



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 14, 2013

No. 67

Senate

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

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Lord God Almighty, we sing praises to You, for You bless all those who depend on You for strength. You are the shield that protects our Nation. You treat us with kindness and honor.

Lord, pour Your spirit upon our Senators so that they will feel Your transforming presence. May they use the abilities You have given them to make the world a better place. Help them to take seriously their opportunity to be instruments of Your grace.

We pray in Your sacred Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable ELIZABETH WARREN 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 14, 2013.

To the Senate:

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

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Ms. WARREN thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

BASEBALL FANS

Mr. REID. Madam President, the Republican leader and I follow very closely the Washington Nationals, and we talk often about how they fare on any given day. We just spent a minute commiserating about a young man from Las Vegas, Bryce Harper. We talk about him often because he is a phenomenon in baseball. Yesterday, while playing in Los Angeles—a late game—he got two walks, a hit, and, as he does all the time—well, not like this—he was chasing a ball full speed and he ran into the wall full speed. I told the Republican leader I am going to talk to his family later. It is too early in the West, but I told him I will talk to his mom or dad and find out how he is doing. But he crashed into that wall, and he has 11 stitches in his chin, he was knocked out, and he hurt one of his shoulders. So we will see how he is.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Will my friend the majority leader yield?

Mr. REID. I would be glad to yield.

Mr. MCCONNELL. As my friend indicated, we were talking about this before the session opened. This kid is one the most incredible competitors I have ever seen.

The game was on the west coast, and I don't know whether my friend stayed up that late, but I didn't stay up late enough to see the crash into the wall. So when my friend speaks to his mother, remind her that this is one thing on which leaders on both sides fully agree: We are hoping Harper has a speedy recovery and is back in the lineup.

Mr. REID. And the manager said, when asked afterwards about him, I don't want him to change anything because he is such a competitor.

But I think he will maybe have to watch those walls in the future.

Mrs. BOXER. Plus, both Senators are wearing the same suit today. It is a good day for it.

Mr. REID. Yes, we are wearing the same suit. We try to match wardrobes.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Madam President, following leader remarks the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 11 a.m. this morning. The majority will control the first half, the Republicans the final half.

Following morning business the Senate will resume consideration of S. 601, the Water Resources Development Act.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

I ask unanimous consent that the full time, the full 1 hour, be given to the Democrats, their half hour, and the Republicans, their half-hour, and if the vote has to come a little later, we just need to get that out of the way before our caucuses. And we could probably terminate that at noon. That will be fine. So I ask unanimous consent that the Democrats have their full half hour and the Republicans their full half hour.

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

Mr. REID. Following morning business, as I indicated, the Senate will resume consideration of the Water Resources Development Act.

Madam President, I was in a meeting a few minutes ago. This is an important bill, and it shows that one of the most liberal Members of the Senate and one of the most conservative Members of the Senate—BOXER and VITTER—can work extremely well together, as they have on this bill. I hope we can have a finite list of amendments and not have to invoke cloture because we would invoke cloture and I would rather not do that. The filing deadline for all second-degree amendments to the bill is 11:15 a.m. today. The managers continue to work to

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S3391

complete action on the bill. If no agreement is reached, there will be a cloture vote at noon today.

THE BUDGET

Mr. REID. Madam President, on Thursday Speaker BOEHNER said a remarkable thing. He said: We can't cut our way to prosperity. It was good to hear him speaking candidly, for that is what Democrats have been saying for years—we cannot cut our way to prosperity. It is important that we have done some cutting. That is very important. And we are proud of the work we have done. To this point, we have cut more than \$2½ trillion.

But it will take more than meat-ax budget cuts to keep our economy on the path to full recovery. To protect our economic growth, it will take a balanced approach, one that couples smart spending cuts with investments in our future and some new revenue from closing these wasteful loopholes I have spoken about to members of the Finance Committee in my caucus on many occasions. Nothing could be further from that balanced policy than the so-called sequester. As long as the sequester's harmful across-the-board cuts remain in effect, our economy is in jeopardy. And as long as Republicans refuse to go to conference on the budget and work out our differences, the sequester will remain in effect.

It has now been 52 days since the Senate passed its budget. Why are Republicans standing in the way? We have talked about that for weeks. We need to move forward and pass a budget that encourages economic expansion by investing in what makes America strong while cutting the deficit.

After years—years—of calling for regular order, after years of demanding the Senate pass a budget, I expected Republicans to embrace this process, but I couldn't have been more wrong. Republicans have objected to a conference half a dozen times and counting. It is obvious they are delaying for one nakedly partisan reason: They hope to delay compromise long enough to create another manufactured crisis, as the Nation once again approaches the debt limit.

The debt ceiling is something we used to just move past. The elephant never forgets, but Republicans obviously don't follow their mascot—the elephant—as they have a very short memory. Elephants don't, but the Republican Party does. They should remember the political pain they inflicted upon themselves—the Republicans—and our country over the last 2 years, in part by driving the country from one manufactured crisis to the next.

It is astonishing that Republicans would once again—as they did in the House last week—pass a bill to hold the full faith and credit of the U.S. Government hostage, if only because it is so bad for their political brand. But it is also bad for our country. The last time

Republicans drove us to the brink of default, it cost the United States its pristine credit rating, and it cost the economy billions of dollars.

When I talk about Republicans, I am not speaking about Republicans generically—that is, Republicans around the country—because many Republicans, if not most, agree these manufactured crises are a waste of time and not good for our country. I am talking about and directing my attention to the Republicans in the Congress because they do not, obviously, agree with the Republicans around the country.

I hope my Republican colleagues will not take their partisan ploy as far as they did in the past. It is time to embrace regular order. It is time to get away from last-minute negotiations and short-term fixes. It is time to engage in a responsible budget process. The budget process is the only way to work through our differences without bringing the country to the verge of another artificial crisis.

Americans are tired of bitter battles over whether the Federal Government should pay the bills it has incurred. That is what we have done. We have incurred these bills, and we have to pay them. We have made purchases on credit. Americans know, as Democrats do, that Congress won't set sound fiscal policy during last-minute negotiations and Congress won't set sound fiscal policy through extortion or hostage-taking.

The Secretary of Defense is going to announce later today that 800,000 civilian employees at the Defense Department are going to get furloughs. The decision is how long it is going to be. He hopes he can make it 11 days, but probably it will be 2 weeks. That may not sound like much, but for somebody who is on a budget, a personal budget, depending on their wages, to suddenly hear that during the time until September 1 they are going to be furloughed, that they are not going to get paid for 14 days, that is a significant amount of money and can wreak havoc with their personal budget.

What this sequestration is doing is setting bad fiscal policy. It can't happen. We have to compromise. We won't set sound fiscal policy without sitting down and finding common ground between the Republican priorities and the Democratic priorities in this Congress. Passing the budget would clarify each side's values. We did that. We had a vote-athon here determining what Republicans wanted to do and what Democrats wanted to do. We finished at 5 o'clock in the morning. We thought that was a good step toward compromise, but we were wrong.

Republicans will not move forward. We have waited 52 days. The next step is to name conferees, and that will only be a first step. After conferees are named, we have to make sure they meet and work things out. Right now, Republicans are the only party standing in the way of progress in getting rid of this sequestration. If my Repub-

lican colleagues are serious about reducing the deficit and charting a course for economic growth, they should stop waiting around for another crisis and start working with Democrats today.

Finally, again, it has been 52 days since the Senate passed this bill. We need Republicans to follow regular order and move to a conference.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

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

IRS ACTIVITIES

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, over the past few days we have heard many in the media talk about how this has been a "rough week" for the administration. That is because it has been a worse week for the First Amendment.

On Friday we learned that—just as we had been told by our constituents—the IRS deliberately targeted conservative groups across the country in the midst of a heated national election. Over the weekend we learned that the extent of it was even broader—even broader—than we originally thought. Then this morning we all learned the targeting wasn't limited to an IRS office out of Cincinnati, as the administration suggested last week, but that it reached all the way to the IRS headquarters right here in Washington.

What we don't know at this point is whether it jumped the fence from the IRS to the White House. But we do know this: We can't count on the administration to be forthcoming about the details of this scandal because so far they have been anything but. So this morning I am calling on the President to make available completely and without restriction everyone—everyone—who can answer the questions we have as to what has been going on at the IRS, who knew about it, and how high it went—no stonewalling, no more incomplete answers, no more misleading responses, no holding back witnesses no matter how senior their current or former positions. We need full transparency and we need full cooperation.

The American people deserve answers. The answers the IRS has now owned up to and that were uncovered by their own inspector general are an outrage—an absolute outrage. We now know the IRS targeted groups for using such terminology as—get this—"we the people" and for educating folks about the U.S. Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

I mean, you can't make this stuff up. What is also clear is that government officials repeatedly failed to own up to what they knew was going on—when it turns out they'd known about it since at least the middle of 2011.

So the IRS knew what was happening—yet they continued to give us

assurances that they were applying the tax rules in a fair and impartial way.

Despite repeated assurances from the Obama administration that it was not targeting its political enemies through the IRS during the last election cycle, we have now learned that the IRS was in fact singling out conservative groups—groups who dared to speak up and express their First Amendment rights.

Let's recap what happened.

Last March, after receiving multiple claims of unusual harassment by the IRS from constituents who wanted to form tax-exempt political organizations, I and several of my colleagues sent a letter to then-IRS Commissioner Shulman questioning selective enforcement on tax exempt organizations.

Now, we learn, according to the IRS' own Inspector General, that the IRS was well aware that this selective treatment was happening at the time our letter was sent, and in fact had already acted to correct what they later called "inappropriate" behavior.

But there was no mention of that in the IRS initial response.

Nor was there any mention of this behavior, which was by that time well-known within the agency, in a second letter sent back to us in September 2012.

We had to wait several more months—to wait for a special investigator's report that Republicans demanded—in order to find out the truth of what was actually happening at the IRS.

In the coming days we'll learn more, and we'll start getting answers to questions like: Was the IRS deliberately misleading Republican Senators, or was it betraying profound incompetence? But, as I said, the fact is, none of this would have come out if we'd relied on the administration's own word and Republicans had not demanded the truth.

Clearly, we've only started to scratch the surface of this scandal.

The American people are looking for answers, and I am determined to help them get to the bottom of this.

Last June, I gave a very public speech in which I called out the Obama administration for serial abuses of government power in going after its political enemies in the middle of a heated national election. The left scoffed at the suggestion. The Washington Post said my speech was full of "red herrings." The New York Times called my argument "bogus". Robert Reich called it "bonkers."

Well, you know what we learned last week: these abuses were even more widespread than we knew.

So it is good to see even some of my Democrat colleagues now criticizing the IRS for such blatant and thuggish abuse of power. It is preferable to the silence—or, worse, encouragement—they have demonstrated in the past.

The Chairman of the Finance Committee was correct in referring to the IRS' actions as an "outrageous abuse

of power and a breach of the public's trust." He's vowed to "get to the bottom" of what happened, and he's promised that his committee will hold hearings on all this. Those hearings should be tough, and they should aim to bring the truth to light. But our Democrat friends should also acknowledge their role in inculcating this culture of intimidation, due to repeated calls for increased IRS scrutiny of groups like the very ones that were targeted.

We owe it to all Americans to get to the bottom of this scandal, hold those responsible accountable, and put the proper safeguards in place for moving forward. Because, as the President was correct in noting yesterday, one day a Republican will inhabit the Oval Office. And when he or she does, the left will want to know that they will not be harassed for having the audacity to disagree. That an agency like the IRS will return to its proper role as a completely non-partisan and apolitical institution—not a tool for an administration of one stripe to bully and intimidate those who adhere to another.

But in order for Congress to effectively perform the oversight it needs to do, the administration will have to make everyone who can answer these questions available expeditiously.

We have even more questions today than we did last year, and we are not going to accept more half-baked responses. We want the full truth this time. And we intend to get it. I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

MORNING BUSINESS

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

The Senator from California is recognized.

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, pretty soon we are going to go back to the Water Resources Development Act, otherwise known as the WRDA bill. I will comment on that soon. We are making terrific progress. I hope Senators who may hear my voice would understand we would prefer to deal with a number of amendments rather than vote cloture. We have been working with almost—I can't tell you—20 different Senators to try to accommodate them, to either take their amendments, if they are noncontroversial, by

voice or to make sure we can vote on their amendments or have side-by-sides.

The bottom line is it is time now—it is past time—that Senators decide if they want to move this bill forward in an open way with regular order or if they want to avoid these very important amendments that we could vote on and go straight to cloture. I hope we can continue to work through the morning.

THE IRS

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, there is no room for politics at the IRS. Senator MCCONNELL is right. Senator REID is right. They have both addressed it. The issue is the IRS has to be completely neutral in politics, but they do have to go after organizations and individuals who are not abiding by the rules, whether they are right, left, center or no ideology at all.

I remember during the Bush years we saw the IRS targeting liberal churches. It was awful. They were harassing them and forcing them to show that they were nonprofits. Now we see the IRS has been targeting tea party groups. Whether they are targeting right or left, that is wrong, and anyone doing it, frankly, needs to get another job because that is against the law. We cannot have politically motivated audits or harassing people, whatever their politics may be.

Here is what we do need. We do need a fair IRS that definitely looks at whether organizations, be they left or right, are truly deserving of tax-exempt status—that is important—but not targeting one group or another. We also know the targeting of the tea party groups took place while a Bush appointee was the head of the IRS, probably—perhaps was quite unaware.

The bottom line is people at the top have to be held accountable. I agree with that. He should have known what was going on. But there is no room for this. I do believe there has to be serious action taken at the personnel level; otherwise, people will just go ho-hum.

No, not ho-hum; you cannot use a position to harass people because of their politics, regardless of where their politics may lie.

BENGHAZI

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I wish to be heard on the issue of Benghazi. I wrote an op-ed piece on this because I absolutely cannot believe what is happening with our Republican friends on this issue.

As a senior member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I can say I sat through the entire testimony of then-Secretary of State Hillary Clinton. Not only did she sit for hours, not only was she straight from the heart and straight from the shoulder, she took full responsibility for what went on, and she ordered an independent investigation which was launched by Admiral Mullen and Ambassador Pickering.

They did an exhaustive study. What they found is that, unfortunately, we did not have enough security at that outpost. It was not an embassy, but it was definitely an outpost.

There is a lot of talk going on about how could this happen—e-mails and all the rest. Let me focus on something very important. It takes funding to protect an embassy. It takes funding to protect a consulate. It takes funding to protect an outpost. Yes, it takes funding. Who cut the funds from embassy security? The Republicans in the House, that is who—hundreds of millions of dollars. If it were not for the Democrats, it would have been cut more, because when it came here, we stood our ground. We had to accommodate their cuts. That is how the process works. So I think the Benghazi “scandal” starts with the Republicans looking in the mirror. Mirror mirror, who is the fairest of them all? They ought to ask: Mirror, mirror, who cut the funding for diplomatic security across this world for America? The answer: Republicans.

They cannot stand the heat so they turn it on Secretary Clinton, and that is completely wrong. I believe if we want to know what happened in Benghazi, it starts with the fact that there was not enough security. There was not enough security because the budget was cut. Secretary Clinton said that she, in hindsight, should have definitely fought against it even harder than she did. But let the record show she predicted problems. When she saw the cuts—I don’t have the exact quote in front of me but to paraphrase—she said there are going to be problems here. This budget is cut too much. And she was right.

What about these talking points? I do not know if the Presiding Officer sits down with her staff to discuss how she is going to phrase something. I don’t know whether the Presiding Officer does that or whether she just does it by herself. What I do or what most people do is they have a collaborative process. When we are trying to put out a press release with a whole number of agencies having to sign off on it, it is a collaborative process. At the end of the day, one statement was approved. The statement that was made by Susan Rice, her paraphrasing of the statement was: It looks like this started because of this protest, but we don’t know for sure. We don’t know and as soon as we know we will say.

The day of or the day after what happened in Benghazi, the President of these United States, President Obama, stood and said this was a terror attack.

Why are the Republicans playing politics with this? It is pretty clear. Their attack coincides with the Karl Rove ad against Secretary of State Hillary Clinton. They are going after her. Why? Because they are looking to the 2016 Presidential election.

I have to say, keep politics out of the IRS, keep politics out of Benghazi. Don’t take four beautiful Americans

who died in a tragic fashion and play politics, 2016 politics, with it. It is an outrage.

So I say they should start off by looking in the mirror, stepping to the plate, admitting that they cut too much from embassy security. If they want to hold a hearing on it, fine. If they want a hearing, they need to call the people to the table who can help us make sure this never happens again.

I will continue to speak out on Benghazi, and I will continue to speak out on whatever issues my Republican friends are pounding on. At the end of the day, the bottom line is, Who cut the money for embassy security?

If they want to divert attention from that, be my guest, but I will bring it home. Everyone knows if we had adequate security there, it could have well been a different outcome.

WRDA

If there are any Senators who have amendments, please come down to the Senate floor. Let’s get this done. We hope to get this agreed to in a timely manner. Let’s get to the amendments. There is a whole list of bipartisan amendments we believe have been cleared. Let’s get this bill done.

The rating we have been given from the engineers is a D-plus for our infrastructure. We need to deepen our ports and there needs to be more flex control. We need to invest in water infrastructure as well as restore our wetlands. We have a lot of work to do.

We are entering into a period of time now where there is more and more extreme weather—weather we have never seen before. We need to make those investments to prevent the worst from happening. We saw what Superstorm Sandy, that one event cost: \$60 billion. How does it make sense to pay after the fact? We need to invest.

This bill has a lot of important reforms. People know we need to fix our infrastructure. We need to fix our roads, bridges, and water infrastructure. It has to be done. This bill will support 550,000 jobs, and Lord knows, people need that as well.

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

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ABUSES OF POWER

Mrs. FISCHER. Madam President, I rise to speak out against the alarming reports that have recently surfaced by the IRS and the Department of Justice.

As the Federal agency tasked with administering the U.S. Tax Code, the IRS has an extraordinary influence on the lives of all Americans, from all walks of life and all points of view. As

citizens we have the absolute right to expect the IRS to be free from political influence, with taxpayers treated fairly and enforcement carried out in an unbiased manner. Unfortunately, in recent days we have learned our expectations are far adrift from reality.

Last week the Internal Revenue Service acknowledged a history of targeting conservative politically active groups during their process of seeking tax-exempt status. This practice first involved flagging groups concerned about government spending and debt. Ironically, such targeting comes at a time when poll after poll indicates the Federal Government’s out-of-control spending and our \$17 trillion debt are top concerns for all Americans. I can tell my colleagues from my experience it is the top concern for Nebraskans.

Despite these legitimate concerns and the patriotic desire of Americans to effect change in government, the IRS worked to impede these organizations with one of the bluntest instruments of government: regulatory abuse. The IRS demanded inordinate amounts of documents from these groups, including donor lists, which served to unfairly delay the tax-exempt certification of these well-intentioned groups.

This news is alarming on multiple fronts. First and foremost, it is unacceptable that the IRS would blatantly target any of our fellow citizens, let alone groups of Americans whose views are at odds with their own. As the Washington Post noted in today’s lead editorial: “Any unequal application of the law based on ideological viewpoint is unpardonable—toxic to the legitimacy of the government’s vast law enforcement authority.” I couldn’t agree more.

These activist groups were simply trying to exercise their First Amendment rights of peaceable assembly and free speech—the cornerstone of our democracy. Yet their reward for expressing concern about the direction our country is going was to be singled out in an attempt to prevent them from fully engaging in the democratic process.

It has been reported that the targeting of these Americans—and muffling of their voices on the pressing issues facing our country—began in 2010. What has happened since then? The passage of very consequential pieces of legislation, including ObamaCare and the Dodd-Frank Financial Reform Act, multiple debates on how to address our Nation’s dire fiscal situation, two national elections, including last fall’s Presidential election.

As alarming as the actions of the IRS are, I am even more troubled by the IRS trying to hide these actions. When an IRS official last week finally acknowledged and apologized for the targeting of conservative groups, it was more than 3 years after the practice is said to have begun. It was more than 1 year after the current Acting IRS Commissioner, Steven Miller, is reported to

have become aware of the targeting, but it doesn't stop with Mr. Miller.

As the Washington Post noted: "Lois Lerner, the head of the IRS's tax-exempt organization office, knew about the targeting in 2011; she seemed to say Friday that she learned about it from news reports last year."

These were not the malicious actions of a rogue agent or simply another example of government incompetence; instead, this was a clear, methodical abuse of government power to discriminate against whole groups of Americans simply because of their political beliefs.

Despite their awareness of abuse, officials from the IRS failed time after time to disclose this targeting and little effort was made to end the practice. Even as recently as their admissions on Friday, the IRS continued to engage in coverups and half-truths. In fact, IRS officials seem to go out of their way to deny wrongdoing.

In testimony last year before the House of Representatives, then-IRS Commissioner Douglas Shulman said there was "absolutely no targeting."

After years of neglecting to inform Congress of this practice, the long overdue admission was the result of diligent lawmakers exercising oversight along with a soon-to-be released report from the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration.

The time for muted outrage and limp apologies has passed. The American people deserve nothing less than absolute assurance that this practice will not happen again. Those who are responsible must be held accountable and removed from their positions. The policies that enabled this gross abuse of power must be changed immediately.

It is also worth noting the IRS is one of the lead Federal agencies in charge of implementing ObamaCare. It does not appear the IRS is in any condition to implement this highly controversial law, particularly as public trust in this agency continues to plummet.

Just yesterday we learned of another breach of public trust and another potential violation of our First Amendment freedom—the freedom of the press. Press reports indicate the Department of Justice secretly obtained extensive telephone records of reporters and editors for the Associated Press in what the head of the news organization called a "massive and unprecedented intrusion" into how news organizations gather the news. According to the Associated Press's legal counsel, the records obtained included those from reporters working out of the House of Representatives press gallery.

While it is unclear at this point how many reporters were targeted and why, the effect of this data gathering is clear: intimidation of the press and suppression of free speech.

This is unacceptable. A free and unfettered press is vital to any democracy. Moreover, the scope of this information gathering is simply beyond the pale—and likely beyond precedent.

The Attorney General and the President owe the American people answers, and they owe them now. These recent abuses of power by both the IRS and the Department of Justice are just the latest episodes of this executive branch's disturbing pattern of overstepping its lawful powers.

We have seen this in the President's unconstitutional recess appointments. We have seen this in the EPA's disclosure of classified information of cattlemen to activist environmental groups. We have seen this in a lack of forthrightness with our government's response to the attacks on the U.S. consulate in Benghazi.

The result of this methodical government overreach has a powerful chilling effect on citizens. There is no place for that in a democracy. There is no place for that in the United States. The American people deserve a government that jealously guards the liberties of its citizens, not a government that tramples on our basic constitutional rights.

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

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, in the interest of all Senators, and frankly in the interest of the people of this country, we are moving forward on the Water Resources Development Act. The question is, will we be able to clear a list of amendments, some by voice vote, and a further list of more controversial amendments by recorded vote. I am hoping that is the case. Senator VITTER and I hope that is the case, that we can get clearance on these packages of amendments. If we do not, we have to decide whether to invoke cloture, which will bring debate to a close. If we have to go that way, we have to go that way. But I am very optimistic that we can get these amendments cleared because, frankly, almost every Senator here has a stake in this very important legislation.

We have ports that are sometimes on the coast, sometimes they are inland. We have waterways. We have floods in our States. Not all of us but most of us. We have environmental restorations in our States with wetland conservation. We have work to do on our water infrastructure. Our infrastructure in this country has been rated a D-plus. That is not very heartening for the greatest country in the world. We have a weak infrastructure. Frankly, that is not good enough.

I want to read a list of supporters for our legislation. I think what people

will notice is how broad-based the list is. They are either representing workers or businesses, or they are businesses themselves. They are businesses that need to ship products. So let me read this. There are environmental organizations.

The AFL-CIO supports us; the American Association of Port Authorities; the American Concrete Pressure Pipe Association; the American Council of Engineering Companies; the American Farm Bureau Federation; the American Foundry Society; the American Public Works Association; the American Road and Transportation Builders; the American Society of Civil Engineers; the American Soybean Association; Associated Equipment Distributors; Associated General Contractors; Association of Equipment Manufacturers; the Clean Water Construction Coalition; the Concrete Reinforced Steel Institute.

I can't even go through it all, it is such a very long list. There is the National Association of Flood and Storm Management Agencies, the National Governors Association, the National Stone, Sand and Gravel Association, the National Waterways Conference, Inc, the American Institute of Architects, the National Association of Manufacturers, The Nature Conservancy, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America. There are more. It is such a long list.

I ask unanimous consent to place this list into the RECORD.

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

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING S.601

AFL-CIO, American Association of Port Authorities, American Concrete Pressure Pipe Association, American Council of Engineering Companies, American Farm Bureau Federation, American Foundry Society, American Public Works Association, American Road and Transportation Builders Association, American Society of Civil Engineers, American Soybean Association, Associated Equipment Distributors, Associated General Contractors of America, Association of Equipment Manufacturers, Clean Water Construction Coalition, Concrete Reinforcing Steel Institute.

Construction Management Association of America, International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers, International Liquid Terminals Association, International Propeller Club of the United States, International Union of Operating Engineers, Laborers International Union of North America, Management Association for Private Photogrammetric Surveyors (MAPPS), NAIOP, The Commercial Real Estate Development Association, National Association of Flood and Storm Management Agencies, National Governors Association, National Grain and Feed Association, National Ready Mixed Concrete Association, National Retail Federation, National Society of Professional Surveyors (NSPS), National Stone, Sand and Gravel Association, National Waterways Conference, Inc.

Plumbing Manufacturers International, Portland Cement Association, The American Institute of Architects, The Fertilizer Institute, The Nature Conservancy, Transportation Construction Coalition, U.S. Chamber

of Commerce, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America Waterways Council, Inc., National Association of Manufacturers; AASHTO.

Letter signed by 160 organizations to Members of the United States Senate (April 29, 2013)

Mrs. BOXER. The point is this legislation represents jobs. This legislation represents moving products. This legislation represents flood control. This legislation represents fixing our ports, making sure we have some reforms that work well. This makes sure that when the Army Corps sets a project timeline, the resources agencies are in the room. It is very important. I have to say, as this country sees, there is a lot of partisanship going on; this is a bipartisan bill.

The bill made it through the Environment Committee without a single “no” vote. Since then, Senator VITTER and I have been working with all Senators, whether they are on the committee or off the committee, to meet the needs of their States to work with them. I think we have done everything in our power to help every State.

We know the last WRDA bill was 2007. We used to have a WRDA bill every couple years, but everything has gotten so controversial. What happened between then and now is a ban on earmarks. This bill used to be a bill that listed projects. We can't do that anymore. What we have to do is figure out a way to fund the needed projects while averting earmarks.

We did it by saying if there is a completed Corps report then, in fact, the project can go forward. We set up a way for future projects to be handled with the local communities coming forward.

I think we handled that issue well. We focused on flood control, ports, and environmental restoration. We have a piece that deals with the Everglades. If you have never been to the Everglades, it is a national treasure, River of Grass. That is what it is called. It is a magnificent, amazing, fabulous, environment, but it needs to be preserved and protected.

When my spouse and I went there with Senator NELSON, we went down through the Everglades. All of a sudden we see a deer jump up. The deer is actually living on the water on these little berms. It is the most remarkable thing I have ever seen.

We put WIFIA in here based on a program we call TIFIA, which will allow us to help local areas leverage their funds and build these projects more quickly. It goes on and on. We have terrible threats from flooding in places such as Sacramento, for example. We are looking at tens of thousands of Californians at risk and \$7 billion in property. We say, OK, it is time to get that done.

We look at flood protection for the 200,000 residents of Fargo, ND, and Moorhead, MN. They have been fighting rising floodwaters in recent weeks. We will restore the reliability of levees that protect places such as Topeka,

KS. It goes on to Texas. I could name literally every State in the Union that has something at stake.

Mr. SANDERS. Will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mrs. BOXER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SANDERS. I thank the Senator from California and the chair of the Environment and Public Works Committee for her work on this important project. I do wish to mention we have in Vermont one small concern that I hope will be addressed in this bill. In Vermont we have suffered through Irene, and it was a devastating experience for many communities in the State and for businesses.

The problem we are having now is that we have State regulations which correctly require that culverts be built which can, in fact, deal with the real problems of flooding. Unfortunately, what FEMA is prepared to pay for is inadequate infrastructure—culverts, among other things, that will not address the problem if we have to deal with another problem such as Irene.

This is a very modest proposal. Senator LEAHY and I feel strongly about this issue. I know the chairperson is sympathetic. There appears to be some problems on the other side, and I very much hope we can resolve this.

Mrs. BOXER. Yes. There is an amendment, I would say to my friend through the Chair, on our list that we have agreed to, Senator VITTER and I. There will probably be a vote on this proposal. I will ask my staff is that correct, on the Leahy-Sanders amendment on the culverts if it is on the list.

Mr. SANDERS. I had heard there was some objection on the other side.

Mrs. BOXER. We are trying to work out the objections, but we will have a vote on it if we cannot. We are working on it.

Mr. SANDERS. It is very important to Senator LEAHY and me that be addressed.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Senator. We are doing everything in our power. This shows the American people right on the floor of the Senate the way Senators have been working with us. I wish to say to my friend I am so proud he is on the Environment and Public Works Committee and how he has looked after his State. He has some very important things in this bill.

As a matter of fact, his work on the extreme weather title is very important and would allow us to prevent these terrible floods before they start. Yes, we are looking at things such as this in every State. We are trying to do everything in our power to meet every Senator's needs.

Sometimes what happens is it is kind of like that pop-up game. Something pops up over here, and it is OK, but then something else pops up over here. It is the legislative fix we are trying to meet and get to here, the legislative fix so every State feels comfortable.

This is an important bill. There is no other bill that deals with the Everglades. There is no other bill that will

deal with the Chesapeake Bay. There is no other bill that is possible that would allow us to move forward with these important flood control issues, because when we ended earmarks, we had no way to authorize any programs.

This Boxer-Vitter bill is not just an important bill, it is an essential bill. We need to move forward.

The extreme weather title I talked about that Senator SANDERS helped us write will require the corps and the National Academy of Science to jointly evaluate options for reducing risks related to future extreme weather events. Let me say that again. Right now the corps is not authorized to look ahead and say, given the extreme weather we are having, what is it we can do across this country to prepare. This study will give us a roadmap to that.

Without this bill, we don't have it. Without this bill, we have no reforms in the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund. People are paying good money into the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund for dredging our ports. Yet the full amount of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund is not going for those uses.

We make moves toward capturing more of those funds. The smaller ports have a good title, the Great Lakes, the seaports that are large donors such as Los Angeles and Long Beach make progress. I think it is a win-win. Our bill is certainly not perfect. Every one of us could write it in ways that benefit our States even more, I think there is no question, starting with the chairman of the committee. But we have to deal with everybody's issues, everybody's concerns, everybody's problems.

We support 500,000 jobs in this bill. There are very few bills that come before us that could make that claim.

I think we can show the American people we can work together. We have this one last stage, and we are working so hard.

I wish to say to my staff—who are still working. My staff and Senator VITTER's staff have worked nonstop. I am talking about Saturday, Sunday, last night. They were still in the office at 11 o'clock. I just want to praise them. People don't see that. People don't understand these bills don't magically appear.

Dealing with every Senator, I think everyone knows every one of us has a very strong personality. They truly care about their States and fight for their States. It is tough to try to preserve everyone's rights and everybody's wishes. We have to work with Senator MIKULSKI in a very good way and Senator SHELBY. Senator LANDRIEU has worked hard on this bill, and now she has an amendment we are trying to dispose of. I hope we will get the approval to do that.

Once we finish our work, Congressman SHUSTER, Chairman SHUSTER over in the House, needs to pass a bill or could take up our bill and pass it.

When I read this list to you, I didn't even get to all of the names. This is

one of the broadest coalitions I have ever seen behind any piece of legislation. It is a huge and important coalition. It represents America. It is people who work every day at building the infrastructure, utilizing the infrastructure, and making sure our homes are safe from flooding. The list includes the National Governors Association. It is a rarity to have that kind of a list.

At this point, we are supposed to vote at noon, and we will be back to you with some further comments.

I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2013

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 601, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 601) to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 12 noon will be divided and controlled in the usual form.

Mrs. BOXER. While we discuss how we are going to proceed, 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.

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

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

Mrs. BOXER. I ask unanimous consent that the time during quorum calls be divided equally.

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

Mrs. BOXER. I note the absence of a quorum.

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MILITARY SEXUAL ASSAULT

Mrs. HAGAN. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the sexual assault crisis that is facing our military and the need to act immediately to address this problem.

Last week, the Department of Defense released a report estimating that over 26,000 servicemembers—and this includes men and women—were sexu-

ally assaulted in 2012, and this is up from approximately 19,000 in 2010. This is astounding and totally unacceptable.

Even more alarming is the fact the number of cases actually reported remains just a fraction of the total. Only 13 percent of these cases are actually reported. Let me repeat that: Only 13 percent of assaults were actually reported in 2012.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee and a Senator from North Carolina, home to the third largest military population in the country, I find these statistics appalling. The brave servicemembers who put their lives on the line should not have to worry about their personal safety on bases in the United States and around the world. The men and women who are already tasked with so much, who have vowed to serve and protect our country, should feel they are afforded the same protection in return, but they are not.

The stories I hear from our female servicemembers are astounding. One woman marine was raped by an acquaintance, her fellow marine, in her barracks one night. No one heard her cries for help. The next day she did report the assault to her chain of command. An investigation was launched from there. While that investigation was underway, from June to January, she was heavily alienated by her peers. She was called derogatory names, and her sergeant major even told her the assault was her fault because she must have given her rapist a reason to think it was OK. In the end the official investigation found her claim was “unfounded” because there were no witnesses, and she did not know at the time she should have gone to the hospital and had a rape kit analysis done.

Other servicemembers—women who have served on forward operating bases in Afghanistan—have told me they limit their water intake throughout the day so they do not have to use the latrines in the middle of the night and by doing so put themselves at further risk of being assaulted. No one should ever have to deal with those kinds of concerns, especially when they are already putting their lives on the line to protect our Nation.

The Department of Defense has reported that half of all servicemembers who were victims of sexual assault say they are actually afraid to report out of fear of retaliation or that their confidentiality will not be maintained. Others believe reporting the crime will jeopardize their military career. They fear they would not receive opportunities for advancement—opportunities they have earned through service to our country.

This is just totally unacceptable. The men and women of our Armed Forces deserve far more. We have to deal with this problem once and for all, and I am encouraged the National Defense Authorization Act of 2013 includes specific directives to reduce the alarming number of assaults that take place and often go unreported.

Specifically, these provisions include independent review boards to examine how sexual assault cases are handled, the creation of a special victims unit, ensuring convicted offenders are permanently barred from the military, improving how the military collects data on this topic, and several other needed provisions.

During his confirmation process, Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel said he was committed to fully implementing these directives, and I urge Secretary Hagel to report to Congress on the progress made as swiftly as possible. I still believe Congress should and must do more. The steps I believe we should consider are, first, the creation of a special victims counsel that would include advocates who can support victims and help them report incidents of sexual assault.

As I mentioned, too many victims do not come forward because they are either afraid of retaliation, they do not believe their confidentiality will be maintained, or they do not have faith in the military justice system. As in the case of the woman I described who had been raped, she did not know she should have had an analysis of rape actually done. These victims advocates would have given her that advice.

Second, we are fortunate in the Senate to have a number of former prosecutors engaged on this issue. Over the last 20 years, they and their colleagues have made great strides in handling sexual assault cases in the civilian world, and I believe we should take the lessons learned from that process to improve the military’s response—lessons including proper training for tackling evidentiary issues and addressing victims’ needs.

Third, commanding officers can overturn verdicts of jury trials, as happened in the Air Force earlier this year. These are commanding officers, they are not appellate judges; they are not legally trained. They should not have the authority to overturn a verdict. I believe we should review that authority as it applies to sexual assault cases, something Defense Secretary Hagel has indicated should be a priority.

Finally, we need to explore whether the present Uniform Code of Military Justice is up to the task of addressing the problem of sexual assault. I believe both the Armed Forces and the cause of justice would be well served by a vigorous debate in Congress on whether sexual assault cases can be effectively handled within the chain of command or whether this process needs to occur independently. Significant overhauls of the Uniform Code of Military Justice should not be approached lightly, but we owe it to our servicemembers to think outside the box and consider all possibilities.

These men and women of our military cannot wait another day, and they should not have to wait another day for this problem to be addressed. I urge my colleagues to join me in taking concrete steps to address this issue and to

protect the men and women who sacrifice so much for us each and every day.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, Senators BOXER and VITTER have worked hard for days now to come up with a finite list of amendments to complete work on this very important bill, the Water Resources Development Act. In just a minute I am going to ask consent that we postpone the vote scheduled for 12 today until 2:30. We will come back in session, I hope, at 2:15 today. When we come back in session I want Chairman BOXER to report to the Senate if they have been able to work out an agreement between the two of them. If they have, I want her to ask the consent and when she asks that consent, if there is an agreement, we will work through a number of amendments they have come up with to complete work on this bill.

If there is no agreement at 2:15 when she comes in, then we will vote at 2:30 on cloture. I hope that is not necessary. But I am not going to have any "I'm objecting on behalf of somebody else." If it is not done, I don't care who objects, we are going to move to cloture. That is what I believe should be done.

It is a lot of work to get this agreement. I think tentatively it has been done. We know how things work; one Senator can block all this. I hope that is not the case. I know the block will not come from our side. Senator BOXER has the complete confidence of all members of our conference. They recognize that she has worked hard on this and has done the right thing—as she always does.

I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the motion to invoke cloture on S. 601 be moved to 2:30 p.m.

I will ask, while she is on the floor, the Senator from California, the chairman of the committee, is there anything I have missed in my statement?

Mrs. BOXER. If my friend will yield, through the Chair, I think he has covered it. Basically what I want to make sure people know as they go to their various conference meetings this afternoon is that we have a very fair list. I think it probably has more Republican amendments than Democratic amendments. We have done everything to reach an agreement.

But I also want to support my leader. If there is objection to this important list of amendments, we will go straight to cloture. I want everyone to understand, without this bill there will be no more water infrastructure projects because there is no path forward. Since we ended earmarks, this is the one bill

that will make sure there is a path forward. Without water infrastructure earmarks you cannot keep commerce moving at the ports, you can't do flood control, you can't restore the Everglades or the Chesapeake. I strongly support what my leader is doing but I also hope colleagues will please allow us to move forward, make the cloture vote unnecessary. But we are going to have that cloture vote, if necessary, at 2:30.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the vote on the motion to invoke cloture on S. 601 be moved to 2:30 p.m. this afternoon; that if cloture is invoked, it will be considered as having been invoked at 12 noon.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

THE BUDGET

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, I rise today to talk about the continuing efforts by a minority of this body to block a Federal budget by blocking a conference with the House to find compromise. I spoke about this one week ago, but the stalemate continues.

Today there was an announcement that in my Commonwealth, 90,000 civilian Department of Defense employees and hundreds of thousands of DOD civilians nationally will be furloughed for 11 days between now and the end of the year. This furlough announcement—along with ample other evidence we have discussed in this body in the last few weeks—demonstrates that budgetary gridlock, budgetary indecision, and budgetary stalling has real-life consequences.

I rise to implore my Senate colleagues to do what is right and to do the job the American public has sent us here to do. This is not only about budgets, it is also about something even bigger than budgets. It is about something fundamental to the entire system of government we have; that is, the willingness to work together to find common ground and find solutions.

I truly view this budgetary stalemate as an attack on compromise. We cannot survive as a Senate or as a Congress or as a nation without finding common ground.

I know the Presiding Officer, like me, was out on the campaign trail a lot in 2012. I heard a repeated critique of this body during the campaign. I heard that this body was unable to produce a budget since 2009. There were some arguments back and forth about whether that was technically accurate. As I looked at it as a candidate, it was at least clear that a normal budgetary order in accordance with the Budget Act of 1974 had not been followed for a number of years.

As a candidate and citizen of the Commonwealth and country, I said: If I have the opportunity to serve in this body, I am going to work with my colleagues to make sure we do the public's business in the way that was contemplated in that statute.

Although I didn't ask, I was assigned to be on the Senate Budget Committee as soon as I got to this body. I immediately made clear—along with many other Members, both newcomers and Members who had been on the committee for a while, including the new committee chair, Senator MURRAY—that this body needed to return to normal budgetary procedures.

It seemed as though over the past few years, Congress tried a lot of other things—supercommittees, sequesters, and continuing resolutions—none of which were working to do the Nation's fiscal business. Along with many Senators of both parties, I said the right strategy for us is to return to normal budgetary procedure. We can make it work just as Congresses in the past have made it work.

I entered the body on January 3—more than 4 months ago—with the profound belief that we needed to embrace the normal procedures about doing a budget. Those normal procedures are known to all. People read textbooks about how bills become laws. Essentially, in the spring the Senate and House, under normal procedure, would each pass a budget. Those budget bills would likely be significantly different.

Even when the parties controlling the two Houses are the same, the two House budgets are different. There is then some effort to find a compromise between the two differing versions often through use of a conference committee. Once that compromise is found, then that compromise is sent back to each House for a vote, and it then becomes the guidance that is used by the Appropriations Committee to write the bill's appropriating dollars for the next fiscal year. That is the normal process, and it is the way Congress has operated under both parties, under split Houses for many years.

Here is the good news: The Senate Budget Committee embraced this challenge. Chairman MURRAY worked with staff and members of the committee to create a draft budget, and then early in mid-March we had robust committee hearings, a full debate, and a full amendment process about a Senate budget.

In March the committee ultimately considered the chairman's mark for 13 hours, and we had a full amendment process. We voted on over 30 amendments, the majority of which were made by Republican members of the committee. We debated and voted on those amendments. I sat there and voted for a number of the Republican amendments to the budget that then became part of the ultimate committee product.

Republican members offered numerous amendments. In response to an amendment offered by a Republican member, I remember my colleague from Maine, Senator KING, asking: If I vote for your amendment, are you going to vote for this committee budget? The answer was given in public.

The answer was: No. I want you to vote for my amendment, but I am still

going to vote against the budget. I am going to vote against it because the House will produce a Republican budget, the Senate will produce a Democratic budget, and then we can get those two budgets together and find compromise going forward.

That was what was said when we met as a Budget Committee. At the end of the day, the Senate Budget Committee passed that budget in mid-March, and passed it without a single Republican vote. The budget was passed and forwarded to the Senate floor.

I know the Presiding Officer remembers this, as it is emblazoned upon all of our memories. We took the budget to the Senate floor in late March. The budget was the subject of floor activity in this body for 39½ hours. We don't do a lot around here for 39½ hours, but the budget was subject to floor activity and numerous speeches by Senators, just like me, over the course of that week.

The entire body then considered, debated, and voted on nearly 110 amendments to the budget. We passed 77 of the amendments. The amendments that were passed were offered by both Democrats and Republicans. I remember voting for many of the Republican amendments that then became part of the ultimate budget bill. This amendment activity—110 amendments, 77 passing—is significantly greater than has been the norm in earlier Senate deliberations.

At 5 a.m. on the morning of Saturday, March 23, the Senate passed its first budget in 4 years. Not a single Republican voted to support that budget even though many of their amendments had been included either in the committee or in the floor amendment process we had during those hours in late March.

I have done a lot of budgets as a mayor and as a Governor. Along with my colleagues on the Budget Committee, I worked hard in the committee and on the floor. My staff—as well as the Senate Budget Committee staff and the staffers of all the members on that committee—also worked hard on this bill. I am proud we passed a budget on March 23, and I believe firmly if that budget were implemented today, without changing one apostrophe, comma, or punctuation mark, it would do a number of things: It would help create jobs, it would help the economy, and it would deal with our debt and deficit in a fiscally responsible way.

I also understood this: that the Senate budget we passed was not the final product. It was the Senate's best effort to find a budget that would move our economy and our country forward. We knew that budget would be placed in a conference with the House budget. The House passed their budget the same week. We knew there would have to be discussion and compromise in an effort to find common ground, but we did our best version and the House, I assume, feels as though they did their very best version.

The two budgets are very different. I deeply believe the Senate budget is superior and the American people, watching the discussions between the two Houses and comparing them, would reach the same conclusion. But at the very least I know this: The American public are entitled to see that debate and discussion. They are entitled to look at the House budget and look at the Senate budget and compare them, just as the conferees would be comparing. They are entitled to watch that process of dialog and debate and, hopefully, compromise. That is, in fact, what they have sent us here to do, and that is what Congresses have done for many years and decades.

The process of a budget conference would not be an easy one because the two budgets are quite different, but there is no substitute for dialog and compromise. In fact, I think all of us in this body know dialog and compromise at its core are what we are about here.

When the Framers of our Constitution, in article I, set up a legislative branch with two Houses—a bicameral branch—and required that most items to pass through Congress would have to go through both branches, they understood very well what they were doing. They were creating a system of checks and balances that required dialog and listening and compromise in order to do good for the benefit of the Nation. At our very root, a bicameral legislature, existing in a system of checks and balances, with a judiciary and an executive branch, depends upon public servants who are willing to find common ground.

Well, since March 23—nearly 7 weeks—a small minority of Senators, often one at a time, has done all it can to block a budget conference from even beginning and, therefore, to block compromise. As we have taken steps to begin a budget conference with the House leadership to put these two budgets together and find compromise, again and again individual Senators have stood on the floor of this body and, in my view, abused the UC rules to block a conference from even beginning. Even as budgetary indecision and sequester are leading to furloughs, they have blocked a conference from even beginning. Even as we are seeing reductions in the number of people who are able to receive Meals On Wheels or children in Head Start, they have abused Senate rules to block a budget conference from even beginning.

I serve on the Armed Services Committee. We are working on the Defense authorization bill now, and we have the service chiefs come in and talk to us every day about the challenges they are facing, about the degraded readiness. One-third of our air combat command units are standing down because of these budgetary challenges. We hear the steady drumbeat, day in and day out, about degradation in readiness and challenges to our modernization programs. We had a hearing about the Marine Corps this morning. Yet even as

we are hearing this testimony in hearings in the morning and in the afternoon, Members come to this floor and stand and try to block a budget conference from even beginning.

This is very serious. When we are talking about the readiness of our military who are facing challenges—just pick up today's paper and read headlines about Syria or North Korea or Iran—as we are facing continuing challenges in Afghanistan, to have Members in this body block efforts to find compromise is very chilling.

Let's be clear about what this is. This is not just an attack on the budget itself, because those who want to attack the budget voted against it in committee. Those who didn't like the budget had a chance and voted against it on the floor. Even in the event a conference committee would produce a budget compromise, that compromise would come back and those who didn't like that budget would have a chance to vote against it again. That is how we attack a budget. That is how we express disagreement with a budget. A Member stands on the floor of this body and votes against it. The Members have had a chance to do that in committee and on the floor and they will have a chance to do it again at the end of the conference process.

The effort that has been underway in this body since March 23 is not fundamentally an attack on budgets, it is an attack on the whole notion of compromise. To block a conference committee from beginning so House and Senate conferees can sit down and listen to each other and try to iron out their differences is fundamentally an attack on compromise. We have seen that too much in this body. Anyone in this room knows that, if a person is not a hermit, if a person is a member of a family or a member of a parish council or a member of the PTA or part of an organizing group of a Little League, if a person has a business or if a person is elected to a school board or to the Senate—everybody knows if we participate in life, it has to be about compromise. Our Founders knew it and they created a system that relies upon compromise.

What we have seen in this body since March 23, after people had a full opportunity to amend and vote on a budget, is not about a budget, it is an attack on compromise.

I conclude by saying that just as no family can succeed without compromise, just as no community, just as no business, just as no school board, just as no group of people can succeed without compromise, Congress, the Senate, and our Nation cannot succeed without a spirit of compromise.

So I implore and I ask my colleagues to rethink the path they are on, to stand down in this attack upon compromise, to allow the budget to go to conference so we can do the tough work of listening to each other and finding common ground for the good of the American people.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECESS

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

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:35 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. BALDWIN).

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2013—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. What is the order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is considering S. 601.

Mrs. BOXER. We are working on our finite list, and we expect to make our unanimous consent shortly.

I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Ms. LANDRIEU. While we have some down time on the floor to wait for the 2:30 hour—I believe we are going to have some action on the WRDA bill, which is very important—I thought I would take this time to talk about an amendment I have pending on the WRDA bill. It is an amendment that I offered for myself, Senator VITTER, Senator SCHUMER, and Senator MENENDEZ. Several other Senators have expressed their strong support over the weekend on both sides, Republicans and Democrats.

There are many States in the Union, and Louisiana is only one—the State of Florida, the State of California, the State of Mississippi, the State of Alabama, other coastal States and, yes, some inland States—that are going to be terribly disadvantaged if the Landrieu-Vitter amendment does not pass on the WRDA bill. What is going to happen because of a reform bill—parts of it were necessary, but there were some parts that, in my view and in the view of many Senators, should never have passed as part of the flood insurance reform bill.

The reason some of us are fairly exercised about this is the bill itself, the reform bill to reform the Flood Insurance Program of the United States, never came to this floor for debate. It

came out of the Banking Committee, and then it was basically tucked into a larger omnibus bill, which happens sometimes. This is not the only or the first time it has happened. It is very unfortunate that it happened with this bill.

In our haste and in our good intentions to try to put national flood insurance on a more even financial keel, we have put the ability, unfortunately, in this bill for flood insurance rates to go up 20 percent a year on hundreds of thousands of first homes in this country—not second homes, not vacation homes, but first homes. The Landrieu-Vitter amendment doesn't try to solve this whole problem on the WRDA bill. It is going to take a little bit of work, which we can do, working together in good faith on behalf of our constituents.

This is big government at its worst—passing a reform bill and making the cure worse than the disease. In this case, for my constituents and for constituents in Florida, Mississippi, California, and New Jersey, we would have taken the disease as opposed to the cure. The cure is going to kill us. We weren't sure about the disease, but the cure is going to kill us.

Our papers have been editorializing for days since this issue has come to the surface on the WRDA bill. Our largest newspaper or second largest newspaper editorialized this morning and spoke about a quite senior woman—in her eighties—who lives with her daughter, who is in her sixties, in Plaquemines Parish. It is very typical to have families of different generations living together. They were in Plaquemines Parish before the flood insurance measure was ever passed.

We were living in Louisiana before this Nation was a nation. Our people have been down there a long time living on this water. They built their houses centuries—not this couple, but we had houses built centuries before this bill was ever passed. Now, what the law—the cure that is going to kill us—says is that this is their choice: They can elevate their home 18 feet, which probably would cost \$50,000, which they don't have, or their flood insurance will go up to something on the order of \$15,000 or \$20,000 a year, which they can't pay.

One may say: That is too bad. Let them sell the house.

Their house has no value.

This is a dilemma not just for the people of Louisiana but for people from Mississippi, Alabama, California, and New York. We have a solution. The solution I have offered is temporary until we can be smart and think about how to fix this, and it doesn't cost anything.

I am begging Members to allow us this short period of time to get this cure corrected. We can find a way to make this program balance. We don't have to do that today, at this moment. Give us a little breathing room to figure this out. I believe this program

could be self-sustaining. I am not an expert on insurance, but I am very fortunate to serve with colleagues who are. I am sure we can put our heads together and come up with something better than what is coming down like a firehose out there on lots of people in communities in Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama.

My understanding is—the managers are not on the floor—that there are about eight or nine amendments that have been worked out, hopefully, on both sides of the aisle. One of them is the Landrieu-Vitter fix, the flood insurance amendment that has zero cost to the taxpayer—zero. It is a temporary reprieve of rates going up for grandfathered homes, which affects many people in Florida, Louisiana, and in other States as well. It has a zero score. The CBO has testified. We have letters from CBO.

Please give our people this breathing room. I promise that I will work in good faith.

There are probably a few other things that need to be fixed in this flood insurance bill as we find a better way to lower costs to the taxpayer and to provide opportunities for people to live on a mountaintop if they choose, in a valley or on the coast, but to be safely sustainable. We all need to work together as a country. We can find an affordable way for our people—and not just millionaires—to be able to live on the coast. We have to make room for our fishermen, our agriculture, our farmers, and our aquaculture folks who have invested a good amount of money in helping to build more sustainable fisheries for our Nation. We have people who have to live near the water for commerce and trade. Not everybody lives by the water to vacation. Some people live by the water to work, which is an essential part of the work to keep this country moving forward. We have to figure out a way to allow them to do that in an affordable manner without completely undermining the coastal counties of our country.

Senator SCHUMER is on the floor now with some others who also have been working. I thank them for working over the weekend. Let's help them get this list of amendments cleared. One of those amendments will be the Landrieu-Vitter amendment on fixing temporarily—giving some reprieve to thousands of homeowners who are desperate for a signal from us that we get it, we understand. We didn't correct this appropriately. We are going to respond, as a democracy should, and give them a little signal today that as the WRDA bill moves forward, we can fine-tune and modify this flood insurance reform.

I understand we are ready for action on WRDA.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENTS NOS. 847, 899 AS MODIFIED, 895, 894, 867, 872, 912, 880, 904, 884, 870 AS MODIFIED, 911 AS MODIFIED, 882, 903 AS MODIFIED, 906 AS MODIFIED, 893, 898, 861 AS MODIFIED, 907, AND 896 EN BLOC

Mrs. BOXER. For the interest of Senators, we are going to very shortly propound a consent agreement that has been cleared by Senator VITTER and myself and we will see where that takes us. If it needs to be modified, we may well do that, but I want Senators to know it is our hope we can avert a cloture vote at this time.

I ask unanimous consent the following amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc: Baucus No. 847, Boxer-Vitter No. 899 as modified, Inhofe No. 895, Wicker No. 894, Inhofe No. 867, Boozman No. 872, Thune No. 912, Cornyn No. 880, Murkowski No. 904, Klobuchar No. 884, Wyden No. 870 as modified, Cochran No. 911 as modified, Carper No. 882, Murkowski No. 903 as modified, Durbin No. 906 as modified, Levin No. 893, Collins No. 898, Cardin No. 861 as modified, Brown-Graham No. 907, and Wyden No. 896; further, that the only remaining amendments in order to the bill be the following: Inhofe No. 797, Barrasso No. 868, Sanders No. 889, Johnson and Landrieu—Johnson No. 891, Landrieu No. 888, Coburn No. 815, Coburn No. 816, Boozman No. 822, Merkley No. 866, Udall of New Mexico No. 853, and Hoeven No. 909; further, that no second-degree amendments be in order to any of the amendments prior to votes in relation to the amendment; that the time until 5 p.m. be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees for debate on all of the amendments; that at 5 p.m. the Senate proceed to vote in relation to the amendments in the order I have listed; that all after the first vote be 10-minute votes; that there be 2 minutes equally divided prior to each vote; that the following amendments be subjected to a 60-affirmative-vote threshold: Sanders No. 899, Johnson No. 891, Landrieu No. 888, and Barrasso No. 868; finally, that upon disposition of the Hoeven amendment No. 909, the cloture motion be withdrawn, the Senate proceed to vote on the passage of S. 601, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I want to point out there is one amendment in this package that is very troubling to me. Under the current flood insurance law we passed just 10 months ago, we put in place a mechanism to diminish the subsidization that occurs now where homeowners in low-risk areas are made to subsidize homeowners in high-risk areas by the nature of the way premiums are set. The existing law is designed to diminish significantly that unfair subsidy that occurs, and I think that is why the chairman and the ranking member of the Banking Committee and many others of our colleagues oppose this amendment.

If this amendment goes through, the Landrieu amendment No. 888, then for 5 years this reform cannot take place and that means not only do people in low-risk areas continue subsidizing people in high-risk areas, but because people in high-risk areas are paying lower premiums than what they ought to pay to reflect the risk they are taking, it creates the moral hazard of a risk to continue building in high-risk areas with the expectation this will continue and therefore jeopardizes taxpayer funds.

This is already a program that is \$24 billion in debt and that is the reason I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, it is my understanding, listening to my friend from Pennsylvania, that he objects to the Landrieu amendment. It is also my understanding that Senator LANDRIEU would like to be heard on this matter. Then I will propound a new consent request. I ask she get the floor and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, I wish to clarify through the Chair that the Senator from Pennsylvania is not objecting to the long list of amendments as described by the chairman of the committee, he is only objecting to amendment No. 888 and objecting to a vote on amendment No. 888 by myself, Senator VITTER, Senator SCHUMER, Senator MENENDEZ, Senator LAUTENBERG, and others; is that correct? Is the Senator objecting to a vote or to the amendment?

Mr. TOOMEY. Madam President, my understanding is there is a unanimous consent request for a series of amendments on this bill, and I am objecting to that consent request because it contains the Landrieu amendment No. 888.

Ms. LANDRIEU. So it is my understanding, Madam President, through the Chair, that the Senator is objecting to a vote on the amendment. He is certainly entitled, in my view, to vote against the amendment. That is what debate on the floor is all about. But he is not expressing his objection to that. He is objecting to having a vote on the amendment; is that correct?

Mr. TOOMEY. Madam President, as I said earlier, this is a matter that has been litigated and adjudicated in this body. We have had a vote on this. This has not come back through committee. This would cause considerable risk to taxpayers. If the Senator from Louisiana believes this is something that needs to be addressed yet again, despite the fact that 10 months ago we had a vote on this—and we did vote, then I would be happy to work with the Senator on how we might address that. But my objection still remains.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, I am just trying to get clarification through the Chair from the Senator from Pennsylvania. I understand he objects to my amendment. That is not what I am asking him. I would just like a yes or no answer; is he objecting to a vote on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. I think I answered the question.

Ms. LANDRIEU. He did not answer the question clearly, but since he will not answer the question, which is unfortunate, I wish to make it clear for the record that the Senator from Pennsylvania is objecting to a vote on the Landrieu-Vitter amendment. He most certainly is entitled to vote no on our amendment. Other Senators may vote no. But I want the record to show he is saying, no, we cannot even have a vote.

If I could have 5 more minutes. I will take 3 more minutes. I want to say how disappointing it is to me because the Senator is unfortunately wrong on several counts.

No. 1, this floor never voted on the Biggert-Waters bill. As I said a dozen times, the bill came out of the Banking Committee with broad bipartisan support. A different bill was passed by the House. Then these two bills that were very different and tried to “reform the flood insurance program” were tucked into a conference committee report. I want the record to show this floor never voted on the reform, and the cure that came out of the conference committee is worse than the disease.

Second, I want to tell the Senator from Pennsylvania I think this is going to come back to haunt him because the people of his own State are going to be negatively affected by his actions today.

There are 74,000 people in Pennsylvania—4,000 in Philadelphia alone but 74,000 people in Pennsylvania who pay flood insurance rates. Under the proposal that never came to this Senate floor, those rates in some cases can go up 20 or 30 percent in 1 year.

For the record, I want to put in: In Florida, 2 million people are affected; Texas, 645,000; Louisiana, 486,000; California, 256,000; New Jersey, 240,000; South Carolina, 205,000; New York, 178,000; North Carolina, 138,000—I am not going to read all of this—Virginia, 116,000; and in Pennsylvania, 74,000. I could go on. I ask unanimous consent this list be printed in the RECORD.

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

FNIP POLICIES BY STATE
(County/City Examples)

State/County/City	Policies in Force
1 Florida	2,060,245
City of Fort Lauderdale	42,126
2 Texas	645,615
City of Houston	132,529
3 Louisiana	486,580
Jefferson Parish	121,501
4 California	256,095
City of Sacramento	46,758
5 New Jersey	240,857

NFIP POLICIES BY STATE—Continued
(County/City Examples)

State/County/City	Policies in Force
Ocean City	17,370
6 South Carolina	205,146
Beaufort County	54,201
7 New York	178,863
New York City	44,415
8 North Carolina	138,605
Dare County	22,157
9 Virginia	116,275
City of Virginia Beach	25,530
10 Georgia	96,906
Chatam County	31,870
11 Mississippi	75,186
Harrison County	20,271
12 Pennsylvania	74,006
Philadelphia	4,330
13 Maryland	73,696
Ocean City	27,232
14 Massachusetts	59,420
Plymouth County	10,748
15 Hawaii	59,290
Honolulu	37,398
16 Alabama	58,048
Baldwin County	26,985
17 Puerto Rico	55,964
Puerto Rico	50,935
18 Illinois	48,498
Cook County	17,777
19 Washington	45,200
Skagit County	5,728
20 Ohio	41,920
Ottawa County	1,962
21 Connecticut	41,710
Fairfield County	17,140
22 Arizona	35,000
Scottsdale	8,672
23 Oregon	34,764
Portland	2,148
24 Tennessee	33,745
Davidson County	7,377
25 Indiana	30,933
Indianapolis	5,852
26 Missouri	26,640
St. Louis County	1,229
27 Michigan	26,247
City of Dearborn Heights	1,232
28 Delaware	26,011
Sussex County	21,250
29 Kentucky	25,179
Louisville-Jefferson County	5,503
30 Arkansas	21,459
Little Rock	1,487

Ms. LANDRIEU. Second, I have a letter from the National Association of Home Builders—not a liberal-leaning organization and most certainly not a group that just works in Louisiana. People build homes all over America including in Pennsylvania. They sent a strong letter urging us to adopt the Landrieu-Vitter amendment which will just temporarily put a hold on raising rates 20 to 40 to 60 to 80 percent on grandfathered homes that were around before the flood insurance program was ever invented by Members of this body, well before I was even a Senator.

What this says is the program should be widely available, it should be affordable, so people can live in many different places of America. This is one big great country with lots of different kinds of neighborhoods. That is what the National Association of Home Builders said, and I am going to submit their letter.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
HOME BUILDERS,
Washington, DC, May 14, 2013.

Hon. HARRY REID,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER REID AND MINORITY LEADER MCCONNELL: On behalf of the more than 140,000 members of the National Association of Home Builders (NAHB), I am

writing to express strong support for amendment #888 (sponsored by Senators Mary Landrieu and David Vitter) to S. 601, the Water Resources and Development Act of 2013. This amendment would delay flood insurance premium increases on certain properties for 5 years. NAHB believes a financially-stable National Flood Insurance Program is in all of our interests, yet we must ensure that overall affordability is not adversely affected.

The Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 (BW12) reauthorized the NFIP for five years and included a phase-in to actuarial rates to help return the program to sound financial footing. Also included in the law was the requirement for a study and a report on the affordability of NFIP premiums and the effects of increased premiums on low-income homeowners.

The BW12 phase-in to actuarial rates is separated into two different segments of policy-holders. Some homeowners will start to see premium increases in October, while the others will start in 2014, once the new scientific rate maps have been drawn and approved. Over the next year and a half, many hard working homeowners in flood-prone areas (and newly-drawn flood prone areas) could see large flood insurance premium increases. The Landrieu-Vitter amendment ensures that the later changes are delayed to help Congress re-examine consumer affordability and answer other questions about implementing BW12. NAHB believes this amendment is a first step in balancing consumer affordability and re-establishing the solvency of the program.

The homebuilding industry depends on the NFIP to be annually predictable, universally available, affordable and fiscally viable. This program enables the home building industry to deliver safe, decent, affordable housing to consumers in all areas of the country. We urge you to support this important amendment that balances the fiscal solvency of the NFIP and consumer affordability.

Sincerely,

JAMES W. TOBIN III,
Senior Vice President &
Chief Lobbyist.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Evidently, the Senator from Pennsylvania doesn't understand this. That is fine. We have disagreements and I respect him. He should vote no. But to stop a vote?

The third and final argument I am going to make in my 30 seconds left, we worked so hard on this amendment that it doesn't even cost anything.

We have a zero score—zero. It does not cost one dime, not one dollar, and still the Senator from Pennsylvania, with 74,000 people in his State who could be affected, is objecting to even voting on giving people a chance. We are going to be on this issue again; it is going to come back.

I praise Senators BOXER and VITTER for their work on WRDA. It is a shame that we cannot even get a vote to postpone this issue to try to see if we could make it more affordable. It doesn't cost anything.

I say to the Senator from California that I am sorry for holding this up. I thought this was important. We worked on it all week. Everybody is cleared except for one Senator from Pennsylvania.

I yield the floor.

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

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I rise to very briefly agree with two key points made by my colleague from Louisiana. First of all, as far as the substance of this amendment goes, I wholeheartedly agree with her, and that is why I am a sponsor of this amendment as well.

We will visit this issue again because it is vitally important that we get it right—not just for the tens of thousands of folks from Louisiana but for millions of Americans across the country. We need to get this right, and we don't yet have it right.

Secondly and also very importantly, I absolutely agree that we should have debate and votes on the Senate floor. I don't think any Member should object to just having a vote on a matter.

My colleague, the Senator from Pennsylvania, has been a leading advocate to have an open amendment process on the Senate floor, to allow votes, and I agreed with that. I fought with the chair of the committee to have an open amendment process in the context of this bill, and we got it. Now, at the end of the day, he objects to even having a vote on a particular amendment he doesn't like. The Senator cannot have it both ways. If the Senator wants an open amendment process on the floor, as I do, then he will have to accept that he may have to take votes on amendments he doesn't agree with. I accept that; I wish he would accept that. I hope it will continue and grow from here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I think everybody who is listening to this understands that there has been a disagreement here—a pretty tough one.

I have to praise Senator LANDRIEU for saying: Look, I am going to bring this fight back another day. She has told me she would be willing to support a new, modified request—the same one I made about 10 minutes ago—and take out Johnson amendment No. 891 and Landrieu amendment No. 888. I believe the new request will be acceptable to all in the Senate.

I renew my request with that change—the deletion of Johnson amendment No. 891 and Landrieu amendment No. 888. I ask unanimous consent that we move forward with this agreement at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, we realized over the last 72 hours that we were all scandalized when we learned that the Internal Revenue Service of the United States and employees within the Internal Revenue Service were targeting fellow Americans and political organizations because of their political views. The feelings we have are bipartisan—I hope they are. I don't think any of us want to see an agency of government being used to target our fellow Americans because of their points of view on a political issue. This is a very serious issue.

Yesterday I called for the President to ask for the resignation of the acting chief of the IRS. I asked that there be a criminal investigation launched in this matter, which Attorney General Holder has announced today.

I have prepared an amendment that I think is timely and that I hope we will consider in this body that makes it a crime for an employee of the IRS to target individual taxpayers or organizations because of their political views. I stand today to ask if the chairwoman would consider consenting to allow my Rubio amendment No. 892 to be included in the unanimous consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. If I might respond to my friend's request, the American people need to know that we are dealing on this Senate floor with a bill that is the Water Resources Development Act. This bill is about improvements in flood control so we don't have anymore Hurricane Sandys. This is also about port-deepening and about 500,000 jobs. This is about restoring the Chesapeake Bay and the Everglades in my friend's home State. What a beautiful spot that is, I say to my friend. It is not about the IRS scandal, although I could not agree more with my friend. Anyone who would play politics at the IRS is doing a disservice to this Nation. I am happy to look at this law. They ought to be canned.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an inquiry which took place by the IRS into a church in my State—the All Saints Church—in the district of ADAM SCHIFF be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Los Angeles Times, Dec. 9, 2005]

INQUIRY INTO IRS INVESTIGATIONS OF
CHURCHES IS SOUGHT

(By Patricia Ward Biederman)

Expressing concern about the 1st Amendment rights of clergy, Rep. Adam B. Schiff (D-Burbank) and two Republican colleagues called Thursday for an investigation by the U.S. Government Accountability Office into the IRS' recent probes of alleged "campaign intervention" by churches, including Pasadena's liberal All Saints Church.

Schiff, whose district includes Pasadena, said he asked for information from the IRS on its church inquiries soon after learning in November that the local Episcopal church could lose its tax-exempt status because of an antiwar sermon preached by former Rector George Regas just before the 2004 presidential election.

Because the IRS has yet to respond to his request, Schiff said, "I've gone to the next level."

On Thursday, Reps. Walter B. Jones (R-N.C.) and Joe Pitts (R-Pa.) joined with Schiff in sending a letter to GAO Comptroller General David M. Walker. They asked the office to look into reports that the IRS is investigating places of worship "based on the content of sermons or other discourse delivered as part of a religious service or gathering."

Although the tax code prohibits tax-exempt organizations from "intervening in political campaigns and elections," the con-

gressmen said, "We believe that the faith community has every right to express itself in the political process."

Spokesman Eric Smith said IRS policy precludes commenting on requests such as the congressmen's. But Smith cited a report released by the Treasury Department in February that found the IRS had "not . . .

All Saints Rector Edwin Bacon announced Nov. 6 that the church's tax-exempt status was threatened.

The congregation has received wide support, from evangelicals as well as liberal groups. All Saints expects an IRS decision soon, a church spokesman said.

Mrs. BOXER. Republicans and Democrats at that time asked for investigations into this, and this is from 2005.

I ask unanimous consent that an article that talks about the investigation of the NAACP that involved the IRS in 2006 be printed in the RECORD.

This is a continuing scandal. It is outrageous, and I think anyone who goes after a liberal group should be canned. Anyone who goes after a conservative group should be canned unless there is reason to do so. But it appears they are not following the rules of nonprofits, which is they cannot be political.

I ask that those items be placed in the RECORD only to remind people that this is a bad and terrible thing that has happened, and it has been a while.

I object to the request that we place such an urgently important matter on this long-term bill. It is going to take a while for us to get it through the House. We don't know when the conference will come back.

I object to the unanimous consent request to turn a bill like this into a bill about the IRS scandal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. First of all, on the second request of the Senator from California, is there any objection?

The Chair hears none.

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

[From the Washington Post, September 1,
2006]

IRS ENDS 2-YEAR PROBE OF NAACP'S TAX
STATUS; LEADER'S CRITICISM OF BUSH IN
2004 DID NOT VIOLATE LAW, AGENCY DE-
CIDES

(By Darryl Fears)

Nearly two years after a controversial decision to investigate the NAACP for criticizing President Bush during the 2004 presidential campaign, the Internal Revenue Service has ruled that the remarks did not violate the group's tax-exempt status.

In a letter released yesterday by the NAACP, the IRS said the group, the nation's oldest and largest civil rights organization, "continued to qualify" as tax-exempt.

If the NAACP were stripped of the status, donors would not be allowed to claim contributions to the group on income tax returns.

Federal law requires tax-exempt nonprofit organizations to be politically nonpartisan.

"It was an enormous threat," NAACP Chairman Julian Bond said of the investigation. The opposite outcome, he said, "would have reduced our income remarkably."

Bond reiterated his belief that the investigation was politically motivated. He said the decision, received by the NAACP on Aug.

9, "meant that they thought they had harassed us enough and they could stop."

In a response to lawmakers who expressed outrage over the investigation in 2004, IRS Commissioner Mark W. Everson said the agency's examinations are based on tax law, not partisanship.

The commissioner said the investigation of the NAACP was undertaken because two congressional leaders, whom he declined to name, requested it. They were unhappy because Bond criticized Bush in a speech in July 2004, saying his administration preached racial neutrality and practiced racial division.

"They write a new constitution of Iraq and they ignore the Constitution at home," Bond said.

After filing four freedom-of-information requests, NAACP lawyers discovered that far more than two members of Congress called for an investigation and that all were Republicans.

Republican Sens. Lamar Alexander (Tenn.) and Susan Collins (Maine) called for the investigation.

Others included Rep. Jo Ann S. Davis (R-Va.) and then-Rep. Larry Combest (R-Tex.). Former GOP representatives Joe Scarborough of Florida, who now hosts a talk show, and Robert L. Ehrlich Jr., currently governor of Maryland, also requested a probe.

The investigation started Oct. 8, 2004, a month before the election. As the investigation dragged on into the following February, the NAACP announced that it would not continue to cooperate.

Angela Ciccolo, an NAACP lawyer, noted that although Bond's remarks were made in July 2004, the investigation did not begin until October, just when the NAACP was attempting to register voters. "The timing of the investigation is critical," she said.

When the investigation started, Bush and the NAACP were locked in a long-running feud that started shortly before the president's first election victory in 2000.

During that campaign, the NAACP ran television spots featuring the daughter of James Byrd Jr., a black man who was dragged to death behind a pickup truck in Texas in 1998. She criticized Bush, then governor of Texas, for not signing hate-crime legislation.

The rift grew when the NAACP charged that Republicans in Florida stole the 2000 election by turning black voters away from the polls.

Recently, however, the relationship between the group and Bush has begun to warm. Bush addressed the NAACP convention in July for the first time in his six years in office, avoiding becoming the first president since Warren G. Harding to snub the group for an entire presidency.

"It's disappointing that the IRS took nearly two years to conclude what we knew from the beginning: The NAACP did not violate tax laws and continues to be politically nonpartisan," said its president, Bruce S. Gordon.

CORRECTION-DATE: September 12, 2006;
September 21, 2006

CORRECTION:

A Sept. 1 article incorrectly said that the Internal Revenue Service had named the NAACP as a group whose tax-exempt status was being investigated in response to questions from congressmen. Though the NAACP's status was investigated, the IRS did not name the group.

A Sept. 1 article incorrectly listed several Republicans as having called for an Internal Revenue Service investigation into the tax-exempt status of the NAACP. Named were Sens. Lamar Alexander (Tenn.) and Susan Collins (Maine); Rep. Jo Ann S. Davis (Va.);

and former representatives Larry Combest (Tex.), Joe Scarborough (Fla.) and Robert L. Ehrlich Jr. (Md.). The lawmakers forwarded complaints and requests for an investigation from constituents to the IRS.

LOAD-DATE: September 1, 2006.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I will not object to the unanimous consent request because of the importance of this issue to many States in the country, let me close by saying that we need to understand what happened here over the last 72 hours and what we found out. Employees of the Internal Revenue Service made a decision that they were going to specifically target groups who had things like “tea party” and the word “patriot” in their organization, groups who looked to do things like protect the Constitution of the United States. This is outrageous.

There is growing evidence that higher-ups—significant people in the IRS—knew about this and were not disclosing that to Members of Congress. Members of this body were asking the IRS directly: Are you involved in this? Is this happening? They were not giving us information we now know they had.

I will not object to the unanimous consent request because of the importance of this issue, but this issue will not and cannot go away because of the importance of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments were agreed to, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 847

(Purpose: To modify a provision relating to Northern Rockies headwaters extreme weather mitigation)

On page 236, strike line 13 and insert the following:

(f) EFFECT OF SECTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this section replaces or provides a substitute for the authority to carry out projects under section 3110 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1135).

(2) FUNDING.—The amounts made available to carry out this section shall be used to carry out projects that are not otherwise carried out under section 3110 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1135).

(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is

AMENDMENT NO. 899, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To improve the bill)

On page 214, strike lines 15 through 20 and insert the following:

“(d) INTERIM ADOPTION OF COMPREHENSIVE MASTER PLAN.—Prior to completion of the comprehensive plan described under subsection (a), the Secretary shall adopt the plan of the State of Louisiana entitled ‘Louisiana’s Comprehensive Master Plan for a Sustainable Coast’ in effect on the

On page 216, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

(c) EFFECT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this section or an amendment made by this section authorizes the construction of a project or program associated with a storm surge barrier across

the Lake Pontchartrain land bridge (including Chef Menteur Pass and the Rigolets) that would result in unmitigated induced flooding in coastal communities within the State of Mississippi.

(2) REQUIRED CONSULTATION.—Any study to advance a project described in paragraph (1) that is conducted using funds from the General Investigations Account of the Corps of Engineers shall include consultation and approval of the Governors of the States of Louisiana and Mississippi.

On page 222, line 14, strike “2018” and insert “2023”.

On page 239, strike lines 14 through 19 and insert the following:

“(1) be made available to the States and locales described in subsection (b) consistent with program priorities determined by the Secretary in accordance with criteria developed by the Secretary to establish the program priorities; and

“(2) remain available until expended.”.

On page 293, line 2, strike “amount” and insert “amounts remaining after the date of enactment of this Act”.

On page 347, line 12, strike “or ecosystem restoration” and insert “ecosystem restoration, or navigation”.

Beginning on page 47, strike line 3 and all that follows through page 53, line 13, and insert the following:

SEC. 2014. DAM OPTIMIZATION.

(a) DEFINITION OF OTHER RELATED PROJECT BENEFITS.—In this section, the term “other related project benefits” includes—

(1) environmental protection and restoration, including restoration of water quality and water flows, improving movement of fish and other aquatic species, and restoration of floodplains, wetlands, and estuaries;

(2) increased water supply storage (except for any project in the Apalachicola-Chat-tahoochee-Flint River system and the Alabama-Coosa-Tallapoosa River system);

(3) increased hydropower generation;

(4) reduced flood risk;

(5) additional navigation; and

(6) improved recreation.

(b) PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may carry out activities—

(A) to improve the efficiency of the operations and maintenance of dams and related infrastructure operated by the Corps of Engineers; and

(B) to maximize, to the extent practicable—

(i) authorized project purposes; and

(ii) other related project benefits.

(2) ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES.—An eligible activity under this section is any activity that the Secretary would otherwise be authorized to carry out that is designed to provide other related project benefits in a manner that does not adversely impact the authorized purposes of the project.

(3) IMPACT ON AUTHORIZED PURPOSES.—An activity carried out under this section shall not adversely impact any of the authorized purposes of the project.

(4) EFFECT.—

(A) EXISTING AGREEMENTS.—Nothing in this section—

(i) supersedes or modifies any written agreement between the Federal Government and a non-Federal interest that is in effect on the date of enactment of this Act; or

(ii) supersedes or authorizes any amendment to a multistate water-control plan, including the Missouri River Master Water Control Manual (as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act).

(B) WATER RIGHTS.—Nothing in this section—

(i) affects any water right in existence on the date of enactment of this Act;

(ii) preempts or affects any State water law or interstate compact governing water; or

(iii) affects any authority of a State, as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act, to manage water resources within that State.

(5) OTHER LAWS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—An activity carried out under this section shall comply with all other applicable laws (including regulations).

(B) WATER SUPPLY.—Any activity carried out under this section that results in any modification to water supply storage allocations at a reservoir operated by the Secretary shall comply with section 301 of the Water Supply Act of 1958 (43 U.S.C. 390b).

(C) POLICIES, REGULATIONS, AND GUIDANCE.—The Secretary shall carry out a review of, and as necessary modify, the policies, regulations, and guidance of the Secretary to carry out the activities described in subsection (b).

(d) COORDINATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall—

(A) coordinate all planning and activities carried out under this section with appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies and those public and private entities that the Secretary determines may be affected by those plans or activities; and

(B) give priority to planning and activities under this section if the Secretary determines that—

(i) the greatest opportunities exist for achieving the objectives of the program, as specified in subsection (b)(1), and

(ii) the coordination activities under this subsection indicate that there is support for carrying out those planning and activities.

(2) NON-FEDERAL INTERESTS.—Prior to carrying out an activity under this section, the Secretary shall consult with any applicable non-Federal interest of the affected dam or related infrastructure.

(e) REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act and every 2 years thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report describing the actions carried out under this section.

(2) INCLUSIONS.—Each report under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) a schedule for reviewing the operations of individual projects; and

(B) any recommendations of the Secretary on changes that the Secretary determines to be necessary—

(i) to carry out existing project authorizations, including the deauthorization of any water resource project that the Secretary determines could more effectively be achieved through other means;

(ii) to improve the efficiency of water resource project operations; and

(iii) to maximize authorized project purposes and other related project benefits.

(3) UPDATED REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall update the report entitled “Authorized and Operating Purposes of Corps of Engineers Reservoirs” and dated July 1992, which was produced pursuant to section 311 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4639).

(B) INCLUSIONS.—The updated report described in subparagraph (A) shall include—

(i) the date on which the most recent review of project operations was conducted and any recommendations of the Secretary relating to that review the Secretary determines to be significant; and

(ii) the dates on which the recommendations described in clause (i) were carried out.

(f) FUNDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may use to carry out this section amounts made available to the Secretary from—

(A) the general purposes and expenses account;

(B) the operations and maintenance account; and

(C) any other amounts that are appropriated to carry out this section.

(2) FUNDING FROM OTHER SOURCES.—The Secretary may accept and expend amounts from non-Federal entities and other Federal agencies to carry out this section.

(g) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements with other Federal agencies and non-Federal entities to carry out this section.

AMENDMENT NO. 895

(Purpose: To clarify the role of the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma regarding the maintenance of the W.D. Mayo Lock and Dam in the State of Oklahoma)

At the end of title V, add the following:

SEC. 50. RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF CHEROKEE NATION OF OKLAHOMA REGARDING W.D. MAYO LOCK AND DAM, OKLAHOMA.

Section 1117 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-662; 100 Stat. 4236) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 1117. W.D. MAYO LOCK AND DAM, OKLAHOMA.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma has authorization—

“(1) to design and construct 1 or more hydroelectric generating facilities at the W.D. Mayo Lock and Dam on the Arkansas River in the State of Oklahoma, subject to the requirements of subsection (b) and in accordance with the conditions specified in this section; and

“(2) to market the electricity generated from any such hydroelectric generating facility.

“(b) PRECONSTRUCTION REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Cherokee Nation shall obtain any permit required by Federal or State law before the date on which construction begins on any hydroelectric generating facility under subsection (a).

“(2) REVIEW BY SECRETARY.—The Cherokee Nation may initiate the design or construction of a hydroelectric generating facility under subsection (a) only after the Secretary reviews and approves the plans and specifications for the design and construction.

“(c) PAYMENT OF DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION COSTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Cherokee Nation shall—

“(A) bear all costs associated with the design and construction of any hydroelectric generating facility under subsection (a); and

“(B) provide any funds necessary for the design and construction to the Secretary prior to the Secretary initiating any activities relating to the design and construction of the hydroelectric generating facility.

“(2) USE BY SECRETARY.—The Secretary may—

“(A) accept funds offered by the Cherokee Nation under paragraph (1); and

“(B) use the funds to carry out the design and construction of any hydroelectric generating facility under subsection (a).

“(d) ASSUMPTION OF LIABILITY.—The Cherokee Nation—

“(1) shall hold all title to any hydroelectric generating facility constructed under this section;

“(2) may, subject to the approval of the Secretary, assign that title to a third party;

“(3) shall be solely responsible for—

“(A) the operation, maintenance, repair, replacement, and rehabilitation of any such facility; and

“(B) the marketing of the electricity generated by any such facility; and

“(4) shall release and indemnify the United States from any claims, causes of action, or liabilities that may arise out of any activity undertaken to carry out this section.

“(e) ASSISTANCE AVAILABLE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may provide any technical and construction management assistance requested by the Cherokee Nation relating to the design and construction of any hydroelectric generating facility under subsection (a).

“(f) THIRD PARTY AGREEMENTS.—The Cherokee Nation may enter into agreements with the Secretary or a third party that the Cherokee Nation or the Secretary determines to be necessary to carry out this section.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 894

(Purpose: To express the sense of Congress that, in recognition of the contributions of Donald G. Waldon to the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, a lock and dam on that waterway should be designated as the “Donald G. Waldon Lock and Dam”)

At the end of title II, insert the following:
SEC. 2. DONALD G. WALDON LOCK AND DAM.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway Development Authority is a 4-State compact comprised of the States of Alabama, Kentucky, Mississippi, and Tennessee;

(2) the Tennessee-Tombigbee Authority is the regional non-Federal sponsor of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway;

(3) the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, completed in 1984, has fueled growth in the United States economy by reducing transportation costs and encouraging economic development; and

(4) the selfless determination and tireless work of Donald G. Waldon, while serving as administrator of the waterway compact for 21 years, contributed greatly to the realization and success of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that, at an appropriate time and in accordance with the rules of the House of Representatives and the Senate, the lock and dam located at mile 357.5 on the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway should be known and designated as the “Donald G. Waldon Lock and Dam”.

AMENDMENT NO. 867

(Purpose: To allow the Secretary to accept and expend non-Federal amounts for repair, restoration, or replacement of certain water resources projects)

At the end of title XI, add the following:
SEC. 11004. AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT AND EXPEND NON-FEDERAL AMOUNTS.

The Secretary is authorized to accept and expend amounts provided by non-Federal interests for the purpose of repairing, restoring, or replacing water resources projects that have been damaged or destroyed as a result of a major disaster or other emergency if the Secretary determines that the acceptance and expenditure of those amounts is in the public interest.

AMENDMENT NO. 872

(Purpose: To improve planning and administration relating to water supply storage activities)

At the end of title II, add the following:
SEC. 2. IMPROVING PLANNING AND ADMINISTRATION OF WATER SUPPLY STORAGE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out activities to enable non-Federal interests to anticipate and accurately budget for annual operations and maintenance costs and, as applicable, repair, rehabilitation, and replacements costs, including through—

(1) the formulation by the Secretary of a uniform billing statement format for those storage agreements relating to operations and maintenance costs, and as applicable, repair, rehabilitation, and replacement costs, incurred by the Secretary, which, at a minimum, shall include—

(A) a detailed description of the activities carried out relating to the water supply aspects of the project;

(B) a clear explanation of why and how those activities relate to the water supply aspects of the project; and

(C) a detailed accounting of the cost of carrying out those activities; and

(2) a review by the Secretary of the regulations and guidance of the Corps of Engineers relating to criteria and methods for the equitable distribution of joint project costs across project purposes in order to ensure consistency in the calculation of the appropriate share of joint project costs allocable to the water supply purpose.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the findings of the reviews carried out under subsection (a)(2) and any subsequent actions taken by the Secretary relating to those reviews.

(2) INCLUSIONS.—The report under paragraph (1) shall include an analysis of the feasibility and costs associated with the provision by the Secretary to each non-Federal interest of not less than 1 statement each year that details for each water storage agreement with non-Federal interests at Corps of Engineers projects the estimated amount of the operations and maintenance costs and, as applicable, the estimated amount of the repair, rehabilitation, and replacement costs, for which the non-Federal interest will be responsible in that fiscal year.

(3) EXTENSION.—The Secretary may delay the submission of the report under paragraph (1) for a period not to exceed 180 days after the deadline described in paragraph (1), subject to the condition that the Secretary submits a preliminary progress report to Congress not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 912

(Purpose: To authorize the Secretary to assist Indian tribes in addressing shoreline erosion in the Upper Missouri River Basin)

On page 234, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

SEC. 5009. UPPER MISSOURI BASIN SHORELINE EROSION PREVENTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION OF ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary may provide planning, design, and construction assistance to not more than 3 federally-recognized Indian tribes in the Upper Missouri River Basin to undertake measures to address shoreline erosion that is jeopardizing existing infrastructure resulting from operation of a reservoir constructed under the Pick-Sloan Missouri River Basin Program (authorized by section 9 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (commonly known as the “Flood Control Act of 1944”) (58 Stat. 891, chapter 665)).

(2) LIMITATION.—The projects described in paragraph (1) shall be economically justified, technically feasible, and environmentally acceptable.

(b) FEDERAL AND NON-FEDERAL COST SHARE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Federal share of the costs of carrying out this section shall be not less than 75 percent.

(2) ABILITY TO PAY.—The Secretary may adjust the Federal and non-Federal shares of the costs of carrying out this section in accordance with the terms and conditions of

section 103(m) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213(m)).

(c) **CONDITIONS.**—The Secretary may provide the assistance described in subsection (a) only after—

(1) consultation with the Department of the Interior; and

(2) execution by the Indian tribe of a memorandum of agreement with the Secretary that specifies that the tribe shall—

(A) be responsible for—

(i) all operation and maintenance activities required to ensure the integrity of the measures taken; and

(ii) providing any required real estate interests in and to the property on which such measures are to be taken; and

(B) hold and save the United States free from damages arising from planning, design, or construction assistance provided under this section, except for damages due to the fault or negligence of the United States or its contractors.

(d) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—For each Indian tribe eligible under this section, there is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section not more than \$30,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 880

(Purpose: To deauthorize portions of the project for East Fork of Trinity River, Texas)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. EAST FORK OF TRINITY RIVER, TEXAS.

The portion of the project for flood protection on the East Fork of the Trinity River, Texas, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1185), that consists of the 2 levees identified as “Kaufman County Levees K5E and K5W” shall no longer be authorized as a part of the Federal project as of the date of enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 904

(Purpose: To declare certain areas in Seward, Alaska, as nonnavigable waters of the United States for purposes of navigational servitude)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3010. SEWARD WATERFRONT, SEWARD, ALASKA.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The parcel of land included in the Seward Harbor, Alaska navigation project identified as Tract H, Seward Original Townsite, Waterfront Park Replat, Plat No 2012-4, Seward Recording District, shall not be subject to the navigation servitude (as of the date of enactment of this Act).

(b) **ENTRY BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.**—The Federal Government may enter upon any portion of the land referred to in subsection (a) to carry out any required operation and maintenance of the general navigation features of the project.

AMENDMENT NO. 884

(Purpose: To require the closure of the Upper St. Anthony Falls Lock and Dam if certain conditions are met)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER PROTECTION.

(a) **DEFINITION OF UPPER ST. ANTHONY FALLS LOCK AND DAM.**—In this section, the term “Upper St. Anthony Falls Lock and Dam” means the lock and dam located on Mississippi River mile 853.9 in Minneapolis, Minnesota.

(b) **ECONOMIC IMPACT STUDY.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report regarding the impact of closing the Upper St. Anthony Falls Lock and Dam on the economic and environmental well-being of the State of Minnesota.

(c) **MANDATORY CLOSURE.**—Notwithstanding subsection (b) and not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall close the Upper St. Anthony Falls Lock and Dam if the Secretary determines that the annual average tonnage moving through the Upper St. Anthony Falls Lock and Dam for the preceding 5 years is not more than 1,500,000 tons.

(d) **EMERGENCY OPERATIONS.**—Nothing in this section prevents the Secretary from carrying out emergency lock operations necessary to mitigate flood damage.

AMENDMENT NO. 870, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To modify a provision relating to Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund prioritization)

Beginning on page 299, strike line 9 and all that follows through page 301, line 16, and insert the following:

“(D) **LOW-USE PORT.**—The term ‘low-use port’ means a port at which not more than 1,000,000 tons of cargo are transported each calendar year.

“(E) **MODERATE-USE PORT.**—The term ‘moderate-use port’ means a port at which more than 1,000,000, but fewer than 10,000,000, tons of cargo are transported each calendar year.

“(2) **PRIORITY.**—Of the amounts made available under this section to carry out projects described in subsection (a)(2) that are in excess of the amounts made available to carry out those projects in fiscal year 2012, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall give priority to those projects in the following order:

“(A)(i) In any fiscal year in which all projects subject to the harbor maintenance fee under section 24.24 of title 19, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation) are not maintained to their constructed width and depth, the Secretary shall prioritize amounts made available under this section for those projects that are high-use deep draft and are a priority for navigation in the Great Lakes Navigation System.

“(ii) Of the amounts made available under clause (i)—

“(I) 80 percent shall be used for projects that are high-use deep draft; and

“(II) 20 percent shall be used for projects that are a priority for navigation in the Great Lakes Navigation System.

“(B) In any fiscal year in which all projects identified as high-use deep draft are maintained to their constructed width and depth, the Secretary shall—

“(i) equally divide among each of the districts of the Corps of Engineers in which eligible projects are located 10 percent of remaining amounts made available under this section for moderate-use and low-use port projects—

“(I) that have been maintained at less than their constructed width and depth due to insufficient federal funding during the preceding 6 fiscal years; and

“(II) for which significant State and local investments in infrastructure have been made at those projects during the preceding 6 fiscal years; and

“(ii) prioritize any remaining amounts made available under this section for those projects that are not maintained to the minimum width and depth necessary to provide sufficient clearance for fully loaded commercial vessels using those projects to maneuver safely.

“(3) **ADMINISTRATION.**—For purposes of this subsection, State and local investments in infrastructure shall include infrastructure investments made using amounts made available for activities under section 105(a)(9) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5305(a)(9)).

“(4) **EXCEPTIONS.**—The Secretary may prioritize a project not identified in para-

graph (2) if the Secretary determines that funding for the project is necessary to address—

“(A) hazardous navigation conditions; or

“(B) impacts of natural disasters, including storms and droughts.

“(5) **REPORTS TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than September 30, 2013, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report that describes, with respect to the preceding fiscal year—

“(A) the amount of funds used to maintain high-use deep draft projects and projects at moderate-use ports and low-use ports to the constructed depth and width of the projects;

“(B) the respective percentage of total funds provided under this section used for high use deep draft projects and projects at moderate-use ports and low-use ports;

“(C) the remaining amount of funds made available to carry out this section, if any; and

“(D) any additional amounts needed to maintain the high-use deep draft projects and projects at moderate-use ports and low-use ports to the constructed depth and width of the projects.”

AMENDMENT NO. 911, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To provide Crediting Authority for Federally Authorized Navigation Projects)

At the appropriate place, insert:

Crediting Authority for Federally Authorized Navigation Projects

SEC. . A non-Federal interest for a navigation project may carry out operation maintenance activities for that project subject to all applicable requirements that would apply to the Secretary carrying out such operations and maintenance, and may receive credit for the costs incurred by the non-Federal interest in carrying out such activities towards that non-Federal interest's share of construction costs for a federally authorized element of the same project or another federally authorized navigation project, except that in no instance may such credit exceed 20 percent of the costs associated with construction of the general navigation features of the project for which such credit may be received pursuant to this section.

AMENDMENT NO. 882

(Purpose: To modify the allocation of funds to the Susquehanna River Basin Commission, Delaware River Basin Commission, and the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin to fulfill equitable funding requirements of the respective interstate compacts of the Commissions)

On page 190, after line 23, add the following:

SEC. 20. RIVER BASIN COMMISSIONS.

Section 5019 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1201) is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) **AUTHORIZATION TO ALLOCATE.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary shall allocate funds from the General Expenses account of the civil works program of the Army Corps of Engineers to the Susquehanna River Basin Commission, Delaware River Basin Commission, and the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin to fulfill the equitable funding requirements of the respective interstate compacts on an annual basis and in amounts equal to the amount determined by Commission in accordance with the respective interstate compact.

“(2) **LIMITATION.**—Not more than 1.5 percent of funds from the General Expenses account of the civil works program of the Army Corps of Engineers may be allocated in carrying out paragraph (1) for any fiscal year.

“(3) REPORT.—For any fiscal year in which funds are not allocated in accordance with paragraph (1), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report that describes—

“(A) the reasons why the Corps of Engineers chose not to allocate funds in accordance with that paragraph; and

“(B) the impact of the decision not to allocate funds on water supply allocation, water quality protection, regulatory review and permitting, water conservation, watershed planning, drought management, flood loss reduction, and recreation in each area of jurisdiction of the respective Commission.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 903, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To authorize the Secretary to enter into deep draft port development partnerships)

On page 243, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

SEC. 5017. ARCTIC DEEP DRAFT PORT DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIPS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may provide technical assistance, including planning, design, and construction assistance, to non-Federal public entities, including Indian tribes (as defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b)), for the development, construction, operation, and maintenance of channels, harbors, and related infrastructure associated with deep draft ports for purposes of dealing with Arctic development and security needs.

(b) ACCEPTANCE OF FUNDS.—The Secretary is authorized to accept and expend funds provided by non-Federal public entities, including Indian tribes (as defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b)), to carry out the activities described in subsection (a).

(c) LIMITATION.—No assistance may be provided under this section until after the date on which the entity to which that assistance is to be provided enters into a written agreement with the Secretary that includes such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be appropriate and in the public interest.

(d) PRIORITIZATION.—The Secretary shall prioritize Arctic deep draft ports identified by the Army Corps, The Department of Homeland Security and the Department of Defense.

AMENDMENT NO. 906, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To provide for a severe flooding and drought management study of the greater Mississippi River Basin)

At the end of title V, add the following:

SEC. 5 _____ . GREATER MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN SEVERE FLOODING AND DROUGHT MANAGEMENT STUDY.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) GREATER MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN.—The term “greater Mississippi River Basin” means the area covered by hydrologic units 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, and 11, as identified by the United States Geological Survey as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER.—The term “lower Mississippi River” means the portion of the Mississippi River that begins at the confluence of the Ohio River and flows to the Gulf of Mexico.

(3) MIDDLE MISSISSIPPI RIVER.—The term “middle Mississippi River” means the portion of the Mississippi River that begins at the confluence of the Missouri River and flows to the lower Mississippi River.

(4) SEVERE FLOODING AND DROUGHT.—The term “severe flooding and drought” means

severe weather events that threaten personal safety, property, and navigation on the inland waterways of the United States.

(b) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out a study of the greater Mississippi River Basin—

(1) to improve the coordinated and comprehensive management of water resource projects in the greater Mississippi River Basin relating to severe flooding and drought conditions; and

(2) to evaluate the feasibility of any modifications to those water resource projects, consistent with the authorized purposes of those projects, and develop new water resource projects to improve the reliability of navigation and more effectively reduce flood risk.

(c) CONTENTS.—The study shall—

(1) identify any Federal actions that are likely to prevent and mitigate the impacts of severe flooding and drought, including changes to authorized channel dimensions, operational procedures of locks and dams, and reservoir management within the greater Mississippi River Basin, consistent with the authorized purposes of the water resource projects;

(2) identify and make recommendations to remedy challenges to the Corps of Engineers presented by severe flooding and drought, including river access, in carrying out its mission to maintain safe, reliable navigation, consistent with the authorized purposes of the water resource projects in the greater Mississippi River Basin; and

(3) identify and locate natural or other physical impediments along the middle and lower Mississippi River to maintaining navigation on the middle and lower Mississippi River during periods of low water.

(d) CONSULTATION AND USE OF EXISTING DATA.—In carrying out the study, the Secretary shall—

(1) consult with appropriate committees of Congress, Federal, State, tribal, and local agencies, environmental interests, agricultural interests, recreational interests, river navigation industry representatives, other shipping and business interests, organized labor, and nongovernmental organizations;

(2) to the maximum extent practicable, use data in existence as of the date of enactment of this Act; and

(3) incorporate lessons learned and best practices developed as a result of past severe flooding and drought events, including major floods and the successful effort to maintain navigation during the near historic low water levels on the Mississippi River during the winter of 2012–2013.

(e) COST-SHARING.—The Federal share of the cost of carrying out the study under this section shall be 100 percent.

(f) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the study carried out under this section.

(g) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this section impacts the operations and maintenance of the Missouri River Mainstem System, as authorized by the Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 897, chapter 665).

AMENDMENT NO. 893

(Purpose: To provide for the policy relating to the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund prioritization)

On page 297, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

(a) POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States that the primary use of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund is for maintaining the constructed widths and depths of the commercial ports and harbors of the United States, and those functions should be given first consideration in the budgeting of Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund allocations.

AMENDMENT NO. 898

(Purpose: To provide for the reopening of the Cape Arundel Disposal Site as a dredged material disposal site)

At the end of title V, add the following:

SEC. 50 _____ . CAPE ARUNDEL DISPOSAL SITE, MAINE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in concurrence with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, is authorized to reopen the Cape Arundel Disposal Site selected by the Department of the Army as an alternative dredged material disposal site under section 103(b) of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 (33 U.S.C. 1413(b)) (referred to in this section as the “Site”).

(b) DEADLINE.—The Site may remain open under subsection (a) until the earlier of—

(1) the date on which the Site does not have any remaining disposal capacity;

(2) the date on which an environmental impact statement designating an alternative dredged material disposal site for southern Maine has been completed; or

(3) the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) LIMITATIONS.—The use of the Site as a dredged material disposal site under subsection (a) shall be subject to the conditions that—

(1) conditions at the Site remain suitable for the continued use of the Site as a dredged material disposal site; and

(2) the Site not be used for the disposal of more than 80,000 cubic yards from any single dredging project.

AMENDMENT NO. 861 AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To improve a provision relating to project acceleration)

On page 121, strike lines 1 through 3, and insert the following:

“(II) conflict with the ability of a cooperating agency to carry out applicable Federal laws (including regulations).

On page 138, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

“(q) AUTHORIZATION.—The authority provided by this section expires on the date that is 10 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 907

(Purpose: To provide for future project authorizations)

At the end of title I insert the following:

SEC. 2 _____ . FUTURE PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) POLICY.—The benefits of water resource projects designed and carried out in an economically justifiable, environmentally acceptable, and technically sound manner are important to the economy and environment of the United States and recommendations to Congress regarding those projects should be expedited for approval in a timely manner.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The procedures under this section apply to projects for water resources development, conservation, and other purposes, subject to the conditions that—

(1) each project is carried out—

(A) substantially in accordance with the plan identified in the report of the Chief of Engineers for the project; and

(B) subject to any conditions described in the report for the project; and

(2)(A) a report of the Chief of Engineers has been completed; and

(B) after the date of enactment of this Act, the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works has submitted to Congress a recommendation to authorize construction of the project.

(c) EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A bill shall be eligible for expedited consideration in accordance with this subsection if the bill—

(A) authorizes a project that meets the requirements described in subsection (b); and

(B) is referred to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate.

(2) COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than January 31st of the second session of each Congress, the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate shall—

(i) report all bills that meet the requirements of paragraph (1); or

(ii) introduce and report a measure to authorize any project that meets the requirements described in subsection (b).

(B) FAILURE TO ACT.—Subject to subparagraph (C), if the Committee fails to act on a bill that meets the requirements of paragraph (1) by the date specified in subparagraph (A), the bill shall be discharged from the Committee and placed on the calendar of the Senate.

(C) EXCEPTIONS.—Subparagraph (B) shall not apply if—

(i) in the 180-day period immediately preceding the date specified in subparagraph (A), the full Committee holds a legislative hearing on a bill to authorize all projects that meet the requirements described in subsection (b);

(ii)(I) the Committee favorably reports a bill to authorize all projects that meet the requirements described in subsection (b); and (II) the bill described in subclause (I) is placed on the calendar of the Senate; or

(iii) a bill that meets the requirements of paragraph (1) is referred to the Committee not earlier than 30 days before the date specified in subparagraph (A).

(d) TERMINATION.—The procedures for expedited consideration under this section terminate on December 31, 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 896

(Purpose: To require the Government Accountability Office to carry out a study evaluating the effectiveness of activities funded by the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund in maximizing economic growth and job creation in port communities)

At the end of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 8. HARBOR MAINTENANCE TRUST FUND STUDY.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) LOW-USE PORT.—The term “low-use port” means a port at which not more than 1,000,000 tons of cargo are transported each calendar year.

(2) MODERATE-USE PORT.—The term “moderate-use port” means a port at which more than 1,000,000, but fewer than 10,000,000, tons of cargo are transported each calendar year.

(b) STUDY.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall carry out a study and submit to Congress a report that—

(1) evaluates the effectiveness of activities funded by the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund in maximizing economic growth and job creation in the communities surrounding low- and moderate-use ports; and

(2) includes recommendations relating to the use of amounts in the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund to increase the competitiveness of United States ports relative to Canadian and Mexican ports.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, it is my understanding—and I ask the floor staff to correct me—is it so that we just now passed the first number of amendments that don't require votes? Was that just done in the unanimous consent? Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mrs. BOXER. I am very pleased with that. We had about 15 of these amendments—quite bipartisan. Half of the amendments were Democratic and half Republican, so that is good.

Now what we are going to do is take up the amendments that require votes. It is my understanding that Senator VITTER wants to speak on the Barrasso amendment, which is fine.

I say to my colleagues through the Chair that they now have approximately 2 hours to come down and make the case on their votes. Senators INHOFE, BARRASSO, SANDERS, COBURN, BOOZMAN, MERKLEY, UDALL, and HOEVEN is where we are. If they wish to be heard, then it is time to come over and be heard.

At this time, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, first of all, let me thank my colleague from California, the chair, and all of my colleagues for allowing us to move forward with a very open amendment process. It is not quite as open a process as I would have wanted—namely on the Landrieu amendment because of the objection from my colleague from Pennsylvania. By any Senate standard, this has been a very open amendment process, and that is very healthy.

I join the chair in urging all of our colleagues who would like to debate upcoming votes to come to the floor now. The time is between now and 5 p.m. Please come to the floor. I am doing that right now. I want to talk about one of those amendments on which we will vote, the Barrasso amendment, which is about waters of the United States. This is an important issue.

JOHN BARRASSO and I and many others believe the EPA should not be able to define and expand its regulatory jurisdiction—in this case, we are talking about the Clean Water Act—without undertaking a formal rulemaking process that provides individuals, businesses, and other stakeholders the opportunity to give meaningful input.

The Clean Water Act authorizes the EPA to regulate the discharge of pollutants into “navigable waters.” Again, that is a very clear term—“navigable waters.” The act defines “navigable waters” as “the waters of the United States, including the territorial seas.” The trouble is clearly understanding what constitutes the waters of the United States. For decades, courts have considered the meaning of “the waters of the United States,” and yet uncertainty still remains.

Recently, in 2006—about 7 years ago—in the Rapanos decision, the Supreme Court considered whether the Army Corps of Engineers properly determined the wetlands in Michigan as being waters of the United States. Although the Court determined that the corps viewed its regulatory authority under the Clean Water Act too broadly, a majority of the Justices still could not come to a precise agreement into ex-

actly what “waters of the United States” means. So they agreed about what it didn't mean in the context of that case—that the corps had gone too far afield—but they didn't clearly agree on exactly what it meant.

More recently, Justice Alito, in the Sackett case, observed that the reach of the Clean Water Act remains “notoriously unclear.” Justice Alito and others have called on Congress to examine the Clean Water Act statutory language to make it precise and clear up the confusion. He also noted that EPA “has not seen fit to promulgate a rule providing a clear and sufficiently limited definition of the phrase”—that phrase being “the waters of the United States.”

Instead, the EPA has done something different. Unfortunately, this is a trend at the EPA. The EPA issued what it calls guidance on this issue. Now, according to the EPA, the guidance “clarifies how the EPA and Corps understand existing requirements of the Clean Water Act and the agencies' implementing regulations” in light of relevant decisions.

The problem is this: Guidance is short of what the EPA should do, which is to promulgate rules and regs. It is short of that for a very particular reason—because there is no clear-cut, nailed-down process for guidance. The EPA can just make up what it wants without having to take input from affected parties. Under the law, there are clear-cut guidelines and rules for promulgating rules and regulations, and that is what the EPA should do.

In this instance, there are two problems. First of all, the guidance is simply mistaken. It is way too expansive, in the view of many folks, including myself and the author of this amendment, Senator BARRASSO. Also, very importantly, guidance doesn't have to go through a process. Guidance doesn't illicit input from citizens, impacted parties, and stakeholders. That is another crucial issue involved.

This Barrasso amendment would clear up that point on two fronts. It would go to the substance of the guidance—and we think EPA is getting it wrong with regard to that substance—but it would also help underscore that there is a process for the EPA to issue rules and regulations, and that is what the EPA should be doing on important matters such as this—not shortcutting, circumventing that process by simply issuing guidance.

So if the EPA wishes to examine the meaning of “waters of the United States” in the Clean Water Act, it needs to do so in a fair and transparent manner, and in a way that provides all Americans the chance to offer meaningful regulatory input. Guidance doesn't do that. This guidance gets it wrong. But, just as importantly, guidance doesn't fulfill the need for transparency and openness and the ability to accept input. This Barrasso amendment would provide EPA with precisely that opportunity: Make them accept

input and make them get it right. That is why I strongly support the Barrasso amendment.

Again, I invite all of our colleagues to come down to the floor to debate any part of this bill, any aspect of pending amendments. We are open for business now until 5 p.m. I think that is going to be a lot of time. We will have a series of votes starting today and going into tomorrow, and I very much appreciate the chair of the committee and others who have allowed this very open amendment process on the floor of the Senate.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. 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. 868

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I wish to call up amendment No. 868.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRASSO], for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. VITTER, Mr. CRAPO, Mrs. FISCHER, and Mr. WICKER, proposes an amendment numbered 868.

Mr. BARRASSO. 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 preserve existing rights and responsibilities with respect to waters of the United States)

On page 452, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following:

SEC. 2055. IDENTIFICATION OF WATERS PROTECTED BY THE CLEAN WATER ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Neither the Secretary of the Army nor the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall—

(1) finalize the proposed guidance described in the notice of availability and request for comments entitled “EPA and Army Corps of Engineers Guidance Regarding Identification of Waters Protected by the Clean Water Act” (EPA–HQ–OW–2011–0409) (76 Fed. Reg. 24479 (May 2, 2011)); or

(2) use the guidance described in paragraph (1), or any substantially similar guidance, as the basis for any decision regarding the scope of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) or any rulemaking.

(b) RULES.—The use of the guidance described in subsection (a)(1), or any substantially similar guidance, as the basis for any rule shall be grounds for vacation of the rule.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, this amendment restricts expansion of Federal authority, and it is a Federal authority attempting to encompass all the wet areas of farms, ranches, and suburban homes all across America, so this amendment is designed to restrict that expansion of Federal authority.

Specifically, the amendment eliminates this administration’s guidance to

implement this expansion of Federal authority. Through proposed guidance—that is the key phrase here, “guidance”—Federal agencies are preparing to expand the definition of “waters of the United States.” I think it would make sense that people would inherently understand what waters of the United States would be. But the Federal Government is preparing to expand the definition to include ditches, including dry areas—other dry areas where water happens to flow and when it only flows even for a short duration after a rainfall. The American people know that should not be considered waters of the United States. Federal regulations have never defined ditches and other upland drainage features as “waters of the United States.” But this draft guidance coming out of Washington does do that, and it will have a huge impact on farmers, ranchers, and small businesses that need to put a shovel in the ground to make a living. The EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers’ guidance amounts to a Federal user fee for farmers and ranchers to farm the land they own.

Just as troubling as ignoring congressional intent, the guidance absolutely disregards the fundamental tenet embodied in two decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court. One is the SWANCC decision and the other is the Rapanos decision. Those are decisions that say there are actual limits to Federal jurisdiction. It is particularly troubling to me and to others around the country—and certainly at home in Wyoming it is particularly troubling—that the guidance allows the Army Corps of Engineers and the EPA to regulate waters now considered entirely under State jurisdiction. As somebody who has served in the State legislature, talking to the Presiding Officer as someone who has served as a Governor of his State, we know the key importance of State jurisdiction in making local decisions.

This guidance would grant the Environmental Protection Agency and the U.S. Corps of Engineers virtually unlimited—virtually unlimited—regulatory control over all wet areas within a State.

In addition, if this guidance is allowed to go forward—the guidance I am attempting to prevent to protect Americans from today—enormous resources are going to be needed to expand the Clean Water Act Federal regulatory program, which could lead to longer delays, and the delays today are significant. Increased delays in securing permits are going to impede a host of economic activities in Wyoming as well as in all of our other States. Commercial and residential real estate development, agriculture, electric transmission, transportation, and mining will all be affected. These are not sectors of our economy we ever want to deliberately hurt, but we certainly would not want to vote for guidance that would harm these sectors while we are in economic times such as these.

That is why I come to the floor with this amendment. I will be urging a “yes” vote on this amendment No. 868 at the appropriate time, to continue with the rights and responsibilities of the States and the private landowners impacting this significant water which is the lifeblood of our States.

Thank you very much. I yield the floor, and I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I rise now to speak in opposition to the Barrasso amendment No. 868 and to explain why.

Before I talk about why I hope the Senate will defeat this amendment, I wish to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for working so closely with me and with Senator VITTER.

The underlying bill is a very good bill and it protects every State. We look at every State’s needs. Whether it is flooding, whether it is preserving fishing, whether it is about ports, whether the ports are inland or coastal, medium, small, or large, we have gone out of our way on both sides of the aisle to accommodate Senators.

I wish to speak about Barrasso amendment No. 868, which will be the first amendment to come before us.

It is an anti-environmental rider. Now, here we go again, again and again and again. There is no reason to bring these anti-environmental riders onto every single piece of legislation that goes through here, but yet that is what we face. So I agreed that we would have a vote on this in the spirit of good faith because it certainly is not germane to this bill. It is not.

It has to do with the Clean Water Act. It does not have to do with the Water Resources Development Act. This Barrasso amendment says the guidance that has been developed by the Army Corps of Engineers and by the Environmental Protection Agency as they get ready for a rulemaking after a Court decision is null and void—without a hearing, without giving the corps a chance to explain their guidance, without giving the EPA a chance to explain their guidance. Without looking at the Court’s decision his amendment would say the guidance is blocked because he does not like the guidance.

Well, trust me. I am sure I do not like everything in the guidance either. But let the process go forward. The guidance is necessary so there can be a rulemaking, which is essential. Right now there is nothing but chaos after the Court’s ruling. People do not know what the Clean Water Act covers.

So the Army Corps, working with the EPA, has issued some guidance. It is

not the final rule, it is guidance. The Barrasso amendment throws the guidance out, throws it into the garbage can, says it cannot be used. If anything like it is ever used, there can be no rulemaking. The Barrasso amendment stops, therefore, the rulemaking. He may not say it explicitly, but if you cannot use any of the guidance, any of the work that has been done, then you cannot have a rule.

Let me tell you who opposes not having a rule: the business community. The business community opposes it. Everyone opposes it. Everybody wants a rule. The vague restriction will make it impossible to initiate a rulemaking, to define what waters are protected under the Clean Water Act. The Barrasso amendment locks into place the current confusion created in the wake of two Supreme Court decisions. He does it by prohibiting any future update of the Clean Water Act regulations or related guidance.

Industry associations and 30 Republican Senators who are opposed to the guidance developed by the Obama administration have called for a rulemaking. They have called for a rulemaking. The letters were just sent to the EPA last month. What we believe to be absolutely accurate is if you throw out the guidance, if you vote for this Barrasso amendment and you say no guidance that looks anything like this will ever be used, there can be no rulemaking.

For decades the Clean Water Act has provided broad protections for the Nation's waters. The Barrasso amendment stops the corps from restoring these longstanding protections, leaving many waters at risk. Let me tell you what that means. Streams that provide drinking water for up to 117 million Americans may not be covered by the Clean Water Act. That is dangerous for the people because there is all kinds of pollution that gets dumped into these streams. There are 20 million acres of wetlands that provide flood protection and serve as wildlife habitat. There will be no rules governing them because of the way the Barrasso amendment is written.

Any effort to clear up uncertainty that has resulted in delays and confusion and slowed efforts to hold polluters accountable will be null and void, can have no effect. You cannot use the guidance. You have to throw it away. If anything comes forward that remotely resembles it, you have to throw it away. Then you cannot make a rule. This is harmful.

In closing, I want to talk about from what harm we want to protect the people. We know some of the dangerous pollution that gets dumped into our Nation's waters sometimes on purpose, sometimes on accident. But we have chemical pollution and all kinds of industrial pollution. It includes such chemicals as arsenic—very dangerous for people. I will have more to say on the specifics, but we know there is waterborne disease. People get very ill if

the drinking water is not good, if the swimming water is not good. The warmer our waters are getting, the more dangerous it is. Certain organisms that live in these warmer waters never existed before.

We had a case in Ohio where a child got deathly ill because the water was so warm it attracted these different kinds of bacteria and organisms. So when I stand here, I speak from the heart. All of us do. But I know we should not vote on something that precludes us from protecting the health and safety and the lives of our people who are the most vulnerable, the children—the children, the pregnant women, the elderly. My goodness, if we are here for any reason, it would certainly be to do no harm to them.

The Barrasso amendment does a lot of harm. It does not belong on the Water Resources Development Act, which is about building projects to protect people using flood control. It is about dredging our waters. It is making sure commerce can move. This is an anti-environmental rider. It does not belong on this bill. It is dangerous for the people.

I urge my colleagues to vote no when the vote comes before us.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE ACTIVITIES

MR. CORNYN. Mr. President, I see the Senator from Vermont here. I will not be long. I did have a few comments to offer about the unusual developments of the last few days in Washington, DC. Back in 2011 and 2012 my office was contacted by some constituents who were active politically with organizers such as the King Street Patriots, True the Vote, the tea party, particularly in Waco and San Antonio. They were concerned that they were being targeted by the Federal Government, specifically the Internal Revenue Service, for their political activity. They were concerned that the activities of the Internal Revenue Service seemed excessive, unreasonable, and improper. They feared the government officials were targeting them for doing nothing more than exercising their constitutional rights under the First Amendment of the Constitution.

So I did what I think any Senator would do, any Member of Congress: I wrote a letter to the Internal Revenue Service and asked them, first of all, about any indication they had that this was the case. Douglas Shulman, the Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service, testified later before Congress and categorically denied any type of targeting was, in fact, taking place.

Well, last Friday we learned that my constituents were correct and the Internal Revenue Service was wrong. It turns out the Internal Revenue Service really was targeting American citizens for exercising their most fundamental rights. Even though the Internal Revenue Service did not acknowledge this until last Friday, the Associated Press

has reported that senior agency officials learned about the abuses as early as June 2011, nearly 2 years ago.

Let me be clear. These abuses are not simply inappropriate, they are a breach of faith with the American people. They are potentially violations of our criminal law.

Now, as my friend from Vermont knows, if the IRS, if the government can target conservative groups such as the King Street Patriots and the tea party, they can target anybody anywhere across the political spectrum. That is why you are seeing such bipartisan outrage over this news. But not only was the IRS targeting tea party groups, they targeted other people based on their advocacy of restoring the Federal Government to its basic constitutional framework, people concerned about government spending. Meanwhile, there is evidence that the IRS also in some cases targeted Jewish organizations as well. I would hope we would all on a bipartisan basis rise and say this is unacceptable and it is immoral. It is the kind of behavior we associate not with the greatest democracy in the world but with corrupt tinpot dictators.

President Obama has said, to his credit, that all guilty parties will be held fully accountable. Well, I wish I could take some comfort from the President's comments. Unfortunately, the administration has repeatedly stonewalled and misled U.S. officials investigating programs like the Fast and Furious gunwalking scandal and the 2012 attacks in Benghazi, Libya.

The President of the United States got four Pinocchios today from the Fact Checker in the Washington Post. That has to be a first. So why should we expect the Internal Revenue Service investigation to be any different? Unfortunately, this administration has shown a tendency to put politics ahead of the rule of law too many times.

For example, during the government-run Chrysler bankruptcy process, the company-secured bondholders received much less for their loans than did the United Auto Workers Pension Fund, a favorite of the Obama administration. As Solyndra was going bankrupt, the administration violated the law by making taxpayers subordinate to private lenders. So the taxpayers got gored first before private lenders were at risk.

Last year the administration made unconstitutional recess appointments to the National Labor Relations Board and to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. Last year the administration illegally waived key requirements of the 1996 welfare reform law.

Finally, to help implement ObamaCare, the IRS has announced that it will violate the text of the law and issue health insurance subsidies through Federal exchanges, something Congress did not authorize. The law clearly states that these subsidies are not available to the Federal exchange but to the State-based exchanges. Indeed, it is the case that the President's

health care law will dramatically expand the power of the Internal Revenue Service because the agency is responsible for implementing so much of ObamaCare's most important provisions.

Well, given what we have learned about IRS malfeasance, does it really sound like a good idea to give them more responsibility, to hire more agents? Before we get to the bottom of the present scandal, do we really want the IRS to administer a law that will affect one-sixth of our economy, as ObamaCare will?

Do we really want the Internal Revenue Service agents collecting so much personal information about millions of American citizens? Remember, even before ObamaCare became the law, the IRS had more than enough power to destroy the lives of individual Americans. Chief Justice John Marshall, at the very beginning of our country, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States said the power to tax involves the power to destroy, and those words are still true today. With trust in the Federal Government already at an all-time low, the IRS scandal will further diminish public confidence in public institutions and in Washington, DC.

As a result, this scandal will make it much harder for us to work together to adopt a fiscal policy and economic reforms that our country so desperately needs. When the IRS starts behaving as a rogue agent that considers itself above the law, we have entered truly dangerous territory. Today I am going to join others of my colleagues to call on the Acting IRS Commissioner Steven Miller to resign. If it is true what currently appears to be true, that Mr. Miller willfully misled Congress when inquiries were made earlier about this political activity, he should resign today.

Furthermore, I am encouraged actually by Chairman MAX BAUCUS of the Senate Finance Committee and Senator ORRIN HATCH who said they believe it is important for the Finance Committee as the appropriate standing committee of the Senate with jurisdiction over the Internal Revenue Service to conduct an investigation.

I hope the first witness they will call is Treasury Secretary Jack Lew, who is the boss of the IRS, or overseer of the IRS, Mr. Miller's direct reporting boss. I look forward to a thorough bipartisan investigation that will deliver justice to these government officials who betrayed the American people in such a shameful and egregious manner.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

AMENDMENT NO. 889

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 889.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS], for himself and Mr. LEAHY, proposes an amendment numbered 889.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, 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 address restoration of certain properties impacted by natural disasters, and for other purposes)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . RESTORATION OF CERTAIN PROPERTIES IMPACTED BY NATURAL DISASTERS.

For all major disasters declared under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act on or after August 27, 2011, the Corps of Engineers and the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall consider eligible the costs necessary to comply with any State stream or river alteration permit required for the repair or replacement of otherwise eligible damaged infrastructure, such as culverts and bridges, including any design standards required to be met as a condition of permit issuance.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, this amendment is cosponsored by my colleague from Vermont, Mr. LEAHY. What it does is it addresses a very serious problem facing the State of Vermont and I think potentially States all over the country.

Mr. President, as you well know, Tropical Storm Irene impacted some 225 Vermont communities with 90 bridges and 963 culverts damaged or destroyed statewide. In a small State, that is a lot of damage.

Long before Irene, the Vermont State legislature enacted stream alteration standards that prevented flood hazards, damage to fish and wildlife, and damage to adjacent property owners. These standards result in resilient infrastructure and are looked to as a model by other States. In other words, what the State legislature did appropriately is pass standards that would do the job, that would protect communities in times of floods and natural disasters.

As we all know, FEMA compensates communities for the rebuilding of bridges and culverts damaged during large storms such as Irene, but FEMA—and here is the main point—in many cases is insisting on overriding Vermont's stronger standards, requiring communities to build inferior projects that are unlikely to withstand the next major storm to hit the State. In other words, communities are standing there wanting to do the right thing. The State has promulgated regulations as to what these culverts and bridges should look like. What FEMA is saying is we are not going to compensate you for doing the right thing. In other words, FEMA is insisting that local communities, in order to get reimbursed for these expenses of replacing damaged infrastructure, must build culverts and bridges to standards that have already failed and are likely to fail again. This is Vermont's problem today. It could be your State's problem tomorrow. The point here is we should not be rebuilding culverts and bridges in a way that will result in them failing once again when another flood or

extreme weather disturbance takes place. That makes no sense at all.

In Vermont, at least 39 bridge and culvert projects would benefit from this amendment, and half of these projects have not yet gone forward because of this dispute with FEMA. In other words, we have many communities in the State of Vermont that are not going forward rebuilding the damaged culverts and bridges but waiting because of this ongoing dispute with FEMA.

Again, today this is Vermont's problem. Tomorrow it could be West Virginia's or California's. It makes no sense to rebuild bridges and culverts in a way that has failed. We want to rebuild them in a way that will enable them to remain strong during the next flood or extreme weather disturbance. If another Hurricane Irene were to hit, those towns would be vulnerable to severe damage yet again. In other words, they are sitting in limbo. They don't have the money to do the job they want to see done, and they are not getting help from FEMA. In fact, communities in States across the country that adopt more resilient standards for infrastructure replacement would benefit from this amendment.

Today it impacts Vermont. Tomorrow it could impact any State in this country. Local communities and States have a better sense of the kinds of standards that are required for bridges and culverts than FEMA, and they should be allowed to go forward with those standards and be compensated by FEMA.

FEMA's current practice throws good money at bad by preventing States and local communities from rebuilding with more resilient, better-defined infrastructure after devastating storms. The amendment Senator LEAHY and I are offering will save taxpayers money, will save lives, and better protect communities from future natural disasters and extreme weather disturbances.

In short, the Sanders-Leahy flood resilience amendment requires FEMA to recognize State standards when providing Federal reimbursements for bridge and culvert replacements after natural disasters, supports communities that want to rebuild more resilient infrastructure after natural disasters, harmonizes the approaches of the Army Corps of Engineers and FEMA, and stops throwing good money after bad, saves taxpayers at the local, State, and Federal level by making smarter investments in more durable infrastructure.

With that, I would ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that the time during all quorum calls be charged equally to both sides.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 868

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, first let me thank Senator BOXER and Senator VITTER for the incredible work they have done in bringing forward the Water Resources Development Act, the WRDA legislation. This truly has been a bipartisan effort to bring forward an extremely important bill for our economy, for jobs, for infrastructure, and for competitiveness. I can speak for the citizens of Maryland as to how important this legislation is to the economic life of our State in maintaining the shipping channels that are critical to the ports in our State, the Port of Baltimore. This legislation will provide the wherewithal for Maryland and our Nation to remain competitive.

In this environment, it is not easy to get a major bill to the finish line. It looks as though as a result of the work done by the chairman and the ranking Republican member, we are on the verge of being able to move this bill forward.

I know we are going to have a few votes in a few moments, and I wanted to take this time to urge my colleagues to reject the Barrasso amendment that would deny the regulation of a lot of the waterways in our country. For 40 years the Clean Water Act dramatically improved the health of a generation of Americans. Without this law, which for decades had protected rivers, streams, wetlands, lakes, and coastal waterways from toxic pollution, all of our Nation's waters would be less safe to swim in, to fish in, and, especially, to drink.

Mr. President, we are talking about the health of the people of this country—the Clean Water Act. We are talking about the health of our streams which people live next to. We are talking about families depending upon clean safe water when they turn their taps on so they can have water to give their families. We are talking about our environment.

I am pretty aggressive on this because I have the honor of representing one of the States that is part of the Chesapeake Bay watershed. The Presiding Officer also represents a State—West Virginia—that is part of the Chesapeake Bay, as is Pennsylvania and Delaware and Virginia and the District of Columbia. My point is there are over 100,000 streams and rivers that feed into the Chesapeake Bay. The Chesapeake Bay is the largest estuary in North America and has thousands of species. The life of the Chesapeake Bay depends upon the waters that flow into it, and the Barrasso amendment would deny the effectiveness of regulating the health of the waters leading into the bay. It would inject into the Clean Water Act a way in which we would be denying the protection of the Clean Water Act to the public.

I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment. It is anti-environment. There is no question about that. But let me cite another reason. I hear my colleagues on both sides of the aisle talk about predictability and we need to know what the rules are. We thought we knew what the rules were on the Clean Water Act, but then the Supreme Court came through with some cases that are, quite frankly, baffling to us because they change the long-standing tradition of the regulations on the Clean Water Act. We thought we understood what it was all about. So there is a great deal of uncertainty today, and the Barrasso amendment takes us back to that uncertainty.

The Obama administration, through its regulatory process, has given us the predictability we need so everyone can plan their activities, knowing full well what the responsibilities are for clean water. I don't think we want to return to that time of uncertainty, and the Barrasso amendment would lead us back down that path.

There are many other reasons why this is wrong to do. When we take a look at how many wetlands and how many streams and brooks we have lost across this country, do we want to turn back the clock on the regulation of clean water on the streams, the brooks, and the wetlands that are involved in our water supply? It is literally because of the protections of the Clean Water Act that we know we are going to have a safe supply of drinking water. It is because of the Clean Water Act we know we can go to our beaches this summer and enjoy the recreational activities along the water. The Barrasso amendment would take us to a point where we could lose the effectiveness of the Clean Water Act in protecting the public health of the people of this Nation.

We have a good bill before us. It is well balanced. I do again applaud the chairman and ranking member. There are provisions in this bill, quite frankly, I would like to see written in a different way, but it was done with full bipartisan cooperation, and so the Barrasso amendment should be rejected by this body, and I urge my colleagues to reject the amendment.

With that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I rise to speak on legislation in regard to surplus water fees. I call it the States Water Rights Act, the States water rights legislation, and I introduced this legislation as an amendment to the Water Resources Development Act. Essentially what it does is it would pre-

vent the Corps of Engineers from unlawfully and unfairly imposing water usage fees on the Missouri River States. Joining me in this bipartisan legislation is Senator JOHN THUNE of South Dakota, Senator HEIDI HEITKAMP of North Dakota, Senator MAX BAUCUS of Montana, and also Senator TIM JOHNSON of South Dakota. It is bipartisan legislation. In fact, I expect Senator THUNE will be joining me here on the floor very shortly, and also Senator HEITKAMP, so we can engage in a colloquy in regard to the legislation.

The Missouri River, of course, flows through the State of North Dakota and the other Missouri River States. We have seven States the Missouri River flows through. In 1944, through the Pick-Sloan Act, waters in those States were dammed to create large-scale reservoirs. There are six mainstream reservoirs. Of course the primary purpose for the dams and reservoirs was to provide flood protection downstream, which we have been doing now for more than 50 years—actually, over 60 years.

At the same time, just as we are providing that flood protection with these reservoirs, at the same time the upper basin States, States throughout the basin, have withdrawn water from those reservoirs for a whole variety of uses—municipalities, tribes, business and industrial—the whole gamut of uses. In all that time, more than 60 years, the Corps of Engineers has never charged the respective States—Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska—any of them—has not charged them for using the water. That makes sense because if they draw the water out of the river—I mean every one of the States has water rights. Tribes have water rights. If they draw the water out of the river, of course, there is no charge.

Likewise, because the States gave up the land for flood protection in order to create those reservoirs, the corps has never charged for drawing water out of the reservoirs either.

That has changed now. Now the corps is saying we are undertaking a study and in our study we are going to look and decide whether we are going to charge a fee if you take water out of the reservoir; even though we never have, now we think maybe we are going to charge a fee.

This amendment blocks that. It says you can't do that. The States have water rights. Just as if you take it out of the river you can't charge us for that water, you certainly can't flood our land and then charge us for it. It doesn't make any sense.

Furthermore, because States have water rights, they would never be able to do it. If in fact the corps were to proceed and impose those fees, we would sue them and we would win under the law because the respective States are entitled to those water rights. That makes this kind of an unusual situation.

We have put this legislation forward, frankly, to avoid the cost of litigation,

the cost to the respective States and the cost to the Federal Government. So the reality is without this legislation we are offering, it would actually cost the Federal Government money because they would have to undertake litigation against the States to impose fees on the States in violation of their water rights which are well established at law. This amendment, in fact, in actuality saves the Federal Government money.

But the CBO, under their scoring regime, says no, wait a minute. Somehow we are going to look beyond that. I guess they would pretend that wouldn't really happen. So we are going to assign a cost to this legislation because the corps might get some fees down the road somewhere; in spite of all these things, they might get a fee. So they have assigned a \$5 million cost to the legislation over the 10-year scoring window; \$5 million over the 10-year scoring window.

We have managed to address that by saying no, we have also added—in addition to the fact that under this legislation the corps can't impose the fees, we have also said you have to find \$5 million in savings over the next 10 years out of your operating budget. Since just their operations alone are \$2 billion a year, obviously that would be a very simple matter. The fact is it is, frankly, a technicality anyway because they are offsetting money they are never going to get so there is no cost to it. But from an accounting standpoint we do that so the CBO does not assign any score to this legislation.

That is kind of some of the nuts and bolts of the legislation. But the key is this: This is about States that have given up fertile farmland, hundreds of thousands of acres, in order to provide flood protection for other States farther downstream. They were able to not only use the land but they were able to draw water from the river as they wanted to without being charged. So here comes the corps and says now that we have flooded your land, now that you have provided that flood protection, oh, golly, we are going to charge you for flooding your land. We are going to charge small towns, we are going to charge tribes, we are going to charge business and industries, farmers—whomever.

It absolutely makes no sense. That is what this act does. It addresses that and makes sure they do not impose those fees in clear violation of States' water rights. In fact, the legislation, even though scored by CBO as having no cost, will save not only the Federal Government money but the respective States money as well.

I am very pleased to note that my distinguished colleague from South Dakota, Senator JOHN THUNE, is here. I wish to ask if he, as cosponsor of this legislation, would express some of his thoughts as well.

Mr. THUNE. I ask the Senator from North Dakota if he will yield for a question?

Mr. HOEVEN. Yes.

Mr. THUNE. This is an issue that is important to both his State and my State for many reasons, not the least of which is we have basically flooded 1.6 million acres of prime bottom land, some of the richest agricultural land in our States, in order to prevent flooding downstream. Then of course there were also stated other various uses of the water that would be allowed for the States that were impacted when this occurred.

But I wonder if my colleague from North Dakota—he has already touched upon many of the reasons why this should not happen, but he is a former Governor of his State. I know our Governor and our attorney general have made it abundantly clear that if the corps moves forward, they intend to file a lawsuit and they will litigate this. As a former Governor, if the now-Senator from North Dakota could respond to how his State of North Dakota might act in the event this actually were implemented by the corps?

It strikes me at least that this is without precedent. This is something that—the Flood Control Act was passed in 1944 and the dams were built subsequent to that. For the past 50 years our States have had access to this water and it is something that is a State right. There is no legal or statutory—there is no historical precedent for doing this. I am wondering how the former Governor of North Dakota might view this as a Governor, as to what his action might be in the event the Corps of Engineers were to move forward with this. Because it certainly would impact a lot of the industrial users, water users in the State, businesses, tribes—a lot of folks are going to be impacted if the corps moves forward with this proposal. If the Senator from North Dakota might tell me as former Governor how he might view this and what he would intend to do and what our Governor and attorney general would intend to do in the event the corps moves forward.

Mr. HOEVEN. I thank the distinguished Senator from South Dakota for joining me, and for his question. Of course, he is anticipating exactly what would happen. The States will initiate litigation against the corps if in fact the corps decides to impose a fee. They are undertaking a year-long study and at the end they are going to come back and say: Oh, they are not going to charge a fee. Or they are not going to impose a fee. If they do impose a fee, here is what it would be. At that point they would be sued by the States. In fact, in the case of North Dakota, the legislature has already set aside monies to fund the lawsuit.

As when I was the Governor, the current Governor and the attorney general have already said very clearly they will commence litigation. It would be multistate litigation. As I said, they have already set aside funds.

That is the point I am making. We can talk about the CBO score—which

we have now squared away so it doesn't score—the reality is we are saving both the Federal Government and the States money with this legislation because there will absolutely be litigation.

Mr. THUNE. Will the Senator yield for another question, if I might?

Mr. HOEVEN. I will.

Mr. THUNE. Our attorney general wrote a letter and said:

This proposal, whether disguised as a reallocation or surplus water, exceeds the Corps' regulatory authority and violates basic principles of federalism.

It went on to lay out the reasons why they, our State, would obviously enter into litigation if it comes to that, if it is necessary in order to protect the rights of South Dakotans to the water that is rightfully theirs.

I would be interested in knowing as well from the Senator from North Dakota if in fact, during the course of the last many years, his amendment would change anything, if his amendment would change anything that is happening today? In other words, today what happens if the State wants to use water in one of the mainstream dams—and there are six mainstream dams, one in Montana, a big one in North Dakota, and then we have four in South Dakota, all of which were created by the Flood Control Act or authorized. These were dams built to protect from flooding downstream and then also authorized various uses of that water.

I might point out what some of those uses are. They were to be for enhanced navigation, cheap hydro power, irrigation, programs to increase public recreation facilities, municipal-industrial water supplies, and fish and wildlife populations. Those are some of the things that are stated that the water is to be used for.

The Senator's amendment, which would prevent the corps from charging for this water, as I understand it, doesn't change anything, the practice as it exists today, because a water user would request an easement from the corps, and then essentially the State would have to issue the water. That is my understanding of how it works today.

Does any of that change—if it is passed—as far as the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, in response to the Senator's question, absolutely not. It doesn't change any of the authorized purposes for the reservoirs and for the system. This does not impact in any way any of the authorized uses for the mainstem dams, the mainstem breviaries or the Missouri River system.

I want to emphasize that because we have the seven Missouri River States, and sometimes we get the upstream and downstream interests. This does not change any of those authorized purposes or how they are utilized or how the respective States interact with them—or even the amount of water usage.

So to try to bring in any of the other issues which have typically been concerns for the Missouri River does not

apply here. This is about whether the respective States—this is one where we can come together. This is upstream or downstream and whether any States will be charged for water that is rightfully theirs. That makes this very much a States rights issue about which all of the States should be concerned.

How can we allow Federal agencies to come in and simply impose a fee because they want to and then impose whatever fee they want? We will do a study and we will impose a fee of whatever size we determine we believe is appropriate.

It is a clear violation of States rights, and on a very important issue, water rights.

If I could, I want to also invite the good Senator from North Dakota, Ms. HEITKAMP, to join us as well in this colloquy. She also brings expertise as the former attorney general in North Dakota and can certainly comment on the legal issues as well.

Before I do that, I will turn it over, Mr. President, to the Senator from South Dakota, who I think had another question and/or comment.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I want to welcome our other colleague from North Dakota who also has experience as a litigator in protecting the interests of her State. Perhaps she could also comment on what actions the States might take if the corps moves forward.

I want to point out to my colleagues, and perhaps the Senator is already aware of this, but I am looking at some things that are proposed charges that the corps would make under this proposal, although I don't think they have stated explicitly what that might be. But it ends up being a significant amount.

In fact, over the Lewis and Clark leg, which is Gavins Point—or I should say, Lewis and Clark Dam—they are talking about \$174 per acre foot of yield from Lewis and Clark Lake. We are talking about businesses, individuals, tribes, and industrial users having access to water they believe—and I think we all believe—is something that was promised to them when this legislation was passed way back in the 1940s.

We have essentially 70 years of precedent where it has been the case that the States have access and can rightfully use that water for those various purposes as authorized under the legislation. This would move away from that and start to impose these fees, which I think over time get to be quite excessive.

I appreciate the work that has been done by the Senator from North Dakota Mr. HOEVEN in terms of trying to get the CBO to evaluate this in the proper context. For a while they were talking about the scoring impact that was much larger than many of us believed it would be. Again, it is a hypothetical situation. It is not happening today.

All the Senator is simply doing is saying we want to keep in place the

rules of the game as they have applied to the mainstem dams for the past 50 years—70 years since the authorization in the legislation that created it, but also since the dams were built.

I guess I would say to my colleagues from North Dakota, I appreciate their good work, and I would simply reiterate—as a South Dakotan, downstream from North Dakota—that our States, and all the States in the upper basin, would be dramatically impacted by this because it would be a precedent that would be entirely new.

Literally, this is something we have not dealt with since we had the dams and the lakes in our States. Again, this would be at a tremendous sacrifice in terms of the amount of prime bottom land that was given up when the dams were built and the land was taken.

I now defer to the former attorney general of North Dakota, Senator HEITKAMP, for some observations she might have with respect to that issue.

Mr. HOEVEN. I thank the Senator from South Dakota for joining, and he is absolutely right. The cost to the States is significant. In actuality, the scoring number is reduced because the probability of them getting it is so remote. As I mentioned earlier, they are flying in the face of well-established water rights the States have. So once they assign the probability they would lend to it, obviously that reduces the amount that gets scored.

Once again, it shows they are trying to impose a fee where they have no right to do it, so it did create some scoring issue that it really never should. The fact is the litigation would far outweigh the score that CBO has put on it, both to the Federal Government and to the respective States. In the end there would be no fees because there is no right to assess those fees.

I think we have someone who as a former attorney general dealt, in fact, with this very type of issue during her tenure as attorney general. I turn to my colleague from North Dakota and ask that she comment on the legality of the issue as well as her thoughts in terms of the fairness and the States rights aspect, which truly makes this an issue our colleagues should join and support. This is exactly what could happen to them, and it could happen to their States.

I turn to Senator HEITKAMP for her thoughts in that regard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. I say thank you to my colleagues from North Dakota and South Dakota. Mr. President, this is not a new issue. This is an issue—even back in the 1990s—I dealt with as the State's attorney general. Why do I mention that? I mention it because we were able to persuade the corps at the time that the intake pipe they were attempting to charge for surplus water was actually in the original river bed. I—just tongue-in-cheek—suggested I would charge them for putting their water on top of our water, and maybe

they should pay a fee to us for the storage we were going to allow them.

In all seriousness, this is not an issue that is going to go away. If any of our colleagues think this is an issue where we can just let it go and ride it out, this is an issue that has percolated for a lot of years. It has culminated right now to this effort to be proactive in this body to prevent litigation, prevent excess expense, and prevent a deterioration of a relationship that is essential to making sure we have flood protection and all of the other good that came out of the Flood Control Act.

So the time is now to take an immediate step to prevent this issue from going any further and to address the concerns that upstream States have.

I want to spend just a few moments talking about this from a legal perspective and what could happen if, in fact, the Federal Government engaged in litigation with the States.

We have heard today from both South Dakota and North Dakota Senators. I am reasonably sure Montana would not allow this precedent to stand without some pushback and an absolute commitment from a bipartisan standpoint from all the upstream States for a pushback.

Let's talk about why there are legal problems with the corps approach. Charging fees for surplus waters, I believe, would violate a State's right to the water that naturally flows through the boundaries as historically recognized by the Federal Government and as recognized by the 10th Amendment.

Charging fees would violate statutory law. Section 1 of the 1944 Flood Control Act provides protection for water resources in Western States. We have a common law water rights argument, a historic argument, and we have a statutory argument.

I think charging fees would reverse decades of corps policy on surplus water and create a precedent which should not be established, not only in the upper Missouri basin but should not be established anywhere in this country. That is why this is an issue that is not just about the Dakotas, it is not just about Montana and the upstream States, it is an issue that every one of our colleagues has an interest in reviewing. If they can do it in this case, why can't they do it in any other reservoir.

Charging fees would penalize Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota by charging for water that is freely available in the absence of the corps reservoir. If there were no reservoir, there would be no issue. In fact, if they tried to charge, most of our colleagues would find that absolutely atrocious. This is in the face of what we know we have sacrificed for flood control in that basin.

I want to mention the unique interest that the Mandan, Hidatsa, Arikara Nation, along with the Standing Rock Nation have and what they have sacrificed for flood control, what they have sacrificed in terms of loss of their

land, division of their reservation boundaries, and division of their property. Now, the corps is saying: Yes, we took your land. Yes, we disrupted your natural boundaries and your natural way of life, and now we are going to charge you for the water that sits on your historic homeland.

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Senator yield for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for another 5 minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. We have a vote locked in at 5 p.m., so the Senator can speak up until 5 p.m.

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

The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask unanimous consent that at 5 p.m., the Senate vote in relation to the Inhofe, Barrasso, and Sanders amendments as provided under the previous order; that following the vote in relation to the Sanders amendment, the Senate proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak up to 10 minutes; further, that when the Senate resumes consideration on S. 601 on Wednesday, May 15, it resume the voting sequence in the previous order with all after the first vote being 10 minutes and all other provisions of the previous order remaining in effect.

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

Mrs. BOXER. For the information of all Senators, it is our expectation that the Inhofe amendment will be the subject of a voice vote. If that occurs there will be two rollcall votes this evening, and the remainder of the votes will occur tomorrow.

I yield the floor.

Ms. HEITKEMP. So when we look at water surplus fees and we think about the fact that we have given our land, we have given our opportunity to have free access to our water, we have done all of this with the idea that it is for the better good of this country, to now charge our citizens and people who have always had historic access to that water—this fee looks a whole lot like a tax—it is adding insult to injury.

I can guarantee that this issue will not go away. If we don't prevail, what we are buying is a lawsuit because the Corps of Engineers is not going to give up. The Corps of Engineers will continue to advance and promote this idea until they implement this idea, and then we are going to be in litigation.

This issue will not go away. The easiest way to resolve this issue in an amicable way and in a way that is going to maintain the kind of historic relationship we have with our tribes is to deal with it today. We need to deal with it within the Water Resources Development Act we are enacting. We need to support amendment No. 909, the amendment of my good friend and colleague JOHN HOEVEN, the Senator from North Dakota, and put this idea to bed once and for all that the corps cannot

charge us for water that historically and legally belongs to the States where that water is located.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HOEVEN. I wish to thank again my colleague for her comments in regard to the legal aspect; again, she brings a lot of direct experience working with this issue. So I thank her for her comments with regard to the legal aspect, but she makes another very important point. This isn't just about States rights; this would be a taking of tribal rights too.

I am going to turn to my colleague from South Dakota and ask him a question on this very same subject. But, in fact, in North Dakota, it is going to be one of our tribes that is most disenfranchised by this action of the corps. Because, again, we have made the point we can take water out of the river. We can continue to do that. They can't charge us for water coming from the river.

The other place they are trying to charge for water is out of the reservoir. But most of the reservoir in North Dakota is inside the tribe reservation, so the people who would be most dramatically impacted, in fact, would be Native Americans in our State.

I am going to turn to our colleague from South Dakota. I am guessing that is true in South Dakota as well.

Mr. THUNE. I would just say to both of my colleagues from North Dakota, that is an absolutely accurate observation.

If we look at who is impacted—and we have the Standing Rock Tribe that is partly in North Dakota and partly in South Dakota so it crosses the State border. We have the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, the Coal Creek Sioux Tribe, the Yankton Tribe. We have a whole bunch of reservations as we go right down that corridor of the Missouri River that would be profoundly impacted. As we mentioned earlier, when this land was given up, when the dams were built, this was a lot of not only private land but tribal-held land which they gave up. This would directly impact the access they would have to water that is rightfully theirs.

So in addition to the concerns our States have and our attorneys general have, we also have a lot of tribes that have a very vested interest in making sure this doesn't happen. That is why it is so important that our colleagues support the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota, because as was pointed out by Senator HEITKEMP, this is precedent setting. If they can do this here, they may try and do it someplace else.

I also think—and the point was made by both of my colleagues—this is a very practical consideration. It will cost the Federal Government and our States a lot more than what they are saying this is going to achieve in terms of revenues when this goes to court. Both the States and the Federal Government will be locked up, I would suspect, in litigation for some time. The

amount of revenues that would be raised by the fees that would be imposed under the various proposals that are being advanced by the corps simply would pale in comparison to the litigation costs that would be involved.

So that is a very practical consideration. I concur. I am not a lawyer, and I certainly am not a former attorney general or former Governor. I know both of my colleagues have experience with these issues. But I can tell my colleagues from talking with our Governor and our attorney general they are highly confident that legally this is a very open-and-shut situation and a case in which our State would prevail. So it seems sort of crazy in a way that we would even have to go down that trail, and I hope we can prevent it from happening by having our colleagues join us in support of this amendment.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I wish to thank my colleague from South Dakota and turn to my colleague from North Dakota for any final thoughts before we yield the floor.

Ms. HEITKEMP. Mr. President, my colleagues from North and South Dakota and I come from practical States. We come from States where we try to anticipate problems and we solve problems before they turn into big, expensive pieces of litigation, and that is what that amendment does. This amendment addresses, in a proactive way, a policy we know will not be put to bed until this body speaks. Let's do it now. Let's do it kind of in the way we do it in our States. Let's be proactive. Let's make sure we aren't wasting money and wasting relationships on litigation and that we are moving forward to manage the Upper Basin as best we can and that we do what is right by the people of our State and the people in our tribal governments and our Native American neighbors.

AMENDMENT NO. 909

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, with that, I wish to set aside the pending amendment and call up the Hoeven amendment No. 909.

I wish to close with a couple other thoughts. Senator BAUCUS from Montana wanted to join with us in the colloquy, but the timeline didn't work out. So I wished to express my appreciation for his support and sponsorship of this legislation as well.

I wish to again make the point that this isn't about using the water. Our respective States will still use the water. The issue is about being charged for it. That is a very important point, so that nobody tries to confuse this issue in order to try to get opposition to the issue. We will still use the water; it is just that we will be charged for it unfairly, except for the fact—as we said, this would be tied up in litigation creating a bunch of costs for the State and the Federal Government, so that wouldn't really happen. So what we are doing is solving a very important problem. It is one that all of the States need to be cognizant of, because

if a Federal agency can come in and try to do it to one State, it can do it to any one of the States. This is a fundamental issue regarding States rights.

If any of our colleagues have questions or concerns about the amendment, I encourage them to come to us. We want to talk to them about it. We truly believe, if they understand the facts, they will be strongly supportive.

Again, I wish to turn to my colleague from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. One final point of clarification and perhaps the Senator from North Dakota can react and comment on this as well.

My understanding is, of course, that this doesn't have any impact on the master manual, the way in which the corps manages the reservoir. So the degree to which there might be concern about whether this is our water versus their water, which historically has plagued a lot of the discussions about the Missouri River—upstream-downstream interests. As the Senator from North Dakota pointed out, the water is going to get used. It is water that is either stored or used. I think it is a question of whether we are going to be charged, the users of that water are going to be charged, and that does, of course, create precedent. If that is something they can do here, the question is, What is the next State? Because this violates a principle of federalism, as pointed out by the attorney general of South Dakota in his letter to the Corps of Engineers.

But I wanted to say for the record, perhaps to those who are viewing this as an upstream-downstream battle, that is not the case. This does not affect the master manual, to my knowledge, and I ask the Senator from South Dakota to react to that as well.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, the Senator is absolutely right. I wish to thank him for emphasizing that point. It is very important. Again, that is why I encourage any of our colleagues to discuss this issue with us if they have any concerns whatsoever. It is just a fundamental fairness issue, and we ask for an affirmative vote from our colleagues.

With that, I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Without objection, the clerk will report the Hoeven amendment.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. HOEVEN] proposes an amendment numbered 909.

Mr. HOEVEN. 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:

AMENDMENT NO. 909

(Purpose: To restrict charges for certain surplus water)

On page 190, after line 23, add the following:

SEC. 2060. RESTRICTION ON CHARGES FOR CERTAIN SURPLUS WATER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No fee for surplus water shall be charged under a contract for surplus water if the contract is for surplus water stored on the Missouri River.

(b) OFFSET.—Of the amounts made available under Public Law 113-6 (127 Stat. 198) for operations and maintenance under the heading "Corps of Engineers—Civil", \$5,000,000 is rescinded.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

AMENDMENT NO. 868

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, shortly we are going to vote; I believe it will be a voice vote on the Inhofe amendment. It is not a controversial amendment; everybody agrees to it. Then we will proceed to the Barrasso amendment which I have spoken about before.

I wish to urge my colleagues to be very careful on this one because it has unintended consequences. The way the Barrasso amendment is drafted, it tries to say, in advance of a rulemaking, that if the rulemaking includes any infrastructure from the guidance that has been put forward by the corps and the EPA—if it even contains anything like it—"the rule will be considered as having been vacated." That is a quote.

So the bottom line is, the Barrasso amendment is such an overreach that we will keep the whole issue of waters of the United States in chaos—and it is in chaos. We received letters from business people begging us to allow the rulemaking to go forward, but because of the way the Barrasso amendment is drafted, essentially we are not going to ever have a rule.

So why is it important to have a rule that is very clear and explains what waters are covered under the Clean Water Act? Let me tell my colleagues why. Without protections of a rule, dangerous pollutants could be put into our waterways. This isn't just hyperbole. We are talking about toxic heavy metals such as arsenic and lead. We are talking about toxins that cause cancer and harm the health of infants and children in particular. Who are the vulnerables? The infants, the children and the elderly and those who are disabled. They are the ones who are the victims of filthy, dirty water.

I am not saying my friend Senator BARRASSO wants to get people sick. I am not saying that. But I am saying there is an unintended consequence of the overreach in this amendment which is pretty clear to all who read it. It says if the draft guidance that has already been looked at is included in any way, shape or form into a final rule, then the whole rule is thrown out on its face and that leaves the situation in chaos.

Say I come to the Presiding Officer and say: I am going to write a book

about mathematics. The Presiding Officer says: That is very exciting, but there is only one thing. I am your publisher and you can't put one single number in the book—not a 1 to a 2 to a 3. You can write a book on mathematics, but it can't contain any numbers. That is the most ridiculous situation. But this is the essence of the Barrasso amendment. It is telling people who are going to write a rule that they can't take anything that was put in the draft guidance and put it into that rule. It makes absolutely no sense.

I want to protect people from toxics such as lead and arsenic. Without these safeguards of the rule, our drinking water supplies would be more at risk and the laws of these protections would increase the risks of dangerous floods in downstream communities because it would eliminate wetlands protections.

One of the things I learned when I was a county supervisor a very long time ago is that wetlands kept in their natural state and enhanced are the best way to have flood protection. When I went to Louisiana after Katrina, I was struck by the fact that the whole community understood the importance of the wetlands, because they absorb the floodwaters.

So now, because we are not going to be able to define what is a body of water that falls under the Clean Water Act, we are going to have a major problem with our wetlands. We are going to have a major problem with our rivers. We are going to have a major problem with our streams. We are talking about enormous bodies of water that are unprotected now because there is no rule. Under the Barrasso amendment, my opinion is—and it isn't just my opinion—there will not be any rule because if the rule picks up anything in the guidance at all—anything substantially similar to the guidance at all—it will be automatically overturned.

I wish to say to my friend, if he doesn't like a rule, he has the CRA, the Congressional Review Act. He can wait until he gets the rule. Don't prejudice it. Don't say the rule is vacated. That is pretty dictatorial to people who are in charge of protecting our water supply.

Nobody wants our kids to get more cancer. Nobody wants this to happen. We have to protect streams that provide drinking water for up to 117 million Americans. We have 20 million acres of wetlands that provide flood protection, improve water quality, and serve as wildlife habitat.

So the hour of 5 o'clock is upon us. We are going to vote on the Inhofe amendment first. Then we will turn to Senator BARRASSO for a moment to make his case, and then I will have 1 minute after that. So at this time we return to regular order. I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 797

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I call up Inhofe amendment No. 797.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows: The Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER], for Mr. INHOFE, proposes an amendment numbered 797.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask unanimous consent to yield back all time.

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

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 797) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To authorize a land exchange)

At the end of title XII, add the following:
SEC. 12 . . . TULSA PORT OF CATOOSA, ROGERS COUNTY, OKLAHOMA LAND EXCHANGE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) FEDERAL LAND.—The term “Federal land” means the approximately 87 acres of land situated in Rogers County, Oklahoma, contained within United States Tracts 413 and 427, and acquired for the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas Navigation System.

(2) NON-FEDERAL LAND.—The term “non-Federal land” means the approximately 34 acres of land situated in Rogers County, Oklahoma and owned by the Tulsa Port of Catoosa that lie immediately south and east of the Federal land.

(b) LAND EXCHANGE.—Subject to subsection (c), on conveyance by the Tulsa Port of Catoosa to the United States of all right, title, and interest in and to the non-Federal land, the Secretary shall convey to the Tulsa Port of Catoosa, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal land.

(c) CONDITIONS.—

(1) DEEDS.—

(A) DEED TO NON-FEDERAL LAND.—The Secretary may only accept conveyance of the non-Federal land by warranty deed, as determined acceptable by the Secretary.

(B) DEED TO FEDERAL LAND.—The Secretary shall convey the Federal land to the Tulsa Port of Catoosa by quitclaim deed and subject to any reservations, terms, and conditions that the Secretary determines necessary to—

(i) allow the United States to operate and maintain the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River Navigation System; and

(ii) protect the interests of the United States.

(2) LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.—The exact acreage and legal descriptions of the Federal land and the non-Federal land shall be determined by surveys acceptable to the Secretary.

(3) PAYMENT OF COSTS.—The Tulsa Port of Catoosa shall be responsible for all costs associated with the land exchange authorized by this section, including any costs that the Secretary determines necessary and reasonable in the interest of the United States, including surveys, appraisals, real estate transaction fees, administrative costs, and environmental documentation.

(4) CASH PAYMENT.—If the appraised fair market value of the Federal land, as determined by the Secretary, exceeds the ap-

praised fair market value of the non-Federal land, as determined by the Secretary, the Tulsa Port of Catoosa shall make a cash payment to the United States reflecting the difference in the appraised fair market values.

(5) LIABILITY.—The Tulsa Port of Catoosa shall hold and save the United States free from damages arising from activities carried out under this section, except for damages due to the fault or negligence of the United States or a contractor of the United States.

Mrs. BOXER. 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.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, what is the order at this time?

AMENDMENT NO. 868

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to the vote on amendment No. 868 offered by the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. BARRASSO.

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, this amendment restricts the expansion of Federal authority to encompass all wet areas of farms, ranches, and suburban homes across the United States. They want to do it through guidance, this proposed guidance that is used by Federal agencies. It seems that they are preparing to expand the definition of waters of the United States to include ditches and other dry areas where water flows only for a short duration after a rainfall.

This guidance is going to have a huge impact on farmers, ranchers, and small businesses that need to put a shovel in the ground to make a living. This guidance will, in fact, trump States rights by preempting State and local governments from making local land and water use decisions.

I have always believed the State and local governments, not Washington, know best how to protect their communities from environmental harm. The guidance does exactly the opposite and puts the power of these decisions in the hands of bureaucrats in Washington.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, the way my colleague and friend has drafted his amendment is very dangerous to the process because he wants to say if, in the rulemaking where we will define the waters of the United States, if they even so much as refer to the guidance that has been put forward, the draft guidance, there will be no rule.

The problem of not having a rule is we leave in place chaos. States cannot go ahead and handle this themselves. Local governments cannot. Under the law, according to all the rules of the Court and everybody else, we have to have a definition. No one I know wants to classify a ditch or a puddle as a water of the United States. That is always brought up, but that is just a red herring.

We need to make sure we have a Clean Water Act that protects the peo-

ple, protects their drinking water, and makes sure they are safe when they swim in a lake. If we do not move forward with a rule, at the end of the day this amendment will not allow that to happen, and we are in chaos. It does not protect our people from arsenic, from lead, from whatever objects there may be in a body of water. So I hope we will reject this. I thank my friend for offering it, but I think it is misguided. I yield the floor.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), and the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI).

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 119 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Alexander	Fischer	McCaskill
Ayotte	Flake	McConnell
Barrasso	Graham	Moran
Begich	Grassley	Paul
Blunt	Hagan	Portman
Boozman	Hatch	Pryor
Burr	Heitkamp	Risch
Chambliss	Heller	Roberts
Coats	Hoeven	Rubio
Coburn	Inhofe	Scott
Cochran	Isakson	Sessions
Collins	Johanns	Shelby
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Cornyn	Kirk	Toomey
Crapo	Landrieu	Vitter
Cruz	Lee	Wicker
Donnelly	Manchin	
Enzi	McCain	

NAYS—44

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Reid
Baucus	Harkin	Rockefeller
Bennet	Heinrich	Sanders
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schatz
Boxer	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Brown	Kaine	Shaheen
Cantwell	King	Stabenow
Cardin	Klobuchar	Tester
Carper	Leahy	Udall (CO)
Casey	Levin	Udall (NM)
Coons	Menendez	Warner
Cowan	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murphy	Wyden
Franken	Reed	

NOT VOTING—4

Lautenberg	Murray
Murkowski	Nelson

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

Mrs. BOXER. 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 ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I want to tell my colleagues what the plan is for tonight and tomorrow on the WRDA bill and thank everyone so much on both sides of the aisle for their cooperation. Senator VITTER and I are so happy we are able to have this open process, and we will finish this bill tomorrow. This will be the last vote this evening. We will continue late morning and complete our work. Right now we are going to have the Sanders amendment, with 2 minutes equally divided, and both Senators from Vermont would like to be heard.

AMENDMENT NO. 889

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 889, offered by the Senator from Vermont, Mr. SANDERS.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. This amendment impacts Vermont today, but it can impact any and every State in this country if it experiences a major flood or a natural disaster.

We all know FEMA compensates communities for rebuilding bridges and culverts damaged during storms such as Irene, but what is not widely known is that FEMA insists that local communities, in order to get reimbursed, must build culverts and bridges to the same standards that already failed and are likely to fail again. It is not terribly sensible. That is what this amendment deals with.

I yield to my colleague from Vermont, Senator LEAHY.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont, Mr. LEAHY.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, all we are saying is that if you are going to be getting relief from the Federal Government but you have a better way to rebuild your culverts, you can do it that way rather than to have the ones that failed before.

I am sure there are a whole lot of States here that will be affected by this amendment, and I hope it will be approved.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Madam President, as ranking member on the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, I know there are a lot of problems with FEMA and the Stafford grant, but this is essentially an earmark for an improvement before FEMA has even determined whether it is going to give mitigation grant money to the State of Vermont.

We need to do a lot in the way of changes with FEMA and grants and the Stafford grant monies. We know that, and we are working on that in Homeland Security. But this starts a process that sets a precedent that will be terrible. This is nothing right now but an earmark for one area, to benefit one State, when we need to make improvements in the whole process.

I hope my colleagues will look at the big picture rather than the small picture, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), and the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI).

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 120 Leg.]

YEAS—56

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

NAYS—40

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

NOT VOTING—4

Lautenberg	Murray
Murkowski	Nelson

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

Mrs. FISCHER. Madam President, I rise today to speak on S. 601, the Water Resources Development Act, WRDA. I would like to focus on Senate Amendment No. 801, a bipartisan provision to provide regulatory relief to our country's farmers and ranchers. Senate Amendment No. 801 is based on S. 496, the Farmers Undertake Environmental Stewardship Act, FUELS Act.

The FUELS Act was introduced by Senator MARK PRYOR and has 10 cosponsors from both sides of the aisle including Senators JOHN BOOZMAN, SAXBY

CHAMBLISS, THAD COCHRAN, JOHN CORNYN, HEIDI HEITKAMP, JAMES INHOFE, JOHNNY ISAKSON, MIKE JOHANNIS, MARY LANDRIEU, and myself. It was referred to the Senate Environment & Public Works Committee, of which I am a member.

I filed the FUELS Act as an amendment to WRDA when it was considered earlier this year by the Senate Environment & Public Works Committee. The amendment was not considered at that time.

The House version of the FUELS Act, H.R. 311, was introduced by Congressman RICK CRAWFORD and has 69 cosponsors. In the 112th Congress, the FUELS Act, H.R. 3158, was reported by the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and passed the House by voice vote. The House Committee Report for H.R. 3158 (Report 112-643) provides background and discusses the need for legislation:

The EPA mandated Oil Spill Prevention, Control and Countermeasures program, or SPCC, requires that oil storage facilities with a capacity of over 1,320 gallons must make infrastructure improvements to reduce the possibility of oil spills. The regulations require farmers to construct a containment facility, like a dike or a basin, which must retain 110 percent of the fuel in the container. These mandated infrastructure improvements—along with the necessary inspection and certification by a specially licensed Professional Engineer will cost many farmers tens of thousands of dollars. Sometimes compliance costs reach higher than \$60,000.

The SPCC program dates back to 1973, shortly after the Clean Water Act was signed into law. In the last decade, it has been rigorously applied to agriculture lands, and has been amended, delayed, and extended dozens of times. The Obama administration updated the rule in 2009 to expand regulation under the SPCC program—applying it to nearly all farms, and lifting a 2006 rule that suspended compliance requirements for small farms with oil storage of 10,000 gallons or less. It applied to crop oil, vegetable oil, animal fat, and even milk. Further revisions came during April of 2011 when the EPA decided to exempt milk.

The 2009 rule—minus regulating milk spills was scheduled to go into effect in November 2011. A few weeks before the November deadline, EPA issued a statement saying they would not begin enforcement until May of 2013. While enforcement has been delayed until 2013, the underlying regulation has not been fixed.

The FUELS Act requires that EPA revise the SPCC regulations to be reflective of a producer's spill risk and financial resources. The exemption level would be adjusted upward from 1,320 gallons of oil storage to an amount that would protect small farms: 10,000 gallons. The proposal would also place a greater degree of responsibility on farmers and ranchers to self-certify compliance if their oil storage facilities exceed the exemption level. If the amount exceeds 42,000 gallons, a professional engineer must certify the SPCC plans for a farm. The bill provides another layer of protection by requiring the producer to be able to demonstrate that he or she has no history of oil spills, or to fully comply with the SPCC regulations.

The University of Arkansas, Division of Agriculture did a study that concluded that, for the entire country, H.R. 3158 would save farmers and ranchers up to \$3.36 billion.

Agricultural production is an energy-intensive endeavor. Farmers need fuel to power machinery, equipment, and irrigation pumps. Because these operations are in rural areas where regular access to fuel supplies is limited, producers rely upon on-farm fuel storage capacity to provide the supply we need at the times we need it.

My family operates a cattle ranch in the Nebraska Sandhills, so I can tell you firsthand that farmers and ranchers take great pride in the work we do. Our success is the direct result of careful stewardship of our natural resources, which we depend upon for our livelihoods. In agriculture, we know the value of clean water, and we work hard to protect the quality of our streams and aquifers. When it comes to preventing spills from our on-farm fuel storage, farmers already have every incentive to do so—not the least of which is the high cost of diesel and gasoline.

I receive calls and letters every day from Nebraska farmers concerned about the compliance challenges associated with the SPCC rule for on-farm fuel storage, a regulation originally designed for oil refineries. Allow me to share a portion of one such constituent email I recently received on this issue:

We just became aware of this regulation yesterday through an email from Farm Bureau. Since we have a large quantity of on-farm storage capacity, we are not able to self-certify and must hire a professional engineer to create a plan. In order to find a qualified engineer, I first called the EPA, who then told me to call the Region 7 office out of Kansas City, who then told me to call the Nebraska Board of Engineers, who then told me to call the Nebraska Society of Professional Engineers, but the number on their website is no longer in service. When I asked the gentleman from the Nebraska Board of Engineers how much it would cost, he said anywhere from \$1500-\$4800, depending on the complexity and the engineer's ability to charge more due to high demand due to the approaching deadline. When I asked the gentleman from the EPA Region 7 office why we hadn't heard about it before now, he said the ruling was in place for a long time but they haven't done a good job of getting the word out.

When I shared these frustrations with Gina McCarthy, the nominee for EPA Administrator, she acknowledged at her nomination hearing on April 11, 2013, that "the agency has bridges to build with the agriculture community." The fact is that good stewardship on farms and ranches and environmental improvements are achieved because of producers' application of new technology, best practices, and conservation measures.

Centralized management and mandates are all too often arbitrary, ineffectual, or even counterproductive, lacking the insight of local stakeholders. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the stakeholder groups on this issue that illustrates this point, July 25, 2012 letter to the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. This letter from national agriculture groups—including the American Farm

Bureau Federation, American Soybean Association, National Association of Wheat Growers, National Cattlemen's Beef Association, National Chicken Council, National Corn Growers Association, National Cotton Council, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, National Milk Producers Federation, National Turkey Federation, and USA Rice Federation explains the arbitrary nature of the current regulation: "EPA's unusual threshold number of 1,320 gallons has no basis in science or in normal tank sizes for agriculture."

WRDA will require EPA, in consultation with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, USDA, to conduct a study to determine the appropriate exemption level "to not more than 6,000 gallons and not less than 2,500 gallons, based on a significant risk of discharge to water." The intent of this provision is to ensure that EPA is not unnecessarily regulating on-farm fuel storage at capacities that do not pose a significant risk to harming water quality. If there is not a significant risk, then regulation is not justified. Compliance costs should not be imposed where there is not a significant risk.

A March 2005 USDA report, *Fuel/Oil Storage for Farmers and Cooperatives*, states, "The SPCC rule will have a substantial cost of compliance for the nation's farmers. A total compliance cost of almost \$4.5 billion is projected. There is very little evidence of fuel/oil spill by farms." The report goes on to state that "the 1,320 gallons aggregated storage trigger is not supported by the survey data. Compliance at this level not only ignores the physical layouts of farm fuel storage but it also imposes a broad and extreme impact on the majority of farms. Nearly 70 percent of all farms would have to comply, at an average aggregated tank cost of \$9,215 and a total compliance cost of \$4.5 billion."

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD other letters of support for the FUELS Act from agricultural stakeholders, including letters from the American Farm Bureau Federation, USA Rice, National Corn Growers Association, American Soybean Association, National Cotton Council, National Association of Wheat Growers, National Cattlemen's Beef Association, and National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, NCFCA.

This quote from the NCFCA letter illustrates the points I have made, further explains the need for the legislation, and emphasizes the importance of the EPA-USDA study in ensuring that we are not unnecessarily regulating capacity levels at which no significant risk of oil spills has been demonstrated.

Without question the members of the agricultural sector who grow the nation's food and rely on surface and well water to meet their families' and agricultural operations' needs are highly motivated to ensure that their environmental practices are sound. These producers work daily to ensure a safe environment for their children and the communities in which they live. As such, they

can and do take very seriously their responsibility, consistent with the intent and spirit of the SPCC provisions, to properly manage the oil resources used on their operations.

Row crop farms, ranches, livestock operations, farmer cooperatives and other agribusinesses pose low risks for spills and are often seasonal in nature. In fact, data on oil spill on farms, cooperatives, and other agribusinesses is almost nonexistent. The Agency has failed to provide data or even anecdotal evidence of agricultural spills to justify such a resource-intensive rulemaking for America's farmers and ranchers. The risk of such spills from agriculture is extremely low and there is little to no evidence that providing greater flexibility through S. 496 will harm the environment.

The Senate's approval of WRDA will be a huge victory for farmers throughout Nebraska and across America, who should not face unnecessary regulations. The bipartisan provision regarding on-farm fuel storage raises the exemption levels for fuel storage capacity to better reflect the spill risk and financial resources of farms. I appreciate my colleagues' support and cooperation on this issue.

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

JULY 25, 2012.

Hon. JOHN MICA,
Chairman, House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. NICK RAHALL,
Ranking Member, House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MICA AND RANKING MEMBER RAHALL: The undersigned organizations would like to express our strong support for H.R. 3158, the Farmers Undertake Environmental Land Stewardship (FUELS) Act, H.R. 3158 would bring some much needed clarity to agriculture on the confusing requirements of the EPA's Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure (SPCC) rule.

As you are aware, farming is an energy-intensive profession. Producers need fuels stored on-farm for everything from fueling mobile equipment to running irrigation pumps. Many of these tanks are seasonal use and stay empty much of the year due to the high cost of fuel and the possibility of theft. Furthermore, EPA's unusual threshold number of 1,320 gallons has no basis in science or in normal tank sizes for agriculture.

In addition, EPA's bifurcation of the rule date (before and after August 16, 2002) has brought immense, unneeded confusion to the farming community as they try to determine whether their current business model is the same that was in operation prior to the 2002 date. The requirement to have Professional Engineers (PEs) sign off on many SPCC plans adds significant costs to the producer as well as the time spent trying to find the limited number of PE's willing to work on this rule in agricultural areas. It has already led to PEs telling producers many things that aren't in the rule as they try to oversell their product.

While the undersigned organizations welcome EPA's extension of the deadline to May 10, 2013, that extension only applies to farms in operation after August 16, 2002, further confusing the industry. Furthermore, farms are still under the costly requirements of providing secondary containment to many seasonal-use tanks and developing complicated 'spill plans'. Despite pleas to the agency for compliance assistance, they have been slow to respond, and despite invitations

to grower meetings, they have little funding for travel.

Thankfully, this Congress has the opportunity to ease this burden on rural America. H.R. 3158 would provide realistic threshold sizes for tank regulation at the farm level and allow more farms to self-certify thus saving time and money that would otherwise be spent in hiring PE's to sign the SPCC plans.

H.R. 3158 is common sense legislation that the undersigned strongly support. We urge the Committee and Congress to pass the bill to help relieve undue regulation on farmers and rural America.

Sincerely,

American Farm Bureau Federation,
American Soybean Association, Arkansas Farm Bureau Federation, Montana Grain Growers Association, National Association of Wheat Growers, National Cattlemen's Beef Association, National Chicken Council, National Corn Growers Association, National Cotton Council, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, National Milk Producers Federation, National Turkey Federation, Pennsylvania Farm Bureau Federation, USA Rice Federation.

NATIONAL COTTON
COUNCIL OF AMERICA,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2013.

Hon. MARK PRYOR,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. JAMES INHOFE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS PRYOR and INHOFE. The National Cotton Council (NCC) supports your efforts to advance S. 496, the FUELS Act.

Your bill will alleviate the costly regulatory burden on farmers resulting from EPA's Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure (SPCC) Rule. EPA's unusual threshold number of 1,320 gallons has no basis in science or in normal tank sizes for agriculture. S. 496 will raise that threshold to a more realistic and practical level. Your bill will also allow more farms to self-certify rather than hiring a qualified professional engineer.

NCC is the central organization of the U.S. cotton industry representing producers, ginners, merchants, cooperatives, textile manufacturers, and cottonseed processors and merchandisers in 17 states stretching from California to the Carolinas. NCC represents producers who historically cultivate between 10 and 14 million acres of cotton. Annual cotton production, averaging approximately 20 million 480-lb bales, is valued at more than \$5 billion at the farm gate. While a majority of the industry is concentrated in the 17 cotton-producing states, the down-stream manufacturers of cotton apparel and home-furnishings are located in virtually every state. The industry and its suppliers, together with the cotton product manufacturers, account for more than 230,000 jobs in the U.S. In addition to the cotton fiber, cottonseed products are used for livestock feed and cottonseed oil is used for food products ranging from margarine to salad dressing. Taken collectively, the annual economic activity generated by cotton and its products in the U.S. economy is estimated to be in excess of \$120 billion.

Again, the Council supports and appreciates your efforts on this issue.

Sincerely,

E. KEITH MENCHEY,
Manager, Science & Environmental Issues.

MAY 6, 2013.

Hon. MARK PRYOR,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.
Hon. JAMES INHOFE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS PRYOR AND INHOFE, On behalf of the National Association of Wheat Growers (NAWG), we appreciate your efforts to advance S. 496, the Farmers Undertake Environmental Land Stewardship (FUELS) Act, and would urge its inclusion in the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) in the Senate. NAWG and its 22 affiliated state associations work together to help protect and advance wheat growers' interests.

As you are aware, farming is an energy-intensive profession. Producers need fuels stored on-farm for everything from fueling tractors to running irrigation pumps. EPA's unusual 1,320 gallon regulatory threshold under the Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure (SPCC) rule has no basis in science or in normal tank sizes for agriculture. S. 496 would raise the exemption threshold to 10,000 gallons, which is a more reasonable level. It would also allow more farms with aggregate storage capacity between 10,000—42,000 gallons to self-certify rather than hiring a professional engineer.

This common sense amendment to WRDA would ease the burden on smaller producers, and we strongly encourage its adoption. Thank you for your support on this important issue.

Sincerely,

BING VON BERGEN,
President,
National Association of Wheat Growers.

AMERICAN SOYBEAN ASSOCIATION,
St. Louis, MO, May 2, 2013.

Hon. JAMES INHOFE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR INHOFE: I am writing on behalf of the American Soybean Association in support of your efforts to include S. 496, the FUELS Act, during Senate consideration of the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA). ASA represents all U.S. soybean farmers on domestic and international issues of importance to the soybean industry. ASA's advocacy efforts are made possible through the voluntary membership in ASA by over 21,000 farmers in 31 states where soybeans are grown.

New rules will take effect at the end of this fiscal year that will require that oil storage facilities with a capacity of over 1,320 gallons make structural improvements to reduce the possibility of oil spills. The plan requires farmers to construct a containment facility, like a dike or a basin, which must retain 110 percent of the fuel in the container.

Most soybean farmers find these threshold levels to be unacceptably low. Your amendment would raise the exemption level to a more reasonable 10,000 gallons for a single container, with farmers able to self-certify compliance if aggregate storage capacity is between 10,000 to 42,000 gallons.

ASA supports this amendment, and urges the Senate to adopt it.

Thank you for your leadership.

Sincerely,

DANNY MURPHY,
ASA President.

MAY 2, 2013.

U.S. Senator MARK PRYOR,
Dirksen Senate Building,
Washington, DC.
U.S. Senator JAMES INHOFE,
Russell Senate Building,
Washington, DC.
U.S. Senator DEB FISCHER,
Hart Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS, The National Cattlemen's Beef Association (NCBA) thanks you for your support of the Farmers Undertake Environmental Land Stewardship (FUELS) Act (S. 496). The FUELS Act eases the burden on farmers and ranchers in implementing the Spill Prevention, Control and Countermeasure (SPCC) rule for farms. NCBA represents over 100,000 cattle producers across the country as the nation's oldest and largest trade association representing cattle ranchers. Our members believe the FUELS Act is a common-sense measure that balances environmental concerns with the burden and cost of the regulation.

U.S. cattle ranchers are proud of their tradition as stewards of our country's natural resources. Our members take very seriously their commitment to protecting water quality from events like fuel spills. They also believe however that the economic burdens of developing spill plans certified by a profession engineer outweigh the marginal benefit that would come with requiring these plans on all farms. Compliance with the rule will cost producers thousands of dollars at a time when their budgets are very limited due to historic drought and other economic factors. In addition, in the rural areas there is an inadequate number of Professional Engineers (P.E.s) to do the engineering work required. The FUELS Act takes into account these considerations. It raises the threshold for fuel storage capacity from a mere 1,320 gallons to 10,000 gallons, which eases the burden on many smaller operations. It also allows more operations to self-certify their plans, eliminating the need for more P.E.s and the increased cost.

The SPCC rule for farms will take effect October 1, 2013 and therefore it is imperative that Congress act to prevent this regulation from creating unnecessary financial burdens on many farmers and ranchers. Thank you for your leadership on this important issue.

Sincerely,

SCOTT GEORGE,
President,
National Cattlemen's Beef Association.

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, DC.

SENATOR,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of the American Farm Bureau Federation, I would like to commend you for introducing S.496, the Farmers Undertake Environmental Land Stewardship Act. This legislation will help clarify the uncertainty created by existing regulations and the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) confusing and potentially costly compliance assistance efforts. AFBF supports the legislation and hopes it will receive strong bipartisan support.

Modern agricultural equipment requires a lot of energy. EPA's current regulatory requirements for farms appear to have little basis in science nor alignment with tank sizes currently in use in agriculture. Equally confusing is EPA's inability to provide clarity with regard to language that asks farmers and ranchers to comply with Spill Prevention, Control and Countermeasure (SPCC) regulations if the operation could reasonably be expected to discharge oil to waters of the U.S. As it stands, this ambiguous term might

apply to features that farmers and ranchers would more likely associate with dry land than water. It is therefore not reasonable for EPA to include such an expectation if it has done nothing to clarify a reasonable understanding of jurisdiction waters that is consistent with congressional intent and judicial case law

S. 496 is common-sense legislation that the Farm Bureau strongly supports. We urge the Senate to pass this amendment to help relieve undue regulation on farmers and rural America.

Sincerely yours,

DALE MOORE.

Senator MARK PRYOR,
Dirksen Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

Senator JIM INHOFE,
Russell Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS PRYOR AND INHOFE: The USA Rice Federation would like to express our strong support for S. 496, the Farmers Undertake Environmental Land Stewardship Act (FUELS Act), as an amendment to WRDA, the Water Resources Development Act. This bill would bring some much needed clarity to agriculture on the confusing requirements of the EPA's Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure (SPCC) rule.

As you are aware, farming is an energy-intensive profession. Producers need fuels stored on-farm for everything from fueling mobile equipment to running irrigation pumps. Many of these tanks are in use seasonally and stay empty much of the year due to the high cost of fuel and the possibility of theft. Furthermore, EPA's threshold number of 1,320 gallons has no basis in science or in normal tank sizes for agriculture.

In addition, EPA's bifurcation of the rule date (before and after August 16, 2002) has brought immense, unneeded confusion to the farming community as they try to determine whether their current business model is the same that was in operation prior to the 2002 date. The requirement to have Professional Engineers (PEs) sign off on many SPCC plans adds significant costs to the producer as well as the time spent trying to find the limited number of PE's willing to work on this rule in agricultural areas.

The USA Rice Federation has joined other groups in our support of EPA's extension of the deadline to May 10, 2013, but that quickly approaching extension only applies to farms in operation after August 16, 2002, further confusing the industry. Furthermore, farms are still under the costly requirements of providing secondary containment to many seasonal-use tanks and developing complicated and expensive 'spill plans'. Despite pleas to the agency for compliance assistance, they have been slow to respond, and despite invitations to grower meetings, they have little funding for travel.

Thankfully, the Senate has the opportunity to ease this burden on rural America. S. 496 would provide realistic threshold sizes for tank regulation at the farm level and allow more farms to self-certify thus saving time and money that would otherwise be spent in hiring PE's to sign the SPCC plans. S. 496 is a piece of common sense legislation that we strongly support. We urge the Senate to pass the bill to help relieve undue regulation on farmers and rural America as a part of the Water Resources Development Act.

Sincerely,

LINDA C. RAUN,
Chairwoman,
USA Rice Producers' Group.

MAY 3, 2013.

Hon. MARK PRYOR,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. JAMES INHOFE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS PRYOR AND INHOFE, On behalf of the National Corn Growers Association (NCGA), we appreciate your efforts to advance S. 496, the Farmers Undertake Environmental Land Stewardship (FUELS) Act, and would urge its inclusion in the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) in the Senate. Founded in 1957, NCGA represents approximately 38,000 dues-paying corn growers and the interests of more than 300,000 farmers who contribute through corn check-off programs in their states. NCGA and its 48 affiliated state associations and checkoff organizations work together to help protect and advance corn growers' interests.

As you are aware, farming is an energy-intensive profession. Producers need fuels stored on-farm for everything from fueling tractors to running irrigation pumps. EPA's unusual 1,320 gallon regulatory threshold under the Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure (SPCC) rule has no basis in science or in normal tank sizes for agriculture. S. 496 would raise the threshold the exemption threshold to 10,000 gallons, which is a more reasonable level. It would also allow more farms with aggregate storage capacity between 10,000-42,000 gallons to self-certify rather than hiring a professional engineer.

This common sense amendment to WRDA would ease the burden on smaller producers, and we strongly encourage its adoption. Thank you for your support on this important issue.

Sincerely,

PAM JOHNSON,
President,
National Corn Growers Association.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF
FARMER COOPERATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 6, 2013.

Hon. MARK PRYOR,
U.S. Senate, Dirksen Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

Hon. JAMES INHOFE,
U.S. Senate, Russell Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS PRYOR AND INHOFE: On behalf of the more than two million farmers and ranchers who belong to farmer cooperatives, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives (NCFC) applauds your outstanding work to create sound policies that maintain the economic and environmental health of farms, ranches, and the rural communities where they operate. This commitment is evident in S. 496, the Farmers Undertake Environmental Land Stewardship Act (FUELS Act).

The SPCC rule was originally promulgated on December 11, 1973. In 1991, a proposed rule was initiated but floundered for more than 11 years. In a move that caught many off guard, the Agency published a final rule on July 17, 2002, amending the SPCC regulations. This new rule became effective on August 16, 2002, and applied to any facility—including farms—with an aggregate of 1,320 gallons of oil on their property in aboveground tanks of 55 gallons or greater, where the spill might eventually reach navigable waters. That rulemaking showed a lack of understanding of production agriculture and as a result, required multiple revisions and compliance deadline extensions that spanned over decade.

While we welcomed the extension of the compliance deadline to May 10, 2013, that ex-

ension only applied to those agricultural operations that currently have an SPCC plan or new facilities that came into operation after the rule was effective. Specifically, if a farm was in existence prior to August 16, 2002, the compliance extension was not applicable as these farms were supposed to be in compliance with the SPCC rule and have a plan in place. EPA's bifurcation of the rule date (before and after August 16, 2002) has brought immense, unneeded confusion to the farming community as they try to determine whether their current business structure was in place prior to the 2002 date.

At the same time, the Agency has unfortunately struggled with efforts to prepare guidance and mobilize specific outreach activities in a timely manner in order to provide the farming community with the understanding and necessary tools to comply with the final rule.

Throughout the history and evolution of the SPCC rule, NCFC has strived to maintain a constructive dialogue with EPA to ensure that any agency action regulating oil spill prevention and response take into account the uniqueness of the agricultural industry; be based on sound science, need, and identified risk; and that final regulations be clear and allow time for education and implementation. While the Agency has shown good faith in working to improve the SPCC rule for agriculture, these efforts have proceeded in fits and starts.

Without question the members of the agricultural sector who grow the nation's food and rely on surface and well water to meet their families' and agricultural operations' needs are highly motivated to ensure that their environmental practices are sound. These producers work daily to ensure a safe environment for their children and the communities in which they live. As such, they can and do take very seriously their responsibility, consistent with the intent and spirit of the SPCC provisions, to properly manage the oil resources used on their operations.

Row crop farms, ranches, livestock operations, farmer cooperatives and other agribusinesses pose low risks for spills and are often seasonal in nature. In fact, data on oil spill on farms, cooperatives, and other agribusinesses is almost nonexistent. The Agency has failed to provide data or even anecdotal evidence of agricultural spills to justify such a resource-intensive rulemaking for America's farmers and ranchers. The risk of such spills from agriculture is extremely low and there is little to no evidence that providing greater flexibility through S. 496 will harm the environment.

We strongly believe S. 496 will bring much needed clarity to agriculture on the confusing requirements of the SPCC rule. Specifically, it would provide realistic threshold sizes for tank regulation at the farm level and allow more farms to self-certify thus saving time and money that would otherwise be spent in hiring Professional Engineers to develop and sign the SPCC plans.

The FUELS Act is common-sense legislation and we strongly encourage the Senate to support its passage as part of the Water Resources Development Act.

Sincerely,

CHARLES F. CONNER,
President & CEO.

MORNING BUSINESS

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

The Senator from Virginia.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—
H. CON. RES. 25

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I rise to make a few brief remarks. I will leave most of those remarks until after I make another request for unanimous consent. I think I know where this unanimous consent request is headed. I am disappointed. I think we are on, I believe, day 51 at this point as to the request that many of us have made in this Chamber to go back to regular order. Part of that regular order is after a budget has passed for budget conferees to be appointed so we can resolve what I believe is the most important issue facing our Nation, the question of our debt and deficit, so we can try to take the actions needed to get this economy jump-started again. I will reserve most of my time for the remarks afterward.

In the meantime, let me make this request:

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to consideration of Calendar No. 33, H. Con. Res. 25; that the amendment which is at the desk, the text of S. Con. Res. 8, the budget resolution passed by the Senate, be inserted in lieu thereof; that H. Con. Res. 25, as amended, be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate, all with no intervening action or debate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I ask consent the Senator modify his request so that it not be in order for the Senate to consider a conference report that includes tax increases or reconciliation instructions to increase taxes or raise the debt limit.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator so modify?

Mr. WARNER. Reserving the right to object, simply as someone who has spent an awful lot of time on this issue, both sides need to be willing to compromise. We need to deal with both the revenue side of this challenge as well as the entitlement reforms that are needed to make sure we can get our close-to-\$17-trillion debt back under control. Recognizing the Senator's request would take part of the opportunity to reach that common ground off the table, I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. McCONNELL. I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I simply want to again take a moment here, 52 days after we spent until 5 o'clock in the morning debating a budget—the budget that had over 100 amendments offered, a budget that had

amendments from both sides offered and rejected but also accepted. Amendments from both sides were accepted into this budget. It passed with a majority.

I know there are some of my colleagues on the other side who say we should go into the next step of this debate with certain things taken off the table. I do not understand how we are ever going to get to the point which every economist from left to right has all agreed upon, that we have to put this issue of lurching from one budget crisis to another behind us.

The fact is there is an awful lot of consensus about what we need to do. Starting back with the Simpson-Bowles report, then followed up by the Gang of Six and the Domenici-Rivlin report, everyone agrees we need to do at least \$4 trillion over the next 10 years. We don't have to solve the whole problem, we just have to take a good step forward.

The remarkable thing is even lurching from crisis to crisis we are over half the way there. Depending on how you want to count, we have done between \$2.2 and \$2.5 trillion of deficit reduction. That means we need about \$2 trillion more to be done for us to again not only provide the boost to the American economy, not only to no longer make Congress the object of more than late-night jokes about our inability to get things done, not only to be able to ensure we have driven our debt-to-GDP ratio back down, headed in the right direction, but, perhaps most important, demonstrate to the American people that when we have an issue of this importance we can actually find that common ground.

To do that is going to require, candidly, everyone in this body and our friends down the hall in the House to be willing to give a little bit. That means we are going to have to find ways to generate additional revenues. I believe, for one—I know sometimes many on my side disagree with me—we are going to have to find ways to reform our entitlement programs so the promise of Medicare and Social Security and Medicaid, some of the best initiatives ever put forward, are going to be here 30 years from now.

But if we are going to reach that kind of compromise, it means the regular order has to proceed. It means we have to have these two very different budgets, one passed by the House, one passed by the Senate, resolved through the regular order of a conference committee. If we do not do this—if we do not do this—my fear is we are going to continue to do the kind of actions we have been on over the last number of months where we continue to cut back on that relatively small piece of Federal spending which is discretionary spending.

We are already seeing, in States such as Massachusetts and Minnesota and Virginia, the effects of sequestration where we have put forward a policy that was viewed by everyone when it

was originally thought up as so stupid, so beyond the pale, that no rational group of folks would ever allow it to come to pass. We are now 3 or 4 months into allowing that to come to pass. While we have taken action on certain items such as relieving the challenge of our air traffic controllers, we have not taken action on making sure the funds have been replaced for the 70,000 to 80,000-plus kids who have lost their Head Start funding. We have not taken action to ensure the NIH cancer grants that are being cut, where we have done multigrant years—where the preceding years of research are now going to be flushed because we cannot do the final year of the grant, we cannot take action on that.

We have not taken action on the fact that now, as announced by the Secretary of Defense, while we have made some progress, where no longer are there 22 days of furloughs, we are now seeing 11 days of furloughs to our defense civilian employees. This is at a time that makes enormous challenges to their budgets but beyond that to the readiness of the men and women who defend our Nation.

We can continue this path on sequestration, frankly, retarding our ability to keep our military ready, holding back our ability to have the kind of economic recovery we would all like to see or we can allow the regular order, a regular order that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle called for, for the last couple of years, for us in this Senate to pass the budget.

We passed that budget. Now we need to take the next step in the process and appoint conferees and let us try to find that common ground between the House and Senate budget so we can address this issue of debt and deficit, so we can demonstrate to the American people that we can do our most basic responsibility, which is to make sure we pay our bills and operate the basic functions of government, and that we can do our job to restore the faith that this institution can work in a way the Founders set up.

Unfortunately, we are not going to take that step today because now, for the fifty-second day in a row, our Republican colleagues have objected to the next step in regular order. I am greatly disappointed, but I know I and other colleagues will come down on a regular basis and continue to make this request. My hope is that at some point in the not too distant future we can let the process continue, and we can get to the hard work of resolving the differences of the House and Senate so we can put this issue of lurching from budget crisis to budget crisis in the rearview mirror.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I thank the former Governor of Virginia. He knows how to balance a budget and how to have a strong budget for the good people of this country. I share his frustration that we are not able to bring this long-awaited budget that we finally passed in the Senate to conference with the House. I hope minds will change and we will be able to get this done.

Again, I thank the Senator for his leadership and for a balanced approach on reducing the debt.

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. I come to the floor today to speak on the importance of passing the Water Resources Development Act or, as we know it around Washington, the WRDA bill.

In my State they know it as a bill that is good for our harbors, rivers, and the flood protection we need in the Fargo-Moorhead area or, as I like to call it in Minnesota, the Moorhead-Fargo area.

The bill advances a critical front to protect the Red River of the north to Moorhead, MN, and Fargo, ND. I visited this region twice over the last year, and I have been back literally every year I have been in the Senate because of flood threats—these years more than ever.

This is literally an every-year occurrence now to the point where people have major sandbag operations filled with volunteers, seniors, and people from the prisons. Everyone is working together, but there must be a better way to do this. Just because we do it so well in North Dakota and Minnesota and have such an incredible spirit of voluntarism doesn't mean there is going to be one year where the flood is too great or that we should continue on this path when, in fact, we have the opportunity to have long-term flood protection.

The river has been above major flood stage 6 out of the last 8 years. In 2009, the year of the record flood, the river rose to more than 40 feet.

I will remind the Presiding Officer of the Grand Forks flood and what happened there. It was literally just about an hour away from Fargo. So we were that close to that happening in Fargo and Moorhead.

In Minnesota and North Dakota, the Red River doesn't divide us, it unites us. It is in that spirit of solidarity that we drive our efforts to help the Red River Basin. This year we were fortunate that the flooding was not nearly as severe as it had been projected. A week before the crest went down, it was projected to be the second biggest flood in history with the late snow.

In 2009 and 2010 homes and farms with ring dikes around them looked like small islands floating in the floodwaters. If anyone thinks this lasts for a day or week, it literally lasts for months. Entire towns create ring

dikes, and they can only get out of them with boats. That is what is happening near the Canadian border in Minnesota and North Dakota. The town of Georgetown, MN, is threatened every time the Red River rises and the Buffalo River overflows.

The volunteer who was working at the emergency center—I went up to him and said: It is so nice that you are making lunches for people. He said he lost his entire home.

I said: And you are here?

He said: Yes, this is the only thing I could think of to do to help other people who had the same bad experience as me. That is the spirit of voluntarism in our States.

I think we can do better. The annual threat of flooding in the Fargo-Moorhead area underscores the need for permanent flood protection. We know about the devastating impact of floods. The flood diversion project, which is authorized in the WRDA bill, is critical to safety and economic development.

I have enjoyed working with Congressman PETERSON on flood diversion efforts, including retention, which he cares a lot about, and we did get some funding for that. I was able to get funding in the farm bill today to help with that. I have also worked with Senator HOEVEN, Senator HEITKAMP, and Senator FRANKEN on this long-term project to have actual permanent solutions to our flooding project in Fargo and Moorhead.

We have a problem, and the WRDA bill is the beginning of a solution. Also included in this bill is a Roseau River project, which is at a critical point. The WRDA bill helps address flood protection for Roseau, MN. Roseau has recovered from a flood in 2002 that caused widespread damage, but the area needs flood protection to reduce the flood stages in the city. The next phase of the plan will include a diversion channel, a restriction structure, and two storage areas designed to remove the city from the regular 100-year regulatory floodplain and reduce future flood damages by nearly 86 percent.

The WRDA bill also advances our Nation's water infrastructure, which is something the Presiding Officer knows a little bit about in Massachusetts. It is clear that our 21st-century economy demands 21st-century infrastructure, and we cannot afford to sit back any longer and allow it to crumble. No place knows this better than Minnesota.

I lived six blocks from that 35W bridge, which is an eight-lane highway. One day, in the middle of a summer day, the bridge fell down in the middle of the Mississippi River. As I said that day, a bridge just shouldn't fall down in the middle of America, but it did.

We are seeing the same crumbling infrastructure and problems with many of our ports across the country. Failure to take action will have consequences no one likes. According to the American Society of Civil Engineers, inefficiencies in infrastructure are esti-

mated to drive up the cost of doing business by an estimated \$430 billion, and that is just in this decade.

The civil engineers' 2013 report card gives our Nation's infrastructure an overall D-plus grade. As someone who has taught students before, I think the Presiding Officer knows that is not a good grade. Our inland waterways infrastructure, which includes our locks and dams on the Mississippi River, gets a D-minus, and our ports received a C grade. We cannot be satisfied with those grades.

When people hear "ports" they think of places such as Massachusetts, South Carolina, Florida, and California. But, in fact, the Great Lakes—including Lake Superior, which we are so proud of in Minnesota—have very significant ports.

In fact, when I first came to the Senate, I was assigned to the Commerce Committee and somehow found myself on the oceans subcommittee. I remember sitting at my first meeting thinking: What am I doing here? I am on the oceans subcommittee. I wrote a note to the Senator from New Jersey, FRANK LAUTENBERG, that said: I am the only Senator on the subcommittee who doesn't have an ocean. I kept the note he wrote back to me. The note said: It is easy, next year just come back and ask for one.

Well, in fact, I found out since then that the oceans subcommittee included the Great Lakes so it gave me a platform to advocate for our Great Lakes. The Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, which is so important to our ocean-bordering States, also includes the Great Lakes. The Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund collects \$700 million each year more than it spends on dredging. In other words, it collects \$700 million more each year than it spends on dredging and maintenance.

Meanwhile, our ports and navigation channels wait for basic maintenance. We need to correct this disparity and ensure the funds are spent to address the needs of the shippers and ensure that the Great Lakes system does not fall into further disrepair.

I was just up at the Port of Duluth-Superior to highlight the need for dredging and maintenance on the Great Lakes. The Port of Duluth-Superior is ranked among the top 20 ports in the U.S. by cargo tonnage. It sees 40 million short tons of cargo and nearly 1,000 vessel visits every year. I think people would be surprised by that since Minnesota has lakes. In fact, we have 1 of the top 20 ports in the country.

We have 11,500 jobs that are dependent on cargo shipments in and out of the port. The port is critical to the economy of northeastern Minnesota where my dad was born and my grandpa worked as an iron ore miner. Guess what. That is how they got the iron ore out of Minnesota and out to the world.

It is critical that high-use ports like Duluth and Two Harbors get dredged so they can support the ships. It is vital

that their trading partners throughout the Great Lakes system receive maintenance as well. Both Duluth and Two Harbors, MN, ports are considered deep-water ports, so they come into a classification which has tended to get the funding, but, in fact, the entire Great Lakes navigation system is in trouble.

The backlog of sediment due to insufficient dredging is more than 18 million cubic yards and estimated at \$200 million. When ships on the Great Lakes have to “light load”—having to reduce the amount of cargo they carry because channels are not deep enough—our economy suffers.

At first some people might think: What does light loading mean? At the end of 2012, the light loading to navigate the Soo Locks on the St. Mary’s River between Lake Superior and Lake Huron meant 10,000 tons of cargo could not be transported on the final voyage. Think of it. These are American goods that our workers produced, and we want them to make more of it. Yet we literally cannot put them on the ships because we have not maintained our ports the way we are supposed to.

The ships that are coming in cannot take the goods. They have to wait until the winter is done. That is what happened this year and has been happening many years.

We are an export economy. America’s way forward is to make goods again, invent, and export to the world. Well, that is not going to happen if we cannot get our goods to market. That is why I have been working so closely with Senators from across the Great Lakes to address this backlog. We have been able to make some progress.

I cosponsored an amendment with Senator LEVIN to direct the Secretary of the Army Corps to manage the Great Lakes navigation system as an interconnected system. This would ensure that maintenance and dredging is done throughout the system. There is much more to do. I will continue to work with Senator LEVIN, Senator STABENOW, and other Great Lakes Senators on this bill.

The WRDA bill will go a long way toward increasing the efficiency of the shipping across the Great Lakes system, thereby strengthening the economic standing of our agriculture, mining, manufacturing, and other industries.

The bill also makes critical reforms to our Nation’s rivers and waterways. The inland waterway system in this country spans 38 States and handles approximately one-half of the inland waterway freight. Farmers and businesses in my State transport soybeans, corn, and other commodities from Minnesota to other terminals in the South. From there, ships are loaded and the commodities are eventually delivered to trading partners.

Again, if we want to produce and export to the world, we have to have the transportation system that supports it. With many maintenance and construc-

tion projects years overdue, the inland waterways are in dire need of major rehabilitation. The Inland Waterways Trust Fund, which funds these projects, is in steady decline. If we don’t make the Inland Waterways Trust Fund sustainable, the industries that are so heavily dependent on the inland waterways will suffer, and this means jobs suffer.

I cosponsored the RIVER Act with Senator CASEY and Senator LANDRIEU to help move forward major construction projects on the inland waterway system. That bill is also supported by Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER. It is a bipartisan bill, and it includes much needed rehabilitation of the locks and dams along the Mississippi River.

This bill includes a number of reforms to the project management process that will ensure that waterway projects are completed on time and minimize cost overruns.

I also, by the way, support the amendment to increase the inland waterways user fee. I am a cosponsor of that amendment. Let me emphasize that the users who pay this fee have asked for it. We have a situation where the industries are willing to pay more so we can improve the locks and dams so they can get their goods to market. That is what is going on here. They understand we are having budget issues, and they are willing to pay a higher fee to pay for the changes.

Industry partners from farmers to shippers to companies, such as cargo companies in my State, strongly support this user fee increase. The increase was, in fact, their idea. They realized that the government wasn’t going to fund these and that they were having trouble doing business, and they have agreed to pay for this increased fee. To me, it is the perennial no-brainer that we get this done. They know this modest change would go a long way to making our Nation’s rivers and waterways viable for years to come.

While the fee increase will not advance, sadly, in the WRDA bill because it is considered a tax provision, it sends an important message that industry and shippers are at the table and volunteering more to help build the infrastructure our economic future requires. We plan on advancing this part of the river act in another bill—in tax reform or standing on its own—because we think it is so important to be able to fund these improvements to the locks.

Finally, in Minnesota, the fishing and boating industries contribute around \$4 billion to our State’s economy each year. Sometimes I like to tease people and ask them how much money do they think we spend on worms in Minnesota every year. Well, it is literally tens of millions of dollars. People come to our State and buy worms and bait and other forms of fishing tackle because of their importance to our economy. In fact, for last week-end’s Minnesota fishing opener, sadly,

cold and ice covered many lakes, but people were still out there looking for that empty hole where there wasn’t ice so they could put their line into the water.

In Minnesota, we also know how important it is to address invasive species problems, especially when they threaten our lakes and rivers. In our State the problem of Asian carp is literally swimming and jumping into our lives. Anyone who hasn’t seen the YouTube video should look at it. You can see Asian carp literally jumping out of the water and hitting fishermen in the head. We are very concerned because we have seen problems with them downriver in southern Minnesota. They are coming our way, and we do not want them to ruin our way of life in Minnesota, nor do we want them to hurt our jobs and our \$4 billion fishing and gaming industry.

I believe we need an “all-of-the-above” solution to this challenge that includes research, carp barriers, as well as authority to close the Upper St. Anthony Falls Lock. I am very glad the provision was included to allow for greater coordination between Federal agencies when it comes to Asian carp, and this also includes rivers and not just the Great Lakes.

So we are continuing to work on this bill when it comes to Asian carp and other invasive species, but I think there are some other good provisions in this bill as well.

I wish to commend Senators BOXER and VITTER for their great work to put together this bipartisan legislation. I support its passage, from fighting to protect towns from flooding to critical waterway infrastructure. This legislation is vital to our economy, to our environment, to our cities, and to our towns. I am excited to be a part of it. I hope my colleagues support it and we can get this done.

Thank you, Madam President. I yield the floor.

25TH ANNIVERSARY OF KENTUCKY BUS CRASH TRAGEDY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I rise today to commemorate a sad and tragic event in Kentucky history that happened 25 years ago today: on May 14, 1988, a horrific bus crash occurred on I-71 near Carrollton, KY. Twenty-seven people were killed, 24 of them children, and 34 were injured when a drunk driver traveling in the wrong direction hit the bus. It remains the worst drunk-driving crash in American history.

On this day 25 years ago, the Radcliff First Assembly of God Church in Radcliff, KY, organized a youth trip to a nearby amusement park, and drove 170 miles to Cincinnati in the church bus. The bus was full with 67 passengers. After a fun day of roller coasters and ice cream, at 10:55 that night, on the return trip, a drunk driver in a pickup truck traveling north in the southbound lane of I-71 struck the church bus directly head-on.

The impact ruptured the bus's 60-gallon gasoline tank, starting a fire which reached 2,500 degrees Fahrenheit and filled the bus with smoke. With the front door blocked by collision damage, and no emergency exits in the windows or roof, most of the survivors exited through a single emergency exit at the rear of the bus. Of the 40 survivors, only 6 escaped uninjured. Many others suffered severe burns and other injuries. And 27 lives were lost in that crash.

I want to extend my gratitude to the Kentucky State Police, who not only provided rescue efforts at the scene and crash reconstruction analysis afterwards, but were also the lead investigative agency for this tragedy, following the case through to the prosecution phase. Current Kentucky State Police Commissioner Rodney Brewer was one of the investigators who worked on the challenging case.

Remembrances and observances in honor of the victims are happening in Kentucky today, where dozens of families remain grief stricken by the senseless loss of their beloved child. Those who survived the crash are still haunted by what happened. I wish to express my deepest sympathies for the victims' families, the survivors, first responders, and all those who were touched by this tragedy. The people of Kentucky stand with you today and share your sorrow.

If any good can be said to have come from this awful event, it is that it directed national attention on driving safety, the dangers of drunk driving, and safety requirements in buses. Kentucky took the lead in responding to this tragedy by requiring school buses to have more emergency exits than the Federal standard and instituting stricter drunken driving laws.

Madam President, I know my colleagues in the Senate join me today in paying tribute to the 27 people who were killed in this bus crash, to their families who grieve today, to the surviving passengers who must still live with the nightmare of what happened, to their families, to the law enforcement officers and first responders who assisted in rescuing the passengers, and to every Kentuckian whose life was altered by the events of that fateful day.

Even today, 27 people are killed every day in America as a result of drunken driving. In 2011, drunk driving killed 9,878 on America's roads and injured over 300,000. I believe one way we can honor the memories of the victims of this terrible accident is to continue to speak out against the dangers of drunk driving and work towards its elimination. No family should have to endure the suffering that so many Kentucky families did on this day 25 years ago.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the 27 crash victims be included in the RECORD following my remarks. I yield the floor.

There being no objection, the names of the 27 victims of the tragedy of May

14, 1988, were entered into the RECORD as follows:

Jennifer Ann Arnett, Cynthia Anne Atherton, Sandy Brewer, Joshua Conyers, Mary Catheryn Daniels, Julie Ann Earnest, Kashawn Etheredge, Shannon Rae Fair, Dwailla Fischel, Richard Keith Gohn, Lori Kathleen Holzer, Charles "Chuck" Kytta, Anthony Marks.

April Mills, Phillip Lee Morgan, Tina Michelle Mustain, William J. Nichols, Jr., Patricia Susan Nunnallee, John R. Pearman, Emillie S. Thompson, Crystal Erin Uhey, Denise Ellen Voglund, Amy Christine Wheelock, Joy Williams, Kristen Williams, Robin Williams, Chad Anthony Witt.

PLIGHT OF THE BAHÁ'Í COMMUNITY

• Mr. KIRK. Madam President I wish to call attention to the plight of the Bahá'í community and the atrocious human rights situation in the Islamic Republic of Iran. Today marks the fifth year Fariba Kamalabadi, Jamaloddin Khanjani, Afif Naemi, Saeid Rezaie, Behrouz Tavakkoli, and Vahid Tizfahm have been behind bars in Iran due to their faith. These six individuals, along with Mahvash Sabet, imprisoned 2 months earlier, make up the "Yaran-I-Iran," or Friends of Iran, which is the former leadership group of the Bahá'í community of Iran. We must not let up on our efforts to defend the Bahá'í community until the Iranian Government's intensifying persecution comes to an end.

Iran outlawed Bahá'í institutions in 1983, leading to the establishment of an ad hoc leadership group to meet the basic spiritual and social needs of the Bahá'í community of Iran. In August 2010, the Government of Iran sentenced the Yaran to 20-year prison terms on the absurd charges of "spying for Israel, insulting religious sanctities, propaganda against the regime and spreading corruption on earth."

The Bahá'í faith is an independent world religion that began in 19th-century Persia. Its central tenets include unity, peace, and understanding. The Bahá'ís are currently the largest non-Muslim minority in Iran, numbering some 300,000 members, and the Bahá'í faith is one of the world's fastest growing religions with more than 5 million followers worldwide. Since the Iranian Revolution in 1979, the Bahá'ís have been a target of systematic government-sponsored persecution. Roughly 200 Bahá'ís in Iran have been killed by government authorities since 1978 and more than 650 Bahá'ís have been arrested since 2005 alone.

In May 2011, the government conducted raids on the Bahá'í Institute of Higher Education, an informal learning system created by the Bahá'í community in response to the exclusion of Bahá'ís from universities. Several educators were arrested and detained. Seven of them—Mahmoud Badavam, Noushin Khadem, Vahid Mahmoudi, Kamran Mortezaie, Farhad Sedghi, Riaz Sobhani, and Ramin Zibaie—were sentenced to 4 and 5-year prison terms,

although Vahid Mahmoudi has since been released. Since October 2011, four more BIHE instructors were imprisoned.

The 2013 U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom Report stated that "during the past year, the already poor religious freedom conditions continued to deteriorate, especially for religious minorities, in particular for Bahá'ís." On February 28, 2013, the U.N. Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran reported that there were 110 Bahá'ís currently imprisoned in Iran solely for practicing their faith. Bahá'ís in Iran are restricted from filling public and private jobs, denied business licenses, and excluded from university. In recent years, the state-sponsored media in Iran embarked on a systematic campaign to demonize and incite hatred against Bahá'ís through the use of false and offensive propaganda pieces. An increasing amount of personal property has been confiscated, an increasing number of Bahá'í-owned businesses have been vandalized and attacked, and an increasing number of Bahá'í cemeteries have been desecrated over the past year across the country.

Despite being bound to numerous international treaties, the Iranian Government continues to persecute those who seek to exercise their freedom of expression, thought, conscience, and religion. As Americans, we honor our fundamental rights and freedoms by speaking out for the rights and freedoms of the Bahá'ís and all others who are oppressed in Iran. And it is incumbent on the Senate to reveal the truth about the situation of the Bahá'í community in Iran and take steps to eradicate the violence and injustice.

Illinois is home to the world-renowned Bahá'í Temple, so the plight of Bahá'ís in Iran holds special significance for our citizens. I am proud to have joined with my Illinois colleague, Senator DURBIN, in introducing S. Res. 75, a resolution that condemns the Government of Iran for its state-sponsored persecution of its Bahá'í minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights. Today, we reaffirm our solidarity with the faithful Bahá'ís in Iran who are subject to discrimination, detention, or worse solely for their beliefs and views. It is my hope that S. Res. 75 will bring the persecution of Bahá'ís and the issue of human rights in Iran to the forefront of the international agenda.●

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, it has been 5 years since the Iranian regime arrested and imprisoned seven members of the Bahá'í community's ad hoc leadership group. Today I rise to mark this sad anniversary and to remind folks of the persecution that religious minorities continue to face in Iran.

The Bahá'í faith was founded in Iran during the 19th century. It is an independent religion not a sect of Islam

and it rejects violence. The Bahá'í faith is practiced today by more than 5 million people around the world, roughly 300,000 of whom still live in Iran.

But rather than celebrate its own religious history, the Iranian regime considers the Bahá'í faith to be a heresy and brutally represses its practitioners. The regime routinely seizes personal property from members of the Bahá'í community, denies them access to education and employment opportunities, and detains them based solely on their religious beliefs. According to some reports, more than 600 Bahá'ís have been arrested since 2004. The American Bahá'í community counts 115 Bahá'ís currently in Iranian prisons and another 437 awaiting trial, appeal, sentencing, or for their sentence to begin.

Five years ago, the Iranian regime arrested seven leaders of the Bahá'í community—Fariba Kamalabadi, Jamaloddin Khanjani, Afif Naeimi, Saeid Rezaie, Mahvash Sabet, Behrouz Tavakkoli, and Vahid Tizfahm—and detained them in Iran's notorious Evin prison. Iranian leaders accused the seven of espionage for Israel, insulting religious sanctities, and propaganda against the Islamic Republic.

These seven have since faced sham trials in kangaroo courts. One of their lawyers, Nobel Peace Prize laureate Shirin Ebadi, reported difficultly establishing basic, meaningful access to counsel. She also stated that the regime had no evidence against the accused and that their trial was riddled with irregularities. Despite these concerns the regime sentenced all seven to 20 years in prison in 2010.

I and many others found these sentences unconscionable and said so at the time. Imagine being sentenced to prison because your faith recognized the divine origin of the world's great religions, the oneness of the human race, and the equality of men and women. Imagine losing 20 years of your life because somebody objected to your personal beliefs.

For the Iranian regime, I am sorry to say, this is more business as usual. This religious persecution is hardly limited to the Bahá'ís either. In fact, since 1999 the State Department has designated Iran as a "country of particular concern" for its human rights record. The U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom's 2012 annual report cited the regime for engaging in "systematic, ongoing, and egregious violations of religious freedom, including prolonged detention, torture, and executions based primarily or entirely upon the religion of the accused." The report goes on to state that "even the recognized non-Muslim religious minorities protected under Iran's constitution—Jews, Armenian and Assyrian Christians, and Zoroastrians—faced increasing discrimination, arrests, and imprisonment."

The Iranian regime must stop its assault on religious expression and free-

dom of conscience, and there is no better day to do so than this sad and dubious anniversary. I call upon Iran's rulers to immediately release the seven Bahá'í leaders and all other prisoners held on account of their beliefs. I also want to urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring S. Res. 75, introduced by Senators KIRK and DURBIN. This resolution condemns the Iranian regime for its state-sponsored persecution of its Bahá'í minority and for its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights, to which Iran is a party.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING THE MAINE TROOP GREETERS

• Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, on May 18, Americans will join together in observance of Armed Forces Day to thank the men and women of our military for their courageous and dedicated service to our Nation. This occasion has a special significance in my home State, as it marks the 10th anniversary of a remarkable group of patriots called the Maine Troop Greeters.

The story of the Maine Troop Greeters is that of hundreds of patriotic citizens who, since May of 2003, have gathered at Bangor International Airport to greet every single flight carrying our military personnel across the Atlantic to Iraq, Afghanistan, Kuwait, or other overseas assignments or bringing them home. Whether these flights land at Bangor in the light of day or the dark of night, in fair weather or foul, the Troop Greeters are there with cookies and coffee, cheers and songs, and handshakes and hugs.

It is the story of more than 1.3 million servicemembers and nearly 350 military dogs who have landed in Bangor on some 6,700 flights. Without exception, our troops have been astonished, overwhelmed, encouraged, and most of all, welcomed and thanked by this spontaneous outpouring of gratitude and respect.

Bangor's tradition of greeting troop flights began long before 2003. On a frigid March morning in 1991, a large group of grateful Mainers came to the airport to welcome home returning troops from Operation Desert Storm. One of those soldiers, MSG Kevin Tillman of Kentucky, borrowed a saxophone from a high school musician and performed a spine-tingling rendition of our national anthem. It was a moment that electrified America.

To underscore the powerful and lasting impact of the Maine Troop Greeters, Master Sergeant Tillman returned to Bangor in 2011, 20 years after that unforgettable moment, to perform in concert with our high school band.

I am often asked by my Senate colleagues why this Troop Greeter phenomenon is so powerful in Bangor. It is not just that the city I am proud to call home is the location of the east-

ernmost airport in the United States, a former Air Force base that can accommodate transatlantic flights. For many of our troops, Bangor is either the last American soil they touch upon deployment or the first they touch upon their return.

That simple answer only scratches the surface. The phenomenon of the Maine Troop Greeters is not merely a matter of geography and facilities but the manifestation of a caring community and of the American spirit. Throughout our Nation's history, young Americans have left the comfort and security of home to defend our freedom and to extend the blessing of freedom to others. And behind patriots in uniform have stood patriots at home to honor their service.

The Maine Troop Greeters are individuals acting out of personal conviction, but their efforts are magnified by the support of local businesses, civic organizations, and the Bangor International Airport. Their generosity strengthens the spirit of volunteerism that is a core American value.

One of the principles of true service is that it is not something that is done only when convenient but a commitment sincerely made and faithfully kept. That is the principle that guides our men and women in uniform and that guides those who honor and support them.

It has been said that it is easy to take for granted that which has never been taken away. Thanks to the veterans who served in the past, America has never lost its freedom. Thanks to those who serve today, we never will. Armed Forces Day reminds us of the high price some pay for what we all cherish, and the Maine Troop Greeters exemplify the gratitude all Americans share.●

RECOGNIZING THE MAINE SCHOOL OF SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS

• Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I am delighted to commend the Maine School of Science and Mathematics, MSSM, of Limestone, ME, on being recognized among the best high schools in our country. MSSM was recently awarded an outstanding 13th-place ranking among more than 21,000 public high schools included in the 2013 U.S. News and World Report national rankings on school achievement. I would like to engage my fellow Senator from Maine in saluting this accomplishment, which makes us both proud.

This award recognizes that MSSM students achieve at the highest level academically. MSSM is a top-performing school on State-required assessments, and staff at the school use assessments throughout the academic year as a tool for improving and customizing instruction. The school's faculty works closely with students to forge a strong school community where students are encouraged to pursue their interests.

I applaud the students who are working hard to excel and in doing so, making their families, communities, and State proud. I also want to commend the administrators, teachers, and staff of MSSM who are succeeding in their mission to generate confidence and momentum for learning. They are making a difference in the lives of their students and are helping them reach their full potential as independent, responsible learners and engaged citizens.

I am pleased that the U.S. News and World Report has recognized the achievements of the Maine School of Science and Mathematics, and I congratulate the entire community for this outstanding achievement. Having grown up in Northern Maine, I could not be more proud of what these students and this faculty have achieved.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the comments of the senior senator from Maine. I too am proud to congratulate the Maine School of Science and Mathematics, MSSM, for its 13th-place showing in this year's U.S. News and World Report on high school rankings. In addition, U.S. News ranked MSSM first in New England and third in the United States among magnet schools. This impressive achievement is a testament to the exceptional caliber of the school's students, faculty, and staff.

Founded by the Maine State Legislature in 1995, MSSM is a residential magnet school that specializes in science and mathematics education. It is the only school of its kind in New England. MSSM serves a diverse student body made up of young people from across the State of Maine and around the world. Graduates of MSSM are prepared for rigorous postsecondary programs and have gone on to notable success in fields as diverse as academia, engineering, public service, and the military.

It bears mentioning that when the school was proposed during my first year as governor, I was opposed to funding it for budgetary reasons. During a time of fiscal restraint, I was uncertain of the wisdom in devoting funds to a new school. Boy, was I wrong—MSSM has become a real gem, and I have never been so glad to have been wrong.

The U.S. News ranking reflects the school's ongoing commitment to excellence. Just last year, MSSM entered into a learning partnership with the University of Maine at Presque Isle that affords MSSM students the opportunity to earn college credit for select coursework. This collaborative approach is precisely the kind of innovative thinking that forges connections between high schools and postsecondary institutions and ensures that students are able to envision clear educational pathways for themselves.

The world-class education offered in Limestone would not be possible without the talented teachers, administrators, and staff who have fostered a genuine community of learning and explo-

ration and who have dedicated themselves to educating the next generation of innovative and well-rounded scholars. The foundation of any successful school lies in the dedication of its staff, and I commend the many individuals who lead and support this outstanding institution.

In its 18 years of existence, MSSM has become a point of pride for the residents of Limestone and for the whole State of Maine. I am delighted to offer my hearty congratulations to all members of the MSSM community, and I look forward to hearing of the school's continued success in the years to come.●

COMMENDING UTAH'S ACADEMY NOMINEES

● Mr. LEE. Madam President, today I wish to recognize eight exemplary Utahns and future officers in the U.S. military. Each of them will begin their education at a military academy this fall.

Jonson Henry, graduating from Park City High School, will be attending the Naval Academy. An accomplished runner, he was captain of his cross-country team and participated in track and field. He is an avid outdoorsman and an accomplished musician. He was also an AP Scholar with Distinction.

Phillip Lowry, a Weber High School graduate, will be attending the Naval Academy. Phillip was an Eagle Scout, captain of his rugby team, and accomplished in Jujitsu and mixed martial arts. He was also an accomplished musician and an AP Distinguished Scholar. His father is currently Active Duty with the Army and is serving in Afghanistan.

Amanda Ley, from Viewmont High School and Northwestern Preparatory School, will be attending the Air Force Academy. Amanda was a member of the National Honor Society and earned her Academic Letter. She was captain of the swim team and actively volunteered with South Davis Community Hospital. Her father is an Air Force veteran.

McKenna Cox graduated from Mountain View High School and will be attending the Air Force Academy. McKenna was a student body officer and a member of the National Honor Society. A great example of a student athlete, she was Academic All-State in soccer and was the captain of the basketball team, the softball team, and the cross-country team. She organized food drives for the Utah Food Bank and care packages for the military.

William Estes, from Dugway High School and attending the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, was a National Honor Society member and participated in ice hockey, baseball, track and field, and was Academic All-State in basketball. He was also band president and participated in the JROTC. His father is currently serving in the Army.

Russell Landes will be attending the U.S. Military Academy at West Point.

Russell attended the American Leadership Academy, where he was student body president. He was captain of the wrestling team and also participated on the football and track teams. He also earned his Eagle Scout award.

Benjamin Lemon, from Bountiful High School and the University of Utah, will be attending the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. Benjamin was a member of the National Honor Society and earned his Eagle Scout. He was captain of the football team and participated in wrestling and the track and field team. His brother also served honorably in the armed services, where he was wounded in the service of his country.

Thomas Maddox, a graduate of Juan Diego Catholic High School, will be attending the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. He was an outstanding scholar and captain of the lacrosse and ice hockey teams. He has over 75 hours of community service. He was student government class officer and founder and president of the Patriots Club.

One of my greatest honors as a Senator has been to get to know and nominate each of these young men and women. I know that our Nation's future is bright in the hands of these exemplary individuals who have distinguished themselves amongst their peers.●

TRIBUTE TO MAJOR NATHAN KLINE

● Mr. TOOMEY. Madam President, I wish to honor the remarkable service of a great Pennsylvanian to our Nation's defense and its veterans. Maj. Nathan Kline, U.S. Air Force, Retired, served for nearly half a century in our country's Armed Forces. After enlisting in the U.S. Army Air Forces in 1942, he served in highly hazardous positions as a bombardier and navigator on a B-26 Marauder. His 65 air combat missions included the D-day invasion and the Battle of the Bulge. Incredibly, he survived after his aircraft was shot down twice during the campaign in Europe. For his actions, he earned the Distinguished Flying Cross and 10 Air Medals. After the war, the French Ambassador welcomed Major Kline into the coveted Legion d'Honneur for his service in the liberation of France.

Major Kline did not seek a quiet postwar civilian life. He continued his military service in the Reserves while working in support of the veterans' community. His advocacy on behalf of veterans and their families became a lifelong endeavor. Major Kline was a founding member of the Lehigh Valley Military Affairs Council. In this capacity, he raised funds to provide scholarships to deployed servicemembers' children, managed assembly and shipment of care packages and helped veterans to find employment.

In honoring Major Kline, we recognize his commitment to service during times of war and peace.

As Congress confronts the dual challenges of ensuring our national security and putting our fiscal house in order, it must remember its profound responsibility to keep our Nation safe and care for its veterans. For well over 200 years, our servicemembers and veterans, like Maj. Nathan Kline, have steadfastly served our Nation and have set a stellar example for those who will follow in the generations to come.●

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 953. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to extend the reduced interest rate for undergraduate Federal Direct Stafford Loans, to modify required distribution rules for pension plans, to limit earnings stripping by expatriated entities, to provide for modifications related to the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

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-1461. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Horses Protection Act; Requiring Horse Industry Organizations To Assess and Enforce Minimum Penalties for Violations; Correction" ((RIN0579-AD43) (Docket No. APHIS-2011-0030)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1462. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Record-keeping for Approved Livestock Facilities and Slaughtering and Rendering Establishments" ((RIN0579-AC61) (Docket No. APHIS-2007-0039)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1463. A communication from the Management Analyst, Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "United States Standards for Wheat" (RIN0580-AB12) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1464. A communication from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Rules of Practice and Procedure; Adjusting Civil Money Penalties for Inflation" (RIN3052-AC87) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 7, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1465. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to three violations of the Antideficiency Act occurring with the Federal Highway Administration's Highway Infrastructure Investment and TIGER Grants accounts within the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 ap-

propriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-1466. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to several violations of the Antideficiency Act occurring with the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration's Administrative account, Motor Carrier Safety Grant account, and the Motor Carrier Safety Operations and Programs account; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-1467. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of two (2) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of major general and brigadier general, respectively, in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1468. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of twelve (12) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of major general and brigadier general, respectively, in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1469. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Policy), Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the training of the U.S. Special Operations Forces with friendly foreign forces during fiscal year 2012; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1470. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs), transmitting, a report of proposed legislation entitled "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1471. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency declared in Executive Order 12978 of October 21, 1995, with respect to significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1472. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the continuation of the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13413 with respect to blocking the property of persons contributing to the conflict taking place in the Democratic Republic of the Congo; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1473. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the continuation of the national emergency relative to the actions and policies of the Government of Sudan as declared in Executive Order 13067 of November 3, 1997; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1474. A communication from the Attorney, Office of the General Counsel, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Consumer Financial Civil Penalty Fund" ((RIN3170-AA38) (Docket No. CFPB-2013-0011)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1475. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of Housing, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Housing Administration (FHA): Section 232 Healthcare Facility Insurance Program—Strengthening Accountability and Regulatory Revisions Update Final Rule Amendment—Revision of Date of Applicability" (RIN2502-AJ05) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on

May 8, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1476. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Contractor Legal Management Requirements; Acquisition Regulations" (RIN1990-AA37) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2013; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1477. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act Regulations" (RIN1024-AD99) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 7, 2013; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1478. A communication from the Acting Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report concerning operations at the Naval Petroleum Reserves for fiscal year 2012; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1479. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "U.S. Department of Education Fiscal Year 2012 Annual Performance Report and Fiscal Year 2014 Annual Performance Plan"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1480. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Wood River Levee System Reconstruction project, Madison, County, Illinois; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1481. A communication from the Chairman of the Administrative Conference of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 2012 Performance and Accountability Report of the Administrative Conference of the United States; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1482. A communication from the Chief, Washington Field Office, U.S. Office of Special Counsel, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office's fiscal year 2012 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1483. A communication from the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Quarterly Report for April 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1484. A communication from the Chairman of the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Inspector General's Semiannual Report for the six-month period from October 1, 2012 through March 31, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1485. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Civil Rights, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Agency's fiscal year 2012 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1486. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-54, "Permanent Supportive Housing Application Streamlining Temporary Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1487. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-59, "Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Time Extension Temporary Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1488. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-60, "Egregious First-Time Sale to Minor Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1489. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-63, "Captive Earthquake Property Insurance Temporary Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1490. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 19-632, "Local Budget Autonomy Amendment Act of 2012"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1491. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Policy), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report to Congress on the Activities of the National Guard Counterdrug Schools for Fiscal Year 2012"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1492. A communication from the Chairman of the United States Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Strategic Plan for fiscal years 2014-2018; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1493. A communication from the Chair, U.S. Sentencing Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the amendments to the federal sentencing guidelines that were proposed by the Commission during the 2012-2013 amendment cycle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1494. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Bureau of Prisons' compliance with the privatization requirements of the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1495. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report on applications made by the Government for authority to conduct electronic surveillance for foreign intelligence during calendar year 2012 relative to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1496. 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: Placement of Lorazepam Into Schedule IV" (Docket No. DEA-369) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2013; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1497. A communication from the Secretary of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Hart-Scott-Rodino Annual Report: Fiscal Year 2012"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. STABENOW, from the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, without amendment:

S. 954. An original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MENENDEZ for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

*Deborah Kay Jones, of New Mexico, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Libya.

Nominee: Deborah Kay Jones.
Post: Libya.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: None
2. Spouse: None
3. Children and Spouses: None
4. Parents: None
5. Grandparents: None
6. Brothers and Spouses: None
7. Sisters and Spouses: None

*James Knight, of Alabama, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Chad.

Nominee: James Knight.

Post: N'Djamena, Republic of Chad.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: James Knight, \$200, Mar 2008, Barack Obama; \$200, Mar 2008, Hillary Clinton; \$200, Mar 2008, John McCain; \$200, Sep 2008, Barack Obama; \$200, Sep 2008, John McCain.
2. Spouse: Amelia Bell Knight; 0.
3. Children and Spouses: Mary Amelia Walker; 0; Christopher P. Alvarez; 0; Richard Adrian Walker III—unmarried, (deceased); James Davis Knight, \$50, 2008, John Edwards; \$200, 2008, Barack Obama; Cheryl Knight, 0; James Lee Knight—unmarried, 0.

Parents: Father Kimo C. V. Courtenay—deceased; Mother Perry Nell Jones—deceased; Stepfather Roy Arthur Knight—deceased.

5. Grandparents: Maternal grandfather Perry W. Caraway—deceased; Paternal grandfather James Crosby Little—deceased; Maternal grandmother Bessie Mae Caraway—deceased; Paternal grandmother Marjorie Elder Little—deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Brooke Courtenay, 0; Spouse name unknown, 0; Paul K. Lindo, 0; Spouse name unknown, 0.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Kathryn Marie Harris, 0; Hugh G. Harris, 0.

Tamsen N. F. Courtenay no response to query for contributions since 2008 unmarried Note: Brooke Courtenay, Paul K. Lindo, and Tamsen N. F. Courtenay are half-siblings with whom I had no contact prior to father's terminal illness in 2011, hence not reported earlier.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed sub-

ject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. HELLER (for himself, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 936. A bill to increase oversight of small business assistance programs provided by the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 937. A bill to prohibit the Internal Revenue Service from applying disproportionate scrutiny to applicants for tax-exempt status based on ideology, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MORAN:

S. 938. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to allow certain veterans to use educational assistance provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs for franchise training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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

S. 939. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to treat certain misfiled documents as motions for reconsideration of decisions by the Board of Veterans' Appeals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico:

S. 940. A bill to provide grants to States to improve high schools and raise graduation rates while ensuring rigorous standards, to develop and implement effective school models for struggling students and dropouts, and to improve State policies to raise graduation rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. HELLER, Mr. VITTER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. RISCH, Mr. COATS, Mr. KIRK, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. SESSIONS):

S. 941. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prevent discriminatory misconduct against taxpayers by Federal officers and employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. HARKIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. MURPHY):

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; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. BENNET):

S. 943. A bill to establish an alternative accountability model; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Mr. BURR):

S. 944. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require courses of education provided by public institutions of higher education that are approved for purposes of the

All-Volunteer Force Educational Assistance Program and Post-9/11 Educational Assistance to charge veterans tuition and fees at the in-State tuition rate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BEGICH, Mrs. HAGAN, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 945. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to diabetes self-management training by authorizing certified diabetes educators to provide diabetes self-management training services, including as part of telehealth services, under part B of the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BURR, Mr. COATS, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. JOHANNES, Mr. MORAN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. THUNE, Mr. VITTER, Mr. LEE, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 946. A bill to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HAGAN (for herself, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. JOHANNES):

S. 947. A bill to ensure access to certain information for financial services industry regulators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. 948. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage and payment for complex rehabilitation technology items under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Mr. JOHANNES):

S. 949. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to improve upon the definitions provided for points and fees in connection with a mortgage transaction; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. KING):

S. 950. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to allow a veterinarian to transport and dispense controlled substances in the usual course of veterinary practice outside of the registered location; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. BARRASSO, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HOEVEN, and Mr. RISCH):

S. 951. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey to a State all right, title, and interest in and to a percentage of the amount of royalties and other amounts required to be paid to the State under that Act with respect to public land and deposits in the State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

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

S. 952. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the treatment of church pension plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. REID, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. DURBIN, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 953. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to extend the reduced interest rate for undergraduate Federal Direct Stafford Loans, to modify required distribu-

tion rules for pension plans, to limit earnings stripping by expatriated entities, to provide for modifications related to the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, and for other purposes; read the first time.

By Ms. STABENOW:

S. 954. An original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; from the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry; placed on the calendar.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. Res. 140. A resolution commemorating and acknowledging the dedication and sacrifices made by the Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers who have been killed or injured in the line of duty; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BEGICH (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WARNER, Mr. HELLER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. REID, Mr. KIRK, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. BLUNT):

S. Res. 141. A resolution recognizing the goals of National Travel and Tourism Week and honoring the valuable contributions of travel and tourism to the United States; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 214

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 214, a bill to prohibit brand name drug companies from compensating generic drug companies to delay the entry of a generic drug into the market.

S. 217

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 217, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to require the Secretary of Education to collect information from coeducational elementary schools and secondary schools on such schools' athletic programs, and for other purposes.

S. 294

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

S. 309

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr.

ENZI), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. COWAN), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) were added as cosponsors of S. 309, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the Civil Air Patrol.

S. 316

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 316, a bill to recalculate and restore retirement annuity obligations of the United States Postal Service, to eliminate the requirement that the United States Postal Service prefund the Postal Service Retiree Health Benefits Fund, to place restrictions on the closure of postal facilities, to create incentives for innovation for the United States Postal Service, to maintain levels of postal service, and for other purposes.

S. 351

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) 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. 382

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) were added as cosponsors of S. 382, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to allow physician assistants, nurse practitioners, and clinical nurse specialists to supervise cardiac, intensive cardiac, and pulmonary rehabilitation programs.

S. 425

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 425, a bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to improve the quality, health outcomes, and value of maternity care under the Medicaid and CHIP programs by developing maternity care quality measures and supporting maternity care quality collaboratives.

S. 463

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 463, a bill to amend the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 to modify the definition of the term "biobased product".

S. 466

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms.

COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 466, a bill to assist low-income individuals in obtaining recommended dental care.

S. 506

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 506, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide recruitment and retention incentives for volunteer emergency service workers.

S. 538

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 538, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to modify the authorities and responsibilities of convening authorities in taking actions on the findings and sentences of courts-martial.

S. 541

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

S. 579

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNIS) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors 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. 635

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 635, a bill to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to provide an exception to the annual written privacy notice requirement.

S. 653

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 653, a bill to provide for the establishment of the Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia.

S. 669

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) were added as cosponsors of S. 669, a bill to make permanent the Internal Revenue Service Free File program.

S. 674

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 674, a bill to require prompt responses from the heads of covered Fed-

eral 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. 700

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 700, a bill to ensure that the education and training provided members of the Armed Forces and veterans better assists members and veterans in obtaining civilian certifications and licenses, and for other purposes.

S. 755

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of S. 755, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to apply the Medicaid primary care payment rate to additional physician providers of primary care services.

S. 764

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 764, a bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to require the disclosure of information regarding how certain taxes and fees impact the amount of premiums, and for other purposes.

S. 789

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNIS), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) were added as cosponsors of S. 789, a bill to grant the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the First Special Service Force, in recognition of its superior service during World War II.

S. 813

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 813, a bill to require that Peace Corps volunteers be subject to the same limitations regarding coverage of abortion services as employees of the Peace Corps with respect to coverage of such services, and for other purposes.

S. 862

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 862, a bill to amend section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an additional religious exemption from the individual health coverage mandate.

S. 865

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 865, a bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission to Accelerate the End of Breast Cancer.

S. 871

At the request of Mr. BENNET, his name was added as a cosponsor 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.

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 871, supra.

S. 892

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNIS) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of S. 892, a bill to amend the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 to impose sanctions with respect to certain transactions in foreign currencies, and for other purposes.

S. 897

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 897, a bill to prevent the doubling of the interest rate for Federal subsidized student loans for the 2013-2014 academic year by providing funds for such loans through the Federal Reserve System, to ensure that such loans are available at interest rates that are equivalent to the interest rates at which the Federal Government provides loans to banks through the discount window operated by the Federal Reserve System, and for other purposes.

S. 901

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 901, a bill to protect State and local witnesses from tampering and retaliation, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 133

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 133, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that Congress and the States should investigate and correct abusive, unsanitary, and illegal abortion practices.

AMENDMENT NO. 856

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 856 intended to be proposed to S. 601, a bill to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 857

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 857 intended to be proposed to S. 601, a bill to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to

construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 868

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 868 proposed to S. 601, a bill to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 874

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 874 intended to be proposed to S. 601, a bill to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 893

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 893 proposed to S. 601, a bill to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 907

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 907 proposed to S. 601, a bill to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 909

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE), the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 909 proposed to S. 601, a bill to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED
BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself
and Mr. BURR):

S. 944. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require courses

of education provided by public institutions of higher education that are approved for purposes of the All-Volunteer Force Educational Assistance Program and Post-9/11 Educational Assistance to charge veterans tuition and fees at the in-State tuition rate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, today, as Chairman of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I am proud to introduce the Veterans' Educational Transition Act of 2013.

My colleague and ranking member of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Senator BURR, joins me in introducing this important legislation.

The Department of Defense estimates that approximately 250,000 to 300,000 servicemembers will separate annually for the next 4 years. That is more than one million brave men and women who will face the harsh reality of transitioning back to civilian life. Many of them will elect to further their education by using the most lucrative benefit afforded to them since WWII—the Post-9/11 GI Bill. Since 2009, the Department of Veterans Affairs, VA, has paid nearly 1 million Post-9/11 GI Bill beneficiaries more than \$28 billion.

The Post-9/11 GI Bill stands as a testament of our willingness to invest in our newest generation of veterans. Unfortunately, this investment often falls short of what they need to complete a post-secondary education and successfully transition back to civilian life. They deserve better.

Given the nature of our Armed Forces, servicemembers have little to no say as to where they serve and where they reside during their military service. Thus, when transitioning servicemembers consider what educational institution they want to attend, many of them choose a school in their home State or a State where they previously served.

I have heard from too many veterans that many of these public educational institutions consider them out-of-State students. Given that the Post-9/11 GI Bill only covers in-State tuition and fees for public educational institutions, these veterans are left to cover the difference in cost between the in-State tuition rate and the out-of-State tuition rate. In some States, this difference can be more than \$20,000 per year. As a result, many of our Nation's veterans must use loans to cover this difference and in the process become indebted with large school loans that will take years to pay off.

I applaud the States that have taken initiative to assist our veterans by recognizing them as in-State students for purposes of attending a public educational institution. Yet, there are too many States that still require transitioning veterans to meet stringent residency requirements before they can be considered in-State students. Recently separated veterans may not be able to meet such require-

ments because of their military service, and once enrolled, they cannot legally establish residency because of their status as full-time students.

The Veterans Educational Transition Act of 2013 would require States, as a condition for course approval under the Post-9/11 GI Bill or Montgomery GI Bill, to recognize certain veterans and their dependents using these education benefits as in-State students for purposes of attending a public institution. The veteran must be within 2 years from the date of discharge, and the individual using the benefit must live in the State while attending the school.

This legislation would help our brave men and women who have sacrificed so much in defense of our country transition to the civilian workforce by giving them a fair shot at attaining their educational goals without incurring an additional financial burden simply because they chose to serve their country.

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. 944

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 "Veterans' Educational Transition Act of 2013".

SEC. 2. APPROVAL OF COURSES OF EDUCATION PROVIDED BY PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION FOR PURPOSES OF ALL-VOLUNTEER FORCE EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM AND POST-9/11 EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE CONDITIONAL ON IN-STATE TUITION RATE FOR VETERANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3679 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(c)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter and subject to paragraphs (3) through (5), the Secretary shall disapprove a course of education provided by a public institution of higher education to a covered individual pursuing a course of education with educational assistance under chapter 30 or 33 of this title while living in the State in which the public institution of higher education is located if the institution charges tuition and fees for that course for the covered individual at a rate that is higher than the rate the institution charges for tuition and fees for that course for residents of the State in which the institution is located, regardless of the covered individual's State of residence.

"(2) For purposes of this subsection, a covered individual is any individual as follows:

"(A) A veteran who was discharged or released from a period of not fewer than 180 days of service in the active military, naval, or air service less than two years before the date of enrollment in the course concerned.

"(B) An individual who is entitled to assistance under section 3311(b)(9) or 3319 of this title by virtue such individual's relationship to a veteran described in subparagraph (A).

"(3) It shall not be grounds to disapprove a course of education under paragraph (1) if a public institution of higher education requires a covered individual pursuing a course of education at the institution to demonstrate an intent to establish residency in

the State in which the institution is located in order to be charged tuition and fees for that course at a rate that is equal to or less than the rate the institution charges for tuition and fees for that course for residents of the State.

“(4) The Secretary may waive such requirements of paragraph (1) as the Secretary considers appropriate.

“(5) Disapproval under paragraph (1) shall apply only with respect to educational assistance under chapters 30 and 33 of this title.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (c) of section 3679 of title 38, United States Code (as added by subsection (a) of this section) shall apply with respect to educational assistance provided for pursuit of programs of education during academic terms that begin after July 1, 2015.

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

S. 952. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the treatment of church pension plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today my colleague Senator PORTMAN and I are introducing this legislation, which refines the language included in a previous bill, S. 3532, introduced in the 112th Congress by Senator Hutchison and myself.

Our goal is to ensure the retirement security of our Nation's clergy, church lay workers, and their families by resolving an unfortunate application of our current pension rules on church pension beneficiaries.

Churches and synagogues established some of the first pension plans in the country, some dating back to the 18th century, and they are designed to ensure that our pastors and lay staff have adequate resources during their retirement years.

Church pensions are critically important compensation plans that help support over one million clergy members across the country in their retirement—particularly those who dedicated their careers to serving in economically disadvantaged congregations.

Church plans developed structures and mechanisms that reflect the differing church polities they serve and their unique status has been recognized in law. However, recent IRS regulations governing 403(b) pension programs and legislative changes have resulted in uncertainty and compliance issues for church pension plans.

The Church Plan Clarification Act is straightforward, non-controversial, and has bipartisan support. I hope we can work quickly to provide clarity for these distinctive plans by enacting this legislation and thereby ensuring that those who dedicate their lives to religious service are not inappropriately and unfairly disadvantaged.

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. 952

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 “Church Plan Clarification Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. CHURCH PLAN CLARIFICATION.

(a) APPLICATION OF CONTROLLED GROUP RULES TO CHURCH PLANS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 414(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) by striking “For purposes” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes”, and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2) CHURCH PLANS.—

“(A) GENERAL RULE.—Except as provided in subparagraphs (B) and (C), for purposes of this subsection and subsection (m), an organization that is otherwise eligible to participate in a church plan as defined in subsection (e) shall not be aggregated with another such organization and treated as a single employer with such other organization unless—

“(i) one such organization provides directly or indirectly at least 80 percent of the operating funds for the other organization during the preceding tax year of the recipient organization, and

“(ii) there is a degree of common management or supervision between the organizations.

For purposes of this subparagraph, a degree of common management or supervision exists only if the organization providing the operating funds is directly involved in the day-to-day operations of the other organization.

“(B) NONQUALIFIED CHURCH-CONTROLLED ORGANIZATIONS.—Notwithstanding the provisions of subparagraph (A), for purposes of this subsection and subsection (m), an organization that is a nonqualified church-controlled organization shall be aggregated with one or more other nonqualified church-controlled organizations, or with an organization that is not exempt from tax under section 501, and treated as a single employer with such other organizations, if at least 80 percent of the directors or trustees of such organizations are either representatives of, or directly or indirectly controlled by, the first organization. For purposes of this subparagraph, a ‘nonqualified church controlled organization’ shall mean a church-controlled organization described in section 501(c)(3) that is not a qualified church-controlled organization described in section 3121(w)(3)(B).

“(C) PERMISSIVE AGGREGATION AMONG CHURCH-RELATED ORGANIZATIONS.—Organizations described in subparagraph (A) may elect to be treated as under common control for purposes of this subsection. Such election shall be made by the church or convention or association of churches with which such organizations are associated within the meaning of subsection (e)(3)(D), or by an organization determined by such church or convention or association of churches to be the appropriate organization for making such election.

“(D) PERMISSIVE DISAGGREGATION OF CHURCH-RELATED ORGANIZATIONS.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), in the case of a church plan (as defined in subsection (e)), any employer may permissively disaggregate those entities that are not churches (as defined in section 403(b)(12)(B)) separately from those entities that are churches, even if such entities maintain separate church plans.

“(E) ANTI-ABUSE RULE.—For purposes of subparagraphs (A) and (B), the anti-abuse rule in Treasury Regulation section 1.414(c)-5(f) shall apply.”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to taxable years beginning before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) APPLICATION OF CONTRIBUTION AND FUNDING LIMITATIONS TO 403(b) GRANDFATHERED DEFINED BENEFIT PLANS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 251(e)(5) of the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982 (Public Law 97-248), is amended—

(A) by striking “403(b)(2)” and inserting “403(b)”, and

(B) by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, and shall be subject to the applicable limitations of section 415(b) of such Code as if it were a defined benefit plan under section 401(a) of such Code and not the limitations of section 415(c) of such Code (relating to limitation for defined contribution plans).”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply as if included in the enactment of the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982.

(c) AUTOMATIC ENROLLMENT BY CHURCH PLANS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—This subsection shall supersede any law of a State that relates to wage, salary, or payroll payment, collection, deduction, garnishment, assignment, or withholding which would directly or indirectly prohibit or restrict the inclusion in any church plan (as defined in this subsection) of an automatic contribution arrangement.

(2) DEFINITION OF AUTOMATIC CONTRIBUTION ARRANGEMENT.—For purposes of this subsection, the term “automatic contribution arrangement” means an arrangement—

(A) under which a participant may elect to have the plan sponsor make payments as contributions under the plan on behalf of the participant, or to the participant directly in cash, and

(B) under which a participant is treated as having elected to have the plan sponsor make such contributions in an amount equal to a uniform percentage of compensation provided under the plan until the participant specifically elects not to have such contributions made (or specifically elects to have such contributions made at a different percentage).

(3) NOTICE REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The plan administrator of an automatic contribution arrangement shall, within a reasonable period before such plan year, provide to each participant to whom the arrangement applies for such plan year notice of the participant's rights and obligations under the arrangement which—

(i) is sufficiently accurate and comprehensive to apprise the participant of such rights and obligations, and

(ii) is written in a manner calculated to be understood by the average participant to whom the arrangement applies.

(B) ELECTION REQUIREMENTS.—A notice shall not be treated as meeting the requirements of subparagraph (A) with respect to a participant unless—

(i) the notice includes an explanation of the participant's right under the arrangement not to have elective contributions made on the participant's behalf (or to elect to have such contributions made at a different percentage),

(ii) the participant has a reasonable period of time, after receipt of the notice described in clause (i) and before the first elective contribution is made, to make such election, and

(iii) the notice explains how contributions made under the arrangement will be invested in the absence of any investment election by the participant.

(4) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This subsection shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) ALLOW CERTAIN PLAN TRANSFERS AND MERGERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 414 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(y) CERTAIN PLAN TRANSFERS AND MERGERS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Under rules prescribed by the Secretary, except as provided in paragraph (2), no amount shall be includible in gross income by reason of—

“(A) a transfer of all or a portion of the account balance of a participant or beneficiary, whether or not vested, from a plan described in section 401(a) or an annuity contract described in section 403(b), which is a church plan described in subsection (e) to an annuity contract described in section 403(b), if such plan and annuity contract are both maintained by the same church or convention or association of churches,

“(B) a transfer of all or a portion of the account balance of a participant or beneficiary, whether or not vested, from an annuity contract described in section 403(b) to a plan described in section 401(a) or an annuity contract described in section 403(b), which is a church plan described in subsection (e), if such plan and annuity contract are both maintained by the same church or convention or association of churches, or

“(C) a merger of a plan described in section 401(a), or an annuity contract described in section 403(b), which is a church plan described in subsection (e) with an annuity contract described in section 403(b), if such plan and annuity contract are both maintained by the same church or convention or association of churches.

“(2) LIMITATION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to a transfer or merger unless the participant’s or beneficiary’s benefit immediately after the transfer or merger is equal to or greater than the participant’s or beneficiary’s benefit immediately before the transfer or merger.

“(3) QUALIFICATION.—A plan or annuity contract shall not fail to be considered to be described in sections 401(a) or 403(b) merely because such plan or account engages in a transfer or merger described in this subsection.

“(4) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection:

“(A) CHURCH.—The term ‘church’ includes an organization described in subparagraph (A) or (B)(ii) of subsection (e)(3).

“(B) ANNUITY CONTRACT.—The term ‘annuity contract’ includes a custodial account described in section 403(b)(7) and a retirement income account described in section 403(b)(9).”

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this subsection shall apply to transfers or mergers occurring after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(e) INVESTMENTS BY CHURCH PLANS IN COLLECTIVE TRUSTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of—

(A) a church plan (as defined in section 414(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986), including a plan described in section 401(a) of such Code and a retirement income account described in section 403(b)(9) of such Code, and

(B) an organization described in section 414(e)(3)(A) of such Code the principal purpose or function of which is the administration of such a plan or account,

the assets of such plan, account, or organization (including any assets otherwise permitted to be commingled for investment purposes with the assets of such a plan, account, or organization) may be invested in a group

trust otherwise described in Internal Revenue Service Revenue Ruling 81-100 (as modified by Internal Revenue Service Revenue Rulings 2004-67 and 2011-1), or any subsequent revenue ruling that supersedes or modifies such revenue ruling, without adversely affecting the tax status of the group trust, such plan, account, or organization, or any other plan or trust that invests in the group trust.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This subsection shall apply to investments made after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 140—COMMEMORATING AND ACKNOWLEDGING THE DEDICATION AND SACRIFICES MADE BY THE FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS WHO HAVE BEEN KILLED OR INJURED IN THE LINE OF DUTY

Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. TOOMEY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 140

Whereas the well-being of all people in the United States is preserved and enhanced as a direct result of the vigilance and dedication of law enforcement officers;

Whereas more than 900,000 men and women, at great risk to their personal safety, serve the people of the United States as guardians of the peace;

Whereas peace officers are on the front lines in protecting the schools and schoolchildren of the United States;

Whereas, in 2012, 120 peace officers across the United States were killed in the line of duty;

Whereas Congress should strongly support initiatives to reduce violent crime and to increase the factors that contribute to the safety of law enforcement officers;

Whereas more than 19,000 Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers whose names are engraved upon the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial in Washington, District of Columbia, lost their lives in the line of duty while protecting the people of the United States;

Whereas, in 1962, President John F. Kennedy designated May 15 as “National Peace Officers Memorial Day”; and

Whereas, on May 15, 2013, more than 20,000 peace officers are expected to gather in Washington, District of Columbia, to join the families of their recently-fallen comrades to honor those comrades and all others who went before them: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commemorates and acknowledges the dedication and sacrifices made by the Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers who have been killed or injured in the line of duty;

(2) recognizes May 15, 2013, as “National Peace Officers Memorial Day”; and

(3) calls on the people of the United States to observe National Peace Officers Memorial Day with appropriate ceremony, solemnity, appreciation, and respect.

SENATE RESOLUTION 141—RECOGNIZING THE GOALS OF NATIONAL TRAVEL AND TOURISM WEEK AND HONORING THE VALUABLE CONTRIBUTIONS OF TRAVEL AND TOURISM TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BEGICH (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WARNER, Mr. HELLER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. REID, Mr. KIRK, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. BLUNT) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 141

Whereas National Travel and Tourism Week was established in 1983 through the enactment of the Joint Resolution entitled “Joint Resolution to designate the week beginning May 27, 1984, as ‘National Tourism Week’”, approved November 29, 1983 (Public Law 98-178; 97 Stat. 1126), which recognized the value of travel and tourism;

Whereas National Travel and Tourism Week is celebrated across the United States from May 4 through May 12, 2013;

Whereas more than 120 travel destinations throughout the United States are holding events in honor of National Travel and Tourism Week;

Whereas one out of every 8 jobs in the United States depends on travel and tourism and the industry supports more than 14,600,000 jobs in the United States;

Whereas the travel and tourism industry employs individuals in all 50 States and all the territories of the United States;

Whereas international travel to the United States is the single largest export industry in the country, generating a trade surplus balance of approximately \$45,000,000,000;

Whereas the travel and tourism industry, Congress, and the President have worked to streamline the visa process and make the United States welcoming to visitors from other countries;

Whereas travel and tourism provide significant economic benefits to the United States by generating nearly \$2,000,000,000,000 in annual economic output;

Whereas leisure travel allows individuals to experience the rich cultural heritage and educational opportunities of the United States and its communities; and

Whereas the immense value of travel and tourism cannot be overstated: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes May 4 through May 12, 2013, as National Travel and Tourism Week;

(2) commends the travel and tourism industry for its important contributions to the United States; and

(3) commends the employees of the travel and tourism industry for their important contributions to the United States.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 916. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 917. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 906 proposed by Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. KIRK, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr.

PRYOR, and Ms. LANDRIEU) to the bill S. 601, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 918. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 797 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 601, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 916. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

This Act shall become effective 1 day after enactment.

SA 917. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 906 proposed by Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. KIRK, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. PRYOR, and Ms. LANDRIEU) to the bill S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 15, insert “, consistent with the authorized purposes of the water resource projects in the greater Mississippi River Basin” after “navigation”.

SA 918. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 797 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 4, strike line 2 and insert the following:

SEC. 12. GREATER MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN SEVERE FLOODING AND DROUGHT MANAGEMENT STUDY.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) GREATER MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN.—The term “greater Mississippi River Basin” means the area covered by hydrologic units 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, and 11, as identified by the United States Geological Survey as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER.—The term “lower Mississippi River” means the portion of the Mississippi River that begins at the confluence of the Ohio River and flows to the Gulf of Mexico.

(3) MIDDLE MISSISSIPPI RIVER.—The term “middle Mississippi River” means the portion of the Mississippi River that begins at the confluence of the Missouri River and flows to the lower Mississippi River.

(4) SEVERE FLOODING AND DROUGHT.—The term “severe flooding and drought” means

severe weather events that threaten personal safety, property, and navigation on the inland waterways of the United States.

(b) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out a study of the greater Mississippi River Basin—

(1) to improve the coordinated and comprehensive management of water resource projects in the greater Mississippi River Basin relating to severe flooding and drought conditions; and

(2) to evaluate the feasibility of any modifications to those water resource projects, consistent with the authorized purposes of those projects, and develop new water resource projects to improve the reliability of navigation and more effectively reduce flood risk.

(c) CONTENTS.—The study shall—

(1) identify any Federal actions that are likely to prevent and mitigate the impacts of severe flooding and drought, including changes to authorized channel dimensions, operational procedures of locks and dams, and reservoir management within the greater Mississippi River Basin, consistent with the authorized purposes of the water resource projects;

(2) identify and make recommendations to remedy challenges to the Corps of Engineers presented by severe flooding and drought, including river access, in carrying out its mission to maintain safe, reliable navigation, consistent with the authorized purposes of the water resource projects in the greater Mississippi River Basin; and

(3) identify and locate natural or other physical impediments along the middle and lower Mississippi River to maintaining navigation on the middle and lower Mississippi River during periods of low water.

(d) CONSULTATION AND USE OF EXISTING DATA.—In carrying out the study, the Secretary shall—

(1) consult with appropriate committees of Congress, Federal, State, tribal, and local agencies, environmental interests, agricultural interests, recreational interests, river navigation industry representatives, other shipping and business interests, organized labor, and nongovernmental organizations;

(2) to the maximum extent practicable, use data in existence as of the date of enactment of this Act; and

(3) incorporate lessons learned and best practices developed as a result of past severe flooding and drought events, including major floods and the successful effort to maintain navigation during the near historic low water levels on the Mississippi River during the winter of 2012–2013.

(e) COST-SHARING.—The Federal share of the cost of carrying out the study under this section shall be 100 percent.

(f) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the study carried out under this section.

(g) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this section impacts the operations and maintenance of the Missouri River Mainstem System, as authorized by the Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 897, chapter 665).

NOTICE OF HEARING

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 meeting of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources has been scheduled to discuss natural gas issues. The meeting will be held on Tuesday, May 21, 2013, at 10:00 a.m., in room 216 of the Hart Senate Office Building.

The purpose of this meeting is to provide a forum to explore what the next applications are for natural gas and how this new demand will be met. Domestic supply and the potential benefits or unintended consequences caused by expansion of natural gas exports will be specific points of interest.

Because of the limited time available for the forum, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the record may do so by sending it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510–6150, or by e-mail to lauren_goldschmidt@energy.senate.gov.

For further information, please contact Todd Wooten at (202) 224–4971 or Lauren Goldschmidt at (202) 224–5488.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 14, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room SR–328A of the Russell Senate Office Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 14, 2013, at 2:30 p.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mrs. BOXER. 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 14, 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

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 14, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room SD–215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Advancing Reform: Medicare Physicians Payments.”

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 14, 2013, at 2:15 p.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet, during the session of the Senate, to conduct a hearing entitled "The ADA and Entertainment Technologies: Improving Accessibility from the Movie Screen to Your Mobile Device" on May 14, 2013, at 2:30 p.m., in room 430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on May 14, 2013, at 10 a.m., in SD-G50 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, continue its executive business meeting from May 9, 2013.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 14, 2013, at 2:30 p.m.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATIONS, TECHNOLOGY, AND THE INTERNET

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Communications, Technology, and the Internet of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to hold a meeting during the session of the Senate on May 14, 2013, at 10:30 a.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The Committee will hold a hearing entitled, "State of Video."

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SEAPOWER

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Seapower of the Senate Armed Services Committee be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 14, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SECURITIES, INSURANCE AND INVESTMENT

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Subcommittee on Securities, Insurance, and Investment be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 14, 2013, at 3:15 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "Returning Private Capital To Mortgage Markets: A Fundamental for Housing Finance Reform."

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

NATIONAL TRAVEL AND TOURISM WEEK

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to S. Res. 141.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 141) recognizing the goals of National Travel and Tourism Week and honoring the valuable contributions of travel and tourism to the United States.

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

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that there be no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 141) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ACKNOWLEDGING THE DEDICATION AND SACRIFICES OF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to S. Res. 140.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 140) commemorating and acknowledging the dedication and sacrifices made by the Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers who have been killed or injured in the line of duty.

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

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

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

The resolution (S. Res. 140) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 953

Mr. REID. I understand S. 953 introduced earlier today by Senator REED is

at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 953) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to extend the reduced interest rates for Federal Direct Stafford loans, to modify required distribution rules for pension plans, to limit earnings stripping by expatriated entities, to provide for modifications related to the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. I now ask for its second reading and object to my own request.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection having been heard, the bill will receive its second reading on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MAY 15, 2013

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, May 15, 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 until 10:30 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the Republicans controlling the first half and the majority controlling the final half; further, that following morning business the Senate resume consideration of S. 601, the Water Resources Development Act, under the previous order.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. There will be a series of up to seven rollcall votes beginning around 10:30 a.m. tomorrow in order to complete action on WRDA.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. 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 6:39 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, May 15, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.