a species is listed or habitat is designated under this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall make available to affected landowners and other parties a description of all options that are available to appeal or obtain compensation from the listing or designation (including administrative and judicial options) against the Federal Government.

''(5) TRESPASSING ON PRIVATE PROPERTY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If any person enters private land without the consent of the landowner to promote the purposes of this Act, any data obtained during or as a result of the trespass shall not be considered—

''(i) to be the best available science; or

''(ii) to meet the scientific quality standards issued under section 515 of the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 2001 (Public Law 106–554; 114 Stat. 2763A–153) (commonly referred to as the 'Data Quality Act').

''(B) AERIAL SURVEILLANCE.—No science that is produced as a result of aerial surveillance of private land without the consent of the landowner shall be considered to meet the scientific quality standards described in subparagraph (A)(ii).''.

SA 995. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. TAXPAYER NONDISCRIMINATION & PROTECTION ACT OF 2013.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Taxpayer Nondiscrimination & Protection Act of 2013''.

(b) MISCONDUCT AGAINST TAXPAYERS BY INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE EMPLOYEES.—

(1) CRIMINAL LIABILITY.—Chapter 13 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 250. Misconduct against taxpayers by Internal Revenue Service employees

''Whoever being an employee of the Internal Revenue Service, knowingly engages, during the performance of that employee's official duties, in an act or omission described in section 1203(b) of the Internal Revenue Service Restructuring and Reform Act of 1998 shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.''.

(2) CLARIFICATION OF ACTS AND OMISSION CONSTITUTING MISCONDUCT.—

(A) RELEASE OF INFORMATION AND POLITICAL VIEWS.—Section 1203(b) of the Internal Revenue Service Restructuring and Reform Act of 1998 (26 U.S.C. 7804 note) is amended—

(i) in paragraph (9), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(ii) in paragraph (10), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon;

(iii) by inserting at the end the following:

''(11) making decisions regarding enforcement actions or investigations, including decisions regarding their relative priority, based on factors related to political or social views, statements, or affiliations of a taxpayer; and

''(12) wilfully releasing confidential taxpayer information to members of the public.''.

(B) FIRST AMENDMENT PROTECTIONS.—For purposes of section 1203 of the Internal Revenue Service Restructuring and Reform Act of 1998 and section 250 of title 18, United States Code (as added by this section) the protections and guarantees afforded under the First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States to political speech and political expression shall not fail to be treated as rights under the Constitution of the United States referred to in section 1203(b) of the Internal Revenue Service Restructuring and Reform Act of 1998.

(3) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 13 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item relating to section 249 the following:

''250. Discriminatory misconduct against taxpayers by Federal officers and employees.''.

SA 996. Mr. PRYOR (for himself and Mr. WICKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 1203(b)—

(1) strike ''The Secretary'' and insert the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary''; and

(2) add at the end the following:

''(2) PERMITTED EXTENSIONS.—The Secretary may extend the term of a marketing assistance loan (including the loan rate) for any loan commodity if—

''(A) at the time the marketing loan is due—

''(i) the loan commodity is stored in a county for which—

''(I) a natural disaster is declared by the Secretary under section 321(a) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1961(a)); or

''(II) a major disaster or emergency is designated by the President under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.); or

''(ii) the port used to ship the loan commodity is closed or restricted pursuant to a Coast Guard regulation;

''(B) the loan commodity is stored in the county described in subparagraph (A)(i);

''(C) the marketing loan is extended not more than 90 days;

''(D) the request for the extension is approved by the applicable State Director of the Farm Service Agency on an individual basis; and

''(E) the extension does not extend the term of the marketing assistance loan beyond July 31 of the applicable crop year.''.

SA 997. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1096, between lines 15 and 16, insert the following:

SEC. 110__. MARKET LOSS PILOT ENDORSEMENT PROGRAM.

Section 523 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1523) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(i) MARKET LOSS PILOT ENDORSEMENT PROGRAM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—To the extent practicable starting with the 2014 reinsurance year, notwithstanding subsection (a)(1) and the limitation on premium increases in section 508(i)(1), the Corporation shall establish and carry out a market loss pilot endorsement program for producers of specialty crops (as defined in section 3 of the Specialty Crops Competitiveness Act of 2004 (7 U.S.C. 1621 note; Public Law 108-465)).

''(2) LOSSES COVERED.—The endorsement authorized under this subsection shall cover losses of a defined commodity due to—

''(A) a quarantine imposed under Federal law, pursuant to the terms of which the commodity is destroyed, may not be marketed, or otherwise may not be used for its intended purpose (as determined by the Secretary); or

''(B) a decline in the market price in response to a naturally occurring or accidental outbreak of a pathogen (as determined by the Secretary).

''(3) BUY-UP REQUIREMENT.—An endorsement authorized under this subsection shall be purchased as part of a policy or plan of insurance at the additional coverage level.

''(4) DETERMINATION BY BOARD.—The Board shall approve a policy or plan of insurance proposed under paragraph (1) if, as determined by the Board, the policy or plan of insurance—

''(A) protects the interest of producers;

''(B) is actuarially sound; and

''(C) requires the payment of premiums and administrative fees by a producer obtaining the insurance.''.

SA 998. Mr. LEAHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; as follows:

Beginning on page 840, strike line 22 and all that follows through page 849, line 18, and insert the following:

''(3) RURAL AREA.—The term 'rural area' means any area described in section 3002 of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act.

''(4) ULTRA-HIGH SPEED SERVICE.—The term 'ultra-high speed service' means broadband service operating at a 1 gigabit per second downstream transmission capacity.'';

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking ''LOANS AND'' and inserting ''GRANTS, LOANS, AND'';

(B) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''make grants and'' after ''Secretary shall'';

(C) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(2) PRIORITY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In making grants, loans, or loan guarantees under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

''(i) establish not less than 2, and not more than 4, evaluation periods for each fiscal year to compare grant, loan, and loan guarantee applications and to prioritize grants, loans, and loan guarantees to all or part of rural communities that do not have residential broadband service that meets the minimum acceptable level of broadband service established under subsection (e);

''(ii) give the highest priority to applicants that offer to provide broadband service to the greatest proportion of unserved rural households or rural households that do not have residential broadband service that meets the minimum acceptable level of broadband service established under subsection (e), as—

''(I) certified by the affected community, city, county, or designee; or

''(II) demonstrated on—

''(aa) the broadband map of the affected State if the map contains address-level data; or

''(bb) the National Broadband Map if address-level data is unavailable; and

''(iii) provide equal consideration to all qualified applicants, including those that have not previously received grants, loans, or loan guarantees under paragraph (1).

''(B) OTHER.—After giving priority to the applicants described in subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall then give priority to projects that serve rural communities—

''(i) with a population of less than 20,000 permanent residents;

''(ii) experiencing outmigration;

''(iii) with a high percentage of low-income residents; and

''(iv) that are isolated from other significant population centers.''; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) GRANT AMOUNTS.—

''(A) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible for a grant under this section, the project that is the subject of the grant shall be carried out in a rural area.

''(B) MAXIMUM.—Except as provided in subparagraph (D), the amount of any grant made under this section shall not exceed 50 percent of the development costs of the project for which the grant is provided.

''(C) GRANT RATE.—The Secretary shall establish the grant rate for each project in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary that shall provide for a graduated scale of grant rates that establish higher rates for projects in communities that have—

''(i) remote locations;

''(ii) low community populations;

''(iii) low income levels;

''(iv) developed the applications of the communities with the participation of combinations of stakeholders, including—

''(I) State, local, and tribal governments;

''(II) nonprofit institutions;

''(III) institutions of higher education;

''(IV) private entities; and

''(V) philanthropic organizations; and

''(v) targeted funding to provide the minimum acceptable level of broadband service established under subsection (e) in all or part of an unserved community that is below that minimum acceptable level of broadband service.

''(D) SECRETARIAL AUTHORITY TO ADJUST.—The Secretary may make grants of up to 75 percent of the development costs of the project for which the grant is provided to an eligible entity if the Secretary determines that the project serves a remote or low income area that does not have access to broadband service from any provider of broadband service (including the applicant).'';

(4) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''loan or'' and inserting ''grant, loan, or'';

(ii) by striking clause (i) and inserting the following:

''(i) demonstrate the ability—

''(I) to furnish, improve in order to meet the minimum acceptable level of broadband service established under subsection (e), or extend broadband service to all or part of an unserved rural area or an area below the minimum acceptable level of broadband service established under subsection (e); or

''(II) to carry out a project under paragraph (4)(B)(ii);'';

(iii) in clause (ii), by striking ''a loan application'' and inserting ''an application''; and

(iv) in clause (iii)—

(I) by striking ''the loan application'' and inserting ''the application''; and

(II) by striking ''proceeds from the loan made or guaranteed under this section are'' and inserting ''assistance under this section is'';

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) in the matter preceding clause (i)—

(aa) by striking ''the proceeds of a loan made or guaranteed'' and inserting ''assistance''; and

(bb) by striking ''for the loan or loan guarantee'' and inserting ''of the eligible entity'';

(II) in clause (i), by striking ''is offered broadband service by not more than 1 incumbent service provider'' and inserting ''are unserved or have service levels below the minimum acceptable level of broadband service established under subsection (e)''; and

(III) in clause (ii), by striking ''3'' and inserting ''2'';

(ii) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

''(B) ADJUSTMENTS.—

''(i) INCREASE.—The Secretary may increase the household percentage requirement under subparagraph (A)(i) if—

''(I) more than 25 percent of the costs of the project are funded by grants made under this section; or

''(II) the proposed service territory includes 1 or more communities with a population in excess of 20,000.

''(ii) REDUCTION.—The Secretary may reduce the household percentage requirement under subparagraph (A)(i)—

''(I) to not less than 15 percent, if the proposed service territory does not have a population in excess of 5,000 people; or

''(II) to not less than 18 percent, if the proposed service territory does not have a population in excess of 7,500 people.''; and

(iii) in subparagraph (C)—

(I) in the subparagraph heading, by striking ''3'' and inserting ''2'';

(II) in clause (i), by inserting ''the minimum acceptable level of broadband service established under subsection (e) in'' after ''service to''; and

(III) by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following:

''(ii) EXCEPTIONS.—Clause (i) shall not apply if—

''(I) the applicant is eligible for funding under another title of this Act; or

''(II) the project is being carried out under paragraph (4)(B)(ii), unless an incumbent service provider is providing ultra-high speed service as of the date of an application for assistance submitted to the Secretary under this section.'';

(C) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''loan or'' and inserting ''grant, loan, or''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by adding at the end the following:

''(iii) INFORMATION.—Information submitted under this subparagraph shall be—

''(I) certified by the affected community, city, county, or designee; and

''(II) demonstrated on—

''(aa) the broadband map of the affected State if the map contains address-level data; or

''(bb) the National Broadband Map if address-level data is unavailable.'';

(D) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by striking ''Subject to paragraph (1),'' and inserting the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (1) and subparagraph (B),'';

(ii) by striking ''loan or'' and inserting ''grant, loan, or''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) PILOT PROGRAMS.—The Secretary shall establish pilot programs under which the Secretary may, at the discretion of the Secretary, provide grants, loans, or loan guarantees under this section to eligible entities, including interested entities described in subparagraph (A)—

''(i) to address areas that are unserved or have service levels below the minimum acceptable level of broadband service established under subsection (e); or

''(ii) for the purposes of providing a proposed service territory with ultra-high speed service, subject to the conditions that—

''(I) not more than 5 projects, and not more than 1 project in any State, shall be carried out under this clause during the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and ending on September 30, 2018;

''(II) for each fiscal year, not more than 10 percent of the funds made available under subsection (*l*) shall be used to carry out this clause;

''(III) for each fiscal year, not more than 20 percent of the funds made available under subclause (II) shall be used for any 1 project; and

''(IV) paragraph (2)(A)(i) shall apply to the project, unless—

''(aa) the Secretary determines that no other project in the State is funded under this section; and

''(bb) no application for any other project that could be funded under this section, other than under this clause, is pending in the State.'';

SA 999. Mr. COBURN (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. MCCAIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1101, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following:

SEC. 11____. LIMITATION ON PREMIUM SUBSIDY BASED ON AVERAGE ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME.

Section 508(e) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(e)) (as amended by section 11030(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(9) LIMITATION ON PREMIUM SUBSIDY BASED ON AVERAGE ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME.—

''(A) DEFINITION OF AVERAGE ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME.—In this paragraph, the term 'average adjusted gross income' has the meaning given the term in section 1001D(a) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308–3a(a)).

''(B) LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subtitle and beginning with the 2014 reinsurance year, in the case of any producer that is a person or legal entity that has an average adjusted gross income in excess of $750,000 based on the most recent data available from the Farm Service

Agency as of the beginning of the reinsurance year, the total amount of premium subsidy provided with respect to additional coverage under subsection (c), section 508B, or section 508C issued on behalf of the producer for a reinsurance year shall be 15 percentage points less than the premium subsidy provided in accordance with this subsection that would otherwise be available for the applicable policy, plan of insurance, and coverage level selected by the producer.

''(C) APPLICATION.—

''(i) STUDY.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the Government Accountability Office, shall carry out a study to determine the effects of the limitation described in subparagraph (B) on—

''(I) the overall operations of the Federal crop insurance program;

''(II) the number of producers participating in the Federal crop insurance program;

''(III) the level of coverage purchased by participating producers;

''(IV) the amount of premiums paid by participating producers and the Federal Government;

''(V) any potential liability for participating producers, approved insurance providers, and the Federal Government;

''(VI) different crops or growing regions;

''(VII) program rating structures;

''(VIII) creation of schemes or devices to evade the impact of the limitation; and

''(IX) administrative and operating expenses paid to approved insurance providers and underwriting gains and loss for the Federal government and approved insurance providers.

''(ii) EFFECTIVENESS.—The limitation described in subparagraph (B) shall not take effect unless the Secretary determines, through the study described in clause (i), that the limitation would not—

''(I) significantly increase the premium amount paid by producers with an average adjusted gross income of less than $750,000;

''(II) result in a decline in the crop insurance coverage available to producers; and

''(III) increase the total cost of the Federal crop insurance program.''.

SA 1000. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 380, between lines 15 and 16, insert the following:

SEC. 40___. DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS TO PROHIBIT PURCHASES OF JUNK FOOD.

Section 17 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2026) (as amended by section 4001(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(m) DEMONSTRATION PROJECT TO RESTRICT ELIGIBLE ITEMS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A State may carry out a demonstration project to plan, design, develop, and implement a program in the State to eliminate purchases of junk food and other unhealthful items by redefining items that qualify as 'food' under section 3(k) if the Secretary approves a waiver request submitted by the State in accordance with paragraph (2).

''(2) APPROVAL OF WAIVER.—The Secretary shall approve any waiver to carry out a program under paragraph (1) if the Secretary determines that the waiver request submitted by the State includes—

''(A) a standard based on nutritional content for redefining items for eligibility under section 3(k) that—

''(i) is determined by the State to be clear, practical, and consistent in excluding certain items from eligibility as a food under section 3(k); and

''(ii) does not—

''(I) expand the number of items otherwise eligible under section 3(k); or

''(II) classify alcoholic beverages, tobacco, and hot foods or hot food products ready for immediate consumption as eligible under section 3(k);

''(B) a description of the cost of implementing the demonstration project in the State;

''(C) a description of the number of households participating in the program to be affected by the demonstration project;

''(D) a procedure for disseminating product eligibility information periodically to retailers;

''(E) a procedure to monitor and evaluate program operations, including impact on small businesses; and

''(F) a statement that the demonstration project does not intend to reduce the eligibility for, or amount of, benefits available under this Act.

''(3) EVALUATION.—Not later than 5 years after the date on which a demonstration is initiated under this subsection, the State shall submit to the Secretary a report that describes the effect of the demonstration project on—

''(A) the costs and benefits under the supplemental nutrition assistance program in the State; and

''(B) the access of individuals receiving benefits under the supplemental nutrition assistance program in the State to nutritious food.

''(4) TREATMENT.—A demonstration project under this subsection shall be considered to be a permissible project to test innovative welfare reform strategies under subsection (b)(1)(B)(ii)(III).''.

SA 1001. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 351, strike lines 11 and 12 and insert the following:

Subtitle A—Food Stamp Program

SEC. 4001. REPEAL OF RENAMING OF THE FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1977 AND THE FOOD STAMP PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Effective June 18, 2008, sections 4001 and 4002 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–246; 122 Stat. 1853) and the amendments made by those sections are repealed.

(b) APPLICATION.—The Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.) shall be applied and administered as if sections 4001 and 4002 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–246; 122 Stat. 1853) and the amendments made by those sections had not been enacted.

In title IV—

(1) strike ''Food and Nutrition Act of 2008'' each place it appears and insert ''Food Stamp Act of 1977''; and

(2) strike ''supplemental nutrition assistance program'' each place it appears and insert ''food stamp program''.

SA 1002. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 380, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

SEC. 4014. PROMOTION AND ENROLLMENT.

Section 18 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2027) (as amended by section 4013) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) LIMITATIONS ON USE RELATING TO PROMOTION AND ENROLLMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), not more than 1 percent of the amounts made available to carry out this Act shall be used to promote increased participation and enrollment in the supplemental nutrition assistance program.

''(2) PROHIBITION ON USE FOR CERTAIN ACTIVITIES.—None of the amounts made available to carry out this Act shall be used for—

''(A) radio and television soap operas;

''(B) social events and parties, including bingo games; and

''(C) giveaways of toys, gift bags, pet toys, and animal food.''.

SA 1003. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 122___. PROHIBITION ON FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE BY PERSONS HAVING SERIOUSLY DELINQUENT TAX DEBTS.

(a) DEFINITION OF SERIOUSLY DELINQUENT TAX DEBT.—In this section:

(1) IN GENERAL.—The term ''seriously delinquent tax debt'' means an outstanding debt under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 for which a notice of lien has been filed in public records pursuant to section 6323 of that Code.

(2) EXCLUSIONS.—The term ''seriously delinquent tax debt'' does not include—

(A) a debt that is being paid in a timely manner pursuant to an agreement under section 6159 or 7122 of Internal Revenue Code of 1986; and

(B) a debt with respect to which a collection due process hearing under section 6330 of that Code, or relief under subsection (a), (b), or (f) of section 6015 of that Code, is requested or pending.

(b) PROHIBITION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or an amendment made by this Act and subject to subsection (c), an individual or entity who has a seriously delinquent tax debt shall be ineligible to receive financial assistance (including any payment, loan, grant, contract, or subsidy) under this Act or an amendment made by this Act during the pendency of such seriously delinquent tax debt.

(c) LIMITATION.—Subsection (b) shall not apply to any benefits or assistance provided under the supplemental nutrition assistance program established under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.).

(d) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Agriculture, in conjunction with the Secretary of the Treasury, shall issue such regulations as the Secretary considers necessary to carry out this section.

SA 1004. Mr. COBURN (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 168, strike line 9 and insert the following:

(b) CONSERVATION PROGRAMS.—Section 1001D(b)(2)(A) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308–3a(b)(2)(A)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''LIMITS.—'' and all that follows through ''clause (ii),'' and inserting ''LIMITS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law,''; and

(2) by striking clause (ii).

(c) APPLICATION.—The amendments made by this

SA 1005. Mr. COBURN (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 421, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

SEC. 42___. EVALUATION AND CONSOLIDATION OF DUPLICATIVE NUTRITION PROGRAMS.

(a) EVALUATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than June 1, 2014, the Secretary, the Assistant Secretary for Aging, and the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, as appropriate, shall submit to Congress and post on the public Internet website of the Department a report on the outcomes of the following programs:

(A) The child and adult care food program established under section 17 of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1766).

(B) The community food projects competitive grant program established under section 25 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2034).

(C) The Emergency Food and Shelter Program under title III of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11331 et seq.).

(D) The grants to American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian organizations for nutrition and supportive services program carried out under title VI of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3057 et seq.).

(E) The food distribution program on Indian reservations established under section 4(b) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2013(b)).

(F) The fresh fruit and vegetable program established under section 19 of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1769a).

(G) The seniors farmers' market nutrition program established under section 4402 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 3007).

(H) The summer food service program for children established under section 13 of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1761).

(I) The emergency food assistance program established under the Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983 (7 U.S.C. 7501 et seq.).

(J) The farmers' market nutrition program established under section 17(m) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786(m)).

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

(i) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subclause (II), the term ''administrative expenses'' has the meaning given the term by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget under section 504(b)(2) of the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010 (31 U.S.C. 1105 note; Public Law 111–85).

(II) INCLUSIONS.—The term ''administrative expenses'' include, with respect to an agency—

(aa) costs incurred by the agency and costs incurred by grantees, subgrantees, and other recipients of funds from a grant program or other program administered by the agency; and

(bb) expenses related to personnel salaries and benefits, property management, travel, program management, promotion, reviews and audits, case management, and communication about, promotion of, and outreach for programs and program activities administered by the agency.

(ii) SERVICES.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subclause (II), the term ''services'' has the meaning provided by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(II) LIMITATION.—The term ''services'' shall be limited to activities, assistance, and aid that provide a direct benefit to a recipient, such as the provision of medical care, assistance for housing or tuition, or financial support (including grants and loans).

(B) REQUIREMENTS.—In evaluating the outcomes of programs for the report under paragraph (1), the Secretary, the Assistant Secretary for Aging, and the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall, for each applicable program that is a subject of the report—

(i) determine the total administrative expenses of the program;

(ii) determine the expenditures for services for the program;

(iii) estimate the number of clients served by the program and beneficiaries who received assistance under the program (if applicable); and

(iv) estimate—

(I) the number of full-time employees who administer the program; and

(II) the number of full-time equivalents (whose salary is paid in part or full by the Federal Government through a grant or contract, a subaward of a grant or contract, a cooperative agreement, or another form of financial award or assistance) who assist in administering the program.

(b) ELIMINATIONS AND CONSOLIDATIONS.—

(1) COMMODITY SUPPLEMENTAL FOOD PROGRAM.—

(A) REPEAL.—Notwithstanding the amendments made by section 4012, section 5 of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 (7 U.S.C. 612c note; Public Law 93–86) is repealed.

(B) USE OF SAVINGS.—Amounts saved as a result of the repeal made by subparagraph (A) shall be made available, without further appropriation, to the Secretary to carry out the food assistance activities of other programs of the Department of Agriculture that the Comptroller General of the United States identified as having positive outcomes related to the goals of the programs in the report entitled ''Domestic Food Assistance: Complex System Benefits Millions, but Additional Efforts Could Address Potential Inefficiency and Overlap among Smaller Programs (GAO-10-346)'' and dated April 2010.

(2) SENIORS FARMERS' MARKET NUTRITION PROGRAM.—

(A) REPEAL.—Notwithstanding the amendment made by section 4202, section 4402 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 3007) is repealed.

(B) INCOMPLETE AND ONGOING PROJECTS.—The Secretary shall continue to carry out any incomplete or ongoing projects previously carried out under the section repealed by subparagraph (A) through the farmers' market nutrition program established under section 17(m) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786(m)).

(C) USE OF SAVINGS.—Amounts saved as a result of the repeal made by subparagraph (A) shall be made available, without further appropriation, to the Secretary to carry out the food assistance activities of other programs of the Department of Agriculture that the Comptroller General of the United States identified as having positive outcomes related to the goals of the programs in the report entitled ''Domestic Food Assistance: Complex System Benefits Millions, but Additional Efforts Could Address Potential Inefficiency and Overlap among Smaller Programs (GAO-10-346)'' and dated April 2010.

(3) ELIMINATION OF DUPLICATIVE FUNCTIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in coordination with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, using the administrative authorities of the Secretaries, shall eliminate, consolidate, and streamline any overlapping or duplicative functions of the Secretaries in carrying out—

(i) section 4(b) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2013(b));

(ii) title VI of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3057 et seq.); and

(iii) section 311 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3030a).

(B) REPORTS.—The Secretary and the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit to Congress a report describing any legislative changes required to carry out subparagraph (A).

(4) REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall ensure that—

(A) in repealing and consolidating programs, the eligibility, benefits, and services to existing clients are not interrupted or reduced; and

(B) in consolidating programs and making recommendations for further consolidations and eliminations, priority is given to continuing programs with the best outcomes that serve the most clients with the least amount of administrative costs.

(5) RECOMMENDATIONS FOR LEGISLATIVE CHANGES.—Not later than 150 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretaries of Agriculture, Health and Human Services, and Homeland Security shall submit to Congress a report that identifies any legislative changes that 1 or more of the Secretaries determine to be necessary to further eliminate, consolidate, or streamline duplicative and overlapping functions identified in—

(A) the report of the Government Accountability Office entitled ''Opportunities to Reduce Government Duplication in Government Programs, Save Tax Dollars, and Enhance Revenue (GAO 11 318SP)'' and dated March 2011;

(B) the testimony of the Government Accountability Office before the Subcommittee on Primary Health Aging, Senate Committee on Health, Education Labor, and Pensions entitled ''Nutrition Assistance: Additional Efficiencies Could Improve Services to Older Adults (GAO-11-782T)'' and dated June 2011; and

(C) the report of the Government Accountability Office entitled ''Domestic Food Assistance: Complex System Benefits Millions, but Additional Efforts Could Address Potential Inefficiency and Overlap among Smaller Programs (GAO-10-346)'' and dated April 2010.

SA 1006. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1037, strike lines 8 through 17 and insert the following:

administrative expenses.

''(3) REQUIREMENTS.—Not less than 80 percent of the amount made available for a fiscal year to carry out this section shall be used—

''(A) to increase access, availability and affordability of specialty crops for children, youth, families and others at risk, including specialty crops for meals served in schools and food banks;

''(B) to ensure or promote food safety;

''(C) to protect specialty crops from plant pests and disease; and

''(D) to produce specialty crops.

''(4) PROHIBITIONS.—None of the funds made available under this section may used—

''(A) to produce, purchase, promote, or market junk food or candy, including potato chips and chocolate;

''(B) to sponsor field days at, or attend, amusement parks or festivals;

''(C) to support pageants or tours by pageant winners; or

''(D) to promote, produce, or otherwise support crops that are ornamental in nature.''; and

(5) in subsection (l) (as redesignated by paragraph (3))—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) $55,000,000 for fiscal year 2014 and each fiscal year thereafter.''.

SA 1007. Mr. COBURN (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 332, strike lines 6 through 9, and insert the following:

SEC. 3102. FUNDING FOR MARKET ACCESS PROGRAM.

Section 211(c) of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5641(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(A)—

(A) by striking ''and'' after ''2005,''; and

(B) by inserting '', and $160,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2018'' after ''2012,''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR CERTAIN ACTIVITIES.—None of the funds made available to carry out this subsection shall be used for—

''(A) animal spa products;

''(B) reality television shows;

''(C) cat or dog food or other pet food;

''(D) wine tastings, beer festivals or beer award contests, beer tasting or beer school seminars, and tastings or seminars for alcohol of any kind (including whiskeys and distilled spirits); and

''(E) cheese award shows and contests.

''(4) TRAVEL-RELATED EXPENSES.—The Secretary shall annually disclose to Congress, and post on a public website, a description of all travel-related expenses incurred to carry out this subsection, including—

''(A) the purpose of the expenses;

''(B) the total costs incurred for travel-related activities for each fiscal year;

''(C) the number of participants and the affiliations of the participants; and

''(D) the destination and itinerary of each trip made to carry out this subsection.''.

SA 1008. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 6104 and insert the following:

SEC. 6104. ACCESS TO BROADBAND TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES IN RURAL AREAS.

Section 601 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 950bb) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''loans and'' and inserting ''grants, loans, and'';

(2) in subsection (b), by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

''(3) RURAL AREA.—The term 'rural area' means any area described in section 3002 of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act that does not have access to broadband service from any provider of broadband service.'';

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking ''LOANS AND'' and inserting ''GRANTS, LOANS, AND'';

(B) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''make grants and'' after ''Secretary shall'';

(C) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(2) PRIORITY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In making grants, loans, or loan guarantees under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

''(i) establish not less than 2, and not more than 4, evaluation periods for each fiscal year to compare grant, loan, and loan guarantee applications;

''(ii) give the highest priority to applicants that offer to provide broadband service to the greatest proportion of unserved rural households or rural households that do not have residential broadband service, as—

''(I) certified by the affected community, city, county, or designee; or

''(II) demonstrated on—

''(aa) the broadband map of the affected State if the map contains address-level data; or

''(bb) the National Broadband Map if address-level data is unavailable; and

''(iii) provide equal consideration to all qualified applicants, including those that have not previously received grants, loans, or loan guarantees under paragraph (1).

''(B) OTHER.—After giving priority to the applicants described in subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall then give priority to projects that serve rural communities—

''(i) with a population of less than 20,000 permanent residents;

''(ii) experiencing outmigration;

''(iii) with a high percentage of low-income residents; and

''(iv) that are isolated from other significant population centers.''; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) GRANT AMOUNTS.—

''(A) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible for a grant under this section, the project that is the subject of the grant shall be carried out in a rural area.

''(B) MAXIMUM.—Except as provided in subparagraph (D), the amount of any grant made under this section shall not exceed 50 percent of the development costs of the project for which the grant is provided.

''(C) GRANT RATE.—The Secretary shall establish the grant rate for each project in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary that shall provide for a graduated scale of grant rates that establish higher rates for projects in communities that have—

''(i) remote locations;

''(ii) low community populations;

''(iii) low income levels;

''(iv) developed the applications of the communities with the participation of combinations of stakeholders, including—

''(I) State, local, and tribal governments;

''(II) nonprofit institutions;

''(III) institutions of higher education;

''(IV) private entities; and

''(V) philanthropic organizations; and

''(v) targeted funding to provide broadband service in all or part of an unserved community that does not have residential broadband service.

''(D) SECRETARIAL AUTHORITY TO ADJUST.—The Secretary may make grants of up to 75 percent of the development costs of the project for which the grant is provided to an eligible entity if the Secretary determines that the project serves a remote or low income area that does not have access to broadband service from any provider of broadband service (including the applicant).'';

(4) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''loan or'' and inserting ''grant, loan, or'';

(ii) by striking clause (i) and inserting the following:

''(i) demonstrate the ability to furnish or extend broadband service to all or part of an unserved rural area that does not have residential broadband service;'';

(iii) in clause (ii), by striking ''a loan application'' and inserting ''an application''; and

(iv) in clause (iii)—

(I) by striking ''the loan application'' and inserting ''the application''; and

(II) by striking ''proceeds from the loan made or guaranteed under this section are'' and inserting ''assistance under this section is'';

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) in the matter preceding clause (i)—

(aa) by striking ''the proceeds of a loan made or guaranteed'' and inserting ''assistance''; and

(bb) by striking ''for the loan or loan guarantee'' and inserting ''of the eligible entity''; and

(II) in clause (ii), by striking ''3'' and inserting ''2'';

(ii) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

''(B) ADJUSTMENTS.—

''(i) INCREASE.—The Secretary may increase the household percentage requirement under subparagraph (A)(i) if—

''(I) more than 25 percent of the costs of the project are funded by grants made under this section; or

''(II) the proposed service territory includes 1 or more communities with a population in excess of 20,000.

''(ii) REDUCTION.—The Secretary may reduce the household percentage requirement under subparagraph (A)(i)—

''(I) to not less than 15 percent, if the proposed service territory does not have a population in excess of 5,000 people; or

''(II) to not less than 18 percent, if the proposed service territory does not have a population in excess of 7,500 people.''; and

(iii) in subparagraph (C), in the subparagraph heading, by striking ''3'' and inserting ''2''; and

(C) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''loan or'' and inserting ''grant, loan, or''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by adding at the end the following:

''(iii) INFORMATION.—Information submitted under this subparagraph shall be—

''(I) certified by the affected community, city, county, or designee; and

''(II) demonstrated on—

''(aa) the broadband map of the affected State if the map contains address-level data; or

''(bb) the National Broadband Map if address-level data is unavailable.'';

(D) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by striking ''Subject to paragraph (1),'' and inserting the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (1) and subparagraph (B),'';

(ii) by striking ''loan or'' and inserting ''grant, loan, or''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) PILOT PROGRAMS.—The Secretary may carry out pilot programs in conjunction with interested entities described in subparagraph (A) (which may be in partnership with other entities, as determined appropriate by the

Secretary) to address areas that do not have residential broadband service'';

(E) in paragraph (5)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''loan or'' and inserting ''grant, loan, or''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by inserting '', and proportion relative to the service territory,'' after ''estimated number'';

(F) in paragraph (6), by striking ''loan or'' and inserting ''grant, loan, or'';

(G) in paragraph (7), by striking ''a loan application'' and inserting ''an application''; and

(H) by adding at the end the following:

''(8) TRANSPARENCY AND REPORTING.—The Secretary—

''(A) shall require any entity receiving assistance under this section to submit quarterly, in a format specified by the Secretary, a report that describes—

''(i) the use by the entity of the assistance, including new equipment and capacity enhancements that support high-speed broadband access for educational institutions, health care providers, and public safety service providers (including the estimated number of end users who are currently using or forecasted to use the new or upgraded infrastructure); and

''(ii) the progress towards fulfilling the objectives for which the assistance was granted, including—

''(I) the number and location of residences and businesses that will receive new broadband service, existing network service improvements, and facility upgrades resulting from the Federal assistance;

''(II) the speed of broadband service;

''(III) the price of broadband service;

''(IV) any changes in broadband service adoption rates, including new subscribers generated from demand-side projects; and

''(V) any other metrics the Secretary determines to be appropriate;

''(B) shall maintain a fully searchable database, accessible on the Internet at no cost to the public, that contains, at a minimum—

''(i) a list of each entity that has applied for assistance under this section;

''(ii) a description of each application, including the status of each application;

''(iii) for each entity receiving assistance under this section—

''(I) the name of the entity;

''(II) the type of assistance being received;

''(III) the purpose for which the entity is receiving the assistance; and

''(IV) each quarterly report submitted under subparagraph (A); and

''(iv) such other information as is sufficient to allow the public to understand and monitor assistance provided under this section;

''(C) shall, in addition to other authority under applicable law, establish written procedures for all broadband programs administered by the Secretary that, to the maximum extent practicable—

''(i) recover funds from loan defaults;

''(ii)(I) deobligate awards to grantees that demonstrate an insufficient level of performance (including failure to meet build-out requirements, service quality issues, or other metrics determined by the Secretary) or wasteful or fraudulent spending; and

''(II) award those funds, on a competitive basis, to new or existing applicants consistent with this section; and

''(iii) consolidate and minimize overlap among the programs;

''(D) with respect to an application for assistance under this section, shall—

''(i) promptly post on the website of the Rural Utility Service—

''(I) an announcement that identifies—

''(aa) each applicant;

''(bb) the amount and type of support requested by each applicant; and

''(II) a list of the census block groups or proposed service territory, in a manner specified by the Secretary, that the applicant proposes to service;

''(ii) provide not less than 15 days for broadband service providers to voluntarily submit information about the broadband services that the providers offer in the groups or tracts listed under clause (i)(II) so that the Secretary may assess whether the applications submitted meet the eligibility requirements under this section; and

''(iii) if no broadband service provider submits information under clause (ii), consider the number of providers in the group or tract to be established by reference to—

''(I) the most current National Broadband Map of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration; or

''(II) any other data regarding the availability of broadband service that the Secretary may collect or obtain through reasonable efforts; and

''(E) may establish additional reporting and information requirements for any recipient of any assistance under this section so as to ensure compliance with this section.'';

(5) in subsection (f), by striking ''make a loan or loan guarantee'' and inserting ''provide assistance'';

(6) in subsection (g), by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(2) TERMS.—In determining the term and conditions of a loan or loan guarantee, the Secretary may—

''(A) consider whether the recipient would be serving an area that is unserved; and

''(B) if the Secretary makes a determination in the affirmative under subparagraph (A), establish a limited initial deferral period or comparable terms necessary to achieve the financial feasibility and long-term sustainability of the project.'';

(7) in subsection (j)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''loan and loan guarantee'';

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by inserting ''grants and'' after ''number of''; and

(ii) by inserting '', including any loan terms or conditions for which the Secretary provided additional assistance to unserved areas'' before the semicolon at the end;

(C) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''loan''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''loans and'' and inserting ''grants, loans, and'';

(D) in paragraph (3), by striking ''loan'';

(E) in paragraph (5), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(F) in paragraph (6), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(G) by adding at the end the following:

''(7) the overall progress towards fulfilling the goal of improving the quality of rural life by expanding rural broadband access, as demonstrated by metrics, including—

''(A) the number of residences and businesses receiving new broadband services;

''(B) network improvements, including facility upgrades and equipment purchases;

''(C) average broadband speeds and prices on a local and statewide basis;

''(D) any changes in broadband adoption rates; and

''(E) any specific activities that increased high speed broadband access for educational institutions, health care providers. and public safety service providers.''; and

(8) by redesignating subsections (k) and (l) as subsections (l) and (m), respectively;

(9) by inserting after subsection (j) the following:

''(k) BROADBAND BUILDOUT DATA.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—As a condition of receiving a grant, loan, or loan guarantee under this section, a recipient of assistance shall provide to the Secretary address-level broadband buildout data that indicates the location of new broadband service that is being provided or upgraded within the service territory supported by the grant, loan, or loan guarantee—

''(A) for purposes of inclusion in the semiannual updates to the National Broadband Map that is managed by the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (referred to in this subsection as the 'Administration'); and

''(B) not later than 30 days after the earlier of—

''(i) the date of completion of any project milestone established by the Secretary; or

''(ii) the date of completion of the project.

''(2) ADDRESS-LEVEL DATA.—Effective beginning on the date the Administration receives data described in paragraph (1), the Administration shall use only address-level broadband buildout data for the National Broadband Map.

''(3) CORRECTIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall submit to the Administration any correction to the National Broadband Map that is based on the actual level of broadband coverage within the rural area, including any requests for a correction from an elected or economic development official.

''(B) INCORPORATION.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Administration receives a correction submitted under subparagraph (A), the Administration shall incorporate the correction into the National Broadband Map.

''(C) USE.—If the Secretary has submitted a correction to the Administration under subparagraph (A), but the National Broadband Map has not been updated to reflect the correct by the date on which the Secretary is making a grant or loan award decision under this section, the Secretary may use the correction submitted under that subparagraph for purposes of make the grant or loan award decision.'';

(10) subsection (*l*) (as redesignated by paragraph (8))—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''$25,000,000'' and inserting ''$50,000,000''; and

(ii) by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(A)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(ii) in clause (ii), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(iii) set aside at least 1 percent to be used for—

''(I) conducting oversight under this section; and

''(II) implementing accountability measures and related activities authorized under this section.''; and

(11) in subsection (m) (as redesignated by paragraph (8))—

(A) by striking ''loan or'' and inserting ''grant, loan, or''; and

(B) by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SA 1009. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 374, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following:

SEC. 4008. PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN USES OF EBT CARDS.

Section 7(h) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2016(h)) (as amended by sections 4007(a) and 4018(e)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(15) RESTRICTION ON USE TO OBTAIN CASH BENEFITS.—An electronic benefit transfer card shall not be used to obtain cash benefits, including through an automated teller machine or through a cashback procedure at a cash register.''.

SA 1010. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. PROHIBITING REPLACEMENT OF ICD–9 WITH ICD–10 IN IMPLEMENTING HIPAA CODE SET STANDARDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services may not implement, administer, or enforce the regulations issued on January 16, 2009 (74 Federal Register 3328), the regulation issued on September 5, 2012 (77 Federal Register 54664), or any similar regulation, insofar as any such regulation provides for the replacement of ICD–9 with ICD–10 as a standard for code sets under section 1173(c) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320d–2(c)) and section 162.1002 of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations.

(b) GAO REPORT ON ICD–9 REPLACEMENT.—

(1) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States, in consultation with stakeholders in the medical community, shall conduct a study to identify steps that can be taken to mitigate the disruption on health care providers resulting from a replacement of ICD–9 as such a standard.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to each House of Congress a report on such study. Such report shall include such recommendations respecting such replacement and such legislative and administrative steps as may be appropriate to mitigate the disruption resulting from such replacement as the Comptroller General determines appropriate.

SA 1011. Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. DONNELLY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1125, after line 23, insert the following:

SEC. 12108. LIVESTOCK INFORMATION DISCLOSURE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) United States livestock producers supply a vital link in the food supply of the United States, which is listed as a critical infrastructure by the Secretary of Homeland Security;

(2) domestic terrorist attacks have occurred at livestock operations across the United States, endangering the lives and property of people of the United States;

(3) livestock operations in the United States are largely family owned and operated with most families living at the same location as the livestock operation;

(4) State governments and agencies are the primary authority in almost all States for the protection of water quality under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.);

(5) State agencies maintain records on livestock operations and have the authority to address water quality issues where needed; and

(6) there is no discernible environmental or scientifically research-related need to create a database or other system of records of livestock operations in the United States by the Administrator.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ''Administrator'' means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(2) AGENCY.—The term ''Agency'' means the Environmental Protection Agency.

(3) LIVESTOCK OPERATION.—The term ''livestock operation'' includes any operation involved in the raising or finishing of livestock and poultry.

(c) PROCUREMENT AND DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION.—

(1) PROHIBITION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Administrator, any officer or employee of the Agency, or any contractor or cooperator of the Agency, shall not disclose the information of any owner, operator, or employee of a livestock operation provided to the Agency by a livestock producer or a State agency in accordance with the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) or any other law, including—

(i) names;

(ii) telephone numbers;

(iii) email addresses;

(iv) physical addresses;

(v) Global Positioning System coordinates; or

(vi) other identifying information regarding the location of the owner, operator, or employee.

(2) EFFECT.—Nothing in paragraph (1) affects—

(A) the disclosure of information described in paragraph (1) if—

(i) the information has been transformed into a statistical or aggregate form at the county level or higher without any information that identifies the agricultural operation or agricultural producer; or

(ii) the livestock producer consents to the disclosure;

(B) the authority of any State agency to collect information on livestock operations; or

(C) the authority of the Agency to disclose the information on livestock operations to State governmental agencies.

(3) CONDITION OF PERMIT OR OTHER PROGRAMS.—The approval of any permit, practice, or program administered by the Administrator shall not be conditioned on the consent of the livestock producer under paragraph (2)(A)(ii).

SA 1012. Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mrs. MCCASKILL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1065, strike lines 1 through 25.

SA 1013. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1101, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following:

SEC. 110___. PROHIBITION ON PREMIUM SUBSIDY FOR HARVEST PRICE POLICIES.

Section 508(e) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(e)) (as amended by section 11030(b)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(9) PROHIBITION ON PREMIUM SUBSIDY FOR HARVEST PRICE POLICIES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law and beginning with the 2014 reinsurance year, the Corporation may not pay any amount of premium subsidy in the case of a policy or plan of insurance that is based on the actual market price of an agricultural commodity at the time of harvest.''.

SA 1014. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1111, after line 20, add the following:

SEC. 110___. CROP INSURANCE SUBSIDY REDUCTION.

(a) REDUCTION IN SHARE OF CROP INSURANCE PREMIUM PAID BY FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION.—Section 508(e)(2) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(e)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B)(i), by striking ''67'' and inserting ''55'';

(2) in subparagraph (E)(i), by striking ''55'' and inserting ''24'';

(3) in subparagraph (F)(i), by striking ''48'' and inserting ''17'';

(4) in subparagraph (G)(i), by striking ''38'' and inserting ''13'';

(5) by redesignating subparagraphs (C) through (G) as subparagraphs (G) through (K), respectively; and

(6) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

''(C) In the case of additional coverage equal to or greater than 55 percent, but less than 60 percent, of the recorded or appraised average yield indemnified at not greater than 100 percent of the expected market price, or a comparable coverage for a policy or plan of insurance that is not based on individual yield, the amount shall be equal to the sum of—

''(i) 46 percent of the amount of the premium established under subsection (d)(2)(B)(i) for the coverage level selected; and

''(ii) the amount determined under subsection (d)(2)(B)(ii) for the coverage level selected to cover operating and administrative expenses.

''(D) In the case of additional coverage equal to or greater than 60 percent, but less than 65 percent, of the recorded or appraised average yield indemnified at not greater than 100 percent of the expected market price, or a comparable coverage for a policy or plan of insurance that is not based on individual yield, the amount shall be equal to the sum of—

''(i) 38 percent of the amount of the premium established under subsection (d)(2)(B)(i) for the coverage level selected; and

''(ii) the amount determined under subsection (d)(2)(B)(ii) for the coverage level selected to cover operating and administrative expenses.

''(E) In the case of additional coverage equal to or greater than 65 percent, but less than 70 percent, of the recorded or appraised average yield indemnified at not greater than 100 percent of the expected market price, or a comparable coverage for a policy or plan of insurance that is not based on individual yield, the amount shall be equal to the sum of—

''(i) 42 percent of the amount of the premium established under subsection (d)(2)(B)(i) for the coverage level selected; and

''(ii) the amount determined under subsection (d)(2)(B)(ii) for the coverage level selected to cover operating and administrative expenses.

''(F) In the case of additional coverage equal to or greater than 70 percent, but less than 75 percent, of the recorded or appraised average yield indemnified at not greater than 100 percent of the expected market price, or a comparable coverage for a policy or plan of insurance that is not based on individual yield, the amount shall be equal to the sum of—

''(i) 32 percent of the amount of the premium established under subsection (d)(2)(B)(i) for the coverage level selected; and

''(ii) the amount determined under subsection (d)(2)(B)(ii) for the coverage level selected to cover operating and administrative expenses.''.

(b) BUDGETARY EFFECTS.—The budgetary effects of this section, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this section, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

SA 1015. Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CHAMBLISS, and Mr. ISAKSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title XII, insert the following:

SEC. 12213. PROHIBITION OF IDEOLOGY-BASED TARGETING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Internal Revenue Service is prohibited, within the exercise of its regulatory authority under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to review applications for exemption from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code, from developing or using any methodology that applies disproportionate scrutiny to any applicant based on the ideology expressed in the name or purpose of the organization.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (A) of section 7803(d)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) by redesignating clauses (ii), (iii), and (iv) as clauses (iii), (iv), and (v), respectively, and

(B) by inserting after clause (i) the following new clause:

''(ii) the number of complaints during the period that allege disproportionate scrutiny in the process of applying for exempt status under section 501(a) based on the ideology of the applicants;''.

(2) EVALUATION OF COMPLAINTS.—Paragraph (2) of section 7803(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(C) In the case of a complaint or allegation described in subparagraph (A)(ii), the report shall provide an evaluation of the source and the circumstances of such complaints, including a timeline of events, identification of any Internal Revenue Service employees involved in the case, and a determination of whether such scrutiny was related to the exercise of permitted political activities (as determined under subsection (c)(3) or (h), whichever is applicable, of section 501) by an applicant or exempt organization.''.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subparagraph (B) of section 7803(d)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''Clauses (iii) and (iv)'' and inserting ''Clauses (iv) and (v)''.

(4) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to reports submitted after the date which is 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 1016. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 9009 and insert the following:

SEC. 9009. BIOMASS CROP ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Section 9011 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8111) is repealed.

SA 1017. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike subtitles A and B of title II and insert the following:

SEC. 2001. REPEAL OF CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM.

Subchapter B of chapter 2 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831 et seq.) is repealed.

SEC. 2002. REPEAL OF CONSERVATION STEWARDSHIP PROGRAM.

Subchapter B of chapter 2 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3838d et seq.) is repealed.

SA 1018. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 968, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

SEC. 8102. FOREST LEGACY PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7 of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2103c) is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 2A(c) of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2101a(c)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (3), by inserting ''and'' after the semicolon;

(B) in paragraph (4), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a period; and

(C) by striking paragraph (5).

(2) Section 19(b)(2) of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2113(b)(2)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by inserting ''and'' after the semicolon;

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a period; and

(C) by striking subparagraph (D).

SA 1019. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1150, after line 15, add the following:

SEC. 122_____. TREATMENT OF INTRASTATE SPECIES.

(a) DEFINITION OF INTRASTATE SPECIES.—In this section, the term ''intrastate species'' means any species of plant or fish or wildlife (as those terms are defined in section 3 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1532)) that is found entirely within the borders of a single State.

(b) TREATMENT.—An intrastate species shall not be—

(1) considered to be in interstate commerce; and

(2) subject to regulation under—

(A) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.); or

(B) any other provision of law under which regulatory authority is based on the power of Congress to regulate interstate commerce as enumerated in article I, section 8, clause 3 of the Constitution.

SA 1020. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title XII, add the following:

SECTION 12_____. REINS ACT.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Regulations From the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2013'' or the ''REINS Act''.

(b) FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(A) Section 1 of article I of the United States Constitution grants all legislative powers to Congress.

(B) Over time, Congress has excessively delegated its constitutional charge while failing to conduct appropriate oversight and retain accountability for the content of the laws it passes.

(C) By requiring a vote in Congress, the REINS Act will result in more carefully drafted and detailed legislation, an improved regulatory process, and a legislative branch that is truly accountable to the people of the United States for the laws imposed upon them.

(2) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to increase accountability for and transparency in the Federal regulatory process.

(c) CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING.—Chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''CHAPTER 8—CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING

''§ 801. Congressional review

''(a)(1)(A) Before a rule may take effect, the Federal agency promulgating such rule shall submit to each House of Congress and to the Comptroller General a report containing—

''(i) a copy of the rule;

''(ii) a concise general statement relating to the rule;

''(iii) a classification of the rule as a major or nonmajor rule, including an explanation of the classification specifically addressing each criteria for a major rule contained within sections 804(2)(A), 804(2)(B), and 804(2)(C);

''(iv) a list of any other related regulatory actions intended to implement the same statutory provision or regulatory objective as well as the individual and aggregate economic effects of those actions; and

''(v) the proposed effective date of the rule.

''(B) On the date of the submission of the report under subparagraph (A), the Federal agency promulgating the rule shall submit to the Comptroller General and make available to each House of Congress—

''(i) a complete copy of the cost-benefit analysis of the rule, if any;

''(ii) the actions of the agency pursuant to sections 603, 604, 605, 607, and 609 of title 5, United States Code;

''(iii) the actions of the agency pursuant to sections 1532, 1533, 1534, and 1535 of title 2, United States Code; and

''(iv) any other relevant information or requirements under any other Act and any relevant Executive orders.

''(C) Upon receipt of a report submitted under subparagraph (A), each House shall provide copies of the report to the chairman and ranking member of each standing committee with jurisdiction under the rules of the House of Representatives or the Senate to report a bill to amend the provision of law under which the rule is issued.

''(2)(A) The Comptroller General shall provide a report on each major rule to the committees of jurisdiction by the end of 15 calendar days after the submission or publication date as provided in section 802(b)(2). The report of the Comptroller General shall include an assessment of compliance by the agency with procedural steps required by paragraph (1)(B).

''(B) Federal agencies shall cooperate with the Comptroller General by providing information relevant to the Comptroller General's report under subparagraph (A).

''(3) A major rule relating to a report submitted under paragraph (1) shall take effect upon enactment of a joint resolution of approval described in section 802 or as provided for in the rule following enactment of a joint resolution of approval described in section 802, whichever is later.

''(4) A nonmajor rule shall take effect as provided by section 803 after submission to Congress under paragraph (1).

''(5) If a joint resolution of approval relating to a major rule is not enacted within the period provided in subsection (b)(2), then a joint resolution of approval relating to the same rule may not be considered under this chapter in the same Congress by either the House of Representatives or the Senate.

''(b)(1) A major rule shall not take effect unless the Congress enacts a joint resolution of approval described under section 802.

''(2) If a joint resolution described in subsection (a) is not enacted into law by the end of 70 session days or legislative days, as applicable, beginning on the date on which the report referred to in section 801(a)(1)(A) is received by Congress (excluding days either House of Congress is adjourned for more than 3 days during a session of Congress), then the rule described in that resolution shall be deemed not to be approved and such rule shall not take effect.

''(c)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section (except subject to paragraph (3)), a major rule may take effect for one 90-calendar-day period if the President makes a determination under paragraph (2) and submits written notice of such determination to the Congress.

''(2) Paragraph (1) applies to a determination made by the President by Executive order that the major rule should take effect because such rule is—

''(A) necessary because of an imminent threat to health or safety or other emergency;

''(B) necessary for the enforcement of criminal laws;

''(C) necessary for national security; or

''(D) issued pursuant to any statute implementing an international trade agreement.

''(3) An exercise by the President of the authority under this subsection shall have no effect on the procedures under section 802.

''(d)(1) In addition to the opportunity for review otherwise provided under this chapter, sections 802 and 803 shall apply, in the succeeding session of Congress, to any rule for which a report was submitted in accordance with subsection (a)(1)(A) during the period beginning on the date occurring—

''(A) in the case of the Senate, 60 session days before the date the Congress is scheduled to adjourn a session of Congress through the date on which the same or succeeding Congress first convenes its next session; or

''(B) in the case of the House of Representatives, 60 legislative days before the date the Congress is scheduled to adjourn a session of Congress through the date on which the same or succeeding Congress first convenes its next session.

''(2)(A) In applying sections 802 and 803 for purposes of such additional review, a rule described under paragraph (1) shall be treated as though—

''(i) such rule were published in the Federal Register on—

''(I) in the case of the Senate, the 15th session day after the succeeding session of Congress first convenes; or

''(II) in the case of the House of Representatives, the 15th legislative day after the succeeding session of Congress first convenes; and

''(ii) a report on such rule were submitted to Congress under subsection (a)(1) on such date.

''(B) Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to affect the requirement under subsection (a)(1) that a report shall be submitted to Congress before a rule can take effect.

''(3) A rule described under paragraph (1) shall take effect as otherwise provided by law (including other subsections of this section).

''§ 802. Congressional approval procedure for major rules

''(a)(1) For purposes of this section, the term 'joint resolution' means only a joint resolution addressing a report classifying a rule as major pursuant to section 801(a)(1)(A)(iii) that—

''(A) bears no preamble;

''(B) bears the following title: 'Approving the rule submitted by _____ relating to _____.' (The blank spaces being appropriately filled in);

''(C) includes after its resolving clause only the following: 'That Congress approves the rule submitted by _____ relating to _____.' (The blank spaces being appropriately filled in); and

''(D) is introduced pursuant to paragraph (2).

''(2) After a House of Congress receives a report classifying a rule as major pursuant to section 801(a)(1)(A)(iii), the majority leader of that House (or the designee of the majority leader) shall introduce (by request, if appropriate) a joint resolution described in paragraph (1)—

''(A) in the case of the House of Representatives, within 3 legislative days; and

''(B) in the case of the Senate, within 3 session days.

''(3) A joint resolution described in paragraph (1) shall not be subject to amendment at any stage of proceeding.

''(b) A joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be referred in each House of Congress to the committees having jurisdiction over the provision of law under which the rule is issued.

''(c) In the Senate, if the committee or committees to which a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has been referred have not reported it at the end of 15 session days after its introduction, such committee or committees shall be automatically discharged from further consideration of the resolution and it shall be placed on the calendar. A vote on final passage of the resolution shall be taken on or before the close of the 15th session day after the resolution is reported by the committee or committees to which it was referred, or after such committee or committees have been discharged from further consideration of the resolution.

''(d)(1) In the Senate, when the committee or committees to which a joint resolution is referred have reported, or when a committee or committees are discharged (under subsection (c)) from further consideration of a joint resolution described in subsection (a), it is at any time thereafter in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) for a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion is not subject to amendment, or to a motion to postpone, or to a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business of the Senate until disposed of.

''(2) In the Senate, debate on the joint resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 2 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the joint resolution. A motion to further limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order.

''(3) In the Senate, immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a joint resolution described in subsection (a), and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate, the vote on final passage of the joint resolution shall occur.

''(4) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate to the procedure relating to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be decided without debate.

''(e) In the House of Representatives, if the committee or committees to which a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has been referred has not reported it to the House at the end of 15 legislative days after its introduction, such committee or committees shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution, and it shall be placed on the appropriate calendar. On the second and fourth Thursdays of each month it shall be in order at any time for the Speaker to recognize a Member who favors passage of a joint resolution that has appeared on the calendar for not fewer than 5 legislative days to call up the joint resolution for immediate consideration in the House without intervention of any point of order. When so called up, a joint resolution shall be considered as read and shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered to its passage without intervening motion. It shall not be in order to reconsider the vote on passage. If a vote on final passage of the joint resolution has not been taken by the third Thursday on which the Speaker may recognize a Member under this subsection, such vote shall be taken on that day.

''(f)(1) For purposes of this subsection, the term 'identical joint resolution' means a joint resolution of the first House that proposes to approve the same major rule as a joint resolution of the second House.

''(2) If the second House receives from the first House a joint resolution, the Chair shall determine whether the joint resolution is an identical joint resolution.

''(3) If the second House receives an identical joint resolution—

''(A) the identical joint resolution shall not be referred to a committee; and

''(B) the procedure in the second House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the first house, except that the vote on final passage shall be on the identical joint resolution.

''(4) This subsection shall not apply to the House of Representatives if the joint resolution received from the Senate is a revenue measure.

''(g) If either House has not taken a vote on final passage of the joint resolution by the last day of the period described in section 801(b)(2), then such vote shall be taken on that day.

''(h) This section and section 803 are enacted by Congress—

''(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and as such is deemed to be part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of a joint resolution described in subsection (a) and superseding other rules only where explicitly so; and

''(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as they relate to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

''§ 803. Congressional disapproval procedure for nonmajor rules

''(a) For purposes of this section, the term 'joint resolution' means only a joint resolution introduced in the period beginning on the date on which the report referred to in section 801(a)(1)(A) is received by Congress and ending 60 days thereafter (excluding days either House of Congress is adjourned for more than 3 days during a session of Congress), the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: 'That Congress disapproves the nonmajor rule submitted by the _____ relating to _____, and such rule shall have no force or effect.' (The blank spaces being appropriately filled in).

''(b)(1) A joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be referred to the committees in each House of Congress with jurisdiction.

''(2) For purposes of this section, the term 'submission or publication date' means the later of the date on which—

''(A) the Congress receives the report submitted under section 801(a)(1); or

''(B) the nonmajor rule is published in the Federal Register, if so published.

''(c) In the Senate, if the committee to which is referred a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has not reported such joint resolution (or an identical joint resolution) at the end of 15 session days after the date of introduction of the joint resolution, such committee may be discharged from further consideration of such joint resolution upon a petition supported in writing by 30 Members of the Senate, and such joint resolution shall be placed on the calendar.

''(d)(1) In the Senate, when the committee to which a joint resolution is referred has reported, or when a committee is discharged (under subsection (c)) from further consideration of a joint resolution described in subsection (a), it is at any time thereafter in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) for a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion is not subject to amendment, or to a motion to postpone, or to a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business of the Senate until disposed of.

''(2) In the Senate, debate on the joint resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 10 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the joint resolution. A motion to further limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order.

''(3) In the Senate, immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a joint resolution described in subsection (a), and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate, the vote on final passage of the joint resolution shall occur.

''(4) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate to the procedure relating to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be decided without debate.

''(e) In the Senate the procedure specified in subsection (c) or (d) shall not apply to the consideration of a joint resolution respecting a nonmajor rule—

''(1) after the expiration of the 60 session days beginning with the applicable submission or publication date, or

''(2) if the report under section 801(a)(1)(A) was submitted during the period referred to in section 801(d)(1), after the expiration of the 60 session days beginning on the 15th session day after the succeeding session of Congress first convenes.

''(f) If, before the passage by one House of a joint resolution of that House described in subsection (a), that House receives from the other House a joint resolution described in subsection (a), then the following procedures shall apply:

''(1) The joint resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee.

''(2) With respect to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) of the House receiving the joint resolution—

''(A) the procedure in that House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House; but

''(B) the vote on final passage shall be on the joint resolution of the other House.

''§ 804. Definitions

''For purposes of this chapter—

''(1) the term 'Federal agency' means any agency as that term is defined in section 551(1);

''(2) the term 'major rule' means any rule, including an interim final rule, that the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of Management and Budget finds has resulted in or is likely to result in—

''(A) an annual effect on the economy of $100,000,000 or more;

''(B) a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, Federal, State, or local government agencies, or geographic regions; or

''(C) significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or on the ability of United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic and export markets;

''(3) the term 'nonmajor rule' means any rule that is not a major rule; and

''(4) the term 'rule' has the meaning given such term in section 551, except that such term does not include—

''(A) any rule of particular applicability, including a rule that approves or prescribes for the future rates, wages, prices, services, or allowances therefore, corporate or financial structures, reorganizations, mergers, or acquisitions thereof, or accounting practices or disclosures bearing on any of the foregoing;

''(B) any rule relating to agency management or personnel; or

''(C) any rule of agency organization, procedure, or practice that does not substantially affect the rights or obligations of nonagency parties.

''§ 805. Judicial review

''(a) No determination, finding, action, or omission under this chapter shall be subject to judicial review.

''(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a), a court may determine whether a Federal agency has completed the necessary requirements under this chapter for a rule to take effect.

''(c) The enactment of a joint resolution of approval under section 802 shall not—

''(1) be interpreted to serve as a grant or modification of statutory authority by Congress for the promulgation of a rule;

''(2) extinguish or affect any claim, whether substantive or procedural, against any alleged defect in a rule; and

''(3) form part of the record before the court in any judicial proceeding concerning a rule except for purposes of determining whether or not the rule is in effect.

''§ 806. Exemption for monetary policy

''Nothing in this chapter shall apply to rules that concern monetary policy proposed or implemented by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System or the Federal Open Market Committee.

''§ 807. Effective date of certain rules

''Notwithstanding section 801—

''(1) any rule that establishes, modifies, opens, closes, or conducts a regulatory program for a commercial, recreational, or subsistence activity related to hunting, fishing, or camping; or

''(2) any rule other than a major rule which an agency for good cause finds (and incorporates the finding and a brief statement of reasons therefore in the rule issued) that notice and public procedure thereon are impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest,

shall take effect at such time as the Federal agency promulgating the rule determines.''.

(d) BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF RULES SUBJECT TO SECTION 802 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE.—Section 257(b)(2) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 907(b)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(E) Any rules subject to the congressional approval procedure set forth in section 802 of chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, affecting budget authority, outlays, or receipts shall be assumed to be effective unless it is not approved in accordance with such section.''.

SA 1021. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018;

which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title XII, insert the following:

SEC. 12213. REPEAL OF ESTATE AND GENERATION-SKIPPING TRANSFER TAXES.

(a) ESTATE TAX REPEAL.—Subchapter C of chapter 11 of subtitle B of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 2210. TERMINATION.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), this chapter shall not apply to the estates of decedents dying on or after the date of the enactment of the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013.

''(b) CERTAIN DISTRIBUTIONS FROM QUALIFIED DOMESTIC TRUSTS.—In applying section 2056A with respect to the surviving spouse of a decedent dying before the date of the enactment of the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013—

''(1) section 2056A(b)(1)(A) shall not apply to distributions made after the 10-year period beginning on such date, and

''(2) section 2056A(b)(1)(B) shall not apply on or after such date.''.

(b) GENERATION-SKIPPING TRANSFER TAX REPEAL.—Subchapter G of chapter 13 of subtitle B of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 2664. TERMINATION.

''This chapter shall not apply to generation-skipping transfers on or after the date of the enactment of the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013.''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The table of sections for subchapter C of chapter 11 is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''Sec. 2210. Termination.''.

(2) The table of sections for subchapter G of chapter 13 is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''Sec. 2664. Termination.''.

(d) RESTORATION OF PRE-EGTRRA PROVISIONS NOT APPLICABLE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 301 of the Tax Relief, Unemployment Insurance Reauthorization, and Job Creation Act of 2010 shall not apply to estates of decedents dying, and transfers made, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) EXCEPTION FOR STEPPED-UP BASIS.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to the provisions of law amended by subtitle E of title V of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 (relating to carryover basis at death; other changes taking effect with repeal).

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to the estates of decedents dying, and generation-skipping transfers, after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 12214. MODIFICATIONS OF GIFT TAX.

(a) COMPUTATION OF GIFT TAX.—Subsection (a) of section 2502 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(a) COMPUTATION OF TAX.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The tax imposed by section 2501 for each calendar year shall be an amount equal to the excess of—

''(A) a tentative tax, computed under paragraph (2), on the aggregate sum of the taxable gifts for such calendar year and for each of the preceding calendar periods, over

''(B) a tentative tax, computed under paragraph (2), on the aggregate sum of the taxable gifts for each of the preceding calendar periods.

''(2) RATE SCHEDULE.—

"If the amount with respect to which the tentative tax to be computed is:	The tentative tax is:
Not over $10,000	18% of such amount.
Over $10,000 but not over $20,000.	$1,800, plus 20% of the excess over $10,000.
Over $20,000 but not over $40,000.	$3,800, plus 22% of the excess over $20,000.
Over $40,000 but not over $60,000.	$8,200, plus 24% of the excess over $40,000.
Over $60,000 but not over $80,000.	$13,000, plus 26% of the excess over $60,000.
Over $80,000 but not over $100,000.	$18,200, plus 28% of the excess over $80,000.
Over $100,000 but not over $150,000.	$23,800, plus 30% of the excess over $100,000.
Over $150,000 but not over $250,000.	$38,800, plus 32% of the excess of $150,000.
Over $250,000 but not over $500,000.	$70,800, plus 34% of the excess over $250,000.
Over $500,000	$155,800, plus 35% of the excess of $500,000.''.

(b) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN TRANSFERS IN TRUST.—Section 2511 (relating to transfers in general) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN TRANSFERS IN TRUST.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section and except as provided in regulations, a transfer in trust shall be treated as a taxable gift under section 2503, unless the trust is treated as wholly owned by the donor or the donor's spouse under subpart E of part I of subchapter J of chapter 1.''.

(c) LIFETIME GIFT EXEMPTION.—Paragraph (1) of section 2505(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(1) the amount of the tentative tax which would be determined under the rate schedule set forth in section 2502(a)(2) if the amount with respect to which such tentative tax is to be computed were $5,000,000, reduced by''.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 2505(a) of such Code is amended by striking the last sentence.

(2) The heading for section 2505 of such Code is amended by striking ''**UNIFIED**''.

(3) The item in the table of sections for subchapter A of chapter 12 of such Code relating to section 2505 is amended to read as follows:

''Sec. 2505. Credit against gift tax.''.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to gifts made on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(f) TRANSITION RULE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of applying sections 1015(d), 2502, and 2505 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the calendar year in which this Act is enacted shall be treated as 2 separate calendar years one of which ends on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act and the other of which begins on such date of enactment.

(2) APPLICATION OF SECTION 2504(b).—For purposes of applying section 2504(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the calendar year in which this Act is enacted shall be treated as one preceding calendar period.

SA 1022. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 968, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

SEC. 81___. FOREST LEGACY PROGRAM.

Section 7(*l*) of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2103c(*l*)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(4) STATE AUTHORIZATION.—

''(A) DEFINITION OF QUALIFIED ORGANIZATION.—In this paragraph, a 'qualified organization' means an organization—

''(i) defined in section 170(h)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; and

''(ii) organized for 1 or more of the purposes described in section 170(h)(4)(A) of that Code.

''(B) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary shall, at the request of a State acting through the State lead agency, authorize the State to allow qualified organizations to acquire, hold, and manage conservation easements, using funds provided through grants to the State under this subsection, for purposes of the Forest Legacy Program in the State.

''(C) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible to acquire and manage conservation easements under this paragraph, a qualified organization shall demonstrate to the Secretary the abilities necessary to acquire, monitor, and enforce interests in forest land consistent with the Forest Legacy Program and the assessment of need for the State.

''(D) REVERSION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary, or a State acting through the State lead agency, makes any of the determinations described in clause (ii) with respect to a conservation easement acquired by a qualified organization under subparagraph (B)—

''(I) all right, title, and interest of the qualified organization in and to the conservation easement shall terminate; and

''(II) all right, title, and interest in and to the conservation easement shall revert to the State or other qualified designee approved by the State.

''(ii) DETERMINATIONS.—The determinations referred to in clause (i) are that—

''(I) the qualified organization is unable to carry out the responsibilities of the qualified organization under the Forest Legacy Program in the State with respect to the conservation easement;

''(II) the conservation easement has been modified or is being administered in a way that is inconsistent with the purposes of the Forest Legacy Program or the assessment of need for the State; or

''(III) the conservation easement has been conveyed to another person (other than a qualified organization approved by the State and the Secretary).''.

SA 1023. Mr. COWAN (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. REED, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. KING) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12213. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON FISHERY DISASTER ASSISTANCE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Commercial, recreational, and subsistence fishing represents the livelihood of many hard-working people in the United States and, in 2011, fisheries supported more than 1,200,000 jobs in the United States.

(2) Seafood represents an important source of high quality, nutritious food for the people of the United States, who consumed 15 pounds of fish and shellfish in 2011 on average per capita.

(3) Commercial, recreational, and subsistence fishing is an integral part of the economic foundation for the coastal communities of the United States.

(4) Despite adhering to strict catch limits, many fishermen and historic fishing communities currently face extreme hardship as a result of dramatic declines in stocks due to natural disasters and undetermined causes.

(5) In 2012, using authority under the Interjurisdictional Fisheries Act of 1986 (16 U.S.C. 4101 et seq.) and the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.), the Secretary of Commerce declared fishery disasters with respect to the following:

(A) Mississippi oyster and blue crab, in response to flooding that occurred in 2011, damage from the oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico in 2010, and Hurricane Katrina.

(B) Northeast Multispecies (Groundfish) Fishery, for Rhode Island, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, and Connecticut.

(C) Alaska Chinook salmon, for Chinook salmon fisheries in the Yukon River, Kuskokwin River, and Cook Inlet.

(D) New Jersey and New York, in response to Hurricane Sandy.

(E) American Samoa, for bottomfish.

(6) Whenever a disaster has been declared by the Federal Government, Congress has traditionally provided funding to assist those affected.

(7) Since 1994, Federal fishery failures have been declared on 29 occasions and nearly $827,000,000 in Federal funding has been provided for fishery disaster relief.

(8) The Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (division A of Public Law 113–2; 127 Stat. 4), did not include the funding for all fishery disasters declared in 2012 that was included in the Senate bill and those fisheries continue to face dire economic straits.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) it is important to support the commercial, recreational, and subsistence fishermen of the United States, who risk their lives to put food on the tables of the people of the United States and to support their communities;

(2) it is in the national interest to ensure that the important and storied United States fishing industry survives and thrives well into the future; and

(3) funds should be provided, as soon as possible, for the fishery disasters declared by the Secretary of Commerce in 2012 and any subsequent fishery disaster declarations.

SA 1024. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 986, between lines 4 and 5, insert the following:

SEC. 8304. CULTURAL HERITAGE AND COOPERATION.

Section 8102 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (25 U.S.C. 3052) is amended by striking paragraph (5) and inserting the following:

''(5) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term 'Indian tribe' means—

''(A) any Indian or Alaska Native tribe, band, nation, pueblo, village, or other community the name of which is included on a list published by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to section 104 of the Federally Recognized Indian Tribe List Act of 1994; or

''(B) any Indian group that has been formally recognized as an Indian tribe by a State.''.

SA 1025. Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. TESTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1150, after line 15, add the following:

SEC. 122_____. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING THE LABELING OF GENETICALLY ENGINEERED FOODS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) 64 countries, including the United Kingdom, South Korea, Japan, Brazil, Australia, India, China, all countries of the European Union, and other key United States trading partners, have laws or regulations mandating the disclosure of genetically engineered food on food labels;

(2) 26 States have introduced legislation in 2013 that would require the labeling of genetically engineered foods;

(3) the Food and Drug Administration requires the labeling of more than 3,000 ingredients, additives, and processes;

(4) the Food and Drug Administration has the statutory authority to require the labeling of genetically engineered foods; and

(5) the process of genetic engineering results in material changes to foods at the molecular level that have never occurred in traditional varieties and are determinative of food purchases by consumers.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the United States should join the 64 other countries that have given consumers the right to know if the foods purchased to feed their families have been genetically engineered or contain genetically engineered ingredients.

SA 1026. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 122___. REPORT ON GMO LABELING.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Commissioner of Food and Drugs and in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, shall submit a report to Congress on the methods of labeling genetically engineered food (also referred to as ''GMO'') in nations that require such labeling and the probable impacts of having differing State labeling laws in the absence of a Federal labeling standard with respect to genetically engineered food.

SA 1027. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12_____. PROTECTION OF HONEY BEES AND OTHER POLLINATORS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in cooperation with the Secretary of the Interior and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, shall carry out such activities as the Secretary determines to be appropriate to protect and ensure the long-term viability of populations of honey bees, wild bees, and other beneficial insects of agricultural crops, horticultural plants, wild plants, and other plants, including—

(1) providing formal guidance relating to proposed agency actions that may threaten pollinator health or jeopardize the long-term viability of populations of pollinators;

(2) making use of the best available peer-reviewed science regarding environmental and chemical stressors on pollinator health; and

(3) regularly monitoring and reporting on the health and population status of managed and native pollinators including bees, birds, bats, and other species.

(b) INTERAGENCY TASK FORCE ON BEE HEALTH AND COMMERCIAL BEEKEEPING.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish an interagency task force—

(A) to coordinate Federal efforts carried out on or after the date of enactment of this Act to address the serious worldwide decline in bee health, especially honey bees and declining native bees; and

(B) to assess Federal efforts to mitigate pollinator losses and threats to the United States commercial beekeeping industry.

(2) MEMBERSHIP.—The task force established under this subsection shall be comprised of officials from—

(A) the Department of Agriculture;

(B) the Department of the Interior;

(C) the Environmental Protection Agency;

(D) the Food and Drug Administration; and

(E) the Department of Commerce.

(3) CONSULTATION.—The members of the task force established under this subsection shall consult with beekeeper, conservation, scientist, and agricultural stakeholders.

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the task force established under subsection (b) shall submit to Congress a report that summarizes—

(1) Federal activities carried out pursuant to section 1672(h) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5925(h)) or any other provision of law (including regulations) to address bee decline; and

(2) international efforts to address the decline of managed honeybees and native pollinators.

(d) POLLINATOR RESEARCH LAB FEASIBILITY STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Administrator of the Agricultural Research Service, shall conduct feasibility studies regarding—

(A) establishing a new bee research laboratory; and

(B) modernizing existing honey bee research laboratories identified by the Agricultural Research Service in the capital investment strategy document dated 2012.

(2) CONSULTATION.—In conducting the feasibility studies under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall consult with—

(A) beekeeper, native bee, agricultural, research institution, and bee conservation stakeholders regarding new research laboratory needs under paragraph (1)(A); and

(B) commercial beekeepers regarding modernizing existing honey bee laboratories under paragraph (1)(B).

SA 1028. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 862, strike lines 10 through 12 and insert the following:

from the decennial census in the year 2020'';

(2) by striking ''25,000'' and inserting ''35,000''; and

(3) by inserting after ''families.'' the following: ''The Secretary may continue to classify such an area to be 'rural' or a 'rural area' if the Secretary determines that the area has a population in excess of 35,000, but not in excess of 50,000, is rural in character, and has a serious lack of mortgage credit for lower- and moderate-income families or lack of affordable housing, or a significant portion of the population of the area is employed in agriculture.''.

SA 1029. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1150, after line 15, add the following:

SEC. 12____. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING CLIMATE CHANGE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) evidence that human activity is contributing significantly to climate change is based on sound measurement practices and well-understood physics;

(2) measurements show that the acidity of the oceans has increased almost 30 percent since preindustrial times, at a rate that exceeds estimates of any rate in 50,000,000 years;

(3) almost 90 percent of scientists, almost 95 percent of active climate scientists, and more than 30 major scientific organizations think humans are significantly contributing to climate change;

(4) the harms of climate change to agriculture include more frequent and severe storms, more frequent flooding, worsening droughts, changes in the range of pests and invasive species, reduced agricultural productivity, damaging stress to livestock health, and reduced productivity of agricultural producers;

(5) the Government Accountability Office—

(A) has added the fiscal exposure of the Federal Government to climate change to the GAO High Risk list; and

(B) has included exposure through the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation as part of the risk;

(6) agriculture-related industry contributes almost 5 percent to the economy of the United States; and

(7) climate change presents a credible risk to—

(A) agriculture and forestry in the United States; and

(B) the infrastructure, health of the people, national security, and economy of the United States.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the scientific evidence and consensus that supports the assertion that humans are contributing to climate change represents a credible risk to agriculture and related industries in the United States;

(2) the scientific evidence and consensus referred to in paragraph (1) is not product of a hoax or deception perpetrated on the people of the United States; and

(3) efforts to reduce carbon pollution and adapt to the effects of climate change are—

(A) economically prudent; and

(B) in the best security and fiscal interests of the United States.

SA 1030. Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. COWAN, and Mr. REED) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 462, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

"SEC. 32____. PILOT PROGRAM OPERATING LOANS TO COMMERCIAL FISHERMEN AND SHELLFISH FARMERS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—In each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018, up to 1.5 percent of the funds made available to carry out this chapter for that fiscal year shall be used to carry out a pilot program to make and guarantee operating loans to individuals or entities primarily engaged in commercial fishing or shellfish farming—

''(1) to pay the costs incident to reorganizing a commercial fishing or shellfish farming business for more profitable operation;

''(2) to purchase commercial fishing or shellfish farming equipment to comply with regulatory requirements, meet management objectives identified by the managing agency, improve the quality of fishery resource harvests, or replace worn equipment;

''(3) to purchase fuel, bait, or to meet other essential commercial fishing or shellfish farming operating expenses;

''(4) to finance commercial fishery or shellfish farming permits;

''(5) to refinance indebtedness; or

''(6) to pay loan closing costs.

''(b) ELIGIBILITY.—A commercial fisherman, a shellfish farmer, or an individual holding a majority interest in an entity primarily engaged in commercial fishing or shellfish farming shall be eligible under this section only if the individual—

''(1) is a citizen of the United States;

''(2) has a record of experienced commercial fishing or shellfish farming that the Secretary determines is sufficient to ensure a reasonable prospect of success in the commercial fishing or shellfish farming operation proposed by the individual; and

''(3) is unable to obtain credit elsewhere.

''(c) CONSISTENCY WITH FISHERY MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES.—Any loan under this section shall support activities or purchases consistent with the management objectives of the 1 or more fisheries or shellfish farms in which the eligible person described in subsection (b) participates, which the Secretary may determine through consultation with—

''(1) the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere; or

''(2) the appropriate State, local, or tribal fishery or shellfish farming management authorities.

''(d) EVALUATION.—Not later than April 1, 2016, the Secretary shall—

''(1) complete an evaluation of the pilot program; and

''(2) submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report describing results of the evaluation.

SA 1031. Mrs. HAGAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1076, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 110___. CROP INSURANCE FRAUD.

Section 516(b)(2) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1516(b)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(C) REVIEWS, COMPLIANCE, AND PROGRAM INTEGRITY.—For each of the 2014 and subsequent reinsurance years, the Corporation may use the insurance fund established under subsection (c), but not to exceed $5,000,000 for each fiscal year, to pay the following:

''(i) Costs to reimburse expenses incurred for the review of policies, plans of insurance, and related materials and to assist the Corporation in maintaining program integrity.

''(ii) In addition to other available funds, costs incurred by the Risk Management Agency for compliance operations associated with activities authorized under this title.''.

SA 1032. Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. TESTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12____. STATE MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING REGARDING INTERSTATE SHIPMENT OF STATE-INSPECTED POULTRY AND MEAT ITEMS.

(a) MEAT ITEMS.—Section 501 of the Federal Meat Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 683) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''that is located in a State that has enacted a mandatory State meat product inspection law that imposes ante mortem and post mortem inspection, reinspection, and sanitation requirements that are at least equal to those under this Act'' before the period at the end; and

(B) by striking paragraph (5);

(2) by striking subsections (b) through (e) and inserting the following:

''(b) STATE MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING REGARDING INTERSTATE SHIPMENT OF STATE-INSPECTED MEAT ITEMS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including regulations), a State may enter into a memorandum of understanding with another State under which meat items from an eligible establishment in 1 State are sold in interstate commerce in the other State, in accordance with the requirements of paragraph (2).

''(2) REQUIREMENTS.—To be eligible to enter into a memorandum of understanding under paragraph (1), a State, acting through the appropriate State agency, shall receive a certification from the Secretary that—

''(A) the ante mortem and post mortem inspection, reinspection, and sanitation requirements of the State are at least equal to those under this Act; and

''(B) the State employs designated personnel to inspect meat items to be shipped by eligible establishments in interstate commerce.'';

(3) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (c);

(4) by striking subsections (g), (h), and (j); and

(5) by redesignating subsection (i) as subsection (d).

(b) POULTRY ITEMS.—Section 31 of the Poultry Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 472) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking paragraph (5);

(2) by striking subsections (b) through (g) and inserting the following:

''(b) STATE MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING REGARDING INTERSTATE SHIPMENT OF STATE-INSPECTED POULTRY ITEMS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including regulations), a State may enter into a memorandum of understanding with another State under which poultry items from an eligible establishment in 1 State are sold in interstate commerce in the other State, in accordance with the requirements of paragraph (2).

''(2) REQUIREMENTS.—To be eligible to enter into a memorandum of understanding under paragraph (1), a State, acting through the appropriate State agency, shall receive a certification from the Secretary that—

''(A) the ante mortem and post mortem inspection, reinspection, and sanitation requirements of the State are at least equal to those under this Act; and

''(B) the State employs designated personnel to inspect poultry items to be shipped by eligible establishments in interstate commerce.'';

(3) by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (c); and

(4) by striking subsection (i).

SA 1033. Mr. KING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12_____. SCIENTIFIC AND ECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF THE FDA FOOD SAFETY MODERNIZATION ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services (referred to in this section as the ''Secretary'') may not enforce any regulations promulgated under the FDA Food Safety Modernization Act (Public Law 111–353) until the Secretary publishes in the Federal Register the following:

(1) An analysis of the scientific information used in the final rule to implement the FDA Food Safety Modernization Act with a particular focus on—

(A) agricultural businesses of a variety of sizes;

(B) regional differences of agriculture production, processing, marketing, and value added production;

(C) agricultural businesses that are diverse livestock and produce producers;

(D) the impact on local food systems and the availability of local food; and

(E) what, if any, negative impact on the agricultural businesses and local food systems would be created, or exacerbated, by implementation of the FDA Food Safety Modernization Act.

(2) An analysis of the economic impact of the proposed final rule to implement the FDA Food Safety Modernization Act with a particular focus on—

(A) agricultural businesses of a variety of sizes;

(B) small and mid-sized value added food processors; and

(C) the availability of local foods in Farmers Markets, Community Supported Agriculture, restaurants, and food hubs.

(3) A plan to systematically evaluate the regulations by surveying farmers and processors and developing an ongoing process to evaluate and address business concerns.

(b) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives a report on the impact of implementation of the regulations promulgated under the FDA Food Safety Modernization Act.

SA 1034. Mr. KING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12_____. POULTRY PROCESSING AT CERTAIN FACILITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7 of the Poultry Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 456) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) PROCESSING AT CERTAIN FACILITIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including section 381.10(b)(2) of title 9, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this subsection)), a person that owns or operates a facility described in paragraph (2) may enter into a lease or other agreement with any other person for the purpose of processing poultry of the other person at the facility—

''(A) subject to the condition that each person that is a party to the agreement has in place a hazard analysis and critical control points plan; and

''(B) regardless of whether the Secretary grants an exemption for the processing under section 15(c)(3) or any other provision of law (including regulations).

''(2) DESCRIPTION OF FACILITY.—A facility referred to in paragraph (1) is a facility that—

''(A) has been inspected in accordance with the requirements of this Act;

''(B) has a capacity of not more than 20,000 poultry; and

''(C) is not used by the owner or operator of the facility to the full capacity of the facility.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 15(c)(3)(B) of the Poultry Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 464(c)(3)(B)) is amended by inserting ''subject to section 7(c),'' before ''slaughters or processes''.

SA 1035. Mr. KING (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

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

SEC. 25_____. FARM BUSINESS CENTERS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) Federal conservation programs, such as the Conservation Stewardship Program and the Environmental Quality Incentives Program—

(A) help farmers and landowners reduce soil erosion, enhance water supplies, improve water quality, and improve wildlife habitat; and

(B) represent the shared cost and responsibility of the Federal Government and farmers and landowners for conservation;

(2) much of the support provided by the programs described in paragraph (1) is in the form of technical support to help farmers and landowners achieve conservation goals;

(3)(A) section 14212(b)(1)(B) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 6932a(b)(1)(B)) provided for the closing of Farm Service Agency offices if the offices had 2 or fewer permanent full-time employees; but

(B) that provision failed to take into consideration that—

(i) some Farm Service Agency offices were colocated;

(ii) some Farm Service Agency programs were interdependent; and

(iii) that colocation and interdependence served as an advantage;

(4) reducing staff levels and closing Farm Service Agency and Natural Resources Conservation Service offices makes it more difficult for farmers and landowners to participate in Federal programs;

(5)(A) the State of Maine is increasing the number of new, small, and mid-sized farms in the State; and

(B) for many of those farms, access to technical assistance is critical for success; and

(6)(A) the policy of the Administrative and Financial Management office of the Department of Agriculture in effect on the date of enactment of this Act supports consolidation of offices of—

(i) the Farm Service Agency;

(ii) the Natural Resources Conservation Service offices; and

(iii) soil and water conservation districts; but

(B) that policy is undermined by other policies that do not evaluate the effect on the entire service system of a decision of such an agency to relocate staff or close an office, which often results in a cost shift to rural communities, farmers, and landowners.

(b) GUIDELINES.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall publish guidelines—

(1) to encourage the colocation of offices of the Farm Service Agency, the Natural Resources Conservation Service, and soil and water conservation districts to establish ''1-stop'' farm business centers of the Department of Agriculture to increase efficiency, improve communication with agency and local government partners, and enhance service delivery to rural communities; and

(2) relating to the use of donated office space, on a full-time or part-time basis, from local governments and other appropriate entities.

SA 1036. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 378, between lines 15 and 16, insert the following:

SEC. 40____. DATA COLLECTION.

Section 11 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2020) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(v) DATA COLLECTION.—The Secretary shall compile data on incidences in which eligible households who are otherwise eligible to continue receiving benefits under the supplemental nutrition assistance program are determined to be ineligible and required to reapply for eligibility, whether through an administrative error or through the fault of the eligible household.''.

SA 1037. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 414, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following:

SEC. 42____. PILOT PROGRAM FOR HIGH-POVERTY SCHOOLS.

Section 18(h) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1769(h)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(B), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''5 States'' and inserting ''10 States''; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''2015'' and inserting ''2020''.

SA 1038. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 378, between lines 15 and 16, insert the following:

SEC. 4____. SENIOR APPLICANT INTERVIEW WAIVER OPTION.

Section 11 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2020) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(v) SENIOR APPLICANT INTERVIEW WAIVER OPTION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall give each participating State the option to carry out the supplemental nutrition assistance

program in accordance with this Act but using a waiver of the eligibility interview for applicant households that consist of not more than 2 members, both of whom are over the age of 65.

''(2) PROHIBITION.—In the case of a participating State that elects to take the option described in paragraph (1), no applicant household described in that paragraph for which the eligibility interview is waived shall be denied benefits under the supplemental nutrition assistance program solely as a result of that waiver.

''(3) VERIFICATION.—If a participating State that elects to take the option described in paragraph (1) determines that any information on the application of an applicant household subject to a waiver is questionable, the applicable State agency may contact the applicant household directly or request additional verification of the questionable information.''.

SA 1039. Mr. CRAPO (for himself and Mr. RISCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title XXII, add the following:

SEC. 12_____. PROHIBITION AGAINST FINALIZING, IMPLEMENTING, OR ENFORCING THE PROPOSED RULE ENTITLED "STANDARDS FOR THE GROWING, HARVESTING, PACKING, AND HOLDING OF PRODUCE FOR HUMAN CONSUMPTION".

No Federal funds may be used to finalize, implement or enforce the proposed rule entitled ''Standards for the Growing, Harvesting, Packing, and Holding of Produce for Human Consumption'' published by the Department of Health and Human Services on January 16, 2013 (78 Fed. Reg. 3503), or any successor or substantially similar rule.

SA 1040. Mr. ENZI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 925 submitted by Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. CORKER, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. COATS, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. COONS, Mr. COBURN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. HELLER) and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 5 of the amendment, line 14, before the period at the end insert ''and eliminate the tariff-rate quotas for maple syrup and specialty syrups''.

SA 1041. Mr. ENZI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 12208.

SA 1042. Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. TESTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12_____. EXEMPTIONS FROM REQUIREMENTS FOR HAZARD ANALYSIS AND RISK-BASED PREVENTIVE CONTROLS AND PRODUCE SAFETY.

(a) QUALIFIED.—Section 418(l)(1)(C)(ii) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 350g(l)(1)(C)(ii)) is amended—

(1) in subclause (I), by striking ''value of the food manufactured'' each place such term appears and inserting ''value of the food subject to the requirements of this section that is manufactured''; and

(2) in subclause (II), by striking ''value of all food sold'' and inserting ''value of all food subject to the requirements of this section that is sold''.

(b) PRODUCE SAFETY AND PREVENTIVE CONTROLS.—Section 419(f)(1) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 350h(f)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''food sold by'' each place such term appears and inserting ''food subject to the requirements of this section that is sold by''; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''value of all food sold'' and inserting ''value of all food subject to the requirements of this section that is sold''.

SA 1043. Mr. PRYOR (for himself, Mr. COONS, and Mr. CHAMBLISS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 1085, strike line 11 and all that follows through page 1086, line 17, and insert the following:

''(i) a study to determine the feasibility of insuring commercial poultry production against business disruptions caused by integrator bankruptcy or other significant market disruptions; and

''(ii) a study to determine the feasibility of insuring poultry producers for a catastrophic event.

''(C) BUSINESS DISRUPTION STUDY.—The study described in subparagraph (B)(i) shall—

''(i) evaluate the market place for business disruption insurance that is available to poultry producers;

''(ii) assess the feasibility of a policy to allow producers to ensure against a portion of losses from loss under contract due to business disruptions from integrator bankruptcy or other significant market disruptions; and

''(iii) analyze the costs to the Federal Government of a Federal business disruption insurance program for poultry producers.

''(D) REPORTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Corporation shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that describes the results of—

''(i) the study carried out under subparagraph (B)(i); and

''(ii) the study carried out under subparagraph (B)(ii).

''(E) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Board shall review the policy described in subparagraph (B) under subsection 508(h) and approve the policy if the Board finds that the policy—

''(i) will likely result in a viable and marketable policy consistent with this subsection;

''(ii) would provide crop insurance coverage in a significantly improved form;

''(iii) adequately protects the interests of producers; and

''(iv) meets other requirements of this subtitle determined appropriate by the Board.''.

SA 1044. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 731, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

''SEC. 3708. LAND GRANT-MERCEDES.

''(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

''(1) Spanish and Mexican land grant-mercedes are part of a unique and important history in the southwest United States dating back to the 1600s and becoming incorporated into the United States through the Treaty of Peace, Friendship, Limits, and Settlement between the United States of America and the Mexican Republic, signed at Guadalupe Hidalgo February 2, 1848, and entered into force May 30, 1848 (9 Stat. 922) (commonly referred to as the 'Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo');

''(2) the years following the signing of that treaty resulted in a significant loss of land originally belonging to the land grant-mercedes due to manipulations and unfulfilled commitments;

''(3) the land grant-mercedes that are recognized as political subdivisions are in need of increased economic opportunities; and

''(4) the rural development programs of the Department of Agriculture are an appropriate venue for addressing the needs of the land grant-mercedes.

''(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) LAND GRANT-MERCEDES.—The term 'land grant-mercedes' means land that was granted by the government of Spain or the government of Mexico to a community, town, colony, pueblo, or person for the purpose of establishing a community, town, colony, or pueblo.

''(2) LAND GRANT COUNCIL.—The term 'Land Grant Council' means an agency of the New Mexico State government established by law—

''(A) to provide support to land grants-mercedes in the State of New Mexico; and

''(B) to serve as a liaison between land grant-mercedes and other State agencies and the Federal government.

''(3) QUALIFIED LAND GRANT-MERCEDES.—The term 'qualified land grant-mercedes' means a land grant-mercedes recognized under a State law.

''(c) PROGRAM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to any other funds made available for similar purposes, the Secretary shall use funds set aside under paragraph (3) to provide grants to qualified land grant-mercedes and the Land Grant Council for the purpose of carrying out economic development initiatives under—

''(A) the Special Evaluation Assistance for Rural Communities and Households (SEARCH) program under section 3501(e)(6);

''(B) the community facility grant program under section 3502;

''(C) the program of rural business development grants and rural business enterprise grants under section 3601(a);

''(D) the rural microentrepreneur assistance program under section 3601(f)(2); and

''(E) the rural community development initiative.

''(2) FEDERAL SHARE.—Notwithstanding any other requirement of the programs described in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall make available to qualified land grant-mercedes grants under those programs at a Federal share of up to 100 percent.

''(3) SET ASIDE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of amounts made

available for a fiscal year for rural development programs of the Department of Agriculture, $10,000,000 shall be used to carry out this section.''.

SA 1045. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1150, afer line 15, add the following:

SEC. 12____. RECEIPT FOR SERVICE OR DENIAL OF SERVICE FROM CERTAIN DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AGENCIES.

Section 2501A(e) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 2279–1(e)) is amended by striking ''and, at the time of the request, also requests a receipt''.

SA 1046. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 216, line 15, strike ''and'' at the end.

On page 217, strike line 21 and insert the following:

habitat.''; and

(6) by adding at the end the following:

''(j) FUNDING FOR COMMUNITY IRRIGATION ASSOCIATIONS.—

''(1) DEFINITION OF ELIGIBLE COMMUNITY IRRIGATION ASSOCIATION.—In this subsection, the term 'eligible community irrigation association' means an irrigation association that—

''(A) is comprised of members who are eligible producers; and

''(B) is a local governmental entity that does not have the authority to impose taxes or levies.

''(2) ALTERNATIVE FUNDING ARRANGEMENT.—The Secretary may enter into alternative funding arrangements with eligible community irrigation associations if the Secretary determines that—

''(A) the goals and objectives of the program will be met by the arrangements; and

''(B) statutory limitations regarding contracts with individual producers will not be exceeded by any member of the irrigation association.''.

SA 1047. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 731, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

''SEC. 3708. FRONTIER COMMUNITIES ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT.

''(a) DEFINITION OF FRONTIER COMMUNITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Director of the Bureau of the Census and the Administrator of the Economic Research Service, shall promulgate regulations to define, for purposes of this section, the term 'frontier community'.

''(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The definition of 'frontier community' shall be based on a weighted matrix that uses population density, distance in miles and travel time in minutes from the nearest significant service center or market, and such other factors as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

''(3) IDENTIFICATION.—The Secretary shall work with State executives, officials of nonmetropolitan local governments, and officials of federally recognized Indian tribes, as appropriate, to identify communities that qualify as 'frontier communities' based on the weighted matrix.

''(4) RECONSIDERATION PROCESS.—The Secretary shall establish a reconsideration process under which a community that has not been designated as a 'frontier community' may petition for designation.

''(b) RESERVATION OF FUNDS FOR FRONTIER COMMUNITIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall reserve an amount of not less than 3 percent of all funds made available for a fiscal year for programs of the rural development mission area that provide grants, loans, or loan guarantees to communities, for the costs of making grants, loans, or loan guarantees to frontier communities in accordance with those programs and this section.

''(2) REQUIREMENTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B) and notwithstanding any other provision of this title, in making a grant, loan, or loan guarantee to a frontier community using funds reserved under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall apply the terms and conditions of the applicable rural development program.

''(B) EXCEPTIONS.—The Secretary—

''(i) in the case of grants and regardless of cost-sharing requirements in the underlying program, may make available a grant of up to 100 percent Federal cost share to frontier communities;

''(ii) for purposes of scoring grant applications, may not consider whether a frontier community belongs to a regional partnership; and

''(iii) may not impose a minimum grant or loan amount requirement.

''(3) INSUFFICIENT APPLICATIONS.—If funds reserved under paragraph (1) remain available due to insufficient applications after the end of the 180-day period beginning on the date on which the funds are reserved, the Secretary shall use the funds for the purposes for which the funds were originally made available.

''(c) CAPACITY BUILDING, TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, AND PROJECT PLANNING.—

''(1) DEFINITION OF ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—In this subsection, the term 'eligible entity' means—

''(A) an association of counties;

''(B) a council of State and local governments;

''(C) a cooperative;

''(D) an Indian tribe (as defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b));

''(E) a public agency;

''(F) a community-based organization, intermediary organization, network, or coalition of community-based organizations that does not engage in activities prohibited under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; or

''(G) a similar entity, as determined by the Secretary.

''(2) GRANTS.—The Secretary shall make available to eligible entities grants to facilitate greater capacity for frontier communities to plan projects and acquire and manage loans and grants made available through rural development programs of the Department and other funding sources.

''(3) PRIORITY.—In considering grant applications under this subsection, the Secretary shall give higher priority to an eligible entity that, as determined by the Secretary—

''(A) demonstrates an existing relationship with the frontier community intended to be served by the eligible entity; and

''(B) is a local organization or government entity.

''(4) RESERVATION OF FUNDS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall reserve an amount of not more than 5 percent of all funds made available for programs of the rural development mission area for a fiscal year to make grants in accordance with this subsection.

''(B) INSUFFICIENT APPLICATIONS.—If funds reserved under subparagraph (A) remain available due to insufficient applications after the end of the 180-day period beginning on the date on which the funds are reserved, the Secretary shall use the funds for the purposes for which the funds were originally made available.''.

SA 1048. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 216, line 15, strike ''and'' at the end.

On page 217, strike line 21 and insert the following:

habitat.''; and

(6) by adding at the end the following:

''(j) FUNDING FOR COMMUNITY IRRIGATION ASSOCIATIONS.—The Secretary may enter into alternative funding arrangements with the Acequia and Community Ditch Associations recognized by the State of New Mexico under Chapter 72, Articles 2 and 3, New Mexico Statutes Annotated 1978, if the Secretary determines that—

''(1) the goals and objectives of the program will be met by the arrangements; and

''(2) statutory limitations regarding contracts with individual producers will not be exceeded by any member of the Acequia and Community Ditch Associations.''.

SA 1049. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 216, line 15, strike ''and'' at the end.

On page 217, strike line 21 and insert the following:

habitat.''; and

(6) in subsection (h)—

(A) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

''(1) AVAILABILITY OF PAYMENTS.—The Secretary may provide payments under this subsection to a producer for a water conservation or irrigation practice that promotes ground and surface water conservation on the agricultural operation of the producer through—

''(A) improvements to irrigation systems;

''(B) enhancement of irrigation efficiencies;

''(C) conversion of the agricultural operation to—

''(i) the production of less water-intensive agricultural commodities; or

''(ii) dryland farming;

''(D) improvement of the storage and conservation of water through measures such as water banking and groundwater recharge;

''(E) enhancement of fish and wildlife habitat associated with irrigation systems including pivot corners and areas with irregular boundaries;

''(F) enhancement of in-stream flows in associated rivers and streams; or

''(G) establishment of other measures, as determined by the Secretary, that improve

groundwater and surface water conservation in agricultural operations.'';

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''or'' at the end and inserting ''and''; and

(ii) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

''(B) any associated water savings remain in the original source of the water for the useful life of the practice.''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) DUTY OF PRODUCERS.—The Secretary may not provide payments to a producer for a water conservation or irrigation practice under this subsection unless the producer agrees not to use any associated water savings to bring new land, other than incidental land needed for efficient operations, under irrigated production, unless the producer is participating in a watershed-wide project that will effectively conserve water, as determined by the Secretary.''.

SA 1050. Mr. BEGICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 877, after line 18, insert the following:

SEC. 6208. GAO REPORT ON UNIVERSAL SERVICE REFORMS.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the report required under subsection (b) is to aid Congress in monitoring and measuring the effects of a series of reforms by the Federal Communications Commission (in this section referred to as the ''FCC'') intended to promote the availability and affordability of broadband service throughout the United States.

(b) REPORT.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall prepare a report providing detailed measurements, statistics, and metrics with respect to—

(1) the progress of implementation of the reforms adopted in the FCC's Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking adopted on October 27, 2011 (FCC 11–161) (in this section referred to as the ''Order'');

(2) the effects, if any, of such reforms on retail end user rates during the applicable calendar year for—

(A) local voice telephony services (including any subscriber line charges and access recovery charges assessed by carriers upon purchasers of such services);

(B) interconnected VoIP services;

(C) long distance voice services;

(D) mobile wireless voice services;

(E) bundles of voice telephony or VoIP services (such as local and long distance voice packages);

(F) fixed broadband Internet access services; and

(G) mobile broadband Internet access services;

(3) any disparities or trends detectable during the applicable calendar year with respect to the relative average (such as per-consumer) retail rates charged for each of the services listed in paragraph (2) to consumers (including both residential and business users) located in rural areas and urban areas;

(4) any disparities or trends detectable during the applicable calendar year with respect to the relative average (such as per-consumer) retail rates charged for each of the services listed in paragraph (2) as between incumbent local exchange carriers subject to price cap regulation and those subject to rate-of-return regulation;

(5) the effects, if any, of those reforms adopted in the Order on average fixed and mobile broadband Internet access speeds, respectively, available to residential and business consumers, respectively, during the applicable calendar year;

(6) any disparities or trends detectable during the applicable calendar year with respect to the relative average fixed and mobile broadband Internet access speeds, respectively, available to residential and business consumers, respectively, in rural areas and urban areas;

(7) the effects, if any, of those reforms adopted in the Order on the magnitude and pace of investments in broadband-capable networks in rural areas, including such investments financed by the Department of Agriculture's Rural Utilities Service under the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 901 et seq.);

(8) any disparities or trends detectable during the applicable calendar year with respect to the relative magnitude and pace of investments in broadband-capable networks in rural areas and urban areas;

(9) any disparities or trends detectable during the applicable calendar year with respect to the magnitude and pace of investments in broadband-capable networks in areas served by carriers subject to rate-of-return regulation;

(10) the effects, if any, of those reforms adopted in the Order on adoption of broadband Internet access services by end users; and

(11) the effects, if any, of such reforms on State universal service funds or other State universal service initiatives, including carrier-of-last-resort requirements that may be enforced by any State.

(c) TIMING.—On or before December 31, 2013, and annually thereafter for the following 5 calendar years, the Comptroller General shall submit the report required under subsection (b) to the following:

(1) The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

(2) The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate.

(3) The Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives.

(4) The Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives.

(d) DATA INCLUSION.—The report required under subsection (b) shall include all data that the Comptroller General deems relevant to and supportive of any conclusions drawn with respect to the effects of the FCC's reforms and any disparities or trends detected in the items subject to the report.

SA 1051. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 10004 and insert the following:

SEC. 10004. STUDY ON LOCAL FOOD PRODUCTION AND PROGRAM EVALUATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall—

(1) collect data on the production and marketing of locally or regionally produced agricultural food products;

(2) collect data on direct and indirect regulatory compliance costs affecting the production and marketing of locally or regionally produced agricultural food products;

(3) facilitate interagency collaboration and data sharing on programs related to local and regional food systems;

(4) monitor the effectiveness of programs designed to expand or facilitate local food systems;

(5) monitor barriers to local and regional market access due to Federal regulation of small-scale production; and

(6) evaluate how local food systems—

(A) contribute to improving community food security; and

(B) assist populations with limited access to healthy food.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall, at a minimum—

(1) collect and distribute comprehensive reporting of prices and volume of locally or regionally produced agricultural food products;

(2) conduct surveys and analysis and publish reports relating to the production, handling, distribution, retail sales, and trend studies (including consumer purchasing patterns) of or on locally or regionally produced agricultural food products;

(3) evaluate the effectiveness of existing programs in growing local and regional food systems, including—

(A) the impact of local food systems on job creation and economic development;

(B) the level of participation in the Farmers' Market and Local Food Promotion Program established under section 6 of the Farmer-to-Consumer Direct Marketing Act of 1976 (7 U.S.C. 3005), including the percentage of projects funded in comparison to applicants and the types of eligible entities receiving funds;

(C) the ability for participants to leverage private capital and a synopsis of the places from which non-Federal funds are derived; and

(D) any additional resources required to aid in the development or expansion of local and regional food systems;

(4) evaluate the impact that Federal regulation of small commercial producers of fruits and vegetables intended for local and regional consumption may have on—

(A) local job creation and economic development;

(B) access to local and regional fruit and vegetable markets, including for new and beginning small commercial producers; and

(C) participation in—

(i) supplier networks;

(ii) high volume distribution systems; and

(iii) retail sales outlets;

(5) expand the Agricultural Resource Management Survey to include questions on locally or regionally produced agricultural food products; and

(6) seek to establish or expand private-public partnerships to facilitate, to the maximum extent practicable, the collection of data on locally or regionally produced agricultural food products, including the development of a nationally coordinated and regionally balanced evaluation of the redevelopment of locally or regionally produced food systems.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report describing the progress that has been made in implementing this section and identifying any additional needs and barriers related to developing local and regional food systems.

SA 1052. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 628, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following:

''SEC. 3502. RIGHTS-OF-WAY FOR RURAL WATER PROJECTS.

''The Secretary shall grant, issue, or renew rights-of-way without rental fees for any rural water project that is federally financed (including a project that receives Federal

funds under this Act or from a State drinking water treatment revolving loan fund established under section 1452 of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300j–12) , if the water project would otherwise be eligible to be granted, issued, or renewed rights-of-way under section 504(g) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1764(g)).

SA 1053. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12_____. ATTORNEY FEE PAYMENT TRACKING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall—

(1) develop a system to track and report attorney fee payment information in accordance with subsections (b) and (c); and

(2) submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report describing the status of the implementation of the system.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The system described in subsection (a)(1) shall track for each case or administrative adjudication in which the Secretary or Department of Agriculture is a party—

(1) the case name;

(2) the party name;

(3) the amount of the claim;

(4) the date and amount of the award or payment of attorney fees; and

(5) the law (including regulations) under which the case was brought.

(c) ANNUAL REPORTS.—Each year, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees described in subsection (a)(2) a report containing the information described in subsection (b).

SA 1054. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE XIII—FARM, RANCH, AND FOREST LAND PRIVATE PROPERTY PROTECTION ACT

SEC. 13001. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Farm, Ranch, and Forest Land Private Property Protection Act''.

SEC. 13002. FINDINGS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The founders realized the fundamental importance of property rights when they codified the Takings Clause of the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution, which requires that private property shall not be taken for public use, without just compensation.

(2) Rural lands are unique in that they are not traditionally considered high tax revenue-generating properties for State and local governments. In addition, farm, ranch, and forest land owners need to have long-term certainty regarding their property rights in order to make the investment decisions to commit land to these uses.

(3) Ownership rights in rural land are fundamental building blocks for our Nation's agriculture industry, which continues to be one of the most important economic sectors of our economy.

(4) In the wake of the Supreme Court's decision in Kelo v. City of New London, abuse of eminent domain is a threat to the property rights of all private property owners, including rural land owners.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the use of eminent domain for the purpose of economic development is a threat to agricultural and other property in rural America and that the Congress should protect the property rights of Americans, including those who reside in rural areas. Property rights are central to liberty in this country and to our economy. The use of eminent domain to take farmland and other rural property for economic development threatens liberty, rural economies, and the economy of the United States. The taking of farmland and rural property will have a direct impact on existing irrigation and reclamation projects. Furthermore, the use of eminent domain to take rural private property for private commercial uses will force increasing numbers of activities from private property onto this Nation's public lands, including its National forests, National parks and wildlife refuges. This increase can overburden the infrastructure of these lands, reducing the enjoyment of such lands for all citizens. Americans should not have to fear the government's taking their homes, farms, or businesses to give to other persons. Governments should not abuse the power of eminent domain to force rural property owners from their land in order to develop rural land into industrial and commercial property. Congress has a duty to protect the property rights of rural Americans in the face of eminent domain abuse.

SEC. 13003. PROHIBITION ON EMINENT DOMAIN ABUSE BY STATES TO CONFISCATE FARM, RANCH, OR FOREST LAND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No State or political subdivision of a State shall exercise its power of eminent domain over farm, ranch, or forest land, or allow the exercise of such power by any person or entity to which such power has been delegated, over property to be used for economic development or over property that is used for economic development within 7 years after that exercise, if that State or political subdivision receives Federal economic development funds during any fiscal year in which the property is so used or intended to be used.

(b) INELIGIBILITY FOR FEDERAL FUNDS.—A violation of subsection (a) by a State or political subdivision shall render such State or political subdivision ineligible for any Federal economic development funds for a period of 2 fiscal years following a final judgment on the merits by a court of competent jurisdiction that such subsection has been violated, and any Federal agency charged with distributing those funds shall withhold them for such 2-year period, and any such funds distributed to such State or political subdivision shall be returned or reimbursed by such State or political subdivision to the appropriate Federal agency or authority of the Federal Government, or component thereof.

(c) OPPORTUNITY TO CURE VIOLATION.—A State or political subdivision shall not be ineligible for any Federal economic development funds under subsection (b) if such State or political subdivision returns all real property the taking of which was found by a court of competent jurisdiction to have constituted a violation of subsection (a) and replaces any other property destroyed and repairs any other property damaged as a result of such violation. In addition, the State must pay applicable penalties and interest to reattain eligibility.

SEC. 13004. PROHIBITION ON EMINENT DOMAIN ABUSE BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO CONFISCATE FARM, RANCH, OR FOREST LAND.

The Federal Government or any authority of the Federal Government shall not exercise its power of eminent domain over farm, ranch, or forest land to be used for economic development.

SEC. 13005. PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.

(a) CAUSE OF ACTION.—Any (1) owner of private farm, ranch, or forest land whose property is subject to eminent domain who suffers injury as a result of a violation of any provision of this title with respect to that property, or (2) any tenant of property that is subject to eminent domain who suffers injury as a result of a violation of any provision of this title with respect to that property, may bring an action to enforce any provision of this title in the appropriate Federal or State court. A State shall not be immune under the 11th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States from any such action in a Federal or State court of competent jurisdiction. In such action, the defendant has the burden to show by clear and convincing evidence that the taking is not for economic development. Any such property owner or tenant may also seek an appropriate relief through a preliminary injunction or a temporary restraining order.

(b) LIMITATION ON BRINGING ACTION.—An action brought by a property owner or tenant under this title may be brought if the property is used for economic development following the conclusion of any condemnation proceedings condemning the property of such property owner or tenant, but shall not be brought later than seven years following the conclusion of any such proceedings.

(c) ATTORNEYS' FEE AND OTHER COSTS.—In any action or proceeding under this title, the court shall allow a prevailing plaintiff a reasonable attorneys' fee as part of the costs, and include expert fees as part of the attorneys' fee.

SEC. 13006. REPORTING OF VIOLATIONS TO ATTORNEY GENERAL OR THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.

(a) SUBMISSION OF REPORT TO ATTORNEY GENERAL.—Any (1) owner of private farm, ranch, or forest land whose property is subject to eminent domain who suffers injury as a result of a violation of any provision of this title with respect to that property, or (2) any tenant of farm, ranch, or forest land that is subject to eminent domain who suffers injury as a result of a violation of any provision of this title with respect to that property, may report a violation by the Federal Government, any authority of the Federal Government, State, or political subdivision of a State to the Attorney General or the Secretary of Agriculture.

(b) INVESTIGATION BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.—Upon receiving a report of an alleged violation, the Secretary of Agriculture shall transmit the report to the Attorney General. Upon receiving a report of an alleged violation from either a property owner, tenant, or the Secretary of Agriculture, the Attorney General shall conduct an investigation, in cooperation with the Secretary of Agriculture, to determine whether a violation exists.

(c) NOTIFICATION OF VIOLATION.—If the Attorney General concludes that a violation does exist, then the Attorney General shall notify the Federal Government, authority of the Federal Government, State, or political subdivision of a State that the Attorney General has determined that it is in violation of the title. The notification shall further provide that the Federal Government, State, or political subdivision of a State has 90 days from the date of the notification to demonstrate to the Attorney General either

that (1) it is not in violation of the title or (2) that it has cured its violation by returning all real property the taking of which the Attorney General finds to have constituted a violation of the title and replacing any other property destroyed and repairing any other property damaged as a result of such violation.

(d) ATTORNEY GENERAL'S BRINGING OF ACTION TO ENFORCE TITLE.—If, at the end of the 90-day period described in subsection (c), the Attorney General determines that the Federal Government, authority of the Federal Government, State, or political subdivision of a State is still violating the title or has not cured its violation as described in subsection (c), then the Attorney General will bring an action to enforce the title unless the property owner or tenant who reported the violation has already brought an action to enforce the title. In such a case, the Attorney General shall intervene if it determines that intervention is necessary in order to enforce the title. The Attorney General may file its lawsuit to enforce the title in the appropriate Federal or State court. A State shall not be immune under the 11th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States from any such action in a Federal or State court of competent jurisdiction. In such action, the defendant has the burden to show by clear and convincing evidence that the taking is not for economic development. The Attorney General may seek any appropriate relief through a preliminary injunction or a temporary restraining order.

(e) LIMITATION ON BRINGING ACTION.—An action brought by the Attorney General under this title may be brought if the property is used for economic development following the conclusion of any condemnation proceedings condemning the property of an owner or tenant who reports a violation of the title to the Attorney General, but shall not be brought later than seven years following the conclusion of any such proceedings.

(f) ATTORNEYS' FEE AND OTHER COSTS.—In any action or proceeding under this title brought by the Attorney General, the court shall, if the Attorney General is a prevailing plaintiff, award the Attorney General a reasonable attorneys' fee as part of the costs, and include expert fees as part of the attorneys' fee.

SEC. 13007. NOTIFICATION BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.

(a) NOTIFICATION TO STATES AND POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall provide to the chief executive officer of each State the text of this title and a description of the rights of property owners and tenants under this title.

(2) LIST OF FEDERAL LAWS.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall compile a list of the Federal laws under which Federal economic development funds are distributed. The Attorney General shall compile annual revisions of such list as necessary. Such list and any successive revisions of such list shall be communicated by the Attorney General to the chief executive officer of each State and also made available on the Internet website maintained by the United States Department of Justice for use by the public and by the authorities in each State and political subdivisions of each State empowered to take private property and convert it to public use subject to just compensation for the taking.

(b) NOTIFICATION TO PROPERTY OWNERS AND TENANTS.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall publish in the Federal Register and make available on the Internet website maintained by the United States Department of Justice a notice containing the text of this title and a description of the rights of property owners and tenants under this title.

SEC. 13008. NOTIFICATION BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.

Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall publish in the Federal Register and make available on the Internet website maintained by the United States Department of Agriculture a notice containing the text of this title and a description of the rights of property owners and tenants under this title.

SEC. 13009. REPORTS.

(a) BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and every subsequent year thereafter, the Attorney General shall transmit a report identifying States or political subdivisions that have used eminent domain in violation of this title to the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, to the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, to the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate, and to the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee of Agriculture of the House. The report shall—

(1) be developed in cooperation with the Secretary of Agriculture;

(2) identify all private rights of action brought as a result of a State's or political subdivision's violation of this title;

(3) identify all violations reported by property owners and tenants under section 13005(c);

(4) identify the percentage of minority residents compared to the surrounding nonminority residents and the median incomes of those impacted by a violation of this title;

(5) identify all lawsuits brought by the Attorney General under section 13005(d);

(6) identify all States or political subdivisions that have lost Federal economic development funds as a result of a violation of this title, as well as describe the type and amount of Federal economic development funds lost in each State or political subdivision and the Agency that is responsible for withholding such funds; and

(7) discuss all instances in which a State or political subdivision has cured a violation as described in section 13002(c).

(b) DUTY OF STATES.—Each State and local authority that is subject to a private right of action under this title shall have the duty to report to the Attorney General such information with respect to such State and local authorities as the Attorney General needs to make the report required under subsection (a).

SEC. 13010. DEFINITIONS.

In this title the following definitions apply:

(1) ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''economic development'' means taking private property, without the consent of the owner, and conveying or leasing such property from one private person or entity to another private person or entity for commercial enterprise carried on for profit, or to increase tax revenue, tax base, employment, or general economic health, except that such term shall not include—

(i) conveying private property—

(I) to public ownership, such as for a road, hospital, airport, or military base;

(II) to an entity, such as a common carrier, that makes the property available to the general public as of right, such as a railroad or public facility;

(III) for use as a road or other right of way or means, open to the public for transportation, whether free or by toll; and

(IV) for use as an aqueduct, flood control facility, pipeline, or similar use;

(ii) removing harmful uses of land provided such uses constitute an immediate threat to public health and safety;

(iii) leasing property to a private person or entity that occupies an incidental part of public property or a public facility, such as a retail establishment on the ground floor of a public building;

(iv) acquiring abandoned property;

(v) clearing defective chains of title;

(vi) taking private property for use by a public utility, including a utility providing electric, natural gas, telecommunications, water, and wastewater services, either directly to the public or indirectly through provision of such services at the wholesale level for resale to the public; and

(vii) redeveloping of a brownfield site as defined in the Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act (42 U.S.C. 9601(39)).

(B) ABANDONED PROPERTY.—In subparagraph (A)(iv), the term ''abandoned property'' means property—

(i) that has been substantially unoccupied or unused for any commercial, agricultural, residential, or conservation-oriented purpose for at least 1 year by a person with a legal or equitable right to occupy the property;

(ii) that has not been maintained; and

(iii) for which property taxes have not been paid for at least 2 years.

(2) FEDERAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT FUNDS.—The term ''Federal economic development funds'' means any Federal funds distributed to or through States or political subdivisions of States under Federal laws designed to improve or increase the size of the economies of States or political subdivisions of States.

(3) STATE.—The term ''State'' means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or any other territory or possession of the United States.

SEC. 13011. SEVERABILITY AND EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) SEVERABILITY.—The provisions of this title are severable. If any provision of this title, or any application thereof, is found unconstitutional, that finding shall not affect any provision or application of the title not so adjudicated.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This title shall take effect upon the first day of the first fiscal year that begins after the date of enactment of this Act, but shall not apply to any project for which condemnation proceedings have been initiated prior to the date of enactment.

SEC. 13012. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the policy of the United States to encourage, support, and promote the private ownership of property and to ensure that the constitutional and other legal rights of private property owners are protected by the Federal Government.

SEC. 13013. BROAD CONSTRUCTION.

This title shall be construed in favor of a broad protection of private property rights, to the maximum extent permitted by the terms of this title and the Constitution.

SEC. 13014. LIMITATION ON STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this title may be construed to supersede, limit, or otherwise affect any provision of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 4601 et seq.).

SEC. 13015. REPORT BY FEDERAL AGENCIES ON REGULATIONS AND PROCEDURES RELATING TO EMINENT DOMAIN.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the head of each Executive department and agency shall review all rules, regulations, and procedures and report to the Attorney General on the activities of that department or agency to bring its rules, regulations and procedures into compliance with this title.

SEC. 13016. DISPROPORTIONATE IMPACT ON MINORITIES.

If the court determines that a violation of this title has occurred, and that the violation has a disproportionately high impact on the poor or minorities, the Attorney General shall use reasonable efforts to locate and inform former owners and tenants of the violation and any remedies they may have.

SA 1055. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1113, line 8, strike ''$10,000,000'' and insert ''$17,000,000''.

SA 1056. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, insert the following:

SEC. 4019. ELIGIBILITY DISQUALIFICATIONS FOR CERTAIN CONVICTED FELONS.

Section 6 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2015) (as amended by section 4004) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(s) DISQUALIFICATION FOR CERTAIN CONVICTED FELONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—An individual shall not be eligible for benefits under this Act if the individual is convicted of—

''(A) aggravated sexual abuse under section 2241 of title 18, United States Code;

''(B) murder under section 1111 of title 18, United States Code;

''(C) an offense under chapter 110 of title 18, United States Code;

''(D) a Federal or State offense involving sexual assault, as defined in 40002(a) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13925(a)); or

''(E) an offense under State law determined by the Attorney General to be substantially similar to an offense described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C).

''(2) EFFECTS ON ASSISTANCE AND BENEFITS FOR OTHERS.—The amount of benefits otherwise required to be provided to an eligible household under this Act shall be determined by considering the individual to whom paragraph (1) applies not to be a member of such household, except that the income and resources of the individual shall be considered to be income and resources of the household.

''(3) ENFORCEMENT.—Each State shall require each individual applying for benefits under this Act, during the application process, to state, in writing, whether the individual, or any member of the household of the individual, has been convicted of a crime described in paragraph (1).''.

SA 1057. Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. CARDIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 122__. HEN HOUSING AND TREATMENT STANDARDS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 4 of the Egg Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 1033) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (a) as subsection (c);

(2) by redesignating subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), and (g) as subsections (f), (g), (h), (i), (j), and (k), respectively;

(3) by redesignating subsections (h) and (i) as subsections (n) and (o), respectively;

(4) by redesignating subsections (j), (k), and (l) as subsections (r), (s), and (t), respectively;

(5) by redesignating subsections (m), (n), (o), (p), (q), (r), (s), (t), (u), (v), (w), (x), (y), and (z) as subsections (v), (w), (x), (y), (z), (aa), (bb), (cc), (dd), (ee), (ff), (gg), (hh), and (ii), respectively;

(6) by inserting before subsection (c), as redesignated by paragraph (1), the following new subsections:

''(a) The term 'adequate environmental enrichments' means adequate perch space, dust bathing or scratching areas, and nest space, as defined by the Secretary of Agriculture, based on the best available science, including the most recent studies available at the time that the Secretary defines the term.

''(b) The term 'adequate housing-related labeling' means a conspicuous, legible marking on the front or top of a package of eggs accurately indicating the type of housing that the egg-laying hens were provided during egg production, in 1 of the following formats:

''(1) 'Eggs from free-range hens' to indicate that the egg-laying hens from which the eggs or egg products were derived were, during egg production—

''(A) not housed in caging devices; and

''(B) provided with outdoor access.

''(2) 'Eggs from cage-free hens' to indicate that the egg-laying hens from which the eggs or egg products were derived were, during egg production, not housed in caging devices.

''(3) 'Eggs from enriched cages' to indicate that the egg-laying hens from which the eggs or egg products were derived were, during egg production, housed in caging devices that—

''(A) contain adequate environmental enrichments; and

''(B) provide the hens a minimum of 116 square inches of individual floor space per brown hen and 101 square inches of individual floor space per white hen.

''(4) 'Eggs from caged hens' to indicate that the egg-laying hens from which the eggs or egg products were derived were, during egg production, housed in caging devices that either—

''(A) do not contain adequate environmental enrichments; or

''(B) do not provide the hens a minimum of 116 square inches of individual floor space per brown hen and 101 square inches of individual floor space per white hen.'';

(7) by inserting after subsection (c), as redesignated by paragraph (1), the following new subsections:

''(d) The term 'brown hen' means a brown egg-laying hen used for commercial egg production.

''(e) The term 'caging device' means any cage, enclosure, or other device used for the housing of egg-laying hens for the production of eggs in commerce, but does not include an open barn or other fixed structure without internal caging devices.'';

(8) by inserting after subsection (k), as redesignated by paragraph (2), the following new subsections:

''(l) The term 'egg-laying hen' means any female domesticated chicken, including white hens and brown hens, used for the commercial production of eggs for human consumption.

''(m) The term 'existing caging device' means any caging device that was continuously in use for the production of eggs in commerce up through and including December 31, 2011.'';

(9) by inserting after subsection (o), as redesignated by paragraph (3), the following new subsections:

''(p) The term 'feed-withdrawal molting' means the practice of preventing food intake for the purpose of inducing egg-laying hens to molt.

''(q) The term 'individual floor space' means the amount of total floor space in a caging device available to each egg-laying hen in the device, which is calculated by measuring the total floor space of the caging device and dividing by the total number of egg-laying hens in the device.'';

(10) by inserting after subsection (t), as redesignated by paragraph (4), the following new subsection:

''(u) The term 'new caging device' means any caging device that was not continuously in use for the production of eggs in commerce on or before December 31, 2011.''; and

(11) by inserting at the end the following new subsections:

''(jj) The term 'water-withdrawal molting' means the practice of preventing water intake for the purpose of inducing egg-laying hens to molt.

''(kk) The term 'white hen' means a white egg-laying hen used for commercial egg production.''.

(b) HOUSING AND TREATMENT OF EGG-LAYING HENS.—The Egg Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 1031 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 7 (21 U.S.C. 1036) the following new sections:

''SEC. 7A. HOUSING AND TREATMENT OF EGG-LAYING HENS.

''(a) ENVIRONMENTAL ENRICHMENTS.—

''(1) EXISTING CAGING DEVICES.—Beginning 15 years after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013, all existing caging devices shall provide egg-laying hens housed therein adequate environmental enrichments.

''(2) NEW CAGING DEVICES.—Beginning 9 years after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013, all new caging devices shall provide egg-laying hens housed therein adequate environmental enrichments.

''(3) CAGING DEVICES IN CALIFORNIA.—

''(A) NEW CAGING DEVICES.—All caging devices in California installed after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013 shall provide egg-laying hens housed therein adequate environmental enrichments beginning 3 months after that date of enactment.

''(B) EXISTING CAGING DEVICES.—All caging devices in California installed before the date of enactment of the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013 shall provide egg-laying hens housed therein adequate environmental enrichments beginning January 1, 2024.

''(b) FLOOR SPACE.—

''(1) EXISTING CAGING DEVICES.—All existing cages devices shall provide egg-laying hens housed therein—

''(A) beginning 4 years after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013 and until the date that is 15 years after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013, a minimum of 76 square inches of individual floor space per brown hen and 67

square inches of individual floor space per white hen; and

''(B) beginning 15 years after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013, a minimum of 144 square inches of individual floor space per brown hen and 124 square inches of individual floor space per white hen.

''(2) NEW CAGING DEVICES.—All new caging devices shall provide egg-laying hens housed therein—

''(A) beginning 3 years after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013 and until the date that is 6 years after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013, a minimum of 90 square inches of individual floor space per brown hen and 78 square inches of individual floor space per white hen;

''(B) beginning 6 years after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013 and until the date that is 9 years after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013, a minimum of 102 square inches of individual floor space per brown hen and 90 square inches of individual floor space per white hen;

''(C) beginning 9 years after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013 and until the date that is 12 years after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013, a minimum of 116 square inches of individual floor space per brown hen and 101 square inches of individual floor space per white hen;

''(D) beginning 12 years after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013 and until the date that is 15 years after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013, a minimum of 130 square inches of individual floor space per brown hen and 113 square inches of individual floor space per white hen; and

''(E) beginning 15 years after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013, a minimum of 144 square inches of individual floor space per brown hen and 124 square inches of individual floor space per white hen.

''(3) CALIFORNIA CAGING DEVICES.—

''(A) EXISTING CAGING DEVICES.—All caging devices in California installed before the date of enactment of the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013 shall provide egg-laying hens housed therein—

''(i) beginning January 1, 2015, and through December 31, 2023, a minimum of 134 square inches of individual floor space per brown hen and 116 square inches of individual floor space per white hen; and

''(ii) beginning January 1, 2024, a minimum of 144 square inches of individual floor space per brown hen and 124 square inches of individual floor space per white hen.

''(B) NEW CAGING DEVICES.—All caging devices in California installed after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013 shall provide egg-laying hens housed therein—

''(i) beginning 3 months after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013, and through December 31, 2023, a minimum of 134 square inches of individual floor space per brown hen and 116 square inches of individual floor space per white hen; and

''(ii) beginning January 1, 2024, a minimum of 144 square inches of individual floor space per brown hen and 124 square inches of individual floor space per white hen.

''(c) AIR QUALITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning 2 years after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013, an egg handler shall provide all egg-laying hens under his ownership or control with acceptable air quality, which does not exceed more than 25 parts per million of ammonia during normal operations.

''(2) TEMPORARY EXCESS AMMONIA LEVELS ALLOWED.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), an egg handler may provide egg-laying hens under the ownership or control of such handler with air quality containing more than 25 parts per million of ammonia for temporary periods as necessary because of extraordinary weather circumstances or other unusual circumstances.

''(d) FORCED MOLTING.—Beginning 2 years after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013, no egg handler may subject any egg-laying hen under his ownership or control to feed-withdrawal or water-withdrawal molting.

''(e) EUTHANASIA.—Beginning 2 years after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013, an egg handler shall provide, when necessary, all egg-laying hens under his ownership or control with euthanasia that is humane and uses a method deemed 'Acceptable' by the American Veterinary Medical Association.

''(f) PROHIBITION ON NEW UNENRICHABLE CAGES.—No person shall build, construct, implement, or place into operation any new caging device for the production of eggs to be sold in commerce unless the device—

''(1) provides the egg-laying hens to be contained therein a minimum of 76 square inches of individual floor space per brown hen or 67 square inches of individual floor space per white hen; and

''(2) is capable of being adapted to accommodate adequate environmental enrichments.

''(g) EXEMPTIONS.—

''(1) RECENTLY-INSTALLED EXISTING CAGING DEVICES.—The requirements under subsections (a)(1) and (b)(1)(B) shall not apply to any existing caging device that was first placed into operation between January 1, 2008, and December 31, 2011. This exemption shall expire on December 31, 2029, at which time the requirements contained in subsections (a)(1) and (b)(1)(B) shall apply to all existing caging devices.

''(2) HENS ALREADY IN PRODUCTION.—The requirements under subsections (a)(1), (a)(2), (b)(1)(B), and (b)(2) shall not apply to any caging device containing egg-laying hens who are already in egg production on the date that such requirement takes effect. This exemption shall expire on the date that such egg-laying hens are removed from egg production.

''(3) SMALL PRODUCERS.—This section shall not apply to an egg handler who buys, sells, handles, or processes eggs or egg products solely from 1 flock of not more than 3,000 egg-laying hens.

''(4) EDUCATIONAL AND RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS.—The provisions of this section related to housing, treatment, or housing-related labeling shall not apply to egg production at an accredited educational or research institution, or to the purchase, sale, handling, or processing of eggs or egg products in connection with such production.

''(5) INDIVIDUAL ENCLOSURES.—The environmental enrichment requirements under subsection (a) shall not apply to any caging device that contains only 1 egg-laying hen.

''(6) OTHER LIVESTOCK OR POULTRY PRODUCTION.—This section shall apply only to commercial egg production. This section shall not apply to the production of pork, beef, turkey, dairy, broiler chicken, veal, or other livestock or poultry.

''SEC. 7B. PHASE-IN CONVERSION REQUIREMENTS.

''(a) NATIONAL CONVERSION REQUIREMENTS.—

''(1) FIRST CONVERSION PHASE.—Beginning 6 years after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013, at least 25 percent of the egg-laying hens in commercial egg production shall be housed either in new caging devices or in existing caging devices that provide the hens contained therein with a minimum of 102 square inches of individual floor space per brown hen and 90 square inches of individual floor space per white hen.

''(2) SECOND CONVERSION PHASE.—Beginning 12 years after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013, at least 55 percent of the egg-laying hens in commercial egg production shall be housed either in new caging devices or in existing caging devices that provide the hens contained therein with a minimum of 130 square inches of individual floor space per brown hen and 113 square inches of individual floor space per white hen.

''(3) FINAL CONVERSION PHASE.—Beginning December 31, 2029, all egg-laying hens confined in caging devices shall be provided adequate environmental enrichments and a minimum of 144 square inches of individual floor space per brown hen and 124 square inches of individual floor space per white hen.

''(b) CALIFORNIA CONVERSION REQUIREMENTS.—

''(1) FIRST CONVERSION PHASE.—Beginning 2 years and 6 months after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013, at least 25 percent of the egg-laying hens in commercial egg production in California shall be provided adequate environmental enrichments and a minimum of 134 square inches of individual floor space per brown hen and 116 square inches of individual floor space per white hen.

''(2) SECOND CONVERSION PHASE.—Beginning 5 years after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013, at least 50 percent of the egg-laying hens in commercial egg production in California shall be provided adequate environmental enrichments and a minimum of 134 square inches of individual floor space per brown hen and 116 square inches of individual floor space per white hen.

''(3) THIRD CONVERSION PHASE.—Beginning 7 years and 6 months after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013, at least 75 percent of the egg-laying hens in commercial egg production in California shall be provided adequate environmental enrichments and a minimum of 134 square inches of individual floor space per brown hen and 116 square inches of individual floor space per white hen.

''(4) FINAL CONVERSION PHASE.—Beginning 10 years after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013, all egg-laying hens in commercial egg production in California shall be provided adequate environmental enrichments and a minimum of 144 square inches of individual floor space per brown hen and 124 square inches of individual floor space per white hens.

''(c) COMPLIANCE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—At the end of 6 years after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013, the Secretary shall determine, after having reviewed and analyzed the results of an independent, national survey of caging devices, whether—

''(A) the requirements of subsection (a)(1) have been met; and

''(B) the requirements of subsection (b)(2) have been met.

''(2) REQUIREMENTS MET.—If the Secretary finds that the requirements of subsection

(a)(1) have not been met, then beginning January 1, 2020, the floor space requirements (irrespective of the date such requirements expire) related to new caging devices contained in subsection (b)(2)(B) of section 7A shall apply to existing caging devices placed into operation prior to January 1, 1995.

''(3) REQUIREMENTS NOT MET.—If the Secretary finds that the requirements of subsection (b)(2) have not been met, then beginning 1 year from the date of the Secretary's finding, the floor space and enrichments requirements (irrespective of the date such requirements come into force) contained in subsection (a)(3)(A) and subsection (b)(3)(B)(ii) of section 7A shall apply to all caging devices in California.

''(4) REPORT.—At the end of 12 years after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013, and again after December 31, 2029, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report on compliance with subsections (a) and (b).

''(5) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAW.—Notwithstanding section 12, the remedies provided in this subsection shall be the exclusive remedies for violations of this section.''.

(c) INSPECTIONS.—Section 5 of the Egg Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 1034) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d), in the first sentence, by inserting ''(other than requirements with respect to housing, treatment, and housing-related labeling)'' after ''as he deems appropriate to assure compliance with such requirements''; and

(2) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''and'';

(ii) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C);

(iii) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraph:

''(B) are derived from egg-laying hens housed and treated in compliance with section 7A; and''; and

(iv) in subparagraph (C), as redesignated by clause (ii), by inserting ''adequate housing-related labeling and'' after ''contain'';

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''In the case of a shell egg packer'' and inserting ''In the cases of an egg handler with a flock of more than 3,000 egg-laying hens and a shell egg packer'';

(C) in paragraph (3), by inserting ''(other than requirements with respect to housing, treatment, and housing-related labeling)'' after ''to ensure compliance with the requirements of paragraph (1)''; and

(D) in paragraph (4), by striking ''with a flock of not more than 3,000 layers.'' and inserting ''who buys, sells, handles, or processes eggs or egg products solely from 1 flock of not more than 3,000 egg-laying hens.''.

(d) LABELING.—Section 7(a) of the Egg Products Inspection Act of 1970 (21 U.S.C. 1036(a)) is amended by inserting ''adequate housing-related labeling,'' after ''plant where the products were processed,''.

(e) LIMITATION ON EXEMPTIONS BY SECRETARY.—Section 15(a) of the Egg Products Inspection Act of 1970 (21 U.S.C. 1044(a)) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by inserting ''(not including subsection (c) of section 8)'' after ''exempt from specific provisions''.

(f) IMPORTS.—Section 17(a)(2) of the Egg Products Inspection Act of 1970 (21 U.S.C. 1046(a)(2)) is amended by striking ''subdivision thereof and are labeled and packaged'' and inserting ''subdivision thereof; and no eggs or egg products capable of use as human food shall be imported into the United States unless they are produced, labeled, and packaged''.

(g) ENFORCEMENT OF HEN HOUSING AND TREATMENT STANDARDS.—Section 8 of the Egg Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 1037) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f) as subsections (d), (e), (f), and (g), respectively;

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

''(c)(1) No person shall buy, sell, or transport, or offer to buy or sell, or offer or receive for transportation, in any business or commerce any eggs or egg products derived from egg-laying hens housed or treated in violation of any provision of section 7A.

''(2) No person shall buy, sell, or transport, or offer to buy or sell, or offer or receive for transportation, in any business or commerce any eggs or egg products derived from egg-laying hens unless the container or package, including any immediate container, of the eggs or egg products, beginning 1 year after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013, contains adequate housing-related labeling.

''(3) No person shall buy, sell, or transport, or offer to buy or sell, or offer or receive for transportation, in any business or commerce, in California, any eggs or egg products derived from egg-laying hens unless the egg-laying hens are provided floor space and enrichments equivalent to that required under subsections (a)(3) and (b)(3) of section 7A of this Act regardless of where the eggs are produced.''; and

(3) in subsection (e) (as redesignated by paragraph (1)) , in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting ''7A,'' after ''section''.

(h) STATE AND LOCAL AUTHORITY.—Section 23 of the Egg Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 1052) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively;

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

''(c) PROHIBITION AGAINST ADDITIONAL OR DIFFERENT REQUIREMENTS THAN FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS RELATED TO MINIMUM SPACE ALLOTMENTS FOR HOUSING EGG-LAYING HENS IN COMMERCIAL EGG PRODUCTION.—Requirements within the scope of this Act with respect to minimum floor space allotments or enrichments for egg-laying hens housed in commercial egg production which are in addition to or different than those made under this Act may not be imposed by any State or local jurisdiction. Otherwise the provisions of this Act shall not invalidate any law or other provisions of any State or other jurisdiction in the absence of a conflict with this Act.''; and

(3) by inserting after subsection (e) (as redesignated by subsection (a)) the following new subsection:

''(f) ROLE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE.—With respect to eggs produced, shipped, handled, transported, or received in California prior to the date that is 15 years after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013, the Secretary shall delegate to the California Department of Food and Agriculture the authority to enforce sections 7A(a)(3), 7A(b)(3), 8(c)(3), and 11.''.

(i) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 1058. Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 256, strike line 15 and insert the following:

(I) Climate change benefit projects, including—

(i) enhancing soil quality;

(ii) reducing greenhouse gas emissions; and

(iii) increasing resilience to rising temperatures, extreme weather events, and related climate changes.

(J) Other related activities that the Sec-

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing will be held on Tuesday, June 4, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The purpose of this hearing is to explore wildland fire management.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, 304 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510–6150, or by email to John__Assini@energy.senate.gov.

For further information, please contact Meghan Conklin (202) 224–8046 or John Assini (202) 224–9313.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will meet in executive session on Wednesday, May 22, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room 430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to mark-up S. 959, Pharmaceutical Compounding Quality and Accountability Act; S. 957, Drug Supply Chain Security Act; the nomination of Mark Gaston Pearce, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board; the nomination of Richard F. Griffin, Jr., to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board; the nomination of Sharon Block, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board; and the nomination of Harry I. Johnson III, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board.

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact the Committee at (202) 224–5375.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 21, 2013, at 10:15 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled ''The Financial Stability Oversight Council Annual Report to Congress.''

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

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Ms. STABENOW. 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 May 21, 2013, at 10 a.m., in room 216 of the Hart Senate Office Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 21, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room SD–215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''A Review of Criteria Used by the IRS to Identify 501(c)(4) Applications for Greater Scrutiny.''

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 21, 2013, at 2:15 p.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 21, 2013, at 2:45 p.m., to hold a Near Eastern and South and Central Asian Affairs subcommittee hearing entitled, ''Prospects for Afghanistan's 2014 Elections.''

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 21, 2013, at 10:30 a.m., in SH–216 of the Hart Senate Office Building, to continue its executive business meeting.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 21, 2013, at 2:30 p.m.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSUMER PROTECTION, PRODUCT SAFETY, AND INSURANCE

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Consumer Protection, Product Safety, and Insurance of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 21, 2013, at 9:30 a.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building. The Committee will hold a hearing entitled, ''S. 921, The Raechel and Jacqueline Houck Safe Rental Care Act of 2013.''

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

PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 21, 2013, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Offshore Profit Shifting and the U.S. Tax Code—Part 2.''

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

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 1003, S. 1004, H.R. 45

Mr. REID. Madam President, I am told that three bills are at the desk. I would ask for their first reading en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bills by title for the first time en bloc.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1003) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to reset interest rates for new student loans.

A bill (S. 1004) to permit voluntary economic activity.

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

Mr. REID. Madam President, I now ask for a second reading en bloc for each of these and I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bills will be read for a second time the next legislative day.

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announces, on behalf of the majority leader, after consultation with the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 112–239, the appointment of the following individuals to be members of the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission: the Honorable Bob Kerrey of Nebraska, and the Honorable Larry Pressler of South Dakota.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF SRIKANTH SRINIVASAN TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

Mr. REID. Madam President, I now move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 95.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

Without objection, the motion is agreed to.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Nomination of Srikanth Srinivasan, of Virginia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Srikanth Srinivasan, of Virginia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Bill Nelson, Christopher A. Coons, Amy Klobuchar, Tim Kaine, Jack Reed, Barbara A. Mikulski, Mark R. Warner, Sheldon Whitehouse, Sherrod Brown, Benjamin L. Cardin, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Tom Harkin, Bernard Sanders, Al Franken, Robert Menendez.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

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

Mr. REID. Madam President, we are moving forward. This will be the sixth or seventh year we have tried to fill vacancies on the DC Circuit. There are four vacancies there. I hope the President sends us some more names. I understand that will be the case maybe before the end of this week.

It is outrageous we have been stopped procedurally from doing the work of this country in filling these nominations in this very important court. We are going to have a cloture vote on this on Thursday, as we should do, and hopefully finish by the end of the week. If we get cloture, we will finish by the end of the week if we have to stay over another day or so.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MAY 22, 2013

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until Wednesday, May 22, 2013; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks the Senate be in a period of morning business for 1 hour with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the Republicans controlling the first half and the majority controlling the final half; that following morning business, the Senate resume consideration of S. 954, the farm bill.

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

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. We will continue to work through amendments on the farm bill

tomorrow. Additionally, there will be a rollcall vote on S. Res. 65, the Iran sanctions resolution, at 5 p.m. tomorrow. There will be 1 hour of debate on that matter.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:35 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, May 22, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.