



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 19, 2013

No. 40

Senate

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

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal spirit, You are God, and all creation worships You. To You all angels, all the powers of Heaven sing in endless praise.

Draw the hearts of our Senators to You today so that they will trust You to guide their minds and control their wills. Replenish their strength, rekindle their enthusiasm for Your purposes, and renew their commitment to serve You with all their hearts. Whatever they plan or accomplish today, may it bring America closer to the righteousness that exalts any nation and away from the sins that bring reproach to any people.

We pray in Your holy Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following leader remarks, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 933, the continuing appropriations legislation. The Senate will recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. today for our weekly caucus meetings.

We are going to continue to work to see if we can get these amendments in

order. We wanted to vote on them last night, but we hope to complete the CR very quickly.

I have not had an opportunity yet to speak to the Republican leader this morning, but very shortly I am going to move to begin work on the budget. Senator SESSIONS and Senator MURRAY are anxious to move forward on that.

I had a long conversation with Senator SESSIONS last night—and I speak to Senator MURRAY quite often—and there is no reason that 30 hours postcloture should be wasted. A Senator who doesn't like what went on before can have 1 hour, but we should not waste our time as we have done so often by killing 30 hours. We should start the budget.

If people decide they are going to use the 30 hours and then another 30 hours—we have to have cloture not only on the substitute but on the bill itself, it is 60 hours—that would mean we would start on the budget sometime Thursday morning. We are going to do it. The 60 hours will be eaten up sometime Thursday morning. I hope we don't have to waste that time, but we are going to finish the budget before we leave here.

We have had conversations on both sides of the aisle about how we need a budget. Because we had the Budget Deficit Reduction Act, which set our 302(b)s, we didn't need to do our usual budget because we had one signed into law by the President. Regardless of that, there will be no more talk about not having a budget. We will have a budget. No matter how long it takes, we are going to do that before we leave for the Easter break.

As everyone knows, there is 50 hours under the budget act, which is statutory, and then afterward there could be a lot of amendments. So everyone should be aware we should start using some of this time to work on the budget, and we will do that. I will come and propound my consent shortly.

MARINE BASE EXPLOSION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, in the late 1920s, there was a violent explosion in New Jersey at an ammunition depot of our military. Basically, it was the Navy at that time, and it was a very bad explosion. After that explosion, there was a decision made that storing our ammunition should be someplace else. After some work done by relevant committees in the House and Senate and working with the President, it was decided the best place to do that was in Nevada near a place called Hawthorne.

Hawthorne is, frankly, in a kind of remote place. That base has been there since about 1930. It was originally a naval ammunition depot where most of our ammunition was stored, and it is still there. It survived base closings—the BRAC work—and it was determined it was essential for the security of this Nation.

Anyone who flies over that area will see miles and miles of bunkers where ammunition is stored. Some ammunition is stored there from World War II. It is a wonderful place for storing ammunition because it is so dry so stuff can stay there for long periods of time.

I just met with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs. They were very impressed with this. It has also become a terrific place for tearing down ordnance—demil, they call it. In recent years, it has also been used as a training facility. The terrain is much like a lot of the desert in Afghanistan and Iraq and places such as that. We have had training exercises there for some time. It is very valuable.

Late last night, seven of our marines were killed in Hawthorne, and many others were injured in an explosion during a training exercise near the ammunition depot in Hawthorne, NV. We don't know exactly what happened, but we know it was a violent explosion. My thoughts are with those who were injured and, of course, the families of those who lost loved ones.

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S1913

Marines all over the world are now focusing on the loss of their fellow marines. They are grieving their loss. Details are emerging, but at this time we don't know everything. The area has been blocked off. As I indicated, it was quite a big explosion. We will follow this news very closely. I will do whatever I can going forward to support the U.S. military and the families of the fallen marines.

It is very important we continue to train our military—it is so important—but one of the things that has happened due to the sequester is we have cut back on our training and maintenance. That is the way the sequester was written. The bill that is on the floor—we hope to pass today—helps that a little bit. At least for the next 6 months it will allow the military some degree of ability to move things around a little bit. We call it flexibility, which is good. But we have to be very vigilant. This sequester should go away.

We have already cut huge amounts of money in deficit reduction, which is not appropriate. Our military cannot train and do the maintenance that is necessary. These men and women are marines who are training in Hawthorne, and with the sequester, it is going to cut stuff back. I hope everyone understands the sacrifices made by our military. They make significant sacrifices by being away from home, their families, and their country. The sequester needs to go away.

THE BUDGET

Mr. REID. Mr. President, for 4 years, the first priority for the country and Congress has been to improve the Nation's economy and strengthen the middle class. Our efforts have paid off. It has pulled us out of the great recession; however, unemployment is still too high. Over the last 36 months, businesses created 6.4 million new jobs—good new jobs—but the economy is not back to full strength.

During the Bush years we lost a lot including our Treasury. When he took office, we had a surplus over 10 years of \$7 trillion. The 10th anniversary of the war in Iraq is today. That war cost us more than \$1 trillion, and we are paying for the loss of life and all the injured in many different ways. We cannot take chances with our recovery. We are pulling out of the mess economically that the President created by all the taxes and a war that was not paid for. We must renew our investments that have always made America strong, such as innovation and job training, education, preventive health care, new roads, bridges, dams, water systems, sewer systems.

To meet our country's long-term economic goals—including the deficit—we must enact policies that support a strong and growing middle class, and that is why this week the Senate will pass, as I indicated earlier, a budget, crafted by one of the most wise Senators ever to serve in this body, PATTY

MURRAY of Washington. "Wise" is the word I chose perfectly for her because it does fit. The work she and her committee have done fully replaces the harmful sequester cuts I have just talked about with balanced and responsible deficit reduction.

The policy outlined in her budget—our budget—will save hundreds of thousands of jobs and safeguard communities by keeping police, air traffic controllers, meat inspectors, and firefighters on the job, but first we must avoid self-inflicted wounds so we can build on the success over the last 3 years. The Senate budget will continue the progress by creating new jobs, repairing crumbling roads, bridges, and train workers for high-skilled jobs. These investments are paid for by eliminating the loopholes that benefit the wealthy of America and the most profitable corporations.

I had the fortune to serve in the Senate with a man by the name of Bill Bradley, who is one of America's great alltime basketball players. I, of course, always wanted to be the athlete he was. I admired him so much and enjoyed my friendship with him. He came out today—this Rhodes Scholar and brilliant man—and said we need to eliminate \$1 trillion in taxes that are unfair and unnecessary. He said that. In addition to that, our budget also makes nearly \$1 trillion in responsible spending cuts across the Federal budget. Meaningful deficit reduction requires shared sacrifice which includes contribution from the wealthiest among us.

If someone owns a profitable corporation that ships jobs to China or India, Democrats in Congress cannot stop them. Go ahead and ship them. But we can keep them from getting the tax break for outsourcing, and that is what we want to do. If they are successful enough to own a second home or yacht, more power to them. That is wonderful. That is an American success story. But Democrats in Congress do not feel we should subsidize these tax breaks for their vacation home or their boat. Ending these wasteful giveaways makes sense to most people. An overwhelming majority of Americans—including a majority of Republicans—support this balanced approach.

In the last 2 years, we have reduced the deficit by \$2.5 trillion. The Senate budget continues this effort without jeopardizing our economic recovery or breaking our promises to seniors and veterans. This budget keeps Medicare strong for today's seniors and preserves it for our children and grandchildren.

PATTY MURRAY is qualified to be budget chair for a number of reasons, not the least of which she was the chair of the supercommittee. She had 12 Members of Congress—6 Republicans and 6 Democrats—arrive at a grand bargain. She was pulled back because a week or so before they were ready to make their decision—which would have been spending cuts and revenue—we got a letter from virtually every Re-

publican saying: No thanks. No revenue. So that failed.

She is qualified in many different ways to lead this committee. Her budget reflects Democratic values, and it honors the belief that success doesn't trickle down from the top; it grows out in the middle class. The Ryan Republican budget introduced earlier this week reflects an entirely different set of priorities—skewed priorities Americans have rejected time and time again. This is the third go-round. President Obama was reelected basically for a number of reasons but not the least of which is the Ryan Republican budget. They are at it again.

The Ryan budget would hand out more budget-busting tax breaks for the wealthy to pay for these wasteful tax breaks. It would end the Medicare guarantee. It would rob 50 million Americans of affordable health insurance. It would raise taxes on middle-class families. To appease the tea party, the Ryan Republican budget would risk lives and risk the recovery, and that is just too high a price to pay.

I was stunned this morning. A Republican Congressman writes an op-ed piece—I don't know if it was in the Times or the Post—saying that the Ryan Republican budget isn't good enough for the tea party and that it should be even more stringent. That is what we are faced with.

The work done by Chairman MURRAY reflects the priorities of the American people, not the wackos referred to also in the op-ed page of the Washington Post today by a person who has won a Nobel Prize for economics.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

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

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS, AND FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 933, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 933) to make appropriations for the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and other departments and agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Reid (for Mikulski/Shelby) modified amendment No. 26, in the nature of a substitute.

Toomey amendment No. 115 (to amendment No. 26), to increase by \$60 million the amount appropriated for operation and maintenance for the Department of Defense for programs, projects, and activities in the continental United States, and to provide an offset.

Durbin amendment No. 123 (to amendment No. 115), to change the enactment date.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY
LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader is recognized.

THE BUDGET

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, last week I noted that the Senate Democratic budget was one of the most extreme, most unbalanced pieces of legislation we have ever seen, one that would never balance, ever, and one that would have a devastating outcome on the middle class.

I said that its centerpiece is a \$1.5 trillion tax hike that would be the largest in American history. Some on the other side have argued with this \$1.5 trillion figure. They say their budget only contains a \$1 trillion tax hike, which is a stunning and telling admission in itself. Just months after Democrats got hundreds of billions in new taxes, they now freely admit their intention to hit Americans with another \$1 trillion in tax hikes. But in reality, it would be more than that since their budget envisions \$1.5 trillion in new revenue. While the Democrats' math may be fuzzy, their intentions are unmistakable. Their massive tax hike would cost average middle-class families thousands in lost income and lost opportunity. And despite that massive hit to working families, the Democrats' budget would still not ever—ever—balance.

But that is just one of the reasons this budget is so destructive to the middle class. Take spending for example. Americans know that a good way to create jobs and increase economic growth is to balance the budget and put our massive national debt on a path to elimination. Yet the Senate Democratic budget would actually increase spending by more than \$½ trillion—increase spending by \$½ trillion.

Put another way, Democrats want to take another \$½ trillion out of the economy, on top of all of the money they would take out with their tax increase, and put it in the hands of Washington bureaucrats and politicians to spend or waste as they see fit. And their budget would balloon the debt by 42 percent, increasing every Americans' share to a whopping \$73,000. They want to grow the government at the expense of the economy, and that is not the way to create jobs or get the private sector moving. In fact, by some estimates, this budget could result in more than 600,000 lost jobs if enacted.

Of course, the Senate Democratic budget won't prevent Medicare and Social Security from going bankrupt. It is not going to prevent Medicare and Social Security from going bankrupt.

So here is what we would get with the Democratic budget: No. 1, a massive tax hike and thousands less for middle-class families—a massive tax hike; No. 2, \$½ trillion more in big-government spending; No. 3, 42 percent more debt, with each American owing \$73,000; No. 4, more than 600,000 lost jobs.

Here is what we won't get: We won't get balance, just more and more unbalanced tax hikes. We won't get the kind of deficit reduction our country needs, just more spending to enrich the Washington establishment at the expense of Main Street. We won't get more jobs or a better economy or sensible reforms to prevent Medicare or Social Security from going bankrupt. And we certainly won't get a balanced budget.

Not only does the Senate Democratic budget never balance—ever—but top Washington Democrats now say they simply don't care about balancing the budget anymore. They just don't care about that. Well, Americans do care. A party that once cared about hard-working American families seems to have gone off the leftmost edge of the reservation with this budget. DC Democrats' priorities are just so far removed from the actual needs of middle-class Kentuckians and Americans who continue to struggle in the Obama economy.

I appreciate that the Senate majority has finally decided to put its ideas on paper. It took 4 years—4 years—to get a budget from them, and we now know why it took so long: because their ideas are so unbalanced and so extreme, so destructive to the economy Americans want us to fix.

We can help foster the conditions necessary to make the economy healthier and create more jobs but only if Washington Democrats finally reach across the aisle to address America's real concerns in a truly balanced way. I hope that will ultimately happen because it is time to start making divided government work for the American people who elected it, and it is time to grow the economy, not the government.

PRESIDENTIAL VISIT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, this week President Obama will travel to two of our closest allies—Israel and Jordan. His visit will come at a moment of great importance for each of our governments.

I join in conveying a message of congratulations to Prime Minister Netanyahu in having formed a new government, in restating our determination to use all available means to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon, and in pledging to work with Israel to meet the regional challenge caused by civil strife within Syria. The fighting in Syria has produced refugee flows of at least 1 million people into Iraq, Turkey, Jordan, and Lebanon. Also of concern to Jordan, Israel, and other allies in the region is the flow of foreign fighters into Syria, especially the al-Nusra Front.

During his visit, I hope the President makes progress in working with our allies to address these threats that have developed while Bashar al-Asad remains in power and to begin the important planning to address the challenges that will come with his fall, such as how best to secure chemical weapons stockpiles.

None of these threats or challenges can be addressed with simple, easy answers, but I fully support America working with Prime Minister Netanyahu and King Abdallah to craft original strategy that serves all of our national interests.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss something of deep importance to me and, I believe, to our country.

Last night the majority leader of the Senate came to the floor to speak on the continuing resolution, which is essentially the only bill we will consider this year to fund the government. It is over \$1 trillion in taxpayer money. He came to the floor and propounded a unanimous consent request that only contained a handful of amendments that could be brought to the continuing resolution. Many germane and, in my view, reasonable amendments that had been advanced and brought to the attention of both sides well in advance were denied an opportunity for a vote on the floor. Because of that, I objected to the consideration of the continuing resolution and the unanimous consent request.

Frankly, I think that when we are spending over \$1 trillion in the only funding bill we are going to vote on, essentially, this year—appropriations bill—we should be allowed to have votes on amendments, particularly germane amendments, as many of my colleagues have had, and my own amendment, which is one that would strike funding for, essentially, a missile to nowhere, which will never produce a missile program or a product our military will ever be able to use.

My amendment is very straightforward. The amendment would strike funding for the Medium Extended Air Defense System Program, called the MEADS Program, by \$381 million—These funds were appropriated for this program—and would actually transfer the funds to the operations and maintenance portion of the defense budget so the money could be used for our men and women in uniform for things they actually need as opposed to \$380 million for a missile to nowhere for which we will never get a result.

When we are almost \$17 trillion in debt, it is truly shocking that we would continue to spend money on a program the Army says it does not want. In fact, in the Defense authorization last year, the Armed Services Committee actually prohibited funding for the MEADS Program. This is something that was passed unanimously on a bipartisan basis last year in the Defense authorization bill that prohibited any further funding for this missile to nowhere. Yet it got included in the appropriations, in this continuing resolution, despite the fact that we are not going to get anything our warfighters can use from \$380 million of spending.

In fact, when Secretary Hagel was asked about whether the Pentagon

would comply with this law, he said: Yes. Let's just review where we are with this program. The Army has already invested over \$2 billion for this program, and we are not going to get a result. It was underperforming.

So according to John McHugh, the Secretary of the Army, in 2011, he said:

The Army has invested over \$2 billion and that's only the partial cost of the program. Frankly, it was under performing.

What else has been said?

Frank Kendall, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology, said:

MEADS is a program that the U.S. decided not to procure a year ago. . . .

So why, when our country is facing sequestration, when our men and women in uniform need to make sure the defense dollars we are providing them are actually resources that they can use for their needs to protect them, to protect our country, are we spending \$380 million on something we will not procure, for which we will not get a result? To me, this is outrageous. If we cannot cut spending for this, how are we ever going to deal with the underlying drivers of our debt, with our nearly \$17 trillion of debt?

In fact, this is what the chairman of the Armed Services Committee has said. I have great respect for Chairman LEVIN, and he said this about the MEADS Program:

We feel strongly that it's a waste of money.

I stood up on the floor last night because I have bipartisan support for this amendment. This is not a Republican issue or a Democratic issue. This is about making sure we do not waste money at a time when our warfighters need the money for support and training, at the time they are facing sequestration and we are facing real threats to our country. We cannot afford to spend more money on a missile to nowhere.

So I am very proud I have bipartisan support from Senator BEGICH, Senator SHAHEEN. Yet it is shocking to me that I cannot get a vote—it is germane—that we cannot strike this funding or get a vote on this Senate floor to strike this funding from this continuing resolution and to make sure the funds actually go to the operations and maintenance portion of the defense budget so they can use this money, warfighters can use it for needs they actually have.

I also want to mention that the Council for Citizens Against Government Waste supports my amendment.

The CEO of Concerned Veterans for America has said: MEADS is the quintessential Pentagon program that lives on indefinitely despite the fact that it will never see the field of battle. With our Nation drowning in \$16.7 trillion worth of debt, Congress must undertake serious reforms to defense spending to maintain a sustainable fiscal path that preserves American power.

Concerned Veterans for America has supported this amendment.

Basically, this is common sense. This is the kind of thing people see at home and say: How could you possibly spend \$380 million on a missile to nowhere when we know our men and women in uniform can use those funds for equipment they can use in theater, for training they can use to be prepared?

It is really unconscionable that we will not allow a vote on the continuing resolution for something that has bipartisan support, for something that was actually struck by the authorization committee on both sides of the aisle, both in the House Armed Services Committee and in the Senate Armed Services Committee.

When the majority leader took to the floor last night, he said: Oh, we have made reasonable accommodations. I do not see what is reasonable about giving a handful of amendments with over \$1 trillion of spending.

On Wednesday, Senator MCCAIN brought forth an amendment—last Wednesday, so almost a week ago—he brought forth an amendment to strike other unauthorized funds from the continuing resolution and to leave those funds for the military to use for priority items and for things our men and women in uniform actually needed. Do you know what happened? There was a motion to table brought against Senator MCCAIN's amendment. Essentially what he was trying to do is what I am trying to do today—to stop money that has not been authorized, to stop spending money when our men and women in uniform need us to allow them to use these resources for the basic needs they have. That is why he brought this amendment to the floor. Do you know what happened? There was a motion to table filed against his amendment, and I think there was a real shock on the floor from both sides of the aisle because on a bipartisan basis that motion to table failed because both sides of the aisle realized that when we are facing sequestration, when we are facing a dangerous world, when we owe it to our men and women in uniform, we cannot continue to fund things that are not priorities, we cannot continue to fund missiles to nowhere. And that amendment was eventually adopted by voice vote. This amendment is just like that amendment.

The American people are tired of us not allowing commonsense amendments to come to the floor for a vote. With \$1 trillion in spending, if we had started voting on amendments last Wednesday, after the floor was shut down—and I think there was a shock among leadership that Senator MCCAIN won his amendment on a bipartisan basis and was able to overturn the motion to table his amendment. If we had started voting on amendments then, we would have already passed the continuing resolution. So it is an absolute cop-out to say that we are somehow faced with a government shutdown, that somehow we cannot have votes on the Senate floor on amendments that are important, germane, and relevant.

Before I yield, I wish to support my colleague JERRY MORAN because he was also denied an amendment that is an important amendment. I am a cosponsor of that amendment. The FAA has notified 189 towers across the country that it is going to cease to fund the towers' operation because of the sequester. Senator MORAN has a commonsense amendment that would make sure it restores 95 percent of this funding by taking money from other areas in the FAA budget that will not disrupt operations.

Well, there is a tower in Nashua, NH, at Boire Field that was on the list of the FAA despite the airport's importance to both the United States and New England and despite a recent investment of over \$24 million by the FAA to upgrade the airport's runway.

Senator MORAN's amendment, which he is also being denied an ability to bring on this floor to have both sides vote on—he has strong bipartisan support—this amendment would ensure that towers like the tower at Boire Field in Nashua, NH, my hometown, would continue to operate. Yet we will not be given a vote on this Senate floor despite the strong bipartisan support Senator MORAN has for his amendment, just as I have bipartisan support for my amendment.

So I have to ask, what is the problem? Why can't we just vote on the amendments—start voting, keep voting, get it done? We can pass the continuing resolution. We can continue to fund this government. But do you know what. We can make improvements to the continuing resolution by striking money for the missile to nowhere, by making sure the air towers that the FAA is shutting down continue to operate in this country.

I am sure my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have many more ideas as to how we can improve this continuing resolution, but the American people will never know about those ideas because we are on a Senate floor where we are not being allowed to vote, to vote on the amendments that matter to the American people, that strike wasteful spending, that improve this important piece of legislation.

I think if we had started voting last Wednesday, we would have already allowed every person in this Chamber to have a vote on their amendment, as the Senate was intended to operate. This is intended to be the most deliberative body in the world. Yet, if you cannot bring up an amendment that is germane to strike spending for a missile to nowhere, it really renders the operation of the Senate at this point not what the Founding Fathers intended, and it puts a gag on the American people; that their elected representatives cannot come here and get votes on things that are going to strike funding like this, that are going to make sure air towers continue to operate in this country.

I think we owe it to the American people that their elected representatives can come down here and get a

vote on amendments that matter, that make a difference, that can improve this continuing resolution. Frankly, this notion that we cannot have votes on it—obviously, people do not want to have votes on it. They want to continue funding missiles to nowhere, whether it is their parochial interests or whatever interests that are driving them. It is wrong. We have to stop it.

Bring this amendment to the Senate floor. Let's vote it up or down now, and let's move forward.

Mr. President, I thank you for the opportunity to speak today, and I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

THE BUDGET

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, we were originally looking today to begin the presentation of the budget that came out of the Budget Committee, produced by the Democratic majority. It passed on a party-line vote. It was drafted by the majority in secret. It was produced and brought to the floor.

I see the distinguished floor manager of the bill is on the floor today. I certainly have no intention of interrupting the Senator's debate, but I was using the opportunity to speak in morning business, if that is all right.

Under the Congressional Budget Act, we need to produce a budget by April 15. There are 50 hours allowed for debate and an ability to offer unlimited amendments to that most important document. That is where we are. I had hoped we would start today. Now it looks as though we have floor disputes and things are dragging out.

I want to say how this can be handled. If the floor debate is not shortened, I would suggest we could come back the week of April 8 and complete our work by April 15 easily. That would be my suggested way to deal with the most important issue we face as a Nation, our financial future and the debt course we are on. That would be the right thing to do. If the majority leader is determined to move forward even into the weekend, we will be here. We are not going to concede any of the time that is set aside for debate, because this is the first budget that has been to the floor of the Senate in almost 1,500 days, over 1,400 days—4 years. We need to talk about where we are, where we are going as a Nation. So I want to say there will be no yielding of time on this side with regard to the opportunity to discuss the financial future of America.

The American people need to know about this. It should be done publicly. They need to know the choices we are dealing with, how tough they are, but what an opportunity we do have to get

the country on a sound path without doing damage to the programs we value in America. We need an open process. The American people need to be engaged with it. But I have to say, it has absolutely been the policy of the majority in the Senate to do just the opposite. Senator REID said it would be "foolish" to have a budget. He has held that view for 4 years now.

The law requires us to have a budget by April 15. He has refused to do so because he did not want to be responsible for laying out a financial path for America. Those are the facts.

The House passed legislation that said: No budget, no pay. Now the Senate is moving forward with a budget, at least to get it out of the Senate and pass it out of the Senate, and then probably we will get paid.

It is important that the budget be moved. It should not be a pro forma act but a very serious evaluation of where we are. I want to say this to my colleagues as we confront the difficult choices facing our country: This is so important to me. I believe, based on a series of important studies in recent months, all of which having come to the same conclusion, that the debt level the United States has today is already pulling down economic growth. It is one of the reasons—maybe even the largest reason—that we have had such little economic growth.

Our debt to GDP ratio—the gross debt to GDP ratio—is over 100 percent. According to the Rogoff-Reinhart study that has been out there for a number of years, which was widely praised, which Secretary of Treasury Geithner told us was a very important study, and which maybe underestimated the risk our Nation faces, but has been universally praised—they say, when debt exceeds 90 percent of GDP, based on their studies of economies all over the world that have gotten into financial trouble, the result is a 1, maybe 2-percent drop in growth. The lack of growth of 1 percent represents 1 million jobs in America. So the difference between 2-percent growth and 3-percent growth is 1 million jobs. The difference of 2-percent growth and 4-percent growth is 2 million jobs, people unemployed, not getting work. Why? Because of the debt overhang that is out there, for a whole lot of factors too complex for us to discuss at this moment, but which are out there that begin to pull down growth.

So one of the reasons we need to decrease deficits in America and balance the budget is to create growth, create jobs, and create prosperity, whereas my Democratic colleagues contend the way to create jobs and create growth is to borrow more money and spend it on a stimulus package. In fact, they have got another stimulus package in the bill they passed out of the Budget Committee, another tax, another borrow-and-spend plan, \$100-plus billion.

This is a big difference in where we are. We cannot keep borrowing, to spend, to create some temporary sugar

high. It all rubs off in the end. There are the studies out there. I mentioned Rogoff-Reinhart. That has been out several years and has been a topic of great discussion among economists and throughout the field. But in recent months, the International Monetary Fund, certainly not controlled by frugal Republicans, the European Central Bank, and the Bank for International Settlements, all have independently done studies. And those studies say that debt begins to slow growth. That is what they conclude—that debt slows growth.

Now if that is true, we have a problem, because they say you can carry a certain amount of debt and it does not slow growth, but if your debt reaches 90 percent of your economy, at least according to Rogoff and Reinhart and the numbers they were using—and, by the way, they were using gross debt, it is absolutely clear in their papers, and not the public debt—then you have slow economic growth.

Let us take a minute to discuss growth in public debt. The public debt is external debt of the United States and it is about 76 percent of our economy. The size of our growth of public debt amounts to almost the size of the economy—three-fourths of it. But if you take the gross debt of the United States, including borrowing from Social Security and Medicare and things like that, it is over 100 percent. What I want to say to you is that people have misinterpreted the Rogoff-Reinhart study over the last several years. They thought the debt figure they were referring to was the public debt.

The \$16 trillion we see on the debt clocks that show how it is increasing every year—the \$16 trillion, almost \$17 trillion now in debt—that is the gross debt, and it is over 100 percent of the economy. And they say growth slows every time—it slows relentlessly—we as a Nation run up too much debt and it gets that high. So the International Monetary Fund, the European Central Bank, the Bank for International Settlements may come at it slightly differently, but they all conclude that when debt levels reach as high as we have in the United States, growth slows.

Jobs are lost when growth slows, tax revenue is lost when growth slows, and people are not going to pay taxes if they are not working. Businesses that are not making profits are not going to pay taxes. If businesses are not expanding, not growing, not investing, not hiring, the economy is hampered and the tax revenue to the Federal Government is less, as a matter of fact. But most importantly, people are not working, jobs are not being created, and more people are on welfare. More people are dependent on the government—unemployment insurance—and that is not good.

Are we making some progress? Yes, we are making some progress. The economy had virtually no growth in the fourth quarter of last year—a stunning development. They are predicting

a slow growth the first quarter of this year. Last year we were well below predictions. Last year our growth, I believe, was about 2.2 percent. Two years before that, the Congressional Budget Office predicted growth for last year would be around 4 percent. They were predicting 2 years ago that growth for 2013 would be over 4 percent, maybe 4.6 percent. That is what the prediction was. But now, as we enter 2013, it looks as if we will be lucky to get much over 2 percent growth.

I am not saying I know with an absolute certainty that the debt is the factor they have to consider when they calculate our growth out of this recession. I don't know for sure. But I am telling you that Rogoff-Reinhart, the International Monetary Fund, the European Central Bank, the Bank for International Settlements—all of those—have concluded when debt is as high as we have in the United States it will slow growth. So I ask: What should we do to get America on a sound path to increase growth at a time we are discussing the budget? We should balance the budget and get on a course to reduce the debt significantly, and we should do it now. If we get that back down, which we can do, we will see more growth. We will see more jobs.

The idea that we should keep borrowing from the future to spend today in order to create growth only has to be said to understand how bogus it is, how irresponsible it is. Why don't we borrow three times as much and spend three times as much if this puts us on a sound path? It doesn't. It weakens us.

The Congressional Budget Office said—when this Congress, and not with my vote, voted for \$787 billion for the stimulus package—yes, if you borrow \$787 billion from the future and spend it today, you will get economic growth for a few years, but it quickly goes away. The money has been spent. The little lift in the economy is over very quickly. What is left then? CBO now estimates that we are carrying a total of \$830 billion, plus interest, from the stimulus, so now we are at \$1 trillion in new debt that we have to pay interest on every year and the growth benefit is long gone.

Now hear this, colleagues: Back when the President took office and he pushed through the stimulus package, they said over a 10-year period we would have less growth if we had a stimulus package than if we didn't have a stimulus package. Did you hear that, my colleagues? That is so important for us to understand. You cannot get something from nothing. Nothing comes from nothing. Nothing ever could, as Julie Andrews sang in the "Sound of Music." Nothing comes from nothing, nothing ever could.

So we borrow the money and spend it today and it is always with us unless we have a plan to pay down the debt, and we have no plan. So already we are about at the point where all the benefits of that stimulus of 3 years ago are gone and we are beginning to have the

burden of carrying the debt indefinitely. I think the American people understand that. The people who don't understand that are the Paul Krugmans and the people who have been driving the agenda in the Senate and in this Congress to borrow and spend. We have to get our heads together on that subject.

Finally, I will point out that the budget that has been produced is totally promoted improperly. This budget came out of the committee, and it claims it reduces the deficit by \$1.85 trillion, but that is not accurate. It took me a long time, and I had to stay on the staff people for the Democratic majority, but eventually, when confronted with the facts, they had to tell the truth and they told the truth. The sequester cuts—that 60 percent of the Budget Control Act we agreed to 18, 20 months ago—is wiped out. Those cuts are eliminated. But they were really not cuts. They were reductions in growth of spending. But that reduction saved us about \$2.1 trillion, and the sequester part is \$1.2 trillion. So that is the \$1.2 trillion that is wiped out. That means we are going to increase spending \$1.2 trillion, and it is not scored in their budget as an increase in spending to offset the \$1 trillion in tax increases they have.

When you consider all of that, you will find this budget, with other gimmicks included in it, barely reduces the deficit at all—at best, maybe by \$300 billion. And over 10 years that amounts to about \$30 billion or \$40 billion in deficit reduction a year, when last year our deficit was \$1.2 trillion.

So this budget plan increases taxes, it increases spending over our current rate, and it does nothing to change the debt course of America. We need a plan that can balance the budget. We can do that and still increase spending every year. It will balance in 10 years if we stay disciplined, but that is not the plan on the floor right now. Our colleagues need to study this budget and should not be voting for a plan that makes no change in our debt course, that does not create growth, but simply borrows more.

I see my colleague, the Democratic whip, I will call him, on the floor, but I appreciate the opportunity to share these remarks.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I thank my friend for yielding.

Earlier today my colleague from New Hampshire, Senator AYOTTE, came to the floor and spoke about the Medium Air Defense System known as MEADS. This is a program the United States has been developing for air defense with our NATO allies, so U.S. taxpayers are truly investing in this program, but our allies are as well.

I am new to this assignment as chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, and I don't take any pleasure in what I am about to say, but

it is a fact and we have to put the facts out before the American people. As we started developing this system, we reached the point where we concluded, the Department of Defense concluded, it wouldn't work. That happens. Some of the greatest ideas turn out not to be feasible, and that is where we are at this point. The question that has been raised by Senator AYOTTE is: Well, if it doesn't work, why do you want to finish the research on it this year?

That is a legitimate question, and the vast majority of Americans would say: Of course, she is right, don't spend another penny on it. The problem is this: We entered into an agreement with our allies that if we terminated the program, there would be penalties assessed to the United States that we would owe to other nations that participated in funding the research, and it turns out the amount of money needed to finish the program is about equal to the penalties we would pay if we terminated it at this moment.

So we have tried to make the best of a very bad situation. The Department of Defense Appropriations Act for 2013 includes \$380 million—a reduction of \$20 million from the original request—for the Department to bring an orderly close to the Medium Air Defense System by either completing the development program or paying the termination.

This is a NATO program, as I said, that we jointly developed with the Germans and Italians. All of us thought this was a good idea and a good investment. It wasn't until we got into it that we realized it wasn't going to do what we thought it would do. The Department determined it would not procure MEADS but has requested funds for the rest of the year to conclude the program to live up to the agreement with our allies, who have also put money into this. The Department does plan to use the advanced technology we did develop here to upgrade other systems. So it is not a complete waste. And it shouldn't be because the taxpayers have their tax dollars on the line.

I share the frustration of many of my colleagues that we have spent so much money and so many years and have reached this point. But I will tell you, we don't want to build a system that doesn't work. We don't want to create false security. And we do want some honesty from those who are developing these systems if, in fact, something we have spent money on is not going to reach its completion.

The cost to finish the development of this program is almost exactly the same as the cost to unilaterally terminate it—a point not made by the Senator from New Hampshire.

She argues about all the savings from these programs in terminating it but doesn't talk about the termination costs we are liable for as a result of that termination. It is unrealistic to assume that you can terminate a major defense program with our allies and walk away without some obligation.

For example, when the Army's Future Combat Systems Program was terminated, the Department was legally obligated to pay over \$500 million in termination liability. In return, we received several technologies that were incorporated into other programs. The same applies to MEADS but only if we fulfill our obligations and pay the termination liability. The Defense appropriations bill is fiscally responsible by providing the funding to the Army to bring this program to an orderly close instead of levying another bill on the Department in times of fiscal constraint.

I urge my colleagues, if the Ayotte amendment does come to the floor, to oppose it—not because I am asking them to vote for a program which we are in agreement is never going to reach the goal it was set out to reach but, rather, let's be honest about this. We are going to pay this money one way or the other. The Army has said, Give us the option to complete the program or pay the termination fee. That to me is a more reasonable approach.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD statements and letters from a variety of different sources, including the Department of Defense, on this program.

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

MINISTERO DELLA DIFESA AND
BUNDESMINISTERIUM DER
VERTEIDIGUNG.

Hon. LEON E. PANETTA,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, DC.

Thank you for your continued support of the MEADS program. As you are fully aware of the present situation surrounding the MEADS Program, you will know that Germany and Italy have grave concerns about the outcome of the MEADS funding discussion in the USA. This is, unfortunately, not a new situation.

The results of the Design and Development (D&D) phase of the MEADS program remain vital for both Germany and Italy as they will be the basis for our future Air and Missile Defense System Architecture. As such they are fundamental for the German and Italian contribution to the "NATO integrated Air and Missile Defense", which is a key element of the Defense package agreed in Chicago by our heads of State and Government.

As Germany and Italy have been fulfilling their full commitments under the MoU, we hope and we do expect that the United States will live up to their MoU commitment as well. If the US does not fulfill its funding commitment for 2013, Germany and Italy would need to interpret this as a unilateral withdrawal. Under the terms of the MoU, Germany and Italy expect formal notification of the US intent to withdraw from the MoU (while funding up to the effective date of the withdrawal). In addition funding for all contract modification and termination costs incurred as a result of the US actions shall be paid by the United States.

We assure you, that this is not negligible. In a first estimate the current US position results in an economic damage to Germany and Italy of more than 400 Mio. US\$. This is a result of development activities, which cannot be executed due to the missing FY 2013 US funding and the termination liability for terminating those contracts earlier.

In addition, there are wider implications of the US withdrawing or breaking the MoU and this would set a bad precedent for future transatlantic cooperation in principle. In particular one result would need to be the reconsideration of multinational cooperation in the context of NATO's SMART Defense initiative. After the Canadian withdrawal from the NAEW&C and AGS programs, the current US position would represent the second evidence in one year of the lack of reliability and as such would set a bad precedent for future transatlantic cooperation in principle.

It should be of common interest not to risk the prominent and significant merits of continued transatlantic co-operation and collaboration between our nations. We rely on your intervention to ensure the timely and full availability of 2013 funds by the end of March 2013 (with no prohibition on expenditure of MEADS funds) so as not to disrupt harvesting of MEADS capabilities in order to enable future meaningful European contribution for NATO Air and Missile defense.

The three Nations' investments have been very fruitful to date, which included a successful 360 degree intercept mission in November 2012. We are in the final year of funding under this MoU and not funding this effort would put in jeopardy all of the significant investment made to date by our countries. After the restructuring MEADS has executed on schedule and within budget for more than 4 years now, which is remarkable in particular given the situation of the program after the US decision not to procure MEADS.

The successful completion of the MEADS activities should be in our common interests for a large variety of reason. The FY 2013 funds of the US are a prerequisite to achieve this goal.

Thank you for your leadership and support on this important defense and transatlantic issue.

Yours truly,

Il Ministro della Difesa,
Bundesminister der
Verteidigung.

EMBASSY OF THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC
OF GERMANY, WASHINGTON, AND
EMBASSY OF ITALY IN WASH-
INGTON,

Washington, January 29, 2013.

Hon. BARBARA A. MIKULSKI,
Chairwoman, Committee on Appropriations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM CHAIRWOMAN, First, let us warmly congratulate you on assuming the chair of the Senate Appropriations Committee. We wish you all the best in steering this important committee through all the challenges that lie ahead.

Among the many issues and decisions to be taken is one at the very center of transatlantic relationships, the future of the Medium Extended Air Defense System (MEADS). This joint development program has brought together three close NATO allies to provide their forces with state-of-the-art technology to meet future threats. The program has achieved important milestones, including a successful intercept test in November 2012.

Italy and Germany have met their MoU obligations by contributing more than 40 percent of the necessary funding for the program since it has started in 2004. A final decision by the U.S. Government to prohibit further funding for MEADS at this advanced stage would lead to a significant loss of technology for which we have commonly worked so hard. It would also be perceived as a serious setback for transatlantic cooperation in general.

The U.S. Department of Defense has acknowledged this fact and requested further

funding for MEADS in fiscal year 2013 to meet its international commitment and also to put itself and its partners in a position to harvest the technologies in which we have all significantly invested.

As the debate on an appropriations bill for the Department of Defense in 2013 continues, we greatly appreciate your consideration of these aspects.

In concluding, we would like to stress that both our governments continue to assume that all parties will ultimately abide by the agreement.

Sincerely,

DR. PETER AMMON,
Ambassador of the
Federal Republic of
Germany.

CLAUDIO BISOGNIERO,
Ambassador of Italy.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,

Washington, DC, September 19, 2012.

Hon. DANIEL K. INOUE,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I concur with Secretary Panetta's letter of June 26 and support, within the Department of Defense budget allocation, funding the final year of Medium Extended Air Defense System (MEADS) development that includes key demonstrations, completion of documentation, and an orderly close of a program of significant importance to two of our important European allies, Germany and Italy. While we are encouraged by the recent Senate Appropriations Defense Subcommittee action recommending \$380 million in fiscal year 2013 funding for MEADS, we recognize this development will need to be reconciled with other Congressional actions.

Honoring our commitment for the final year of the MEADS "Proof of Concept" would signal the U.S. commitment to working with allies to cooperatively develop capabilities required for the challenges facing the NATO Alliance. Commitment of U.S. funds would enable and further encourage our European partners to make additional contributions to NATO missile defense. Failing to provide the final year of funding when we are so close to completion would send the wrong message to all of our allies and partners at a time when the global situation requires more, not less, cooperation.

The United States relies on our NATO allies to share the burden of defense of NATO territory and peacekeeping in coalition activities. Difficult domestic budget and economic situations make it imperative for allies to consider ways to work together to maintain and build new capabilities to defend against modern threats, like the proliferation of ballistic missiles. These are vital capabilities that many allies can only obtain if they work together to develop and acquire them. We made a commitment to two of our closest allies, Germany and Italy, to develop MEADS cooperatively, share development costs, and realize integrated coalition capabilities. It is critical that we honor our commitments.

At the NATO Summit in Chicago, allies declared an interim missile defense capability as an initial step toward establishing the NATO missile defense capability that allies agreed to develop at the 2010 NATO Summit in Lisbon. While the United States is making a significant national contribution to this system through the European Phased Adaptive Approach, we expect and have requested additional contributions from allies to make the capability more effective and share the burden of missile defense protection of European NATO territory, populations, and forces.

Germany and Italy envision MEADS not only as an essential basis for their own future air defense capabilities, but more importantly as the basis for their respective contributions to NATO missile defense. The agreement to deploy a territorial NATO missile defense capability and its implementation are major achievements of U.S. and Allied policy. A decision by Congress not to provide or to prohibit funding MEADS at this late date would diminish the consensus reached in Lisbon and Chicago for this capability, discourage allies from participating in cooperative projects in the future, and ultimately, delay greater European contributions to NATO missile defense.

My staff is ready to answer any questions you or your staff may have. Sincerely yours,
Sincerely yours,

HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON.

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, DC.

Hon. DANIEL K. INOUE,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In response to your inquiries, I am writing to ask that you strongly support the President's Budget request for FY 2013 funding to complete the Medium Extended Air Defense System (MEADS) Design and Development (D&D) Proof of Concept (PoC) effort with Germany and Italy. The Department is seeking \$400.9 million in FY 2013 funds to honor the final year of our MEADS D&D Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) commitment that will enable completion of the MEADS development phase as it is currently planned. The PoC effort enables all three nations to obtain benefit from our collective program investment to date and will bring the development program to an orderly conclusion. Failure to fund our FY 2013 commitment will be viewed by our allies as reneging on our promises.

During the NATO Summit in Chicago on May 20, 2012, NATO Allies achieved a major breakthrough on missile defense—10 years in the making—by declaring an interim ballistic missile defense capability as an initial step towards establishing a NATO missile defense system. The European Phased Adaptive Approach will be a major contributor to NATO missile defense and is designed to protect the U.S. homeland, U.S. deployed forces, and our allies against the increasing threats posed by the proliferation of ballistic missiles. Where ballistic missile defense was once a controversial subject within the Alliance, we have reached consensus to operationalize this capability and have the Allies share the burden of deterring and defending against those who could threaten us with ballistic missiles. This is a major achievement of U.S. policy; a decision by Congress to prohibit any additional funding for MEADS at this late date would diminish the consensus reached in Chicago.

The United States relies on allies to share the burden of peacekeeping and defense in coalition activities and the development of effective defense capabilities that are of direct benefit to the United States. In this context, I believe that it is important to live up to our commitments to our allies. We made a commitment to two of our closest allies, Germany and Italy, to develop MEADS cooperatively to achieve those objectives. Failure to meet our MEADS MOU FY 2013 funding obligations could negatively affect allied willingness to join future cooperative endeavors, bilaterally or through NATO, that have been strongly supported by the Administration and Congress at a time when cooperation through concepts such as Smart Defense is critical to ensuring NATO and its members are developing needed capabilities for the future.

In addition, failure by the United States to provide funding for FY 2013 likely would lead to a dispute with Germany and Italy, both of which have indicated that they would assert that the United States has unilaterally withdrawn from the MOU. On the other hand, full funding of the final year of the MEADS PoC would ensure that the United States receives a return on its 8-year investment in the form of a data archival package for future potential use on other U.S. air and missile defense improvements.

We must act now to avoid a situation that would cause harm to our relationships with two of our closest allies. My staff is ready to answer any questions you or your staff may have on MEADS.

Sincerely,

LEON PANETTA.

DIETARY SUPPLEMENTS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, almost 1½ years ago I sent the Government Accountability Office a letter asking them to examine the FDA's Adverse Event Reporting System for dietary supplements.

Dietary supplements, vitamin pills, and mineral pills are common across America. There are shops all over Chicago and downstate Illinois selling these supplements, and many people—including myself—take a vitamin each day. Maybe it is good for me, maybe it isn't. I hope it is good. It is certainly not harmful. But there are thousands of dietary supplements for sale. They are not all made in the United States, and they are not all made to the highest specifications.

So we said to the Food and Drug Administration, We want you to collect information from American consumers if there is a problem. If there is a dietary supplement that is being sold and someone has an adverse event—in other words, a health event—that could be serious, report it to the FDA. If we receive more than one, it is worth taking a look at to see if there is a pattern emerging and we should take something off the shelf.

Today the General Accountability Office released a report assessing how the system is working on this adverse event reporting on dietary supplements, and they had some recommendations. This reporting system is an important surveillance tool the FDA uses to identify and respond to cases of serious adverse reaction, such as heart attacks, hospitalizations, and, in some cases, death.

Over the years the types of dietary supplements sold have evolved from some very basic formulas such as simple vitamin C and calcium supplements to include products with potentially serious side effects, and even foods and beverages masquerading as dietary supplements that could pose a significant danger.

Take a look at these energy drinks that are for sale everywhere. Try to get past the cash register at your local gas station without running into a 5-Hour Energy drink or Monster Energy drink. And for some of them, when you turn the container back you will see it is not being sold as a beverage; it is being sold as a dietary supplement—in other

words, like a vitamin or a mineral. There is a reason for that: because if it is sold as a beverage, FDA has different regulatory authority over the product and its ingredients. If it is sold as a dietary supplement, the regulations are not there in the same way as they would be for beverages.

Unfortunately, people are led to believe these products have all been approved by the FDA and pose no risk. In reality, unlike drugs or over-the-counter drugs, dietary supplements are not reviewed and tested by the FDA for safety or effectiveness before being sold to the American public. That will come as a surprise to a lot of people. Most dietary supplements today are safe and they are used by millions of Americans as part of their personal choice for a healthy lifestyle. That is not true of all supplements.

In 2002, a 16-year-old boy named Sean Riggins from Lincoln, IL, just a few miles away from my home in Springfield, died after taking a dietary supplement containing ephedra. Sean was a high school football player. Before playing in a game, he went to the local gas station and bought something called Yellow Jackets. It was a form of ephedra, clearly marketed to children to give them an energy boost. How often do you hear that? Sean washed the pills down with a bottle of Mountain Dew. Sean was unable to finish the football game that day and died of a heart attack.

Before his death, Metabolife—the largest manufacturer of supplements containing ephedra—claimed they had no ephedra-related adverse events to report. This was 2002. Under pressure, Metabolife later gave FDA over 13,000 ephedra-related adverse event reports that showed people taking their products with ephedra and getting sick.

In 2006, I worked with Senators ORRIN HATCH and TOM HARKIN to pass the Dietary Supplement and Nonprescription Drug Consumer Protection Act. The law requires dietary supplement manufacturers to report serious adverse events to the Food and Drug Administration.

Today's GAO report shows that since the law was enacted, serious adverse events reported to the FDA have increased dramatically, from almost 400 reports of serious events in 2007, to 6,307 between 2008 and 2011. The GAO report highlights commendable efforts by the FDA to improve the safety of dietary supplements. In 2008, the FDA only conducted 120 inspections in the United States. By 2012, that number was up to 400 inspections. Between 2008 and 2011, FDA took 19 regulatory actions, including warning letters and injunctions, against companies that didn't report as required—such as reporting serious adverse events but omitting contact information on their labels. That is pretty basic, isn't it? When you buy a product like a dietary supplement, you ought to at least know who made it and how you can contact the people who made it. If

something goes wrong or if there is a question and you need to contact someone, that basic information should be there.

In addition to outlining steps, FDA is taking steps to strengthen the Adverse Event Reporting System to protect consumers. The GAO report also suggests ways the FDA can improve this process. For instance, in some cases FDA has used these adverse event reports to inform actions to protect consumers. But the Agency could do more and develop ways to educate consumers about potentially harmful products.

The GAO report encourages the FDA to issue final guidance clarifying the definition of a conventional food and dietary supplement. The vague distinction between a dietary supplement and conventional food or beverage has created a murky growing market where some companies sell products potentially dangerous with unapproved ingredients, products such as Lazy Cakes, a brownie marketed as a dietary supplement—not as a brownie, but as a dietary supplement, that contains roughly 8 milligrams of the sleep aid melatonin, almost double the upper limit of the typical dose—and energy drinks sold in huge 16-, 24-, and 32-ounce cans right next to soda and Gatorade. Soda and Gatorade are regulated; the energy drinks are not. How would a consumer know?

The GAO report also encourages the FDA to work with the Poison Control Centers to establish a data-sharing agreement. This is a source of real frustration, and when I describe the information you will understand why.

As you can imagine, when somebody feels sick after using a supplement, they don't usually call the Food and Drug Administration; they call a local hospital or the Poison Control Centers which are all across America. Between 2008 and 2010, Poison Control Centers heard from 1,000 more people who had experienced adverse events with dietary supplements than the Food and Drug Administration did. The Poison Control Centers information could be a meaningful contribution to the information the FDA is receiving about harmful products—information that can help us protect American consumers. I encourage the Food and Drug Administration and Poison Control Centers to work together to share this information. Sadly, the Poison Control Centers are demanding millions of dollars that the FDA doesn't have to get access to the basic information about dangerous products sold in America that are causing harm to Americans. Holding back this information is not in the best interests of keeping America healthy and safe.

Moving forward, I am going to continue to work with the FDA to enhance the regulation of dietary supplements and ensure customers have the information they need to make informed decisions. Every time I come to the floor and say anything about dietary supplements, I can guarantee you that at

some Web site somewhere they are saying, Here comes Durbin again. He is going to take your vitamin pills away. He is going to make it so you need a prescription to take vitamin C. Not the case at all. That is not what I am arguing for.

Let me tell you the bill I will reintroduce this year, the Dietary Supplement Labeling Act, would do. It addresses the growing concern of dietary supplements with misleading information and the bad actors selling it. This bill would require more information on labels. People using dietary supplements have the right to know if there is a risk associated with the product. Some ingredients may be safe for the general population but risky for groups such as kids or pregnant women, or the ingredients included in there might be dangerous for people with special conditions such as diabetes or high blood pressure.

The bill would also help curb the growing practice of foods and beverages with added ingredients masquerading as dietary supplements by directing the FDA to establish a definition for conventional foods. This definition would clarify for industry, consumers, and even the FDA what products are foods and which products are dietary supplements. Today you can't tell.

If you have the time and good eyes, go into that gas station and take a look at some of these energy drinks, and then look at the bottle of Gatorade or soda next to it in the case. One often regulated as a beverage, the other—the dietary supplement—is not.

Many people would be surprised to learn that the FDA doesn't even know how many dietary supplements are being sold in the United States. I will bet you the majority of American people are sure their government is testing those things that are on the shelves. Not necessarily. Most people don't know if a dietary supplement ingredient presents any serious health concerns. The FDA doesn't have the information to track down products containing these harmful ingredients in many circumstances. The Dietary Supplement Labeling Act which I am introducing would require dietary supplement makers to give the FDA the name of each supplement they produce, along with a description, a list of ingredients, and a copy of the label. Is that onerous? Is that the heavy hand of government? If you want to sell a dietary supplement product in America, isn't it reasonable that you at least register the name of the product, its ingredients, the name and address of the company that can be reached if something goes wrong? That, to me, sounds very basic, and I hope my colleagues will consider supporting it. With that information, the FDA would be better equipped to protect consumers' health and to work with supplement manufacturers to address problems as they arise.

I visited dietary supplement companies in Chicago. I am impressed. They

take it seriously. It looks as you would hope it would look, like a very sterile, professional environment with medical professionals on board. The same cannot be said of all the things we are importing from all over the world. If you take a look and see that the product was made in China, you may have some second thoughts about buying it or giving it to your children. We have had some scandals associated with adulterated products coming in from China. I would pause if that were the source of a dietary supplement. I would have more confidence if it is made in the United States, particularly by a reputable dealer that I have seen on the shelves in a local drugstore over and over again.

Let me reiterate. Most dietary supplements available in America today are safe and are used by millions of Americans as part of a healthy lifestyle. As I said, I am one of the consumers taking that dietary supplement multivitamin every morning. But the GAO report confirms there is still work to be done to enhance the FDA's Adverse Event Reporting System, and to ensure that people who take these products have the information they need to make healthy, informed decisions.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

THE BUDGET

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I am back on the Senate floor today with my favorite chart, one that I think is indicative of the fiscal dysfunction that is occurring here in Congress, particularly in the Senate, now marking 1,420 days without a budget. But people should be encouraged that as a result of the House passing a "no budget, no pay" bill, it has finally prompted our friends across the aisle to mark up a budget in the Budget Committee that will come to the floor in the next few days, and we will be having a lot of important discussions and debates about budgets, taxes, and debt ratios.

I hope everyone remembers what this is really about. It is not just about numbers, it is about our obligation, our moral obligation to future generations of Americans.

I would just footnote that the President in a recent interview said that we do not have an immediate debt problem, and to say: Mr. President, the debt is discouraging and retarding economic growth which we need in order to get Americans back to work.

That is why unemployment is at 8 percent, roughly, with some 23 million Americans either out of work or underemployed, working part time when they would like to work full time. It is

a national tragedy and why we need to get our fiscal house in order here so we can put America back to work and grow our economy and opportunity.

Like many in this Chamber, my father was a member of what we call the “greatest generation.” I think Tom Brokaw coined that phrase, talking about the World War II generation that fought and won a world war. My dad was a B-17 pilot, and on his 26th bombing mission over Mannheim, Germany, he was shot down and captured as a prisoner of war. Thank goodness that after 4 months he was released from captivity thanks to General Patton and his Army sweeping through that part of Germany at the end of World War II.

My father and others like him fought to ensure that his children and his grandchildren would grow up in a country that had greater opportunity than he himself and my mother had when they were alive. Indeed, that is every parent’s dream, that their children and their grandchildren will enjoy more opportunity, more freedom, and a higher standard of living than they themselves had. That is the reason why parents and grandparents sacrifice and why they work hard for their kids and grandkids—because of their hope and their belief in that dream. As a result, my dad and my mother and countless other members of the “greatest generation” left this country better off than they found it. The question for all of us today is, Will the present generation do the same? I certainly hope so, and I am doing everything I know how to do, as one Senator, to make sure we do.

As a parent, I want nothing but the best for my two daughters. My wife and I want and hope and pray for the best for them. As an American, I want to see every child, everyone’s sons and daughters, succeed and prosper. But right now we have, in effect, a war being waged against America’s youth. I know some might consider that hyperbole or perhaps unnecessarily inflammatory, but let me explain to you why I do believe that you could logically conclude that we have been waging a war against America’s youth.

Consider the following: Our national debt is close to \$17 trillion. That means every child born in America today comes into this world owing \$53,000 in debt. Meanwhile, the Federal Government is spending more than \$200 billion a year on interest payments alone. The Medicare hospital insurance trust fund—Medicare—is projected to go bankrupt within 11 years, and we are looking at more than \$100 trillion in unfunded liabilities; that is, promises we have made to future generations, and we currently have no clue how to pay for those. That is what “unfunded liabilities” means.

We know the younger generation has virtually no hope that Medicare and Social Security will be there for them when they retire unless we act—and we must act. But rather than reform and protect our existing programs, such as

Medicare and Social Security, the President chose in his first year in office to create yet another new entitlement program funded by a \$1 trillion tax increase. Of course, we all know it goes by the name of ObamaCare or, if you prefer, the Affordable Care Act, which I think, if you look at it, history will ultimately conclude was unaffordable—not the Affordable Care Act but the Unaffordable Care Act.

One impact of ObamaCare is that young people under the age of 40 are going to have to pay higher and higher health insurance premiums. You might ask how that is possible since they are the healthiest people in America today. This is a phenomenon known as age banding, which says under ObamaCare that seniors can pay no more than three times what young healthy people pay for their health insurance. But it is no secret that older Americans incur higher medical expenses by virtue of their advancing years. Yet they can only pay three times what young healthy people pay for health insurance. That will lead to much higher premiums for young people in America. Indeed, one recent survey found that premium costs for young and healthy Americans “will increase on average by 169 percent.” I have no way of knowing whether that prediction will be entirely accurate, but I can promise that health insurance premiums for young, healthy Americans will continue to rise under the current law known as ObamaCare.

Such a dramatic rise in health insurance premiums will come at a time when young workers and middle-class families are already struggling to make ends meet. After all, the median household income in America has fallen by more than \$2,400 since June 2009. In other words, average households in America are not just treading water, maintaining their place, they are losing, they are taking on water, and they are \$2,400 poorer today than they were in June 2009.

Not only will ObamaCare drive up insurance premiums for younger Americans, it also is destroying jobs. In fact, we already have evidence that many full-time jobs are being reduced to part-time jobs in preparation for ObamaCare’s costs and regulation. In particular, in many places where young people get a start in their work life—working in restaurants, working in hotels, working for retailers—those very same employers are now replacing full-time jobs with part-time jobs in order to avoid the crushing costs of ObamaCare. So this will hurt younger Americans more than anyone else.

Then there is this: While unemployment is, generally speaking, about 7.9 percent—the Congressional Budget Office expects it to go up to 8 percent by the end of this year—fewer and fewer people are still looking for jobs. It is called the labor participation rate. You can go online and look at the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and they will show you that the number of people looking

for work as a percentage of the population is as low as it has been for 30 years. So not only are people having a hard time finding full-time work, if they can find work at all, some have simply given up.

A new study shows that the unemployment rate among teenagers is over 25 percent now, and a new study shows that Americans in their twenties and thirties are accumulating savings at a much slower rate than their parents did. What we find among many young Americans and not-so-young Americans is that they are living off of their 401(k) or retirement savings now at unprecedented rates.

I ask my colleagues, is this really the future we want to leave our children and grandchildren? Will this leave them better off than we were or will it leave them worse off? I know that no one in this Chamber and no American in this country wants to leave their children and grandchildren worse off than they are. That is why we have to do everything we can to reverse the Federal overreach of the past 4 years and to boost economic opportunity with policies that will promote fiscal health and strong, broad job creation and upward mobility. In other words, we need to embrace policies that expand our economy and not government. We do not need people more dependent on government, we need more people independent and prospering on their own because we have a growing economy that provides opportunities for them to work, to save, and to support their families and deliver to their children and grandchildren greater prosperity than they inherited from their parents. That is the future Americans want, and that is the future we must strive to deliver.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss an amendment that has been filed by my friend Senator MORAN that I am proud to support. This amendment would stop the Federal Aviation Administration from targeting air traffic control towers across the country, including the towers that are considered to be in the Contract Tower Program under sequestration.

As I have said before on this floor and will continue to say, many of these problems will be resolved, I am convinced, if the Appropriations Committee does its work and that work is recognized and debated on the floor. And I hope we will not be having this same kind of discussion on October 1 when we begin the new spending year.

But the impact of sequestration—cutting from this account—is real. Senator MORAN’s amendment is important.

It is something that could impact the communities served by these towers. This amendment tries to ensure that these communities are not impacted.

In our State, there are contract towers in Missouri—in Branson, in Joplin, in Colombia, in Jefferson City and Saint Joseph. All those could be affected, depending on how the FAA administers this cut in the contract tower line. A number of other airports in Missouri, including Springfield, downtown Kansas City, and downtown St. Louis, could lose their towers in the after-midnight service, and those planes that now land there after midnight would either not do that or would do that without the support of the tower they have now that assists in landing.

This amendment of Senator MORAN would protect those towers as well as the federally funded portion of 16 cost-share towers, which also could be closed at the end of this fiscal year. Specifically, this amendment takes \$50 million from one place in the FAA—in fact, it is \$50 million in research and capital funds—that is money that could easily be set aside for this short period of time so that these towers do not close—and then Senator MORAN would add \$50 million in the Federal Aviation Administration operations account. The amendment makes it clear that the Contract Tower Program and contract tower cost-sharing programs are subject to the 5-percent sequestration cuts but, again, would transfer enough money within accounts that there should be money to keep these important towers open in Missouri, in Kansas, in Maryland, in Alaska. Many States—almost every State has something that would be impacted by this contract tower section.

This \$50 million would be more than 95 percent of the estimated money necessary to be sure that the contract tower program and the cost-share program would stay in place. If someone was using one of these airports and bought a ticket to travel out of one of these airports, or if someone is a general aviation customer at one of these airports, the tower is one of the ways they would expect their tax dollars to be spent.

What Senator MORAN is trying to do is find a way to do that which still allows sequestration to occur and still keeps the spending below the spending cap in the law. It is exactly in sync with the spirit of the law as well as the letter of the law. This just tries to solve a problem.

I wish to solve this problem in another way, by saying that Federal funds and employees who are involved in public safety have to be prioritized as people who show up, and we are going to move forward with that particular view legislatively if we cannot get it added to this spending bill which takes us from now until the end of the year.

It is my hope we are not talking next year about how we get to the end of the

year because we figured out how to get to the end of the year at the beginning of the year. That does not sound like an incredible goal for the Senate to have. But in a Senate that has not voted on a single appropriations bill for 16 months, updating the spending—5 of the 12 bills spend 70 percent of the money—in this continuing resolution is in the spirit of what our new chairman and our new ranking member want to do, and what the Senate should want to do, which is to deal with these things in the regular way.

I would very much like to see Senator MORAN's amendment included in what we are doing today. Just as importantly, I want to work with Senator MORAN to see that as we look toward October 1, these kinds of issues don't have to become a regular part of our process, but the kind we look back on and say: Remember we failed to do our job the regular way and all the problems that created? Let's get back to regular order.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, before the Senator from Missouri leaves the floor, I wish to make a comment.

First of all, I would personally like to thank him for all of his cooperation in trying to help move this bill forward within the Senate. It is characteristic of both him and the spirit in which Vice Chairman SHELBY and I have undertaken this effort. We have tried to work together to get this bill disposed of in an orderly way in order to avoid a government shutdown. It is not the bill we like, but it is the bill that was presented to us. At the same time we are beginning to establish both a tone, a decorum, and a process so we can get back to regular order.

I share the frustration of the Senator from Missouri in that we are dealing with a really big bill. The legislation that is pending here includes all 12 of the separate appropriations bills. It is very difficult to parse them out and to have rational conversations on matters of policy.

I hope as we get to October 1, which is our fiscal New Year's Eve, we will have had an orderly disposal of all 12 of the bills. I truly believe we can agree on the process and procedure. We can and should have a debate on policy. There should be a debate on funding. I am not one who likes to contain debates or contain amendments, but the clock is ticking.

We have two big issues before us. One issue is the funding for the rest of the fiscal year—fiscal 2013—and then we have the budget for fiscal 2014 which Senator MURRAY and Senator SESSIONS want to bring to the floor. I would like it if we could bring our bill to an orderly close and move to the budget debate so when we take our Easter-Passover break, if we do that, we will have shown the people of America that we can govern by disposing of two major policy considerations with decorum,

dignity, civility, and pretty robust conversation.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

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

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

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes as in morning business.

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

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I am here, once again, to sound an alarm about carbon pollution's damage to our oceans and to our climate. It is past time for Congress to wake up to our responsibility as elected officials and as stewards of this planet.

The alarm has been sounded by the scientific community which overwhelmingly warns about the effects of our carbon dioxide emissions on our atmosphere and oceans. Our defense and intelligence communities warn of the threats posed by climate change to national security and international stability. Economists recognize the distortion of energy markets that overlook the true cost of carbon pollution, and government accountants now list climate change as a threat to our fiscal stability.

Today, as we enter the Passover and Easter season and as Catholics the world over celebrate the selection of a new Pope, we turn to voices of faith. They too call upon us. They call upon us to heed the moral imperatives of protecting creation and seeking justice for all people. They call upon us to reflect on our faith, on our relationship to our world and each other and on our responsibility to future generations, and they call upon us, as President Obama reminded us in his inaugural address, to "preserve our planet, commanded to our care by God."

I lay no claim to religious authority, but I must believe this: Something that harms others, something that disturbs God's creation, something that stands on lies and greed—protecting that must not be consistent with God's will.

In his 2010 World Day of Peace message entitled "If You Want to Cultivate Peace, Protect Creation," Pope Benedict XVI called upon the faithful:

... [t]o protect the environment, and to safeguard natural resources and the climate ... while at the same time taking into due account the solidarity we owe to those living in the poorer areas of our world and to future generations.

In his inaugural mass this morning, Pope Francis said:

Please, I would like to ask all those who have positions of responsibility in economic,

political, and social life, and all men and women of good will: let us be "protectors" of creation, protectors of God's plan inscribed in nature, protectors of one another and of the environment.

As early news reports indicated, the new Pope chose his papal name Francis out of respect for Saint Francis's sense of obligation to God's creation. He noted in one of his very earliest comments that our relationship with God's creation is not so good right now. Of course, the Pope is not the only one.

Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew I of Constantinople, the spiritual leader of the world's Orthodox Christians, also reminds us to remember those most affected by climate change:

Climate change is much more than an issue of environmental preservation. Climate change constitutes a matter of social and economic justice.

In the United States, hundreds of evangelical leaders signed the Evangelical Climate Initiative statement which declares: "Love of God, love of neighbor, and the demands of stewardship are more than enough reason for evangelical Christians to respond to the climate change problem with moral passion and concrete action."

The Hindu Declaration on Climate Change affirms that "the dire problems besetting our world will all be magnified manifold by the predicted impacts of climate change."

Buddhist leaders, including the Dalai Lama, urge both individual and institutional transformation to confront what they call "the gravest challenge that humanity has ever faced: the ecological consequences of our own collective karma."

As Rev. Fletcher Harper of the interfaith coalition GreenFaith explains, all faith-based communities have a spiritual connection to the natural world. For example, Sheikh Ali Gomaa, the internationally respected Egyptian Islamist, sees this connection as central to a faithful life. I will read:

If we take seriously our role as God's deputies on Earth, not just by benefiting from the environment, but by preserving it and ensuring that other communities and generations will have the same possibilities to drink clean water, breathe fresh air, and live in a world that is in harmony with itself and with ourselves, we may hope to be among those who are beloved to God due to their care for his creation.

For many, faith compels work toward fairness and justice for all living beings, regardless of nationality or social status, and encourages us to consider the effects of our actions on future generations.

For many individuals all over the world, the fight against climate change is a moral call. As Americans, we have a tradition of calling upon our own deeply held spiritual convictions to address our society's greatest moral challenges. People of faith are answering that call, from major denominational governing bodies down to local parishes and synagogues.

Representative HENRY WAXMAN and I, as part of our work on the Bicameral

Task Force on Climate Change, recently wrote to 300 groups to ask for their views on actions the Federal Government could take to reduce carbon pollution and strengthen our resiliency to climate change. A number of those organizations which answered are religious organizations.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD excerpts of letters from six of these groups.

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

COALITION ON THE ENVIRONMENT AND
JEWISH LIFE AND JEWISH COUNCIL
FOR PUBLIC AFFAIRS.

New York, NY, February 20, 2013.

REP. HENRY A. WAXMAN AND SEN. SHELDON
WHITEHOUSE,
*Co-chairs, Bicameral Task Force on Climate
Change.*

DEAR SENATORS WAXMAN AND WHITEHOUSE: Thank you for requesting our input. The Coalition on the Environment and Jewish Life (COEJL) and Jewish Council for Public Affairs (JCPA) are pleased to respond to the Task Force's request for input on federal policy responses to climate change.

COEJL deepens and broadens the Jewish community's commitment to the stewardship and protection of the earth. COEJL has been an initiative at the Jewish Council for Public Affairs since 1993. Through a network of 27 national organizations (including all major denominations) and 125 community agencies, COEJL is mobilizing the Jewish community to address today's energy and climate change crisis. Through its role in the National Religious Partnership for the Environment (NRPE), COEJL works closely with our colleagues at the Evangelical Environmental Network, National Council of Churches, and US Conference of Catholic Bishops. JCPA is the public affairs arm of the organized Jewish community and serves as the national coordinating and advisory body for the 14 national and 125 local agencies comprising the field of Jewish community relations.

Today, COEJL's priorities are to mobilize the Jewish community to address the climate crisis through advocacy for appropriate legislation as well as action to reduce our own greenhouse gas emissions. COEJL challenges and supports Jewish organizations to pursue sustainability in their facilities, operations and programs in order to protect the earth for future generations.

COEJL's Jewish Energy and Environment Imperative, signed by over 50 Jewish community leaders in 2012, states that "the need to transform the world's energy economy while addressing global climate change is not only a religious and moral imperative, it is a strategy for security and survival." Next month, COEJL is bringing . . .

COMMITTEE ON DOMESTIC JUSTICE
AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

Washington, DC, February 21, 2013.

Hon. HENRY WAXMAN,
*Co-Chair, Bicameral Task Force on Climate
Change, Ranking Member, Committee on
Energy and Commerce.*

Hon. SHELDON WHITEHOUSE,
*Co-Chair, Bicameral Task Force on Climate
Change, Chairman, Subcommittee on Over-
sight, Senate Committee, Environment and
Public Works.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WAXMAN AND SENATOR WHITEHOUSE: At the request of Cardinal Dolan and as chairman of the Committee on Domestic Justice and Human Development, I am responding to your letter dated January 31, 2013. We thank you for your leadership to

address climate change and for the opportunity to share our suggestions for effective measures to address the moral and environmental challenges of climate change with this Bicameral Task Force.

Effective measures to address climate change are urgent and necessary. Evidence continues to point toward significant damaging impacts from climate related events in the United States, across the globe, and particularly for the poorest developing countries. Some poor nations and small island states already experience these impacts as a matter of survival for their people and cultures.

People living in poverty in communities served by Catholic Relief Services (CRS) already suffer the tragic consequences of climate change. Increasingly limited access to water, reduced crop yields, more widespread disease, and increased frequency and intensity of droughts and storms all make the lives of the world's poorest people even more precarious. CRS, which supports projects in almost 100 countries, already assists many communities to adapt to the consequences of climate change.

In signaling the moral dimensions of this issue and advocating for the needs of the most vulnerable, the Catholic Church brings a distinct perspective to this urgent matter. Throughout his pontificate, Pope Benedict XVI demonstrated strong leadership on climate change in his teaching office and through efforts to reduce the Vatican's own carbon footprint. In his 2010 World Day of Peace Message, *If You Want to Cultivate Peace, Protect Creation*, he pointed to the urgent moral need for solidarity with creation and those affected by climate change. The pope insists, "To protect the environment, and to safeguard natural resources and the climate, there is a need to act in accordance with clearly-defined rules . . . while at the same time taking into due account the solidarity we owe to those living in the poorer areas of our world and to future generations" (no. 7).

The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) is guided by the teaching of Pope Benedict XVI and the principles articulated in the USCCB's statement, *Global Climate Change: A Plea for Dialogue, Prudence and the Common Good*. This statement notes that, "At its core, global climate change is not about economic theory or political platforms, nor about partisan advantage or interest group pressures. It is about the future of God's creation and the one human family." As pastors and people of faith, we are not experts on the science, technical remedies and particular provisions of legislation or regulatory measures to address climate change. Our efforts seek to link care for creation and care for "the least of these." As is noted in the bishops' statement, "Action to mitigate global climate change must be built upon a foundation of social and economic justice that does not put the poor at greater risk or place disproportionate and unfair burdens on developing nations."

For the USCCB, a fundamental moral measure of any policy to address climate change is how it affects the poor, in our country and around the world. Well-designed policies can both reduce the severity of climate change and protect the most vulnerable. The USCCB supports strong leadership by the United States in enacting policies that protect poor and vulnerable people from bearing the impacts of climate change and from the human and economic costs of any proposed legislation to respond to climate change.

The USCCB asks the U.S. Congress and the federal government to consider the following principles as they shape policies and measures to address climate change:

Prudence requires us to act to protect the common good by addressing climate change at home and abroad.

The consequences of climate change will be borne by the world's most vulnerable people and inaction will worsen their suffering.

Policies addressing global climate change should enhance rather than diminish the economic situation of people in poverty.

Policies should create new resources to assist poor and adversely affected communities to adapt and respond to the effects of global climate change in the U.S. and in vulnerable developing countries.

Policies to address climate change should include measures to protect poor and vulnerable communities from the health impacts of climate change, including increased exposure to climate-sensitive diseases, heat waves and diminished air quality.

Participation by local affected communities in shaping policy responses to address climate change and programs for adapting to climate change is essential.

Technology should be made available to people in the most vulnerable developing countries to help them adapt to the effects of climate change (adaptation) and reduce their greenhouse gas emissions (mitigation).

We appreciate your commitment to address this urgent global challenge confronting the human family. The USCCB stands ready to work with you, members of Congress, and the Administration to ensure that needed climate legislation both cares for creation and protects "the least of these."

Sincerely yours,
 MOST REVEREND STEPHEN E. BLAIRE,
Chairman,
Committee on Domestic Justice and Human Development.

EVANGELICAL ENVIRONMENTAL NETWORK,
New Freedom, PA, February 20, 2013.

Hon. SHELDON WHITEHOUSE,
 Hon. HENRY WAXMAN,
Co-chairs, Bicameral Task Force on Climate Change, Capitol Hill, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR WHITEHOUSE AND CONGRESSMAN WAXMAN: On behalf of the Board and staff of the Evangelical Environmental Network (EEN) I write to thank you for your service to our country, in particular for your leadership on climate change, including your co-chairmanship of the Bicameral Task Force on Climate Change. In your capacity as Co-chairs, you have asked us to provide "ideas for actions the federal government can take to address climate change." This letter is our response to your request.

A. THE GREAT MORAL CAUSE OF OUR TIME

We consider overcoming climate change by keeping the temperature rise to 2°C above preindustrial levels to be the great moral cause of our time and the next great cause of freedom. EEN has been seriously engaged on this issue for over a decade, and it remains our top policy priority. We believe overcoming climate change is part of what it means to be a Christian today; it is part of loving God and our neighbors as ourselves, of respecting the sanctity of life given by God, including the unborn and those yet to be born.

B. SOWING THE SEEDS OF BIPARTISANSHIP

We note at the outset that one of the most important things the federal government can do is to act in a manner that enjoys or will eventually enjoy broad bi-partisan support to ensure that whatever actions are taken will carry forward into the future, regardless of which party holds power in the legislative and executive branches. No one knows better than we do how difficult this particular issue can be for the more conservative members of

our society, including many Republicans. We know that bipartisanship on climate action is not easy. But it is necessary.

The simple truth is, those opposed to climate action have done a good job of having climate change viewed as a political issue, even a partisan one. We firmly believe that the need to act to overcome climate change is a moral issue, that it should be viewed morally rather than in a partisan fashion. Science helps us understand that there is a problem and the magnitude and urgency of the problem. The systemic nature, the magnitude, and the urgency of the problem require not only that individuals act in keeping with their values, but that government at all levels must act—especially the federal government. But the decision to act, both individually and through our various levels of government, is a moral one. This is a moral cause whose solutions require government policies in keeping with freedom.

As such, we implore you as statesmen to help move our country forward in a manner that sows the seeds of bi-partisanship to be reaped in the future. Let's work together to stay out of the partisan trap set by opponents of climate action.

C. WE MUST ACT STARTING NOW

Precisely because climate change is the great moral cause of our time and the need for action is urgent, we cannot wait to act until there is complete unanimity. Even in the absence of strong bipartisan support today, actions must be taken now to keep us within striking distance of avoiding 2°C and help us adapt to the impacts that will occur. But such actions must always be taken with an eye towards eventual bi-partisan support, or that would lead to eventual bi-partisan solutions.

D. ACTION TO ADDRESS THE CAUSES: MITIGATION

1. Preference for Market-based Mechanisms

As conservatives, we believe in using the least amount of government power necessary to achieve the common good. Since the issuing of the Evangelical Climate Initiative statement in 2006, EEN has endorsed the use of market-based mechanisms to put a price on carbon, thereby allowing the dynamics of the marketplace to find the most efficient and least-costly ways of overcoming climate change. As such, we favor cap-and-trade or a carbon tax as preferred choices over regulation when it comes to addressing the causes, or climate mitigation.

But we are past time for serious action on climate mitigation, and thus our country must move forward even if Congress is currently unable to price carbon via a market-based mechanism.

2. EPA Regulations, a Second Best Option

Therefore, we strongly urge the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), under its authority contained in the Clean Air Act (CAA), to issue a rule on existing sources that would be finalized in 2014. We further urge the EPA to require strong emissions reductions that keep our country's contribution in striking distance of 2°C, thereby enhancing freedom in the future by reducing impacts. But, also in keeping with freedom, we urge that states be given maximum flexibility as to how emissions can be reduced.

Strength of resolve, flexibility in implementation, infused with freedom—these should be the watchwords for the EPA's regulation of existing sources. Remaining steadfast on the * * *

FRIENDS COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL LEGISLATION,
Washington, DC, February 20, 2013.

DEAR SEN. WHITEHOUSE AND REP. WAXMAN: FCNL is delighted that you have formed the bicameral Task Force on Climate Change.

We are thankful for your leadership on climate disruption—the greatest challenge humanity has ever faced—and look forward to working with you to ensure that Congress does its part to address it. We are honored to be invited to respond to the questions you have posed.

In recognition of the gravity and immensity of climate disruption, the questions posed first merit contextual background—much of which you know all too well—yet bears repeating, for without it, the tangible paths of specific negotiations and actions in present day circumstances can turn in unexpected directions or end in inadequate places.

CONTEXT

As you know, the scientific community feels the world is unable to stay below the 2 degree Celsius target that the global political establishment set in Copenhagen as the maximum global temperature increase acceptable to avoid serious and catastrophic disruptions of Earth's ecosystems and in turn human societal systems. Some scientists, observing and monitoring present day manifestations of climate disruption, feel that this target is now too lenient. Other scientists think it's too late to prevent catastrophic consequences on human civilization even if world GHG emissions halted right now.

Yet human civilization is increasing global GHG emissions in quantities exceeding the worst case scenario posited in the IPCC's Fourth Assessment Report. The International Energy Agency says we must keep in the ground 2/3rds of the world's proven fossil fuel reserves to prevent catastrophe, yet some nations and corporations aggressively and successfully pursue policies to the contrary. Few if any national or international policies are in place to abate these trends. Grim is the understated description of these circumstances.

What must be done?

The ideal and mandatory goal is for the world to urgently and dramatically reduce global greenhouse gas emissions (e.g., by transitioning to renewable energy sources, energy efficient buildings and technologies, and protection of carbon sinks like rainforests), and for significant resources and expertise to be directed towards building the resilience of human infrastructure and critical ecosystems to prepare for and withstand the impacts of phenomena generated or exacerbated by climate disruption. With regard to the first aspect of this goal, some suggest reductions more ambitious than that proposed in prior comprehensive climate legislation, e.g., 80% reductions in global GHG emissions by 2025, not 2050. * * *

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN THE USA,
Washington, DC, February 25, 2013.

Hon. SHELDON WHITEHOUSE,
Co-Chair, Bicameral Task Force on Climate Change, Chairman, Subcommittee on Oversight, Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Hon. HENRY WAXMAN,
Co-Chair, Bicameral Task Force on Climate Change, Ranking Member, Committee on Energy and Commerce.

DEAR SENATOR WHITEHOUSE AND REPRESENTATIVE WAXMAN: The National Council of Churches (NCC), on behalf of its 37 Christian denominations, is grateful for your leadership on the issue of global climate change and the opportunity to provide input regarding potential actions and legislation that can respond to the global climate crisis. We are appreciative of your continued commitment to bring this issue to the forefront for both houses of Congress.

The NCC, through its Eco-justice Program, has, for more than 30 years, sought to address the issue of global climate change with a focus on reducing greenhouse gas emissions to prevent the worst impacts of climate change, ensuring economic protections for those living in poverty as we shift to a low-carbon future, and preparing communities at home and abroad for those climate impacts that we can no longer prevent. In 2006, the NCC along with an interfaith coalition developed its Faith Principles on Global Warming. This document lifts up justice, stewardship, sustainability and sufficiency as guiding tenets for our work and ministry on climate change and has informed the following recommendations.

A central component of the NCC's efforts is focused on minimizing our contribution to global climate change by reducing heat-trapping pollutants both in our congregations and at the national level. This is critical if we are to achieve climate justice and prevent the worst impacts of climate change.

In order to effectively address climate change, the United States must incorporate the principles of mitigation and adaptation at every level and in every branch of government. We currently have a number of administrative options available to us through federal agencies that should be used to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Currently there are a variety of policies that could be both adopted and enforced by federal agencies would limit greenhouse gas emissions. First, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) should use its authority under the Clean Air Act to address methane released from energy extraction processes such as mountaintop removal coal mining and hydraulic fracturing. Both processes release significant amounts of methane, a gas often found in fossil * * *

THE REGENERATION PROJECT
INTERFAITH POWER & LIGHT,
San Francisco, CA, February 20, 2013.

Rep. HENRY WAXMAN,
Sen. SHELDON WHITEHOUSE,
Bicameral Task Force on Climate Change,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SEN. WHITEHOUSE AND REP. WAXMAN: Thank you for forming the Bicameral Task Force on Climate Change and for including Interfaith Power & Light in your request for ideas for actions the federal government can take to address climate change.

As President Obama said in his inaugural speech, we are "commanded by God" to preserve the planet. In his State of the Union address he further said, "for the sake of our children and our future, we must do more to combat climate change". We are encouraged that the president sees this as a moral issue. People of faith agree and support bold action. The president's call for Congress to act opens an opportunity, and we thank you for your leadership to advance that action.

In response to your questions we have listed some ideas for your consideration, below.

1. What actions or policies could federal agencies adopt, using existing authorities, to reduce emissions of heat-trapping pollution? We urge Congress to support proposed EPA standards on carbon pollution from new power plants and ensure timely action to limit carbon pollution from existing power plants and oil refineries.

2. What actions or policies could federal agencies adopt using existing authorities, to make our nation more resilient to the effects of climate change?

A coordinated strategy involving FEMA, Department of Agriculture, DOT, DOE, and EPA to help prepare communities for the impacts of climate change could be productive. Communities must become more resilient, more equipped for storms and high heat

events, droughts and transportation challenges. Supporting local food infrastructure, cooling centers for urban areas, and shelters with their own power sources (preferably renewable) could help communities cope with extreme weather events that disrupt food, transportation and electricity infrastructure.

Superstorm Sandy offered lessons in this regard, and could be used as a case study to be better prepared for future events. However, each community is different, and local communities should be encouraged to come up with their own preparedness strategies. A public campaign coming from the government that declares the climate issue is real, and response is urgent might move more Americans to understand that we need to act. This should be framed as a moral issue, not an environmental or scientific one.

3. What legislation would you recommend Congress enact to strengthen the ability of federal agencies to prevent and respond to the effects of climate change?

We suggest legislation to advance energy efficiency and renewables and to upgrade the electrical grid which would allow for more renewable energy to come to market. In order to level the playing field between renewable energy and traditional fossil fuels, we suggest legislation that would limit the amount of subsidies to oil, coal and gas and redirect these subsidies to renewables. Legislation could also remove barriers to investment in renewable energy, so that wind and solar and other clean energy development can benefit from Master Limited Partnerships and Production Tax Credits.

The Department of Energy could also be directed to help low-income communities and households, as well as nonprofits, take advantage of energy efficiency and renewable energy solutions by providing rebates rather than tax-credits. The upfront cost is currently a major barrier to low-income households, houses of worship, and other nonprofits that want to weatherize, retrofit their facilities or install solar or on-site wind.

4. Additionally we suggest legislation to secure and direct robust funding for international climate adaptation and mitigation. The U.S. must maintain and increase our investments in critical international actions to the impacts that are already being felt, particularly in developing countries and the most vulnerable communities. These investments are essential to promoting global solutions to climate change; protecting our national interests and economic competitiveness, shared security, and development goals; and enabling developing countries and vulnerable communities to plan and prepare for climate-related disasters and losses. In addition, the U.S. should ensure that all our international investments promote low-carbon development pathways and support climate resilience and preparedness, especially for the most vulnerable communities. This is not only our responsibility as a global leader, it is a moral imperative.

I want to assure you that our 40 state affiliates and thousands of congregations view a swift and equitable transition to a clean energy economy as our moral responsibility, and are prepared to support your efforts every step of the way. Thank you for your important work to steward God's Creation and protect our children's future.

With faith,
THE REV. CANON SALLY BINGHAM,
President.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. The Coalition on the Environment and Jewish life and the Jewish Council for Public Affairs wrote to us that "the need to transform the world's energy economy while

addressing global climate change is not only a religious and moral imperative; it is a strategy for security and survival."

The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops says:

At its core, global climate change is not about economic theory or political platforms, nor about partisan advantage or interest group pressures. It is about the future of God's creation and the one human family.

The bishops ask Congress to consider seven principles in shaping responsible climate change policies:

No. 1, addressing global climate change means protecting the common good.

No. 2, climate change will hit the most vulnerable communities the hardest.

No. 3, we must seek solutions that enhance rather than diminish the economic standing of the poor.

No. 4, new resources must be made available to poor communities to adapt to the effects of a changing climate.

No. 5, we must protect vulnerable peoples from the negative human health effects of climate change.

No. 6, local affected communities should have a voice in shaping the response to climate change.

No. 7, technological solutions to reduce carbon emissions and adapt to a changing climate must be made available to the people of developing nations.

That is from the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops.

We heard from the Quaker Friends Committee on National Legislation. They wrote that climate change is "the greatest challenge humanity has ever faced."

The Evangelical Environment Network urges immediate, bipartisan action saying:

The simple truth is, those opposed to climate action have done a good job of having climate change viewed as a political issue, even a partisan one.

We firmly believe that the need to act to overcome climate change is a moral issue, that it should be viewed morally rather than in a partisan fashion.

The National Council of the Churches of Christ, representing 37 Christian denominations, calls for a national policy that "lifts up justice, stewardship, sustainability and sufficiency as guiding tenets."

Interfaith Power and Light, a national faith-based campaign against global warming, tells us that its "[40] state affiliates and thousands of congregations view a swift and equitable transition to a clean energy economy as our moral responsibility, and are prepared to support [the Task Force's] efforts every step of the way."

These religious leaders and groups are, unlike Congress, not sleepwalking through history. Faith groups throughout America are acting on their sense of spirit, justice, and stewardship, and are mobilizing locally to combat and prepare for the effects of climate change.

In my home State, Rhode Island Interfaith Power and Light provides

free energy audits, training workshops, and online information about implementing and maintaining energy efficiency programs for houses of worship. The Jewish Alliance of Greater Rhode Island's Community Relations Council is working to reduce the carbon footprint of Rhode Island synagogues by 14 percent by next year.

In East Providence, RI, the Newman Congregational Church made some simple changes, such as installing occupancy sensors and better lighting, and experienced a 25-percent reduction in electricity costs.

Last year, the Beneficent Congregational Church of the United Church of Christ in Providence undertook an ecumenical Lenten carbon fast. This spring, from Easter to Pentecost, the congregation will be taking part in the United Church of Christ's national campaign of volunteering and environmental advocacy.

These urgent calls from religious leaders of so many faiths, and these conscientious actions by individual houses of worship, demonstrate the powerful connection men and women of faith feel to the wonders of creation and to our fellow humankind. For some, this connection derives from a connection to a higher power. For others, it is hope for future generations or a commitment to justice for all living things.

I once heard a colleague here in Congress brush off the warnings of science about climate change saying: "God's still up there," implying that there is no need to worry about climate change. Well, if God is still up there, what better use of the gifts of moral reasoning that we have been given as His people than to protect His creation—and one another—from harm?

As we sing in the old hymn:

Field and forest, vale and mountain,
Flowering meadow, flashing sea,
Chanting bird and flowing fountain,
Call us to rejoice in Thee.

We are each called in our own way to wake up and to do the right thing.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, I want to comment on the comments of the Senator from Rhode Island.

First of all, I know it is so heartfelt and so genuine, and I want to thank him for that. And I want to thank him for approaching it from a faith-based standpoint about this fragile ecosystem we live on called planet Earth. He has brought a perspective, with that chart he has of the Earth, that it is so beautiful and yet it looks so fragile. As a matter of fact, when you look at the rim of the Earth from the perspective in space, you see a thin film, and you realize that is what sustains all of life, which is the atmosphere. Even with the naked eye from space, you can see how we are messing it up.

I could see, coming across Brazil, the color differentiation where they were destroying the Amazon. Then I could

look to the east at the mouth of the Amazon and see the effects of the extra silt that discolored the waters of the Atlantic for hundreds of miles.

So the Senator brings a great perspective, and I thank him for it.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, if I may respond by thanking the Senator from Florida for his kind remarks. He is the only Member of this body now or ever to have seen that view of our planet from the space capsule in which he looked down on Earth. He has spoken with enormous eloquence and passion about what that experience meant to him, both on the floor and to us in our caucus. I am very grateful for his kind remarks.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I want to say, first of all, we have had three astronaut Senators. We have Senator BILL NELSON, who just spoke so eloquently about the planet and the way he saw it, we have had our own very beloved and hero with the right stuff, Senator John Glenn, and also Senator Jake Garn, our wonderful colleague who retired many years ago but was also on the VA-HUD Committee. When I first came to the Senate, Senator Garn was one of the Members from the other side of the aisle who helped me learn the Senate and he gave me a tremendous introduction to the space program.

In fact, we went, in a bipartisan way, to every space facility in this country so we could learn: what were the great assets we had, how we needed to fund them, and what was the future of the American space program.

So we have had three Senators who were certified astronauts and actually went into space. We have had other Senators who have been in orbit. Some maybe still are out there somewhere.

But I say to my two colleagues, with my feet firmly on the ground, we want to thank them for what they are doing to save the planet. Because of the advocacy talked about by the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from Florida, we, in the Commerce, Justice, Science bill, which I fund—which funds not only the American space program but also funds the National Science Foundation—we need to understand our great planet.

Another great astronaut, Sally Ride—a very happy and blessed memory who passed away last year—was asked by NASA to do a strategic plan. What should NASA be looking at? Should we be going to Mars? Dare we go even further? Venus? What about, should we do it with human beings? Should we do it with robots?

Dr. Ride came back with many suggestions, one of which was, she said we should study planet Earth as if it were a planet in our solar system. She said there was a great belief that there was

even intelligent life on planet Earth, and we will continue to search for it from time to time here.

But, really, Dr. Ride encouraged us to look at our own planet, and our own planet as if those from outside of our solar system were looking at us. Because she said that what every astronaut feels—and I have talked to many, along with Senators NELSON, Glenn, and Garn—is that when they go up and see the majestic universe that God has created, their greatest thrill is to look back on planet Earth, and how touching and how moving it is, and how we want to protect it.

We need to protect it because there is life on this planet. There is the life of human beings, and there is the life of the bounty that God has given us in both the sea and on the land in agriculture or in others that help take care of us, and we are now called to take care of them.

I pledge to them, if we can work together on a bipartisan basis, it is really not about global warming, it is about saving the planet. We need to look at all of our science across all of the subcommittees and say: What are the best practices that nourish us and nourish our planet and nourish the way we wish to continue to proceed in the 21st century?

I believe science and technology leads the way. It is a great gift given to us: the gift of reason and the gift of discovery. So let's all work together, and I thank the Senators for what they said.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I thank the Senator.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, we are now a few minutes before we are going to recess for the luncheon hour.

POPE FRANCIS

I want to comment briefly to say for those of us of the Roman Catholic faith this is, indeed, a great day. We now have a Pope who has been formally invested as the leader of our church: Pope Francis.

We know there are many Members of the Senate who would have liked to have gone to that investiture. But duty called and we are here bringing to a close our debate on the continued funding resolution to make sure we are funded through fiscal 2013 in an orderly, agreed-upon way and move to our big budget debate.

But Pope Francis is calling us today, as he has in other sermons, to think about the poor, the elderly, the children, and the vulnerable in our society, as well as the very planet. So we say to His Holiness, we really wish him well. We wish him well in the ministry we believe he will provide to the world. But we should also take heed to this message about the children, about the elderly, and about those who are vulnerable populations.

Again, we think what we have in here, our step, is an appropriations that will guarantee funding through fiscal year 2013. I do not want to link it to His Holiness's message. We wish him

well. But I also wish now we could do what we could in these closing hours. We have been guaranteed 30 hours of debate—we have used probably about 5—that we look at how we can bring this debate to a close in an agreed-upon way on both sides of the aisle so we can then move on to the budget debate of fiscal year 2014.

I am sorry, I did not know the Senator from Kansas was here. We will not recess until the Senator has a chance to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Maryland, my chairwoman.

I spoke last night on an amendment I have continued to ask be made in order on this continuing resolution. As I indicated last night, we are going to spend in excess of \$1 trillion in this bill, and I am hoping that my amendment, and perhaps others, could be made in order yet during this postclosure 30-hour period of time.

One of the concerns that has been raised is whether, if my amendment were adopted, this would create difficulties in the House of Representatives for the final passage of the continuing resolution. I am pleased to be on the floor, particularly with the chairwoman being here, the Senator from Maryland, to indicate that I now have indications from the Speaker's Office that they would have no objection to the amendment I continue to offer, that I hope will be made in order, that I hope a vote will be taken on related to the air traffic control towers.

Also in the period of time since I last spoke, we have numerous Members of the Senate who have now joined as co-sponsors of this amendment. The number is now 14 Democrats and 12 Republicans. The number continues to grow. And I have had a number of conversations with particularly Democratic Members of the U.S. Senate who indicate to me: Why can't your amendment be made in order?

So I am hoping, as Members of the Democratic Caucus and the Republican Conference meet during this 12:30 lunch period, that perhaps there is still an opportunity for this issue to be resolved.

I would indicate once again that, while I listened to the suggestion of the majority leader this morning that we move to the budget during this 30-hour postclosure timeframe, in the absence of some agreement related to this amendment, I will object to moving to the budget until the 30 hours expire.

I also have indicated publicly that I will object to the next 30 hours—the next opportunity in which unanimous consent is requested as we get back to the base bill. It is not my nature to be an obstructionist. This is an amendment that matters greatly. It has been determined by the Parliamentarian to be germane and, in my view, ought to be made in order.

Just as the chairwoman talked about bipartisan efforts, this is one that clearly is bipartisan and apparently bicameral. So I am hoping to utilize the rights as a Member of the Senate to see that there still is an opportunity for this amendment to be considered. I would say that the reason this matters so much in this timeframe is that I am of the view, and I think it is shared by many, in the absence of this amendment being adopted and included in this continuing resolution, and the continuing resolution being passed, that the control towers will be eliminated on April 7, and there will be little if any opportunity for the Appropriations Committee then to restore funding to, in a sense, a program that no longer exists.

There are many of the topics I share with my colleagues here about the consequences of the sequester. I am willing to work with them to see that we move money from one place to another to solve that problem. In the absence of that happening, there is still an opportunity for the Appropriations Committee and ultimately the Congress in the appropriations process to solve those problems. But should April 7 come, the 179-plus contract towers are eliminated. Then it seems highly unlikely to me that any appropriations process would include money for a program that is no longer in existence.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I appreciate the tenacity and persistence of the Senator from Kansas in being an advocate for his constituents. I would hope that during this noon hour—I can give no promises. There are leadership concerns on both sides of the aisle. But we have to acknowledge the Senator is a real fighter for what he believes in. We admire that. How that gets translated will be subject to further discussion during this noon hour.

RECESS

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 2:15 for the respective party conferences to discuss important issues.

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

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:32 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. BALDWIN).

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS, AND FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized for up to 7 minutes.

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

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, we have been listening to our good friend from Kansas concerning this contract air traffic control tower amendment. I think there is no better example to use when talking about a bureaucracy taking something that everybody wants, that is very inexpensive, and using that to try to force people to do something that should never have happened.

In terms of the contract air traffic control towers, this is not just a rural issue. This is something that can happen all around. It happens that I have six in my State of Oklahoma and up in Kansas I believe they have five, but the fact is this is a major safety issue. We have a huge, bloated bureaucracy in the FAA. Yet we are saying we have to close a handful of towers and let people be uncontrolled. I know a little about that; it is what I did for a living. It is totally outrageous.

So we have an amendment, Senator MORAN and I, to redirect the money within the FAA budget. There would be no additional cost. It would rescind \$23.8 million from FAA facilities and equipment. Now, I ask, are facilities and equipment more important than actually having an active control tower in these congested areas? Also, it would take \$26.2 million from FAA research and development. Well, I can assure you this is more significant, and no one looking at this would rationally say it is not. So I encourage my good friend from Kansas to pursue this.

Similar to this is something that I, along with several Democrats—the primary one being KAY HAGAN—am concerned about, and that is what has happened in terms of a decision that was made by the Secretary of Defense to take out the tuition assistance. This is a very small amount of money for our troops who are over there serving now.

This is kind of interesting because I was a product of the draft. My service was not voluntary when I was in, and I thought a total voluntary force would not be effective. As I found out, it was. Well, one of the main reasons people do sign up—a lot of people say: Yes, I want to serve my country. A lot say: Yes, I want a career in the Army, Navy, Marines, or Air Force. However, they also want to advance themselves. They want an education, and in many cases, the only way they can get one is to have this tuition assistance program.

I can recall being over in the mess halls in Afghanistan and actually out in the field in Afghanistan where we have some 200,000 Army troops there now who are participating in this program. This is not an expensive program. All we want to do is make sure we give what was taken away from those individuals who are trying to better themselves, trying to better their lives, perhaps work toward a career in the military.

Stop and think about the amount of money that could come out of, say,

some of the green initiatives. How many people know that our Navy was forced to pay \$29 a gallon for 450,000 gallons of fuel when you can buy it on the market for \$3? All these things. Do we have any business having a bio-refinery built by the Federal Government? These are all things in this budget, and any one of them would be far more than the assistance we are giving our troops for their tuition.

We are circulating a letter that draws attention to this, and we have Democrats and Republicans—just about even—saying: Mr. Secretary of Defense, go ahead and rescind that. We have a lot of waste we need to get rid of, but this is not waste. Our troops' preparation for the future is not a waste of our taxpayer money.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

THE BUDGET

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, our national debt currently stands at nearly \$17 trillion. It is difficult to believe it has reached that level. What is more difficult to believe is that there is anyone in this country who can look at that number and not feel a sense of urgency to address our Nation's spending and debt problems. Yet, as we begin to debate the first budget resolution in over 4 years, it seems there are many in this very Chamber who seem to think the size of our debt is no big deal. If you take a good look at the budget we are debating this week, there is really no other conclusion to draw. The raw overall numbers make a pretty convincing case that the authors of this budget see no real need to change course when it comes to our debt.

The budget before us maintains our current unsustainable spending and debt trajectory. It doesn't balance, not at any point. Its goal is to grow government, not jobs and the economy. Under this budget, the national debt would increase by more than \$7 trillion over the 10-year window; that is, if we are lucky. In 2023 the debt would be over \$24 trillion and rising rapidly. How can anyone bring a budget such as this to the floor—one that massively increases our debt without even a faint attempt to reach balance at any time—and claim to be fiscally responsible?

But that is not all. I haven't even gotten to the worst part yet. True enough, this budget will do some pretty irresponsible things, but the real story is what this budget doesn't do. Everyone knows the main drivers of our national debt are our entitlement programs—Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. That fact has been confirmed by the Congressional Budget Office, the programs' boards of trustees, and every serious economist or analyst who has spent longer than 5 minutes looking over our Nation's finances. Over the next 10 years, we will spend \$6.8 trillion on Medicare, \$4.4 trillion on Medicaid, and \$11.2 trillion on Social Security, for a combined total of

\$22.4 trillion. That is trillion with a "t."

Medicare by itself is extremely problematic. While the percentage of workers paying into Medicare has been in decline for over a decade, 10,000 seniors join the program each and every day. According to the budget we are debating this week, Medicare will account for \$504 billion this year alone. Now, that comes out to about \$1.4 billion a day. Over the next 10 years, Medicare spending will increase by over 70 percent, according to the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission's most recent report. By the end of that time, we will be spending more every year on Medicare than on our entire national defense. Even President Obama, who has generally been reticent to consider real changes to Medicare, has admitted that absent reform, the program will be bankrupt within 10 years.

The story is not any better with Medicaid. In 2013, once again according to the very budget we are debating, Federal spending on Medicaid will account for about \$265 billion, and if you include what States are spending on Medicaid, that is \$450 billion. That is \$1.2 billion a day for just this one program. Over the next 10 years, Federal Medicaid spending as a share of the U.S. economy is set to grow by 37 percent, according to OMB. By 2020, 84 million people—nearly one out of every four Americans—will be dependent on Medicaid.

With Social Security, we have a problem, facing more than \$20 trillion in unfunded liabilities over the long term. In the short term, the disability insurance trust fund within Social Security is projected to be exhausted by 2016. That means that in about 3 years, the disability insurance benefits will, by law, have to be cut by 21 percent. All combined Social Security trust funds will be exhausted by 2033, at which time all Social Security benefits will have to be cut by 25 percent.

So it isn't just that we are spending a lot of money on these programs, it is that these programs are structurally unsustainable. That is why the Director of the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office has referred to our health care entitlements as our "fundamental fiscal challenge." It is why the Social Security Board of Trustees, which includes a number of high-ranking officials in the Obama administration, has said with regard to Social Security that "legislative action is needed as soon as possible."

Entitlement reform is not an option, it is a necessity. It is not a matter of politics, it is a matter of math. America's social safety net is coming apart at the seams, and if these programs are going to be there for future generations, they need serious structural reforms. If we do that now, it will be much easier than if we wait too much longer.

This isn't new information. It isn't privileged or classified. Anyone paying attention to our Nation's fiscal situa-

tion is aware these challenges exist. So what do the authors of the Senate budget propose that we do about it? The answer, unfortunately, is nothing.

Here is a perfect illustration—the Murray budget entitlement plan. We are going to have \$22.4 trillion at the end of 10 years. Well, let me just say for a second that if you look at that chart, you will see, as I have stated, that we are projected to spend a total of \$22.4 trillion on Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security over the next 10 years. That is the red bar on the chart. All total, the Democrats' budget would reduce Medicare spending by \$46 billion and spending on Medicaid by \$10 billion. It would make no changes whatsoever to Social Security.

Adding those numbers together, the Democrats would reduce entitlement spending by only \$56 billion over the next 10 years or by 0.2 percent. That is the yellow bar, if you can see it, right here on the chart. You heard that right, Madam President. The budget resolution before us would reduce entitlement spending by two-tenths of 1 percent over the 10-year budget window.

Here is the Murray entitlement spending versus the baseline. If you look at this next chart, you can see the path in entitlement spending over the next 10 years in blue. It is the upper line here. That is Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security spending, all combined, with no changes to our budget. The Murray budget spending path for entitlements is in red. It is this little sliver right here. That is the Murray budget. See the difference? The answer, of course, is that you cannot. Put simply, this budget ignores our unsustainable entitlement spending and allows it to continue on a path that will bankrupt these programs.

The Democratic majority has opted to continue to look the other way as our entitlement programs collapse under their own weight. This is simply irresponsible, and it is an insult to middle-class Americans who rely on these programs and want to keep them protected.

In January 2009, President Obama, when speaking on entitlements, said:

... what we have done is kick this can down the road. We're now at the end of the road, and we're not in a position to kick it even further.

With this budget, the Democrats are refusing to even acknowledge that there is even a can that needs to be kicked. The budget doesn't even pay lipservice to the need for reforms in our entitlement spending. It ignores the problem entirely.

Indeed, if you read the documents accompanying this resolution, you will find nothing even suggesting there are any problems with these programs. Instead, you will find a multitude of statements accusing Republicans of wanting to "weaken" Social Security, "dismantle Medicare," or make "Dragonian cuts to Medicaid."

There is a lot of talk about keeping promises but literally no mention of

how these promises can or will be paid for. And there is no recognition that this budget sets in place benefit cuts of over 20 percent for disabled American workers in a few short years, while watching other threads of the social safety net fray as trust funds become exhausted. Anyone supporting this budget will be sending a clear message to younger generations of Americans, which is that they don't really care whether the safety net will be there for them.

This budget is further evidence of what has become a key difference between Republicans and Democrats. Over the last 2 years, Republicans have united around the principle of entitlement reform. We put forward plans that make tough, and sometimes politically difficult, decisions in order to preserve programs such as Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security for future generations. Republicans haven't chosen this path out of political convenience, that is for sure. This is simply what the reality of our fiscal situation demands. Rather than acknowledging this same reality, Democrats have opted to attack and vilify any Republican who even suggests that changes to these programs are necessary. They have continued the same talking points of the past, claiming that all of our Nation's fiscal problems can be solved simply by asking the so-called rich to pay a little more in taxes. All the while, according to Democrats, there do not need to be any substantive changes to entitlements. They have pursued this course even as our debts continue to mount along with the evidence that suggests their approach simply is not working.

The budget we are debating this week is proof not only that the Democrats are more interested in politics than solutions but also that their policies simply won't work in the real world. This budget would do all the things Democrats say they want to do to grow the government. It would raise taxes by as much as \$1.5 trillion. And, once again, it would leave Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security just as they are. Yet, in the end, this budget never balances.

Under this budget, our Nation's debt would continue to grow, making it more difficult to respond to real crises or emergencies in the future. In the end, our entitlement programs would continue on their path to bankruptcy, and we would end up with an even bigger government that we cannot pay for.

The Washington Post editorial page, not typically known for being overly critical of the Democrats' policies, assessed this budget, saying:

Partisan in tone, and complacent in substance, [the budget] scores points against Republicans and reassures the party's liberal base—but deepens these senators' commitment to an unsustainable policy agenda.

The editorial concluded by saying that this budget

. . . gives voters no reason to believe that Democrats have a viable plan for—or even a

responsible public assessment of—the country's long-term fiscal predicament.

I couldn't have said it better myself. The American people have waited for over 4 years for the Senate Democrats to produce a budget. After all that time, we now finally have on paper their blueprint for America's future. Unfortunately for the American people, the blueprint does not address our Nation's most pressing fiscal challenges. Instead, it would continue an unsustainable status quo in terms of both policy and politics. This budget will not grow the economy and jobs; it will grow the Federal Government. This budget will never attain balance; it just taxes more and spends more. This budget will not reduce our debt; it buries the middle class even further in debt. This budget will not preserve the safety net for future generations; it allows entitlement programs to perish.

That being the case, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject this budget and demand a more responsible plan for our country. We need to do better around here.

Admittedly, we need to have both parties working together. We used to do that. I used to be part of that; I wouldn't mind being part of that again. But we have got to find some way of getting together and getting these fiscal problems under control. We can't continue to grow the Federal Government, and we can't continue to ignore the structural defects of Social Security, Medicaid, and Medicare that are eating us alive and are going to really eat us alive over the next 10 years, and there isn't a thing in this budget that does anything to solve this problem.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, we are waiting for the two party conferences to conclude and for the majority leader to come to the floor and kind of talk about the path forward. Let me outline the pending business here.

We are now continuing the 30 hours mandated under cloture on the continuing funding resolution. Other Senators have come to the floor and spoken quite passionately about the budget that Senator MURRAY and Senator SESSIONS have worked on. I am eager to get to that discussion, too, because it will be about the fiscal funding for 2014 and the path ahead.

The way we get to the budget is to finish the bill I have pending. The methodology for getting to that is for yielding back the 30 hours. So if you want to get to the budget—which I really want to—let's yield back the time under the 30 hours. Right now it is scheduled to expire sometime after

midnight. We can talk about talk, we can talk about bills, or we can actually move expeditiously to conclude the continuing funding resolution. Because, remember, when we finish our business on the continuing funding resolution, it must return to the House for them to say yea or nay to our substitute which we are sending back.

I know we are waiting for the leaders to come. We have had great cooperation on both sides of the aisle. I am very appreciative of the cooperation I have received within the Democratic caucus and the cooperation from the other side, which we too have done. But if you want to get to the budget, let's yield back time on the continuing funding resolution.

I know the Democratic leadership will be here momentarily and others are waiting for what the leader has to say. In the meantime, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Ms. AYOTTE. Madam President, I rise today to address some comments that were made. I came to the floor earlier to talk about \$380 million of funding for the MEADS Program, which is the missile to nowhere. I sought, and continue to seek, to offer an amendment to the continuing resolution and the appropriations bill before the Senate right now to strike that funding, and then to transfer the funding from this missile to nowhere to the operations and maintenance fund so that our troops can use the money for important needs they have, especially in light of sequestration.

My colleague from Illinois, Senator DURBIN—for whom I certainly have great respect—came to the floor earlier to counter what I had to say. In fact, the Senator from Illinois said essentially that the U.S. taxpayers have truly invested in this program, and he suggested that if we were to cancel funding for this missile to nowhere, we would be incurring damages, or that our allies who have entered into this MEADS Program with us—under the agreements we have entered into, our allies—in particular the Germans and the Italians—would be able to seek damages from us, so, therefore, we would incur damage costs by terminating it.

I want to point out, first of all, not just in my view, this is wrong based on the plain language of the memorandum of understanding we have with our allies.

In fact, I go back to first-year contracts class in law school. When you have an agreement with someone, you start with the language of your agreement and the language of the contract. The language of the contract of the

memorandum of understanding we have on the MEADS Program in 2005 with Germany and Italy says very clearly:

The responsibilities of the participants will be subject to the availability of funds appropriated for such purposes.

So a first-year contract student would know that if we do not appropriate funds for the missile to nowhere, then we will not have legal obligations to our allies. In fact, that is essentially what the Department of Defense said to us when they wrote in a report to Congress about this with regard to the 2013 funding.

Please understand the history of this. In 2012, in the Defense authorization, the defense committee said very clearly: This is it. We are not going to fund a program anymore that is not going to get us a result. We are not going to waste taxpayer dollars anymore. So understand, this is the end of our obligation.

As a result, the Department of Defense said clearly to the Senate Armed Services Committee:

[If Congress does not appropriate FY 2013 funding, the U.S. DOD [Department of Defense] would take the position that the FY 2012 funds represent the U.S. DOD's final financial contribution under the MOU. The U.S. DOD would also take the position that failure to provide FY 2013 funding would not be a unilateral withdrawal from the MOU . . .

So contracts 101, very clearly, if we cut off the appropriations for the missile to nowhere and make sure that this fund goes to actually something our warfighters need and can use, we will not be subject to a claim by our allies because we expressly protected the taxpayers in the 2005 MOU that was entered into.

In addition, I will say that there is another portion of the agreement itself. Section 5 of the 2005 MOU states that our maximum commitment from the United States had to be \$2.3 billion. Yet between 2004 and 2011, we have already spent \$2.9 billion on a missile to nowhere that we are not going to get a result from. So not only do we have no responsibility because we clearly put in that if we did not appropriate for this, then we would not have further responsibilities under the MOU, but in addition to that, we have already paid \$2.9 billion, and the MOU says our responsibility is only \$2.3 billion.

So I come to the Senate today to say, with great respect to my colleague from Illinois, his claim that somehow terminating this contract is going to subject the United States to damages is wrong and is not supported by the plain language of the agreement, and we should not continue to fund a missile to nowhere.

I will end with this. If you look at the history of this MEADS Program, what has happened? The House Armed Services Committee said in 2013—excuse me, the 2013 authorization: End funding for this program—zero. The Senate Armed Services Committee

said: End funding for this program. It is a missile to nowhere. Zero. The House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee said: End funding for this; We are not going to appropriate for this. Zero.

The only committee that has appropriated for this is the Senate Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, and if we stop that appropriation, we can end the missile to nowhere. That is what my amendment is about. That is why I hope we will have an amendment and a right to be heard on the continuing resolution. I wish to make sure money goes into the operations and maintenance fund so it can be used for our troop needs during a difficult time in addressing sequestration.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, yesterday the Senate invoked cloture on the appropriations bill we have been working on for several weeks. Now what we are doing is burning, wasting 30 hours postcloture. During the postcloture time, each Senator has the right to speak for 1 hour. It is obvious there are 100 of us, so we all can't speak. Senators who do not like the bill and want to express their views as to why it is a bad bill, they get 1 hour.

This is truly a waste of time. It always is a waste of time, but it is a waste of time now because we have so much important work to do. Next in line is the budget resolution. We have heard speeches over here. Oh, gee, have we heard speeches. We need the Democrats to do a budget. No one mentions, but that is OK—no one mentions we did not have a budget resolution; we had President Obama sign a law that took care of our budget problems. But we want to satisfy the Republicans and we want to get to that budget debate.

I talked this morning about what a terrific job Chairman MURRAY has done on this bill. It has been outstanding. But the budget is here by virtue of a law that was passed. There is 50 hours permitted for debate on the budget. Then we can have a lot of amendments after all debate time is over.

Republicans said let's do the budget debate and we say let us do it. Why should we sit around here and look at each other and do nothing? My friend, the ranking member of the Budget Committee, the junior Senator from Alabama, said let's do it after Easter. We are going to do this. We are going to do this before we go home for Easter. If we want to use the whole 60 hours, we will start the debate on the budget sometime Thursday morning and we will have 50 hours and a lot of votes. If that is what they want to do, we can do that, but why put the Senate through that? Why put the Senate through wasting 60 hours?

I wish to make clear to all Senators that we are going to continue working on this, the CR and the budget resolution, until we complete them. When we come back, we have lots of stuff to do.

We have gun legislation. We have the WRDA bill, which I am told is going to be reported out of that committee, Environment and Public Works, on a bipartisan basis led by Senators BOXER and VITTER.

That is a strange, unusual marriage, but I am happy to hear that. It is an important bill.

We have to do immigration. We have to do appropriations bills. We have a lot to do. The Senate will not leave—the third time I am telling everyone here—for Easter-Passover recess until we complete the budget. If that means because of the delay in this bill we wasted 60 hours, we will be voting here Thursday, Friday, Saturday, Sunday—whenever we have to do it. My hope would be that we can complete this appropriations measure and move on to the budget resolution this afternoon. But the least we should be able to do is begin debate on the budget. The least we should be able to do is the debate. We have been through these lots of times, some of us, and a budget.

During the first 50 hours, not much is going to happen unless there is an agreement that the time for voting will not be counted against 50 hours. If there is no agreement there, there will be no amendments. What I would like to do is have amendments offered during the 50 hours and have whatever the time is for voting, which is usually 10 or 15, sometimes 20 minutes, that will be counted against the 50 hours. But if we do not do that, then what we will have is just 50 hours of PATTY MURRAY and JEFF SESSIONS talking to each other and whoever wants to join in the conversation.

I hope we can begin debate on this. I have a couple unanimous consent requests. I have alerted the Republicans I would be doing this.

I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding cloture having been invoked on the Mikulski-Shelby substitute, the following amendments be in order: Mikulski-Shelby No. 98, as modified with the changes that are at the desk; and Pryor-Blunt No. 82, this deals with food inspectors, meat inspectors, an important amendment that these two Senators feel strongly about as do a number of us; that no other first-degree amendments to the substitute or the underlying bill be in order; that no second-degree amendments be in order to any of the amendments listed above prior to the vote; and that there be 30 minutes equally divided between the two leaders or their designees prior to votes in relation to the amendments in the order listed; that upon disposition of the Pryor-Blunt amendment No. 82, the Durbin second-degree amendment to the Toomey amendment be withdrawn—that is amendment No. 115; that the Senate proceed to vote in relation to the Toomey amendment, No. 115; that all amendments, with the exception of the substitute, be subject to a 60-affirmative-vote threshold; and upon disposition of the Toomey amendment, the Senate proceed to vote on

the Mikulski-Shelby substitute amendment, as amended; that if the substitute amendment, as amended, is agreed to, the cloture motion on the underlying bill is withdrawn and the Senate proceed to vote on passage of the bill as amended.

That is my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MORAN. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. MORAN. Let me ask the majority leader if the two amendments listed in his unanimous consent, No. 98 and No. 82, are considered, then following that we would move to final action on the bill—on the substitute as potentially amended; is that accurate?

Mr. REID. That is correct.

Mr. MORAN. While I am not opposed, certainly, to the Pryor-Blunt amendment—I am a sponsor of that amendment—because that would then waive the 30 hours and move to final action, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. I have objected to the unanimous consent request, and in addition to my concern that while there are amendments that are fine with me if they are made pending and brought before the floor for a vote, I would object because we would move to final action; but I also would object because the amendment I have offered in regard to control towers is not included in the unanimous consent request.

Mr. REID. I am glad the Senator clarified that because it sounded as if he did not have an objection to this, and I was going to say he could still have his 30 hours, but I got his objection.

I ask unanimous consent notwithstanding cloture having been invoked, at 4 o'clock today it be in order for the Senate to begin consideration of S. Con. Res. 8, the budget resolution for fiscal year 2014; that any time used for consideration of S. Con. Res. 8 during the postcloture period on H.R. 933 also count toward postcloture time on H.R. 933; further, that on Tuesday, March 19, at a time to be determined by the majority leader after consultation with the Republican leader, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 933.

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

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I object.

Mr. REID. Madam President, this is one of the amazements of the American people. There is nothing—nothing going to happen during how many hours is left in the 30 hours—nothing. Why, logically, would anyone have an objection to going ahead with the budget resolution? We are looking at each other—not very often, because nobody is on the floor. It is things such as this that are going to cause the Senate to have to reassess all these rules.

Right now we accomplish so little. I am disappointed in my friend, for whom I have the greatest respect, my friend from Kansas, whom I know and knew in the House very well. He is a fine person. I like him a lot. I know how strongly he feels about this. But strong positive or negative feelings should not stop the progress of what we are trying to do to help the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, it will not be long—of course it might be longer than it appears to be, but at least this week we were supposed to be considering the budget resolution and hopefully before the week is out we will. It has been 4 years since the Senate has passed a budget. The Senate deficit majority has been devoid of leadership on this matter. While American families and businesses compile a budget each and every year, the Senate deficit majority has shirked its responsibility, producing a budget has even been called “foolish,” by the Democratic majority leader.

After years of record deficits and debt, I think the American people disagree with the fact that the Senate has not taken up a budget for the last 3 years, even though the law requires every year for the Senate to adopt a budget. Thankfully, this year it looks as if we are going to have this debate and adopt a budget.

While we are about to debate a budget resolution, a few hours or a few days away, the President has not even proposed his budget for consideration. The Budget Committee, of which I am a member, did not hear from a single administration witness in preparation of this budget that the Senate will be working on. That is a new historical low, for which the Obama administration can take credit. House Budget Chairman RYAN has produced a budget. Chairwoman MURRAY produced a budget. It is quite remarkable that the President has yet to submit a budget, even though the law requires it be done by February 4.

The President plans to release his budget the week of April 8, 2 months overdue. This will be the first time a President has failed to submit a budget until after the House and the Senate have acted.

Once again, on fiscal issues, the President is leading from behind. He set a new low for fiscal responsibility. During the past 4 years, we spent well beyond our means. The gross Federal debt has increased by \$6 trillion as a result. Unless we change course, we will add another \$9 trillion over the next 10 years. The gross debt is now and maybe by then will still be larger than the U.S. economy. It is approaching levels where economists agree deficits and debts are causing slower economic growth.

During the past 4 years, we witnessed President Obama's theory of economic stimulus. We saw massive expansion of government and deficit spending.

President Obama and the Democratic leadership in Congress pushed spending up to 25 percent of the economy in recent years and an \$800 billion stimulus bill was a big part of that. That bill was pushed through in the name of economic growth. It was supposed to keep unemployment below 8 percent. It did not keep unemployment below 8 percent because, in fact, the legislation written was more an appropriations bill than a stimulus bill.

It didn't create the sustainable job growth it was supposed to. It was one big ineffective spending bill. The economic growth it was supposed to stimulate never materialized. Now we are dealing with a deficit and debt caused by that failed stimulus bill.

Despite this failure, the President and the Senate deficit majority seem even more fixated on growing the government. According to the economic policies of President Obama, the government needs to grow even bigger to help our economy. It is not going to work. The overriding belief of the administration is that economic growth will only come through private wealth confiscation that supports an even bigger and more intrusive government.

If government just gets a little bigger and a little more involved in every facet of our economy and of our lives, that will surely increase the economic prosperity of Americans, right? Of course not. The problem is raising taxes only extracts private capital from job creators and small businesses. Small businesses happen to be where 70 percent of the new jobs are created. So if we want to create new jobs, why would we take capital out of a sector where job creation can occur and bring it to the government where it is spent wastefully by often inefficient and bloated bureaucracies? The higher taxes are robbing the unemployed of needed jobs. The government they support does not create economic growth or self-sustaining jobs.

This 4-year spending binge we have been on has led to deficits that crowd out private investment which would otherwise be used to grow the economy and create jobs. The government doesn't create self-sustaining jobs; the government only creates government jobs. The private sector creates jobs. Wealth is created in the private sector. It is the responsibility of the government to create an environment for job growth and opportunity—opportunity for entrepreneurs who then create jobs.

Instead of raising taxes, what this country needs is more taxpayers. We get more taxpayers by reducing the unemployment, and we do that by keeping money in the private sector. Besides that, the government can provide this environment by instituting the rule of law, protecting property rights and a patent system. There are many other things I could probably mention as well. The government consumes wealth. It does not create wealth through economic freedom. Entrepreneurs and individuals are free to innovate and prosper.

This budget fails to recognize these simple principles. The budget presented by the deficit majority makes no effort to reduce the deficits, reduce spending, balance the budget, or grow the economy. Instead, this budget seeks to grow government by taxing more and spending more. It is time we all recognize that government exists to serve the needs of the people rather than people serving the needs of their government. There are some who believe government is the only creator of economic prosperity. If others have achieved success, by default they must be the cause of others' hardships. This type of class warfare—demagoguery, as it is—is harmful to America and our future. It seeks to divide America.

The budget presented by the deficit majority is partisan business as usual. It would tax success by adding another \$1 trillion. It increases government spending, it ignores the subject of our health care entitlements, and this whole approach is simply not good for advancing America's economy. It places no priority on ever bringing our budget into balance. The deficit majority speaks at length about growing the economy and creating a middle class. Their budget is perfectly backward. It does nothing to address economically harmful deficits and debt or the drag it creates on the economy, and it includes as much as \$1.5 trillion in job-killing tax hikes.

The majority claims this revenue can be collected without harming the economy by closing loopholes. The fact is that regardless of how it is described, a \$1.5 trillion tax increase will affect the middle class, harm the economy, and not create jobs. A \$1.5 trillion tax hike—while economic growth is slow and unemployment remains at 7.7 percent—is a reckless formula and will further devastate the economy. Even worse, the tax increases will not be used to balance the budget. Higher taxes support even higher spending.

This is a typical tax-and-spend budget. This budget was crafted as if we don't even have a spending problem or a debt crisis. This budget assumes everything is just fine and everything will work out if we simply proceed forward on the current path of tax and spend. This budget represents a missed opportunity. Don't take my word for it. Editorial writers across the country have made similar statements about this budget.

A Washington Post editorial called it a complacent budget plan. They wrote that the majority budget fails to recognize the long-term fiscal problems:

Partisan in tone and complacent in substance, it scores points against Republicans and reassures the party's liberal base—but deepens these senators' commitments to an unsustainable policy agenda.

In short, this document gives voters no reason to believe that Democrats have a viable plan for—or even a responsible public assessment of—the country's long-term fiscal predicament.

The Chicago Tribune had a similar description in their editorial. They described it as a deficit of ambition:

The Democrats, unfortunately, are feigning fiscal responsibility instead of practicing it. What is needed is a lot more ambition than the Murray plan reflects.

If Democrats don't like the Republican plan for balancing the budget, they should produce their own.

Finally, a USA Today editorial referred to the budget as a namby-pamby budget that underwhelms at every turn:

The Murray budget neither balances the budget nor reins in entitlements. Its one-to-one ratio of spending to tax increases might sound balanced, but the spending cuts are not actual reductions. They are merely reductions in the expected rate of growth.

All this makes the Murray budget barely a Band-Aid.

And that one-to-one ratio that is quoted in the USA Today editorial reminds me—and let me explain this—of where they raise \$1 of taxes for \$1 of cuts, which reminds me of the President's own position on that which he stated just before the election in his meeting with the Des Moines Register editorial board and suggested that we raise taxes \$1 and cut expenditures \$2.50.

How do we go—just before the President is elected—from a \$2.50 reduction for every \$1 increase to a one-to-one ratio now? I hope when the President submits his budget on April 8 that he sticks to that ratio of \$2.50 to \$1.

I am sure we will hear the term "progrowth" applied to this budget when we hear from people speaking on the other side of the aisle. The only thing it can mean is growth in the size and scope of the Federal Government and growth in the national debt. We will also hear the term "balanced." Please don't be fooled. The deficit majority is not speaking about a balanced budget. Their understanding of balance is higher taxes and higher spending.

This budget does not tackle runaway spending. It raises taxes, not to balance the budget but to spend more and more. This budget will grow the government, harm economic growth, and increase the debt. After 4 years of contemplating a budget resolution, I would have expected a more fiscally responsible budget. The American people deserve much better.

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

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

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

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is considering H.R. 933 postcloture.

Mr. LEAHY. Thank you.

Mr. President, I couldn't help but think, watching the debate, that it has been more than 2 weeks since we had

an all-too-familiar stalemate in Congress that prevented the passage of commonsense legislation. As a result, it triggered the across-the-board budget cuts better known as sequestration.

When these automatic budget cuts first became a possibility, everybody said that no Congress would be irresponsible enough to allow them to go into place. Well, in the weeks leading up to sequestration, we heard almost daily from Federal agencies, defense contractors, and Members from both sides of the aisle about how harmful these cuts would be.

Notwithstanding the talk about how ridiculous it is to let them go forward, the deadline for sequestration has come and gone. Now the focus appears not to be upon the wide swath of harm that is beginning to descend on communities across the Nation but instead on the closure of White House tours and whether we are going to have the Easter egg roll. Come on.

I hope the American public and I hope the press and everybody else will focus on how serious these cuts are. In fact, to simply accept and avoid fixing these indiscriminate and harmful cuts is irresponsible. They are slowly being implemented, and they have already begun to affect our States and communities.

I was up in Vermont this weekend for 3 days, and I was all over the State. Everywhere I went—just as I do every day—I heard from Vermonters about the consequences for their jobs, for their children, for their communities.

I have heard from Vermont families who have begun to plan for the furloughs that will hit their family budgets; through no fault of theirs—these are hard-working, honest Vermonters—but because Congress has failed to act.

I have heard from community organizations about the difficult decisions they will have to make in the weeks ahead. It should alarm everyone that reductions are expected, for example, in the number of children being served by Head Start.

I have heard from young scientists at the University of Vermont who have already been denied research grants because of sequestration.

Vermonters facing already high rents are facing a 7-year wait for section 8 housing assistance. Until the sequester is resolved, housing authorities in Vermont will not be granting any new rental vouchers, and hundreds of Vermonters are going to lose this vital lifeline.

To put it in reality, at my home in Vermont, overnight we had 8 or 9 inches of snow. During the next 24 hours, we had another 8 or 9 inches. Once it got past 15 inches, we actually had schools close. This is very unusual. But think of the people who do not have housing, what that is doing to them. It is an unfortunate, needless reality.

I have heard about the impact sequestration is having on our military families in Vermont, as some members

of the National Guard prepare for furloughs. These are Guard members who have been called up and are willing to serve in Iraq and Afghanistan, putting their lives on the line for America, but now they prepare for furloughs and reductions in staff who provide services to their families. Then we have the elimination of the Army tuition assistance program that serves veterans—a promise we made to our men and women in uniform when they were willing to stand up and go into combat for America.

These are the impacts felt in the small State of Vermont so far. We haven't yet seen the consequences for Vermont schools and how sequestration will affect students and teachers. We haven't yet felt the true impact on funding for the grants that support our law enforcement people, our job search assistance, the Meals on Wheels programs, or those programs that provide lifesaving vaccines.

Members have filed amendments to the spending bill we are currently debating to attempt to insulate and protect programs that impact their States most, but they want to do it at the cost of other States. We need to stop looking at how we can save just a single program and get back to the table and negotiate a sensible, balanced approach that addresses deficit reduction in a responsible way and not on the backs of the most vulnerable Americans. We cannot simply cut our way out of this deficit.

We created the situation partly by putting two wars on the Nation's credit card. This morning it was estimated that the war in Iraq is going to cost \$2 trillion. It is the first war in our Nation's history where we went to war and said: We don't have to pay for it. We will just borrow the money.

Vietnam and Korea were very unpopular wars. Yet we still passed the taxes to pay for them. In Iraq—although it is going to be over in a matter of weeks and we don't have to pay for it 10 years later—thousands of Americans were killed and wounded, to say nothing about our allies and tens of thousands—hundreds of thousands of Iraqis, and we are stuck with a \$2 trillion bill and growing, all on borrowed money.

The only people who pay the price in that war for America are the brave men and women who serve there and their families. They pay a huge price. We don't have a draft, so most families didn't get touched by it. Certainly a lot of people have made a lot of money on that war. They didn't pay a price. And the people, including people who were in the administration at the time who lied to the Congress about what was there—weapons of mass destruction, a connection with 9/11, things they knew were untrue—they simply lied about it, and we ended up having that war. There is \$2 trillion.

Do not tell me now—the same people who voted for that war—do not stand here and tell me how we have to take

the money out of medical research in America to pay for it, how we have to take the money out of educating our children to pay for it, how we have to take the money out of seniors who need help to pay for it, how we have to take the money out of repairing our bridges and roads in America to pay for it.

My answer to them is you voted for that; you should be willing to pay for it.

We have already reduced the debt by \$2.5 trillion, with the vast majority of those savings coming from spending cuts. The American people want and expect us to take a balanced approach. They know it is not wise to protect endless corporate loopholes and tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans instead of investing in our schools, our factories, our roads, and our workers.

I think of the billions of dollars we spend on roads and bridges, for example, in Iraq and Afghanistan. As one Vermonter said: Yes, we spend billions to build roads and bridges in Iraq and Afghanistan, and then they blow them up. Build them here in the United States—in Vermont or West Virginia or Oklahoma. We Americans will take good care of them.

There is a simple bottom line: Putting our fiscal house in order, which we should do, has to go hand in hand with targeted, commonsense steps to promote economic growth, create jobs, and strengthen the middle class—all things President Obama and Democrats in both Houses of Congress are eager to do. But we need some cooperation from the other side of the aisle. We need cooperation. Putting on mindless autopilot the crucial decisions about what should be our budget and growth priorities is a terrible and dishonest way to treat the American people. It is a recipe for economic dysfunction. It threatens tangible harm to millions of families and for communities across the Nation.

Difficult decisions are in front of us. Every single Member of the Senate should go back and read their campaign promise of: Oh, of course, I will face up to difficult questions. Really? We are stalled here. People want to filibuster rather than face difficult questions, but we have to face them. We cannot punt them. We in Congress need to put aside talking points and turn to the task of replacing these harmful autopilot cuts with sensible and balanced budget decisions. Instead of slogans, let's have some substance. The American people expect more from Congress, and they certainly deserve a lot more from Congress.

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

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

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for up to 15 minutes.

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

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to talk about the important budget debate we will have this week here in the Senate. We hope to get on that soon. We are disposing of some of last-year's budget work before that. But I think this is an important moment for the Senate because it has been 4 years since we did this; 2009 was the last time the Senate acted on a budget. During the time which has lapsed, we have added \$6 trillion to our national debt. I would like to think as we get into this budget debate, we could do something about that. Unfortunately, the budget that is going to be put before us by the Senate Democrats doesn't do anything to address the debt.

I think perhaps the reason we are finally doing a budget here is because there was a No Budget No Pay Act passed earlier this year which required that a budget be passed. It was moved by the House of Representatives and drew attention to the fact that the Senate hadn't for 4 years done a budget, and suggested that before the Senate get paid, it actually ought to do its work and pass a budget. So we are here now for the first time in 4 years.

Unfortunately, the budget that has been proposed by the chair of the Senate Budget Committee fails to balance the budget and instead means more taxes, more spending, and more debt. That is a formula we have heard before.

If you look at the last several years, we have added \$6 trillion of debt since President Obama took office. We have seen tax increases already of about \$1.7 trillion if you combine the tax increases associated January 1 with the fiscal cliff, and then couple that with the tax increases that were included in the President's health care bill—\$1.7 trillion in new taxes, \$6 trillion in new debt, a runup in spending unlike anything we have seen in recent history. So you would think, given the fact that we have seen debt, spending, and taxes go up over the past several years, we would actually get a budget that is finally focused not on growing the government but on growing the economy. But the Senate Democratic budget does exactly that—it grows the government, not the economy.

Their proposal contains more of the same big spending and big government policies that have led to a dismal average economic growth rate of just eight-tenths of 1 percent over the past 4 years. That has been the economic growth on average for the first 4 years of President Obama's first term, eight-tenths of 1 percent. Less than 1 percent is what the economy has grown over that time period.

A better approach when it comes to putting forward a budget would be to advance a budget that actually is focused on growing the economy, not the

government. Over the next few days we are going to have an opportunity to debate and improve this budget proposal on the Senate floor. I look forward to that debate.

As it stands today, the Senate Democrats' budget increases spending by 62 percent over the next decade; it raises taxes by \$1.5 trillion—and that is in addition to the \$1.7 trillion in tax increases we have already seen enacted under President Obama. Even with the enormous tax increase, the Senate Democrats' budget would result in \$7.3 trillion in new debt over the next decade. So you have a 62-percent increase in spending, you have \$1.5 trillion in new taxes, and a \$7.3 trillion debt, in addition to the debt we hand down to our children and grandchildren.

The amazing thing about that, even with this enormous tax increase, is the budget would never balance, which begs the question: What is balanced about a budget that never balances?

You hear the Democrats come here on the floor of the Senate and talk about, We need a balanced approach. The President of the United States gets up all the time and talks about, We need a balanced approach. What is balanced about a budget that never balances? That is a fundamental question I would expect the American people to ask.

In contrast, the House Republicans will be enacting a budget this week through the House of Representatives. Hopefully, eventually something like it will get enacted. But it balances in 10 years. I think 10 years is a responsible, reasonable timeline to achieve a balanced budget, and I think most Americans who balance their budgets month in and month out would agree with that proposition.

The budget put forward by Senate Democrats also fails to target waste, fraud, and inefficiencies across the Federal Government. For each of the past 2 years, the Government Accountability Office has outlined hundreds of billions of dollars of wasteful and duplicative spending throughout the Federal Government. The Federal Government is a \$3.6 trillion enterprise, and there is plenty of waste to target and reform—low-hanging fruit most would agree is a complete waste of taxpayer dollars—but Senate Democrats have failed even to make an attempt at reining in this waste with their budget plan.

Budgets are a reflection of values. As Vice President BIDEN once said:

Show me your budget, and I will tell you what you value.

It seems from the Senate Democrats' budget that they value the same big spending and big government policies of the past 4 years that have prolonged this period of slow economic growth and high unemployment.

In contrast, the budget proposed by the Republicans in the House would balance the budget in 10 years—again, something I believe we ought to be able to do—and it grows the economy. It

starts by cutting wasteful spending, which is not an extreme proposition and something we ought to be able to do.

The House Republican budget also reforms our broken Tax Code to promote economic growth, which will mean more jobs, better pay, and more opportunities for hard-working Americans and middle-class families.

The House budget also recognizes that if Washington fails to take action, Medicare and Social Security are headed toward bankruptcy in the not too distant future.

I commend my colleagues in the House for the vote that they will have this week, and for recognizing that reality, that our seniors across this country and those who are nearing retirement age and those of younger generations of Americans are not going to be protected when it comes to the programs that someday they will rely upon if we don't make the changes and the reforms that are necessary to align those programs with the present and future demographics of this country. So the House budget strengthens those priorities.

The budget debate for fiscal year 2014 that we are going to have on the Senate floor this week presents an opportunity, an opportunity to solve our fiscal challenges, to move past the job-destroying policies of the past few years, and to grow the economy.

As I said earlier, average economic growth under this President has been 0.8 percent—eight-tenths of 1 percent—of the overall share of the economy. This is a reflection of the negative impacts high levels of spending and high annual deficits have had during President Obama's tenure.

Unfortunately, the proposal that will be before the Senate this week only continues and doubles down on those policies. In fact, there is evidence this is the opposite of what we should be doing.

Harvard Professors Alberto Alesina and Sylvia Ardagna have studied economies around the world and various fiscal adjustments that have taken place in some of these countries. They found targeted spending cuts have led to economic expansions, while tax increases have been recessionary.

According to these Harvard economists:

Spending cuts have a positive effect on private investment while increases to taxes . . . hurt investment through the labor market and firms' profitability.

The evidence is there. Growing the government will not solve our economic challenges. If that were true, we would have a much stronger economy today, because with the massive health care plan that passed a few years ago, with the trillion-dollar stimulus program that was put into place early on during the President's first term, and all the additional runup in discretionary spending that we have seen, we still have slow growth, high unemployment, massive amounts of debt, and

many Americans who are struggling with their own personal economies and lower take-home pay.

The focus should be on growing our economy. That starts with passing a budget that cuts spending and reforms the Tax Code in a way that promotes economic growth.

Again, I believe there is a better approach out there. The House of Representatives has put forth one. It is unfortunate that the Senate Democratic budget fails to address the long-term spending and economic problems facing this country and, instead, focuses once again on growing government.

In fact, the Washington Post editorial board had this to say of the Democrats' budget proposal:

In short, this document gives voters no reason to believe that Democrats have a viable plan—or even a responsible public assessment of—the country's long-term fiscal predicament.

Failure to act and solve our fiscal challenges could result in another damaging credit downgrade, thanks to the out-of-control spending, and such a downgrade would have a very negative effect on the American people. A credit downgrade would drive up interest rates across the board on everything from student loans to home mortgages. That means it would be more expensive to buy a home or a car, to send a child to college, or to pay down personal debt.

So as we get ready to debate the majority's proposed budget for fiscal year 2014 on the floor this week, I hope the Senate will take an honest look at the relationship between spending and economic growth. We need to put the Federal Government on a stable fiscal path in order to create the kind of economic certainty and the economic conditions we need to grow our economy and to create jobs.

The majority's budget goes in the opposite direction. It grows government instead of growing the economy. We need to be talking about a budget here in the Senate whose primary focus is to grow the economy, not to grow the government.

So this will give us a chance over the course of the next few days to present two very different visions for the future of this country: one that is based upon higher spending, higher taxes, more debt, and one that is focused on putting in place a responsible spending plan that protects and saves important programs such as Social Security and Medicare, that reforms our Tax Code in a way that encourages and promotes economic growth, and that puts policies in place that will actually get this economy growing and expanding again, get more Americans back to work, and increase the standard of living and the quality of life for future generations of Americans.

We can't do that if we can continue to borrow and spend like there is no tomorrow, and that is precisely what the Democrats' budget would do.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I was not planning to come down here. I was at several meetings. As we all have in our offices, I have the screen view of the floor to figure out what action might be occurring or not occurring. I kept looking. The floor was empty. The floor was empty. And I know that earlier this afternoon, the majority leader asked that we get on the budget so it is not an empty zone here.

I know people sitting up there behind me are wondering what is happening. What is happening is, the way these procedures work, which are ridiculous, you sit around and burn up time, let the clock just tick, tick, with no action because for some reason some people think this is strategic. It is not. It is what people are fed up with in this country.

The leader came down and said: Let's get on with the budget. I come down, it seems every day or so, and see the charts of how many days the budget hasn't passed or how many days we have not had a budget. Here we come and offer to get onto the budget, and the other side objects. It is probably the most frustrating thing for me to see and for my constituents to see in the conference room.

They say: What is happening on the floor?

And I have to say: Nothing, because they are not allowing us to get to the budget.

They complained for the last 2½ or 3 years, we never get to a budget. Here we have a chance. The budget will have lots of amendments and a lot of debate. Some have said: Let's wait until after Easter. I am not waiting until after Easter. I know it is tough for people because they want to get back and fundraise and all the other stuff they do, but, you know what? They wanted us to get to the budget, and we are ready to get to the budget. Let's get to the budget and have this debate.

But here we are. The camera is on me, one person, but the room is empty. It is amazing. The people behind me, quietly sitting up there observing because they are not allowed to say anything, are wondering what is going on, as are many of my constituents.

As a former member of the Budget Committee, I can tell you budgets are not easy. This budget—it doesn't matter where you may be on it—starts to cut the budget, starts reducing the deficit, and starts dealing with it. I am happy to debate it. I am not sure where I am going to be at the end of the day on this budget, but I am happy to debate it. Anytime today would be good. But instead, what people want to do, through a parliamentary procedure, is

just burn off hours. So people sit around waiting for the time to end. Then we come down and debate.

Mr. President, I know you are new. I am kind of new but not as new as you are, and it is probably what you hear back home, as I still do today, the frustration level at how this place operates. Here we are. We had a chance earlier this morning—earlier this afternoon to move forward on the budget, and they objected because they didn't want the two times between the CR and the budget—I know this is a little process thing, a little wonky—to simultaneously run. The fact is, we could have done that because obviously they care so much about the budget? They are not down here.

Maybe if we get to the budget, they would come down and talk about their objections, as I have. I said publicly that I am going to look at the budget that has come forward. I want to make sure there are enough cuts in there, make sure they are real cuts that last a long time because we have to get this budget under control, this deficit under control. We want to make sure we continue to move this economy forward with the right kind of sustainable budget over the long haul. I am happy to debate it. I am looking forward to it. My poor staff didn't know I was coming down here, and I said I am coming down anyway and walked down the hall and got frustrated because we could be doing this.

Here is what is going to happen. I can see it already. Come Thursday, we will be in a mad dash around here, turning around, working double time—which is fine—rushing amendments. Instead, we could have a deliberative process right now—right now on the budget. That is what we should be doing. That is what the American people want. That is what Alaskans tell me every day: Debate it and debate the issues.

I am anxious. Maybe we will ask again to get consent by the other side to get on with the budget, but they have already objected to that. I am shocked. I think the American people would be shocked. But no one is down here, so it is hard not to be shocked when there is no debate.

I wanted to come down here in a little bit of frustration and make my point heard, that we have a chance—we could have had a chance earlier today to start this budget debate. We did not. Now we are just waiting for the clock to tick. It is really somewhat embarrassing, as someone said in the Senate, that I came here to get stuff done, not to sit around waiting for time to run out because people want to use the process to drag on their political desires rather than what we should be doing here: getting on with getting this economy moving, making sure jobs are created, and doing everything we can to get the budget under control and make sure the long-term sustainability of the government continues.

I thank the Chair for the indulgence, allowing me a couple of minutes down

here to maybe rant and complain about a process that I thought was going to start at 2:30—and yet nothing. My guess is that they will not consent. They will burn the time. The American people will get frustrated. Then we will finally get into the debate, it will be rushed instead of having a long, good, positive deliberation.

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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). The Senator from Washington.

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

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, Republicans have spent the last 2 years attacking Democrats for "not bringing up a budget resolution in the Senate," despite the fact—I would add—that we had the Budget Control Act which took the place of the budget and the fact that those attacks were not very persuasive to the American people. Nonetheless, Republicans invested a lot of time, energy, and money pushing for a budget for a very long time. They could not agree amongst themselves on a lot of things, but they at least agreed the Senate should pass a budget.

The Senate Budget Committee has now passed a progrowth budget resolution out of committee which was strongly supported by every Democrat and every Independent on the committee from the moderates to the progressives. They took a balanced approach that put jobs and the economy first. It tackles our debt and deficit responsibly and keeps the promises we all made to our seniors, families, and our communities.

Democrats know we are on the right side of this issue when it comes to policy. We know we are on the right side when it comes to what the American people want. We know our budget resolution reflects the values and priorities of the vast majority of the American people, and we are looking forward to a debate. We are confident that when we lay out our balanced and responsible approach and the House lays out their extreme approach—which actually doubles down on the failed and rejected policies of the past—the contrast will be clear and the American people will continue to stand with us as we work toward a balanced and bipartisan deal.

The reason I am here is because I am so disappointed we cannot start this debate and move the process so we can offer amendments and get going. This is an issue the American people want to hear about and deserve to hear about. Senators should be able to come to the floor so they can debate and offer amendments. Based on what I heard from Republicans over the last 2 years, I thought they wanted this debate too.

So I am kind of surprised we are here running the clock on a continuing resolution. There is no one out here, no one talking, and we are twiddling our thumbs waiting for the clock to run out on time. We could be here having the debate the Republicans called on us to have so we can move it forward. We could do it tonight, tomorrow, Thursday, and probably be done by Thursday or Friday. Because of this delay, we now get to wait and watch the time run out until Thursday night.

We will be here Friday, Saturday, and Sunday doing this debate. I am sure our Republican colleagues will say: We should be doing this during the week when everybody is watching. We are here and ready to go. We want to have this debate. We want to have this discussion. I want to hear what they have to say. I would hope they want to hear what we have to say and then vote on a budget and move it out. But, no, we are here waiting, time running out, once again.

We are proud of our budget. We are ready to debate. I would hope our Republican colleagues would say: Yes, it is time to debate. Let's move this budget forward. We have been talking about it forever. Let's move this forward, and let's get this budget process going.

I am ready as chair of the Budget Committee. I know we as Democrats are ready to go. Let's yield back the time. Everyone knows what the end is going to be. Let's get it done. Let's get moving. Let's have the debate that is critically important to every family, every community, and to the future.

Thank you, Madam President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, first, let me thank the chair of the Budget Committee, my friend and colleague from the State of Washington, Senator MURRAY, for her remarks and, even more, for her excellent work on putting together a terrific budget. That may be the reason our colleagues want to delay.

For 4 years, they have had a great time saying: You don't have a budget. You don't have a budget.

It was perhaps the only thing they had to say because the actual confines of their budget are so far away from what the American people want, they couldn't get into the details. After all, nobody wants to end Medicare as we know it. Nobody, as in the Ryan budget, wants to reduce taxes dramatically on the wealthiest Americans—39 percent to 25 percent—and then take away deductions for middle-class people, good deductions that make sense, such as the mortgage deduction, the charitable deduction, the retirement deduction, and the health care deduction. No, no one wants to do that. And no one wants to eat our seed corn—cut money dramatically for things such as investment in education, in infrastructure, and in scientific research—in

order to cut taxes on the very wealthy or keep existing narrow loopholes open, deductions for moving businesses overseas, stuff for the oil companies. They don't want to debate that, I guess. But now we have a budget because of the leadership of the chair of the Budget Committee and the members of her committee.

By the way, this is not a small group of Democrats. It runs from our most liberal Members to our most conservative Members, all united around a budget that is fiscally responsible. It meets the Simpson-Bowles restraints, the budget targets, it invests in jobs and the economy, and it closes loopholes and preserves the middle class's ability to grow and proceed.

So we now are in this 30-hour thing. We could actually be debating a budget while those 30 hours tick by. We don't have to be sitting here doing nothing. One of our colleagues said he would like to debate the budget 2 weeks from now. Why is he putting things off? Well, I guess if I had their budget and looked at it compared to our budget, that is what I would want to do, but that is not fair and it is not right.

So I just came to the floor to join my colleague from Washington in pleading with our colleagues: Let's have a real debate on the budget. The lines are sharply drawn. Our budget and their budget contrast. Let the American people hear the debate and decide what they like. We are pretty confident they will like ours better. They no longer have the talking point that we don't have a budget. Instead, they are now preventing us from actually talking about our budget. It is not fair. It is not fair, and it doesn't really help the process.

I know there are some Members on the other side of the aisle who have some objections to the CR in certain areas. We are all hurt by the CR, by the way, I would say to my colleagues. If we want to get rid of things such as the horrible things that are happening in the air traffic towers, vote on our budget. We do not do sequestration. We undo sequestration, and it might pave the way to doing more things this year. But to sit here and let the clock tick makes no sense.

One thing I can tell my colleagues: I know my good friend HARRY REID, and we are not going to kick the budget can down the road for 2 weeks. We will be here, whether it has to be Saturday night and Monday and Tuesday. We will be here. So they may as well let us debate the budget. There is 50 hours. We can have a nice, full, open debate and then do our votes.

It is a logical request. I don't think there is any good argument against it. I haven't thought of one.

I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle—we would say, Mr. Republican leader, Mr. Republicans, let's debate the budget. Tear down the wall of not debating, and let us show our budget, you show yours, and let the American people decide.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I wish to add my words to those eloquently spoken by our Budget Committee chairman PATTY MURRAY and by one of our leaders here, the able Senator from New York, Mr. SCHUMER.

We have been waiting for hours and hours. I can only imagine what the public thinks when they look down on this floor and absolutely nothing is happening.

I came down here not knowing my friend and colleague was going to be here. I guess we both had the same sense of it, that we had to explain to the American people why this is happening. There is only one reason: Republicans are stalling and stalling and stalling and filibustering and filibustering and filibustering. But they are not doing a talking filibuster; they are just letting the clock tick. They are filibustering a very important bill to keep this government open. They say they want to keep the government open and they don't want to shut down, so why not get that vote done with?

Senator MIKULSKI has led us, in a beautiful way, with Senator SHELBY, in a very bipartisan fashion—let's vote on that bill, keep the government open, and, as Senator MIKULSKI said, show the country we can work together and get to the one thing the Republicans have been saying not for months but for years; that is, a budget.

The truth is, instead of doing a budget, we did the Budget Control Act, so of course we did a budget. As a matter of fact, the Budget Control Act was actually in many ways more specific than a budget.

But setting that aside, they went out on the campaign trail and attacked Democrats: Where is your budget? Where is your budget? Well, guess what. Under the able leadership of my friend from Washington Senator MURRAY, there is a budget, and it is well done, and it has strong deficit reduction and strong investments. It is balanced in a way the Ryan plan is not. It saves Medicare where he destroys it. It invests in education and infrastructure where he destroys that. His budget is a wrecking ball. Our budget, under the able leadership of Senator MURRAY, is an optimistic path to our future, not the pessimistic, painful plan Mr. RYAN put forward in the name of the Republican Party.

Now the people are witnessing a filibuster. It is possible that we could end it, but I will tell my colleagues this: We are trying for some friendship and comity across the aisle right now. We want to keep the government open.

The Senator from Kansas stood here last night and said the reason he is filibustering—he never used that word, but the reason he is insisting that we spend 30 more hours, 40 more hours, 50 more hours on this last year's business, which is last year's appropriations bill, is because he demands to have a vote

on his amendment, about which he feels very strongly. It has to do with making sure the sequester doesn't hit our air traffic control towers, meaning they can stay open. I agree with the Senator from Kansas; we should keep those air traffic control towers open. But I want to say to him—and maybe we have a chart here, if I can get to it—I want to say to my friend who isn't here who is leading the filibuster that this is where we are.

We want to restore those air traffic controllers. But I will tell my colleagues what I want to restore in addition to the air traffic controllers and the towers—he is right—I want to restore Head Start for 70,000 children. I want to restore 10,000 teacher jobs. I want to restore 7,200 special education teachers who are working with kids who desperately need help. I want to restore the title I funds that impact 1 million kids. I want to make sure we can conduct 424,000 HIV tests that are administered by the CDC. How does it make us a better country when people don't know if they are HIV positive and they spread that virus? How about the 25,000 breast and cervical cancer screenings that are not being done? These are the consequences of the sequester, in addition to the terrible consequences to the FAA.

I was here when the Republicans shut down the FAA, if my colleague remembers that. They shut it down, but suddenly they care about it. Good. I am glad they care about it. I care about it too. I haven't talked about the 804,000 outpatient visits to Indian health centers or 2,100 food inspections that are going to save lives. These are not happening because of sequester: 4 million meals served to seniors; 600,000 women and children who are not getting nutrition assistance because of sequester; national science grants cut, 1,000 of them; and \$902 million cut from loans to our small businesses, which are the job creators; and even 1,000 FBI agents and other law enforcement personnel.

So, yes, I say to my friend who is not here who is leading the filibuster, the Senator from Kansas—I hope he comes and shows up—I hear him. I feel the pain he feels for his State. I have a list I won't bore my colleagues with that just shows the cuts to my State. It is painful. But how do we solve it? Not by amendment after amendment after amendment on a must-pass bill that the House has said to keep simple or the government shuts down—not that way but by turning to the Democratic budget, where Senator MURRAY and colleagues on her committee have restored those cuts, and they have found other ways to cut, better ways to cut, sensible ways to cut.

So I call on my friends on the other side of the aisle: If you want to wait 10 hours, 20, 30, 40, 50, 60, 70, 80 hours, it is your call. We will be here. We will be here. But we are not going to put off the passage of the budget. It is too important. We will be here until it is done.

I yield back the remainder of my time. I thank my colleague Senator MURRAY so much for her leadership.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I wish to thank the Senator from California, the Senator from New York, and the Senator from Alaska, who was here just a short time ago expressing the same frustration.

We are ready to go. We have a budget, and we want to debate it. We believe, when the American public sees the values in our budget and what we are fighting for to make sure the middle class has an opportunity, that we balance our budget in a responsible way and work to manage our debt in a responsible way, that we can do that and build on the promise of hope that this country has always had, we are going to have a solid budget passed. We want to get started.

Where are our Republican colleagues on this empty floor? They are filibustering. They are counting down the hours so that sometime late Thursday night we can finish the continuing resolution after silence, silence, and more silence. It will pass. It has to pass. They all know that. We all know that. None of us love it, but we all recognize the situation we are in. We are ready to move to the budget tonight, tomorrow morning, have the debate, full and open, do the amendment process, or we are going to be doing it Friday, Saturday, and Sunday. Fine with us. We are ready to do it.

But for all of our Republican colleagues who said we do not have a budget, we do have a budget. We are ready to debate it. We are ready to talk about it. We are proud of it. We are ready to go. I would just ask our Republican colleagues, yield back the time, vote the way we are going to vote—everybody knows how they are going to vote at this point—give us an opportunity to get on the budget and to move it forward in a responsible way because at the end of the day, the clock is ticking on our country as well. We have families who want to know whether they are going to be able to have the ability to send their kids to college or pay their mortgage. We have communities that want to know whether section 8 housing is going to be there for families who are struggling today. We have men and women in our military today who are wondering whether they are going to be furloughed. We have military hospitals that are telling soldiers who are coming home in the next few months that they may have to wait for appointments because of the furloughs that are taking place.

We are ready to move the budget. We are ready to get the country moving again. We are ready to get past this managing by crisis and shutdown and CRs and all these things and get back on the right path, but we cannot do it when there is a filibuster going on on the floor and we are not allowed to

bring up our budget for debate and we are sitting here ticking off the clock in an empty, silent Senate.

I urge our colleagues to allow us to move forward on this. We are ready to go.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, all across America people are calling their cable providers and they are asking if they can get a refund for C-SPAN coverage of the Senate. There seems to be some concerns that there is no serious debate underway, no serious votes being taken, and the hours just continue to flow by.

I can understand the frustration of the American public watching this Chamber. We are going through a 30-hour interval. The Senate is kind of designed on 30-hour intervals, and this is the 30-hour interval before we enter the next 30-hour interval in the hopes that we will ultimately get to a vote. Does it have to be this way? Of course not. It should not be this way.

I understand the depth of feeling some Senators have about a variety of issues, and they have come to the floor to express them. In fact, I even agree with some of their positions. But there comes a point where you have to say: All right, I did not win my battle today. I am not going to get my day in court. Let's at least go on with the business of the Senate because, you see, we have an important responsibility ahead of us.

Senator MURRAY just spoke before me. She is chairman of the Senate Budget Committee. She has a Herculean task, and she is up to it. In fact, she has shown herself to be a very able leader of the Budget Committee in producing a budget proposal for the next fiscal year. It is a balanced proposal. It is one that I think is sensible.

I have some background in this, at least by way of avocation. Having been a member of the Simpson-Bowles Commission, I sat through a year of committee hearings and debates that led to a vote on a proposal to reduce the budget deficit. So I have heard some of the arguments that have been made on both sides. I then joined a bipartisan group of Senators, the so-called Gang of 8, and we sat down to try to do the same, and we spent over a year doing exactly that. So I kind of know where this comes down.

My approach to this—an approach that is being followed by Senator MURRAY with her proposed Democratic budget resolution—is, yes, the deficit is a serious problem, the debt of America is a serious problem. When you borrow 40 cents of every \$1 you spend, it is

unsustainable. So we have to deal with that issue and deal with it honestly. But first and foremost, let's do it in a fashion that builds the American economy, that creates good-paying jobs. If you want to find your way out of a deficit, put people to work first. When they are paying taxes as opposed to drawing benefits, that really tips the scales in the right direction in dealing with the deficit.

So what the Murray budget does, the Democratic budget resolution will do is make investments in what does produce jobs in America, and it is very obvious.

Education. Who is going to argue with that one? Is there a person standing in the Senate who did not rely on their own education and training to progress in life? And didn't you tell your son and daughter the same thing when they were making their life choices? Stay in school. Get a good education. So education is an investment. It is part of the Democratic budget resolution.

Secondly, the notion of research and innovation. One of the most heart-breaking parts of sequestration to me was when we took \$1.6 billion away from the National Institutes of Health. That is the organization that does the medical research to find new cures, new vaccines, new medical devices so people can survive when they have a diagnosis that could be fatal, to make sure children have a chance at a full life. We are cutting that in the name of budget deficit reduction, and that is troubling.

The third area is infrastructure. I spent the entire day with contractors from my State of Illinois, people who represent road builders, for example, bridge builders. They believe—and I do too—that investment in infrastructure pays off over generations. We just had a meeting on the waterway system, the Mississippi River, which is such an important part of national commerce. We need to improve the dams and the locks on the Mississippi and the adjoining rivers, such as the Illinois.

So the Murray budget deals with investments—investments to build the economy, investments to spark economic growth—but then it goes on to seriously reduce the deficit. The goal in this, of course, is to not only meet but surpass the goal of the Simpson-Bowles budget commission in terms of deficit reduction. The way Senator MURRAY does it, of course, is in a balanced approach, which includes spending cuts, which must be part of it, as well as revenue. I think that is the sensible approach to it.

Unfortunately, on the other side, the argument is made that we just cannot raise any more revenue. I know better. Anyone who has taken a close look at the Tax Code in America realizes that we literally forgive tax obligations of over \$1 trillion a year in our Tax Code, some of them very worthy—the deduction for a home mortgage, for example; deductions for charitable contribu-

tions, for example. These things are worthy of our Tax Code. But there are other things that cannot even be explained. Why in the world would we put in our Tax Code a provision which says that if an American business wants to move jobs overseas, we will give them a tax break to do it? I do not think so. That should be a decision, if they make it, with no encouragement from our Tax Code. Rather, let's encourage businesses to stay in the United States.

Similarly, Senator CARL LEVIN of Michigan has really made a concerted effort to investigate and expose the offshore tax havens that cost us over \$300 billion a year in taxes owed to the United States. People who park their money in faraway places with strange-sounding names end up escaping tax liability. Why do we let that happen? The average family across America, the average business across America cannot escape and does not even try to escape this liability. Yet we built into the Tax Code these Cayman Islands, little fiascos in Bermuda and all the other places they head to. We could put an end to that in a hurry and bring revenue back to the United States to reduce the deficit.

So what Senator MURRAY and the Budget Committee talk about is generating revenue to reduce the deficit and making spending cuts.

In addition, Senator MURRAY and the Budget Committee will face the entitlement issues. They are important. If you just left the entitlements without change, the cost of health care would lead us to further bankruptcy in America. They are addressing it, as we should. While protecting the integrity of the programs, they are finding ways to save money to reach the goal.

Wouldn't this be a great debate to have on the floor of the Senate, to have that budget resolution before us, to actually have some votes on amendments? Well, it would be. But, unfortunately, because of the objection of several Republican Senators, we cannot get to it. So the clock is continuing to turn. We are watching hours slip away, and now we are facing the possibility of a weekend session because one or two Senators do not want us to bring this matter to a vote. That is unfortunate. It may be their right to exercise that kind of power in the Senate, but it is not fair. It is not fair to this institution or to the American people who count on us to do more than just waste time on the Senate floor. They count on us to use our time to solve problems.

So I urge my colleagues on the Republican side who are holding up these votes, who are engaged in this filibuster, for goodness' sake, let's move on, let's vote on the continuing resolution, and let's start the debate, the important debate on the budget resolution. Let's get this done.

For the longest time, we were preached to by Members on the other side about no budget resolution. I even heard a speech today by my friend from

Texas, the senior Senator, talking about how derelict we have been in not bringing up a budget resolution. We want to. We are being stopped by Republican Senators. They are the ones who will not let us bring this to a vote. I hope they will change their minds, and soon. I would like to spend next week back in Illinois and with my family, as most Senators would, during the Passover and the Easter seasons. More importantly, I would like to get my job done before that happens. To do that, we ought to be working on the floor right now. Instead of an empty floor, it should be a floor filled with Senators debating the issues and voting on them. I think that is what we were elected to do, and I think the people watching on C-SPAN would like to see some activity on the Senate floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. COATS. Madam President, I was puzzled earlier today when the Senate majority leader came to the floor to propose a unanimous consent request that we move forward with this continuing resolution. He is right, we should move forward with this. But I was puzzled by the fact that he said we have been standing around here looking at each other and we are not doing anything. We have not done anything on the Senate floor for the past 36 hours while we are trying to figure out who has the right to offer an amendment and whether that amendment will be agreed to in part of this unanimous consent request limiting the time. The problem here is that we came to the Senate believing each Senator had the right to offer an amendment. That is what we are here to do, debate that amendment, then take a vote on that amendment and pass the amendment. It is not a question of I will not offer my amendment unless it passes. Let's debate it, see how each of us votes, and then go forward.

But the majority leader has essentially said he would decide how many amendments will be offered and which amendments will not be offered, denying Senators the opportunity to bring their amendment to the floor. There is an objection to the majority leader's request to move forward, because Senators have been denied that opportunity. That is not what the Senate is all about. That is not what people elected us to do. We have been in an empty Chamber talking to no one, or at best to each other, and not moving forward with funding this government for the next 6 months in this fiscal year. We are all ready to go forward, but we wish to have the right, particularly as the minority, to offer our

amendments to this resolution which provides for this funding. I do not know how I am going to vote on all of these, because on some of them I am not sure what would be brought forward. But we are here to evaluate those, to make our best judgment, to vote our yeas or nays, to be able to explain to the people back home why we voted that way.

Apparently the majority leader has problems with some of these proposed amendments. Maybe he does not want his Members to have to vote on them because it is a tough vote politically. Well, what are we here for? We are not here to find consensus on everything that goes forward. We have different points of view. We will not always have consent to pass everything that is brought forward. We ought to be debating that. There are different visions here about how we ought to go forward. The solution to the problem of moving forward and getting this spending bill in place, which we obviously have to do, is to simply give Members the opportunities to propose their amendments, debate, vote on them, and move on.

Over these last 36 hours, how many of these amendments could we have been debating and voting on? We probably could have cleared out all of the amendments that were proposed by various Members in half that time or much less. And that is why we are here. We are a divided government, so there are going to be two sides to each issue. Standing around and having one person, the majority leader, decide whether he will subject his Members to a vote because he thinks that might put them in a difficult political situation. His side can offer their amendments, we can offer our amendments. Hopefully, we are offering amendments for the good of the country and not for some political gain or "gotcha" amendments. But nevertheless, that is the right of a Senator, to offer whatever amendment he or she deems best in his or her own estimation.

We are sitting here facing a serious debt crisis. Some have said this debt crisis isn't here yet so we have more time to deal with it. I reject that. If \$16.7 trillion in debt isn't a crisis, I don't know what is. And at the rate we are going here in Washington, we don't have more time to waste.

But don't take my word for this. Just last week, we had a hearing in the Joint Economic Committee on the debt crisis. In the hearing, we found widespread agreement from witnesses across the ideological spectrum on a variety of issues, including the vital importance of dealing with our long-term debt in a timely fashion and reforming health and retirement security programs to rein in spending and preserve much-needed benefits. I am going to relate some of their testimony, because I think it's important to establish that there is some consensus here on how to move forward. Former Senator and former Senate chairman of the Budget Committee, Judd Gregg,

who now serves as the co-chair of the Campaign to Fix the Debt, stated this:

On our current path, this nation goes bankrupt.

A similar statement to the one made by Judd Gregg, a Republican, was made by a Democrat, Erskine Bowles, who headed up the President's own fiscal commission, former Governor Bowles and former Chief of Staff to former President Clinton. He said about the looming debt crisis:

This is the most predictable financial crisis in the history of the country.

That was several years ago and nothing has gotten better since then. We just careen closer and closer to that tipping point. Senator Gregg says on our current path this Nation goes bankrupt. He also noted that mandatory spending is the primary driver of the debt when he said:

Unfortunately, all of the measures put in place have ignored smart entitlement reforms to control spending over the long-term and comprehensive tax reforms to make the tax code more efficient.

We have all heard that before from people all across the political spectrum. There is a growing consensus these elements must be addressed if we are to address our long-term debt problem.

Douglas Holtz-Eakin, former Director of the Congressional Budget Office, noted:

The level and projected growth of federal debt is a drag on current U.S. economic growth and a threat to future prosperity. . . . the Nation, despite claims to the contrary, remains on a damaging debt pathway.

Dr. Holtz-Eakin countered arguments that reducing the debt is not urgent because the crisis is a distant threat by pointing out the following:

. . . the U.S. is already paying an economic price for the excessive federal debt.

He was referring to terms of slow job creation and growth. He went on to say:

The obvious conclusion is that additional deficit reduction is needed to avoid debt-driven economic stagnation.

He called for the following action:

. . . a strategy that shifts the focus of spending control to the needed entitlement reforms and shifts the debate on taxes away from harmful higher marginal tax rates in favor of pro-growth tax reform.

Alice Rivlin, the first Director of the Congressional Budget Office and co-chair of the Debt Reduction Task Force for the Bipartisan Policy Center as well as a former resident of Indiana, insisted on the importance of a long-term budget plan that will halt the projected rise in debt. She said:

The prospect of debt growing faster than the economy for the foreseeable future reduces consumer and investor confidence, raises a serious threat of high future interest rates and unmanageable Federal debt service, and reduces likely American prosperity and world influence.

She stressed in her testimony the urgent need to act now to get the Federal debt under control before events overtake us.

A sense of urgency was unmistakably present during this hearing. We read about it in the paper every day. We read about it from columnists and hear it on the radio and television: Why can't you get together and get this thing solved and resolved so we can move forward? You are holding down the growth of the economy. You are keeping people out of work. We are at stagnant growth—half our historic average coming out of a recession.

We all know a significant percent of the money we spend here has to be borrowed from China, Saudi Arabia, from foreign entities. This is no way to sustain and maintain a healthy fiscal situation in this country.

Our final witness at the hearing, Simon Johnson, a senior fellow at the Peterson Institute for International Economics, called for significantly more long-term debt reduction than has been contemplated in many of the proposals thus far, suggesting that the U.S. should aim at a national debt in the range of 40 percent to 50 percent of GDP.

Let me repeat that. Simon Johnson said that more long-term debt reduction than has been contemplated in many of the proposals so far needs to be looked at, suggesting the United States should aim at a national debt in the range of 40 to 50 percent of GDP rather than our current 90 to 100. When discussing how much time we have to act, Dr. Johnson said:

We have no idea . . . We should start now.

We absolutely should start now. We should be spending each day here working on a long-term debt reduction plan, because unlike the haphazard, rushed legislation we have seen over the past few years, a real, credible, long-term fiscal plan cannot happen overnight. It requires bold spending reforms. It must include a way to restructure programs like Medicare and Social Security so we can prevent them from going bankrupt and preserve benefits for current and future retirees.

Let me state that again. Those of us who have stood up and taken a stand on dealing with these so-called political suicide issues—Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security—are saying we need to do something now to prevent these programs from becoming insolvent, to prevent benefits from having to be reduced or massive tax increases on the next generation to be imposed in order to keep them solvent. We want to deal with that now so we don't undermine these programs.

Those who say we should not touch Medicare are not being truthful with current and future beneficiaries of that program. The same is true for Social Security. They are saying, we don't want to make the tough decision now to address some of these problems and make sensible reforms. We will be gone when this comes undone. What they are saying to people is that we are going to turn our heads to the plight of future beneficiaries, and even to current beneficiaries of these programs by not doing anything.

It is time we worked together to find a solution to this. I think there is a consensus that comprehensive tax reform—an area that I believe both sides can find common ground. Comprehensive tax reform is absolutely essential, as our witnesses all stated, to providing the growth element so this country and this economy can begin to grow. Additional revenue will come in from a more prosperous nation and from a greater rate of growth, and that will help us reduce our deficit spending, it will help us move toward a balanced budget, and keep us from continuing the plunge into more debt and more deficit.

Comprehensive tax reform is the best way to reduce the debt, grow the economy, and make America more competitive. Grow the economy—not more government. That is what makes us more competitive and puts more people back to work. That is what puts us on a path to American prosperity.

These things will not be easy. It will require time and it will demand political will courage. So let's get moving. The Senate majority leader needs to stop wasting time, allow Members to offer and vote on amendments so we can get to regular business of the Senate done and focus on the larger priority—growing this economy. Your Members, our Members—ones we like, ones we don't like. We are sent here to make the tough choices, to make our yes or our no and represent people back home. That is what the Senate is all about.

So instead of standing here speaking to an empty Chamber and letting the clock run down so these amendments can be closed out and never offered under this bill, we should be debating these issues. In doing so, we can get to the point where we will have our final vote and, hopefully, we will be funding the government going forward. It is called regular business and that ought to be our focus.

Growing this economy and strengthening it for future generations is the challenge before us. It is the challenge of our time. We need political will and courage and boldness to go forward, but it is absolutely essential for the future of this country. I suggest that instead of standing around doing nothing, we begin to address these issues.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes as if in morning business.

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

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I noted last week the Republican

leader came to his desk and spoke about the budget and described our Democratic budget as a leftwing manifesto.

We have done \$1.8 trillion in spending cuts already. We raised \$600 billion—one-third of that—in revenue by restoring the Clinton-era tax rates for families earning over \$450,000 a year. So in the balance between spending cuts and new revenues, it is already 3 to 1 in favor of spending cuts. In our budget, we propose to fill the gap of the remainder with 50 percent spending cuts and 50 percent revenue and that is a leftwing manifesto.

The Republican budget changes Medicare into a voucher program. The Republican budget cuts nondefense discretionary spending to levels lower than at any time since OMB started keeping track a half century ago. The Republican budget would set annual domestic spending at rates lower than 1962, when there were no Pell grants at all, when 30 percent of American seniors lived in poverty. But that is not extreme. A Democratic budget that is 50-50 spending cuts and revenues, that is a leftwing manifesto.

The Democratic budget has \$975 billion in new spending cuts and it has \$975 billion in new revenue in order to close that budget gap 50-50. That means, including the deficit reduction we have already done of \$1.8 trillion, we will be, in total, at \$4.3 trillion in deficit reduction, which is probably just a little bit over the target that most of the experts have given us to hit. About \$2.8 trillion of the \$4.3 trillion will come in spending cuts, \$600 billion has come in new tax revenue, and \$975 billion will come from loopholes, for a total of \$1.6 trillion coming from new revenues. Some leftwing manifesto, \$1 trillion more in spending cuts than revenue at a time when billionaires in America are paying lower tax rates than brick masons. If that is a leftwing manifesto, then the leftwing needs to fire its manifesto writers. That is some pretty high rhetoric.

We know where the word "manifesto" comes from, of course. It comes from the Cold War and the Communists—50 percent spending cuts, 50 percent revenue—and the rhetorical hint is that we Democrats with our budget are a bunch of Commies. That is high rhetoric indeed, and it is not coming from some fringe Senators in their rank and file. This is the Republican leader of the Senate.

In the face of the obvious facts of the balance of our budget, why might the rhetoric be getting so high? What might the Republicans be getting so touchy about? Let's look at where we get the rest of our revenue for our 50-50 budget.

We got the first \$600 billion from restoring the Clinton-era tax rates, a time of huge economic success for our country for folks over \$450,000 in income. Where do we get our \$975 billion in new revenue? We go to the Republican treasure trove. We go to Ali

Baba's cave for corporations and the rich. We go to the tax earmarks and the special deals that special interests have, year after year, squirreled away in the Tax Code.

People think: How much can that be? What can it mean when we have money going through the Tax Code and out but not coming to the government in revenues? What is in Ali Baba's cave? How big is the treasure trove? Have a look.

This is the amount of money the U.S. Government collects in taxes from individuals—\$1.09 trillion. Here is how much goes back out the backdoor of the Tax Code to people who have loopholes, special rates, deductions in the Tax Code that helped them: \$1.02 trillion—virtually the same. For every \$1 of revenue the United States collects in actual revenues from individual taxpayers every year, another 94 cents goes back out through the loopholes and the deductions and the special rates, a grand total every year of more than \$1 trillion. Since we budget over a 10-year period, it is \$10 trillion in this budget period.

On the corporate side, for every \$1 of revenue the United States collects in actual revenues from corporations, another 87 cents goes back out the backdoor of the Tax Code through loopholes and special rates and deductions. Again, because we do this over—every year, \$157 billion. Again, because we do this over 10 years, that is more than \$1.5 trillion. If we add these two together, it is more than \$11.5 trillion in the budget period. If we presume some modest growth in the economy over those 10 years, that number gets to about \$14 trillion.

So Ali Baba's Tax Code cave of tax spending is very big. There is lots of treasure squirreled away in it, and that doesn't even count the billions of dollars that corporations and wealthy tax avoiders hide offshore so it never even gets into the tax equation. The IRS has pegged that recently at about \$385 billion a year.

There is one little building in the Cayman Islands that Chairman Conrad used to refer to regularly when he was chairman of the Budget Committee. One little building in the Cayman Islands, maybe 5 stories tall, where over 18,000 companies claim to be doing business. One can imagine what kind of business they are doing there. That is how \$385 billion a year never even appears in the tax equation.

This spending that gets done through the Tax Code that does not get reviewed by annual appropriations, it gets squirreled away in there and it is there to stay. It is a big treasure trove indeed—not counting offshoring, probably \$14 trillion in a 10-year budget period for those who are clever and connected enough to get their special deals, their tax earmarks, into the Tax Code.

We take out of that, call it \$14 trillion—at a minimum \$11.5 trillion—\$975 billion, about 7 percent. That is how

much of it, this little red slice, is what we take to balance the budget for deficit reduction. The problem is the Republicans do not want us to look into their treasure trove. Ali Baba's cave of tax tricks is where the juicy earmarks are for special interests. Do you want to know why Mitt Romney had to fiddle his taxes to get up to a 14-percent tax rate—which, by the way, is a lower tax rate than a solitary hospital orderly pays walking down the halls of Rhode Island Hospital at night. How does he get it so he has to fiddle his taxes to get up to a rate lower than a hospital orderly pays? How do Romney and the hedge fund billionaires pull off that trick? Look in Ali Baba's cave for the carried interest exception.

Do you want to know where ExxonMobil, which is the richest and most profitable corporation in the history of the world—where ExxonMobil gets its hands into the American taxpayers' pockets? Look at the Big Oil subsidies in Ali Baba's cave.

Do you want to know how corporate jets get special favored tax treatment compared to the commercial jets that ordinary mortals fly? Look at the accelerated depreciation schedules in Ali Baba's cave of tax tricks. If using the phrase "leftwing manifesto" seems a little strident, a little exaggerated about a budget proposal for 50 percent spending cuts and 50 percent revenues and you want to inquire why, look no further than the Republican treasure trove of corporate and special interest tax earmarks heaped up in Ali Baba's cave.

We are knocking at the door. We are knocking on the door of Ali Baba's cave, which so far has been untouched. We have done all spending cuts and a little bit of tax rate increases for families over \$450,000 back to the Clinton-era rates. We have not touched, yet, Ali Baba's cave. What we are saying as Democrats is that Americans paid in deficit reduction spending cuts what they are going to lose in services and in benefits, \$1.8 trillion, and they will pay in another \$975 billion in cuts under our Democratic proposal. We are saying that folks earning over \$450,000 a year income saw their tax rates go up to Clinton-era levels, and they are paying in another \$600 billion in deficit reduction. Now we want to go into Ali Baba's cave of tax earmarks and out of at least \$11.5 trillion, probably more like \$14 trillion, and if you throw in the offshoring that takes you up to \$17 trillion, \$18 trillion—we want to take less than \$1 trillion out over 10 years to help reduce our budget deficit.

So the Republicans are getting anxious. The alarms are ringing in the special interests and the Republicans are rushing to the trenches to defend their special interests and their cherished tax earmarks. The best defense being a good offense, that is how a balanced deficit reduction plan that in sum has \$1 trillion more in spending cuts than in revenues suddenly becomes a leftist manifesto.

We just had the hearings in the Budget Committee on our budget. If you listened on that committee, the Republicans said it plainly. They did not mince words: Not a penny of tax loopholes, not a penny from Ali Baba's cave of tax treasures can go for deficit reduction—not a penny. That is their rule.

They will say they are willing to move the treasure around a little bit in Ali Baba's cave so long as it all gets used for corporations and the wealthy. Again, that is not a guess. That is in the Republican budget—none of the goodies squirreled away by the special interests over the years in Ali Baba's cave for deficit reduction—none; all of it to lower tax rates for corporations and the rich, the ones who mostly benefit from the treasure in Ali Baba's cave to begin with. They are willing to spread the treasure around a little as long as it stays in the hands of big corporations and the rich.

We are at the gates of Ali Baba's cave, this treasure trove of Tax Code special deals and earmarks for the rich and the well connected. We are at the place where the lobbyists wheel the sweet corporate tax deals. We are knocking on the door of a \$14 trillion tax spending area that has been, so far, left completely untouched in deficit reduction and so our Republican friends are getting a little twitchy.

Come on, tell us, out of nearly \$14 trillion in tax spending and earmarks, can't we just put a little bit toward the deficit? Just 7 percent? Under their own budget, they take 41 percent of it and give it back in the form of lower high-end tax rates, lowered rates for big corporations and the rich. Can't we do just 7 percent for deficit reduction? I thought the deficit was so important, but maybe not when it comes to our friends protecting the interests of the big corporations and the rich.

Madam President, I also wish to speak about the continuing resolution and its provisions relating to Commerce, Justice, and Science appropriations. Specifically, I want to highlight how the continuing resolution will support continuing advances in the field of digital forensics.

The continuing resolution is accompanied by a series of explanatory statements that detail Congress' intent behind the raw numbers of the resolution itself. The explanatory statement for the Commerce, Justice, and Science provisions in turn incorporates portions of the Appropriations Committee report on the earlier Commerce, Justice, and Science bill. "[L]anguage included in . . . Senate Report 112-158," the explanatory statement provides, "that is not changed by this explanatory statement or this Act is approved." Neither the explanatory statement nor the continuing resolution change language from Senate Report 112-158 regarding computer forensics. The language from Senate Report 112-158 therefore states the intent behind this portion of the continuing resolution.

This is what Senate Report 112-158 says:

Cell Phone Digital Evidence—As smartphones and the Internet have become integral parts of daily life, these technologies have also become an integral part of a majority of criminal acts and enterprises, from drug deals by text to child pornography websites. Because more than 95 percent of all criminal cases are investigated and prosecuted at the State and local levels, the Committee is concerned that without the Department's support, the ability of State and local law enforcement to effectively investigate and prosecute cases involving digital evidence and computer-based crimes will diminish. The Committee encourages the Department to prioritize State and local assistance toward computer forensics and digital evidence training and investigations surrounding drug and violent crimes, and crimes against children.

Collaborative Efforts To Fight Cybercrime—According to the Norton Cybercrime Report 2011, more than 69 percent of online adults have been a victim of cybercrime in their lifetime, resulting in an annual price of \$388,000,000,000 globally. The Committee is aware of the important progress that has been made in the fight against cybercrime by collaborative efforts that bring together prosecutors, researchers, and DOJ in a multidisciplinary effort to identify and prosecute cybercrimes such as 'phishing.' These collaborative efforts involve experts in computer forensics that help to identify the source of phishing, train prosecutors in the intricacies of the crime and how best to prosecute cybercriminals, and conduct research to stay ahead of cybercriminals and their ever changing tactics. The Committee believes these collaborative efforts have made good progress against cybercrime and encourages the Department to continue funding these important initiatives.

I applaud Chairwoman MIKULSKI for stressing the importance of computer forensics training and research, first as the Chairwoman of the Commerce, Justice, and Science Appropriations Subcommittee and now as chairwoman of the full Appropriations Committee. I am very grateful for her leadership on this important issue.

The report clearly identifies the need for continued Justice Department attention on this subject. This is particularly the case in light of the severe cybersecurity threats facing our Nation. Like the Norton report cited by the committee, a recent report by the security firm Mandiant highlighted the growing threat to our national economic security posed by cyber attacks launched by criminal organizations and foreign countries. Every day, sophisticated hackers are attempting to steal America's secrets, its intellectual property, and the identities of our citizens. As FBI Director Robert Mueller has stated, "[w]e are losing data, we are losing money, we are losing ideas and we are losing innovation. Together we must find a way to stop the bleeding." Digital forensics tools that help attribute the source of an attack and the extent of the damage caused will be an important element of any cybersecurity solution.

Digital forensics tools also help law enforcement investigate and prosecute

more traditional crimes. Criminals use smartphones and computers to engage in all kinds of criminal acts and enterprises, from drug dealing to child pornography. Even when criminals do not use modern electronics in the commission of the crime, digital forensics can provide useful evidence relative to, for instance, the whereabouts and intent of the offender, or the participants in a conspiracy. Federal, State, and local law enforcement thus must have access to digital forensics tools and appropriate training to investigate and prosecute these crimes effectively.

For the last decade, the Justice Department has funded extremely important research in these areas. For example, its National Institute of Justice, or NIJ, has funded research on tools for scanning for child pornography; forensic tools for mobile cellular devices; data forensics for cloud computing; technologies to identify and defeat encryption methods used by criminals; and forensic tools for seizing digital evidence in a forensically sound way. NIJ also has funded invaluable training that equips state and local law enforcement to tackle the cybercrime and digital forensics issues that they encounter in their criminal investigations. I believe that NIJ and the Justice Department more broadly must support this research and training going forward. I am very pleased that the continuing resolution we are considering today likewise prioritizes this important work.

Again, the fact that the continuing resolution does this is a testament to Chairwoman MIKULSKI's leadership in this field. She has been a champion of effective law enforcement for a long time. She now is bringing the same leadership to bear on cybersecurity and criminals' use of emerging technologies. I also would thank Senator SHELBY, who is the ranking member of both the full Committee and the Commerce, Justice, and Science Subcommittee, for his work on this important issue. As a result of their collaboration, the continuing resolution will support a broad range of important Federal initiatives. It is very good news that research and training on digital forensics will be one of them.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, the Medium Air Defense System is a NATO program we jointly develop with the Germans and Italians. They have made clear if the United States does not fulfill its funding commitment for 2013, Germany and Italy would interpret this as a unilateral withdrawal, and they have stated this in writing to Congress.

The Memorandum of Understanding among the U.S., Germany and Italy clearly states that a "withdrawing Participant will pay all Contract modification or termination costs that would not otherwise have been incurred but for the decision to withdraw."

This is a standard clause for cooperative international agreements. In fact,

it is usually included at the insistence of the U.S. to ensure long-term commitment of our Allies so they do not withdraw on joint programs, leaving the U.S. to pay the bills. It is included in agreements on the Excalibur program; technologies and systems for AEGIS-equipped ships; and the Global Positioning System. It will also be included when the U.S. and Israel enter an agreement on the Iron Dome missile defense program.

There is precedent. Following its withdrawal from the NATO Alliance Ground Surveillance Memorandum of Understanding, Canada was assessed a fiscal penalty, even though a development contract had not yet been awarded. The MEADS program has contracts with industry that, if canceled, will require the payment of termination liability. To think that we would get out for free is unrealistic. If we take the funding out of this program, we leave the Army a bill that it will have to pay.

MEADS is not a "missile to nowhere." Last November, MEADS conducted a successful intercept test that demonstrated advanced technologies for air defense. The Department of Defense has informed us the missile used in the MEADS program will be incorporated into the aging Patriot system next year.

The United States has not paid more for the program than what was agreed to in the MOU. The U.S. share of the program is \$2.32 billion in 2004 dollars, which when adjusted for inflation is closer to \$2.9 billion in today's dollars.

Finally, premature withdrawal from MEADS sends the wrong signals to our allies when the U.S. has been asking them to do more on missile defense. Secretary Panetta sent the Senate Defense Appropriations Subcommittee a letter last June, echoed by a letter from Secretary Clinton in September, which specifically asks Congress not to terminate MEADS at this time, as it would undermine a new and fragile consensus achieved by the U.S. with its NATO Allies in Chicago last spring.

I agree with my colleague from New Hampshire now, more than ever, we need to be vigilant about how and where federal defense dollars are spent. Prohibiting funding for this final installment of MEADS research is the wrong way to approach this, but I look forward to working with her and other Senators as we develop the fiscal year 2014 spending bills.

Mr. REED. Madam President, before I begin, I want to thank Chairwoman MIKULSKI. She has demonstrated both leadership and resolve in her new role and in assembling this bill under very challenging circumstances.

Overall, this bill provides a total of \$1.043 trillion for discretionary spending, and it reflects a number of reductions that the Appropriations Committee had to make in order to accommodate the \$4 billion cut to the discretionary spending caps mandated by the January agreement on the so-called

"fiscal cliff." In addition, because of a point of order raised by Senator TOOMEY last year, the emergency designation was removed for \$3.5 billion in disaster and mitigation funding in the Superstorm Sandy appropriations bill. I opposed this point of order because I believe disaster funding should be treated as an emergency, as it has been in disasters past. Because we fell three votes shy of the 60 needed to waive the point of order, we must now absorb \$3.5 billion in cuts in this bill. That will have real impacts on critical programs.

Moreover, I am deeply disappointed we have not been able to come up with a commonsense and balanced solution to turn off sequestration. These crippling across-the-board spending cuts 7.8 percent for defense programs and 5 percent for domestic discretionary programs will be applied to virtually every discretionary program in this bill. If left unaddressed, they will translate into an estimated 750,000 fewer jobs across this country, including in my home State of Rhode Island, where the unemployment rate is just under 10 percent.

I was one of a majority of Senators who voted for a reasonable solution to replace sequestration with a balanced mix of revenues and spending reductions. I am frustrated that a minority in this Chamber blocked this plan, which would have prevented the self-inflicted job losses and economic pain of sequestration. Now, in order to avoid a government shutdown on March 27, we must forge ahead and pass the best appropriations bill we can, despite these limitations.

Even in the face of these limitations, the Senate bill represents a better path because it makes responsible investments and saves jobs.

Without the funding provided in this bill to meet the funding levels promised in MAP-21, last year's transportation authorization bill, we would lose an additional 25,000 jobs. As chairman of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, I worked to provide \$2.4 billion in funding for clean water and drinking water projects, \$336 million more than the President requested. This investment, when combined with state matches and leveraging, will support 849 projects and 130,000 jobs.

Let me turn to the Interior title of this continuing resolution in more detail. The CR provides \$29.8 billion, which is an increase of \$650 million over the Subcommittee's FY 2012 allocation.

While that amount is a 2 percent increase, most of it, approximately \$600 million, is needed to fully fund the 10-year average for fire suppression. In addition, we must also absorb the cost of \$423 million appropriated as part of the September continuing resolution to repay fire borrowing that occurred in FY 2012.

Even though the subcommittee's allocation rose, so did the costs of programs we must fund. The House was able to avoid tough decisions for the

Environmental Protection Agency and Interior funding in its CR because it had an even larger allocation for this title. But it only accomplished that by shortchanging other important investments in other titles, including transportation, child care, education, health research, police, and firefighters.

Lest anyone be confused by the House's new-found commitment to the EPA and other environmental priorities, one should only review the devastating cuts it made to these programs in its initial FY 2013 committee-reported Interior Appropriations bill.

With the resources available and the challenges we face, I believe we in the Senate have funded all agencies in the Interior Appropriations title fairly, and we have still been able to achieve a number of important environmental goals.

As I have already noted, we have been able to provide a solid level of funding for infrastructure through the clean water and drinking water State revolving funds.

We were able to hold funding levels steady for grants that help States run their environmental programs at \$1.1 billion. These funds create jobs at the State level and provide for enforcement of our Federal pollution control laws.

As I mentioned, we also fully funded the 10-year average of fire suppression for both the Interior Department and Forest Service, in anticipation of a tough fire season.

We were able to include \$53 million in new funding to hire doctors, nurses, and support staff at newly constructed Indian Health Service facilities. These funds will allow seven facilities to open their doors to patients that would otherwise sit vacant.

I am pleased to say this bill also includes language to extend the authorizations of 12 national heritage areas so they will continue to receive their partnership grant funding from the National Park Service.

We want to make sure these heritage areas continue to thrive, so I am proud we were able to extend their authorizations in this bill. And it is worth noting that these grants don't require new funding they are already paid for within the existing National Park Service budget.

This is important in my State, with the John H. Chafee Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor, but for many others, as well.

Finally, land and water conservation funding is sustained at the FY 2012 level of \$322 million.

Of course, there are tradeoffs within this bill, and places where we had to sustain cuts below the FY 2012 enacted level.

This is in part due to the hand we were dealt by the President in the budget he submitted for FY 2013. We accepted cuts proposed by the administration for several programs, including construction programs and Superfund.

The Senate bill funds the EPA at \$8.34 billion, which, while a reduction

of \$107 million from the FY 2012 level, is the amount requested by the President for FY 2013. Additionally, the Senate bill spares the agency from the debilitating cuts set in the FY 2013 House Interior bill, which funded the EPA at a level that is \$1.29 billion less than FY 2012. Yes, that is a billion.

Unfortunately, however, those reductions alone were not enough to meet our obligation to provide an approximately \$1 billion increase for fire. We had to make cuts to other operating programs in the bill cuts that I know will only be more difficult because they will come in addition to sequestration.

Before I conclude, I want to address a few other aspects of this bill and the consequences of continuing resolutions and the sequester.

A major reason we are now confronting such huge deficits is the utter collapse of our financial markets beginning in 2008. Some of this collapse occurred because parts of our financial system were either lightly or barely regulated such as our derivatives and subprime mortgage markets.

However, we also learned the severe costs of having an under-resourced and outmatched Securities and Exchange Commission and Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

I still remember an April 2008 hearing with former SEC Chair Christopher Cox, in which he stated the SEC didn't need more resources meanwhile Bernie Madoff was scamming more and more victims in the largest Ponzi scheme in history, and Lehmann Brothers was levered 30-1 and hiding its precarious financial condition through repurchase agreements.

By starving the SEC and CFTC of resources, we are repeating the mistakes of the recent past.

The CFTC is already suspending its examinations of key market participants and "shelving" enforcement actions because of budget constraints. The impact of static funding along with the sequester will further erode its oversight. Indeed, under the CR, the CFTC will operate with a budget that is 37 percent less than the administration says it needs.

The case of the SEC is more disturbing. While subject to appropriation, the SEC has no impact on the deficit since its expenditures are offset by transaction fees applied to the industry. With the impacts of the sequester, the SEC will operate at 20 percent less than the administration has requested. This failure to appropriately fund the SEC will do nothing to improve the fiscal situation. At the same time, our economy and our capital markets will be more vulnerable. That makes no sense.

If we want American markets to be the most liquid, transparent, efficient, and orderly in the world, we need to provide the cops on the beat—the SEC and CFTC with an adequate and stable source of funding.

I also want to speak about the impacts CRs can have on specific pro-

grams because they offer no nuance or flexibility. That has been shown to be the case this year with the Weatherization Assistance Program, a program that creates jobs and helps provide energy efficient retrofits to low-income individuals and families.

President Obama described the program this way in a 2009 interview: "[Y]ou're getting a three-fer. Not only are you immediately putting people back to work but you're also saving families on [their] energy bills and you're laying the groundwork for long-term energy independence. That's exactly the kind of program that we should be funding."

Under the Recovery Act, we invested \$5 billion in this program, which annually received only \$175 to \$200 million. As the program worked through this infusion, funding for the regular program was scaled back. In FY 2013, funding will be only \$68 million even before the sequester is applied. Since there will no longer be carry-over from earlier years, there will not be enough funding to mount a viable program in all 50 states. That's not only regrettable, it is also counterproductive to our goals to create jobs and increase energy efficiency. I hope we can work with the Department of Energy to find ways to sustain the program in 2013 as we seek to address the shortfall in 2014.

Finally, while this should be the case for all of our spending priorities, I want to note that this package includes a full defense appropriations bill that provides DOD with the funding for programs it needs. I am particularly pleased that the bill provides funding to build two Virginia-class submarines in FY 2013 and to purchase equipment for two submarines in FY 2014, which will ensure that we will have the capital resources and workforce in place to move forward. This also retains thousands of good paying jobs for highly skilled workers in my State and elsewhere.

There is much to comment on about the tough choices we have had to make in this bill and the sequester cuts that loom over every discretionary program. Given the very challenging circumstances we face, Chairwoman MIKULSKI has done her best to craft a bill that can clear the Senate and hopefully get to the President's desk so that we can avoid a government shutdown, which would be even more disastrous.

TRIBAL SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. FRANKEN. Madam President, I rise today to discuss tribal school construction funding—an issue that is central to the academic wellbeing and intellectual development of tribal children across the country.

It goes without saying that all kids need clean, safe places to study.

And making sure that every child gets a good education, in a safe, clean environment will benefit our economy and our society as a whole. Unfortunately, many Indian kids attending

schools run by the Bureau of Indian Education are forced to study in aging facilities that should be replaced.

As Senators, we have responsibilities to all children in our States to ensure that they all have access to safe and clean school buildings. The Federal Government has a particular responsibility to the tribes that includes taking care of tribal schools. That is why I offered an amendment to the continuing resolution with Senators TOM UDALL, TIM JOHNSON, KLOBUCHAR, HEITKAMP, and HEINRICH, to secure funding for tribal school buildings that need to be replaced.

In these times of tight budgets, everyone is making sacrifices. Programs across the Federal Government are forced to make difficult cuts and to do more with less. School construction is one small but vital program that I believe should continue to be funded. I was disappointed that the administration's fiscal year 2013 budget did not include funding for Indian school replacement construction.

I ask the Senator if it would be fair to say that the absence of funding for tribal school construction replacement in this CR should not be seen as a lack of support for this activity in future appropriations bills?

Mr. REED. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. FRANKEN. The continuing resolution we are now considering is needed to get us through the last 6 months of this fiscal year. It is my hope that as we return to a more regular appropriations process for fiscal year 2014, we can refocus on this important priority to support Indian school construction. I ask the Senator, would he be willing to work with me and our colleagues on that?

Mr. REED. Yes, I will welcome the opportunity to work with the Senator and our colleagues here in the Senate on priority needs within the Interior bill, including American Indian and Alaska Native health and education issues, to the extent possible given the overall budget constraints we face.

Mr. FRANKEN. I thank the Senator for committing to work with us.

WEATHERIZATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Mr. REED. Madam President, I would ask my colleague, Senator MIKULSKI, Chairwoman of the Appropriations Committee, if she would join me and our colleague Senator COLLINS in a colloquy on the Weatherization Assistance Program.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I would be pleased to join my colleagues.

Mr. REED. I thank the Chairwoman.

I know a major reason that the Chairwoman wants to get back to regular order is that continuing resolutions are blunt instruments that do not allow for the adjustments for specific programs. One place where that has played out is in the Energy and Water Development bill, specifically with respect to the Weatherization Assistance Program.

I know the chairwoman has long supported the weatherization program, which helps provide energy efficient retrofits to low-income individuals and families. It also provides jobs, which is so important given the continuing challenges in our economy.

President Obama described the program this way in an interview in 2009, "[y]ou're getting a three-fer. Not only are you immediately putting people back to work but you're also saving families on [their] energy bills and you're laying the groundwork for long-term energy independence. That's exactly the kind of program that we should be funding."

Under the Recovery Act, we made a one-time investment of \$5 billion in this program, which has historically received \$175 to \$200 million in annual appropriations. As the program worked through this infusion, funding for the regular program was temporarily scaled back. In FY 2013, funding for the program will be only \$68 million even before the sequester is applied. Since there will no longer be carry-over funds available, there will not be enough funding to mount a viable program in all 50 States. That is regrettable, particularly when the Senate bill contained \$145 million, \$6 million more than the budget request. It is also counterproductive to our goals to create jobs and increase energy efficiency.

I would ask the Chairwoman if she would work with us and the Department of Energy to find ways to sustain the program through appropriate reprogramming so that it does not cease to be a 50-State program. I would also ask if she would work with us in fiscal year 2014 to see how we can support this important initiative. Before I yield to the Chairwoman to respond, I would ask Senator COLLINS if she would like to comment.

Ms. COLLINS. I would like to echo Senator REED's comments and thank the Chairwoman for her support of the Weatherization Assistance Program.

This program is currently facing significant funding challenges and its viability in many States is threatened. Weatherization plays an important role in permanently reducing home energy costs for low-income families and seniors, lessening our reliance on foreign oil, and training a skilled workforce. The current funding level represents a substantial reduction for the program, and the ability of the program to continue to deliver services is in serious jeopardy.

I too would like to ask the Chairwoman if she would work with us and the Department of Energy to find ways to sustain the program through appropriate reprogramming, so that low-income families and seniors in every State can continue to receive the energy savings from the weatherization of their homes.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I thank the Senators for their comments and would be pleased to work with them on this important issue and ways to maintain a 50-State weatherization program.

Mr. REED. I thank the Chairwoman for that response. I look forward to working with her, Senator COLLINS, and others to support this program in fiscal year 2013 and during the fiscal year 2014 funding cycle.

PLANT PROTECTION ACT

Mr. TESTER. Madam President, I wish to engage my colleague, Chairwoman MIKULSKI, in a colloquy. I thank the Senator for her important work in bringing this bill to the Senate.

However, I would like clarification on Section 735 of Division A of the bill. This provision requires that the Secretary of Agriculture, if requested, issue temporary permits or temporary deregulation in the event a genetically engineered crop deregulation is set aside or vacated as unlawful. As you know, I oppose this provision and have deep concerns about its impact. I wish to confirm my understanding, even though this provision does not operate through a restriction of funds in this act, it is in effect only for the duration of the continuing resolution.

Ms. MIKULSKI. The Senator is correct.

Mr. TESTER. I thank the Senator.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

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

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

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that at 11:15 a.m. tomorrow, all postcloture time on the Mikulski-Shelby substitute amendment be considered expired, the Durbin second-degree amendment to 115 be withdrawn with no other second-degree amendment in order; that the Senate proceed to vote in relation to the Toomey amendment No. 115; that upon disposition of the Toomey amendment, the Senate then proceed to vote on the Mikulski-Shelby substitute amendment, as amended; that upon disposition of the substitute amendment, the Senate proceed to the cloture vote on the underlying bill; finally, if cloture is invoked, the 30 hours postcloture begin to run as if cloture were invoked at 1 a.m. on Wednesday, March 20.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

REMEMBERING LAWRENCE E. NEWMAN

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, the enduring imprint of a life well lived is the positive impact one has on those closest to them. The way you live your life and the people you touch along the way speak convincingly long after we are gone. Such is the case with Lawrence Newman. By all accounts, he was a loving husband and family man; a strong Christian who devoted much of his time to his church, Hartford Memorial Baptist; and a proud Postal employee for more than 30 years. It is with this in mind that Senator STABENOW and I celebrate his life.

Lawrence Newman was a Detroit native through and through. He was born on May 22, 1935, in Detroit and spent much of his life there. He graduated from Cass Tech in Detroit in 1957 and then went on to study at the University of Detroit. Soon after, he was drafted into the Army and served his Nation honorably until his discharge in 1964.

After serving his country, Lawrence secured employment with the U.S. Postal Service. He would go on to spend three decades helping to ensure the Postal Service continues to meet its obligation to provide efficient service to the people of Detroit and Michigan. In addition to working for the Postal Service, Mr. Newman served as a member of the board of directors of the Detroit Postal Employee Credit Union and of the National Association of Postal Supervisors for many years.

It is clear Lawrence Newman held his Christian beliefs dear. He not only spent four decades as a member of Hartford Memorial, he also served on Hartford Memorial's board of trustees, eventually earning the distinction of trustee emeritus, and as the church's official photographer.

And so we take this moment to remember Lawrence Newman. He leaves behind a wonderful family, including his loving wife of 51 years, Shirley Jane, and 2 sons, David and Daryl. He will be dearly missed, and Senator STABENOW and I are honored to recognize a man who has meant so much.

TRIBUTE TO MELISSA DORE

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I rise today in celebration of my staff member, Melissa Dore, who is retiring after working with me throughout most of my years in the U.S. Senate.

Melissa started as a staff member in my East Lansing office and immediately impressed us with her ability to connect with people when they called. Hers was often the first voice constituents heard when contacting me and her natural ability to be compassionate and empathetic made their first impression a good one.

Melissa's compassion and tenacity made her a natural choice to work with those who contacted me for help with their Social Security or Medicare benefits. Time and time again, I have seen her go to bat for people and get answers about their cases and resolve very tough problems. Melissa is someone who cares deeply and her commitment shows in the results she gets for people. There probably isn't a week that goes by where we do not receive a thank you note or I don't get stopped by someone who tells me about the difference her advocacy has made.

My staff and I will miss her presence in the office and her passion for helping others. I also know that the many families in Michigan whose lives she touched as well as those she worked with in agencies and in my office will miss her.

After leaving the Senate, Melissa looks forward to spending more time with her family and dogs, traveling and going to her cottage in Northern Michigan. She is very creative and I know her passion for quilting will result in many beautiful creations.

I am sad because I am losing a valued member of my staff, but I am happy to see her move on to new life experiences, and I wish her the best of everything.

RECOGNIZING PRICE OF FREEDOM MUSEUM

Mr. BURR. Madam President, I rise today to recognize the Price of Freedom Museum in China Grove, NC. The Price of Freedom Museum strives to pay tribute to those Americans who have made the ultimate sacrifice in the fight for freedom.

Bob Mault began collecting and preserving uniforms and military artifacts from all branches of the armed forces more than 40 years ago. These artifacts were first showcased in Mr. Mault's gas station in the 1970s, with the hope that others who saw these artifacts might be able to truly understand the price of freedom.

Thanks to the efforts of Mr. Mault's friend Frank Albright, many volunteers and donations, these military artifacts have now found a home at the Old Patterson School Complex, and I understand the historical collection now consists of more than 5,000 military artifacts—each representing a very unique and individual story. This collection now provides an educational and patriotic experience for all who see it.

It is always inspiring to hear of the efforts made by American citizens to pay tribute and give life to the stories

of those who have made the ultimate sacrifice in service to their country. We must always endeavor to remember those who have died so that we may live in freedom.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING VICTIMS FROM CALIFORNIA'S PUBLIC SAFETY COMMUNITY

• Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, today I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Jeremiah MacKay, Michael Crain, Monica Quan, and Keith Lawrence—four extraordinary members of Southern California's public safety community who were tragically killed by the same deranged gunman. It is heartbreaking to lose these brave heroes, who dedicated their lives to protecting our families and our communities.

Jeremiah MacKay, a San Bernardino County sheriff's deputy, was a 14-year veteran of the force. He served at the Yucaipa sheriff's station and was a bagpiper and officer in the Inland Empire Emerald Society, which provides financial assistance for the families of fallen law enforcement officers. A native of San Bernardino and a graduate of Rim of the World High School in Lake Arrowhead, Jeremiah was a proud husband and father known for his love of family and his infectious laugh.

Michael Crain was a Riverside police officer who served as a patrol officer and a member of the Special Weapons and Tactics, SWAT, Team. During his 11-year tenure with the Riverside City Police Department, Officer Crain also served on the University Neighborhood Enhancement Team and as a Helicopter Observer, Field Training Officer, and Firearms Instructor. A decorated retired Marine sergeant, Officer Cain is remembered by his colleagues as a consummate family man who loved nothing more than coaching his son's baseball team or attending his daughter's dance recitals.

Monica Quan was the daughter of attorney Randal Quan, a former captain with the Los Angeles Police Department who had represented the shooter during his unsuccessful appeal of dismissal from the Los Angeles Police Department. Monica, a former high school and college basketball star, was the assistant women's basketball coach at California State University, Fullerton.

Keith Lawrence, Monica Quan's fiancé, was a public safety officer at the University of Southern California who had attended the Ventura County Sheriff's Academy and trained with the Oxnard Police Department. He and Monica met when both played basketball at Concordia University, and they had recently become engaged.

On behalf of the people of California, whom they served with such valor and distinction, I send my deepest condolences to the families and friends of

Jeremiah MacKay, Michael Crain, Monica Quan, and Keith Lawrence.●

REMEMBERING LORAN BAKER
AND ELIZABETH BUTLER

● Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, today I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Loran “Butch” Baker and Elizabeth Butler, two members of the Santa Cruz Police Department who were recently killed in the line of duty. These extraordinary officers dedicated their lives to their family, community, and Nation. Their courage and dedication inspired all who were lucky enough to know them, and they will be deeply missed.

A 28-year veteran of the Santa Cruz Police Department, Detective Sergeant Baker was one of the most experienced and respected officers in Santa Cruz. He loved his job and served as a friend and mentor to many Central Coast law enforcement officials, including his son, Adam, who in 2010 joined the department as a community service officer. Detective Sergeant Baker was in turn inspired by his son, noting that he saw in Adam glimpses of himself when he had first started police work. Father and son relished working together. Adam called his dad “Sarge” at work, and the two had mailboxes next to each other marked “Baker” and “A. Baker.”

Detective Sergeant Baker, a graduate of San Jose’s Bellarmine College Preparatory and Fresno City College, patrolled Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz’s downtown strip and he was easy to spot. As one friend noted, “Even in the dead of winter, he always wore his signature shorts.” Detective Sergeant Baker also worked in community services and hostage negotiations, served as a field training officer, and was one of the founding members of the DUI Enforcement Team. He was well known for his fantastic sense of humor, his infectious laugh, and his commitment to the community that loved him so much.

Detective Butler, a 10-year veteran of the Santa Cruz Police Department, grew up in Los Angeles and moved to Santa Cruz in 1992 to attend UC Santa Cruz, where she graduated as a community studies major. Filled with idealism and a passion for helping others, she first focused her talents on community development lending with the nonprofit Opportunity Fund and then Wells Fargo Bank, before settling into her career with the Santa Cruz Police Department. During her tenure, she worked as a patrol officer, hostage negotiator, downtown foot and bike officer, and agent assigned to the Santa Cruz County drug task force.

Detective Butler dearly loved living and working in Santa Cruz. She savored the morning buns rolled in sugar from Kelly’s French Bakery and the sweeping views of Santa Cruz from atop a roller coaster at the Santa Cruz Beach Boardwalk. “I enjoy living and working in Santa Cruz because one can enjoy the ocean, the mountains, inter-

esting people, and a healthy lifestyle all in one spot,” she once wrote. Detective Butler was known by friends and family as warm, caring, and funny. Above all, she loved spending time with her partner and two young sons.

On behalf of the people of California, whom they served so valiantly, I extend my deepest sympathies to Detective Sergeant Baker’s wife, Kelly, and three children, Adam, Ashley, and Jillian; Detective Butler’s partner, Peter, and two sons, Joaquin and Stellan; and their extended families, colleagues, and friends.●

REMEMBERING ALBERT “CAP”
LAVIN

● Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the memory of Albert “Cap” Lavin, a high school and college basketball star, dedicated English teacher, and loving husband, father, and grandfather. Cap passed away on February 10, 2013 at the age of 82.

Cap Lavin was a San Francisco Bay Area native through and through. Growing up in San Francisco’s Richmond District, Cap played pickup basketball games at Rochambeau Playground before becoming a star player and All-City guard on St. Ignatius College Preparatory’s basketball team. He was so good that he was named St. Ignatius’s player of the decade for the 1940s. He continued to hone his basketball skills at the University of San Francisco, where he played for two Hall of Fame coaches in the early 1950s and was later inducted into the USF Dons Hall of Fame.

Following college, Cap turned his love of reading into a 43-year-long career as an English teacher at the University of California Berkeley, San Francisco State University, Dominican University, and Drake High School in San Anselmo, his true home, where he taught English for 40 of those 43 years. Though his students at Drake kept him busy, Cap also found the time to author 19 books and co-found the Bay Area Writing Project at UC Berkeley. After inspiring generations of students, Cap retired from Drake in 1997.

In retirement, Cap and his wife, Mary, enjoyed exploring the Bay Area, hiking, biking, taking tai chi classes, and going to the opera, the symphony, and lectures in San Francisco. Those who knew Cap will always remember him as a generous, inspiring, and passionate man full of zest for life. His contributions to the sports world, academia, and the San Francisco Bay Area community will never be forgotten.

I extend my deepest condolences to Cap’s loving wife, Mary; his children Rachel, John, Mark, Ken, Suzanne, and Steve; and his many grandchildren.●

TRIBUTE TO MAJOR NATHAN
KLINE, RETIRED

● Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I wish to acknowledge the remarkable life-

time commitment of a Pennsylvania constituent to our Nation’s security and veteran community. Maj. Nathan Kline, United States Air Force, Ret., has a total of 42 years of active and ready reserve service. His military career began at the age of 18 when he enlisted in the U.S. Army Air Forces in November 1942. During the war, he served as a B-26 Marauder bombardier and navigator who saw action during the D-day Invasion and the Battle of the Bulge. Serving on 65 missions, his aircraft was shot down twice. His actions during the war earned him a Distinguished Flying Cross, 10 Air Medals, and 4 Battle Stars for the European-African-Middle Eastern Campaign Medal. Years later, the French Ambassador would welcome Major Kline into the Legion of Honour as recognition to his endeavors that contributed to the liberation of the people of France.

After experiencing war firsthand, no one would have blamed Major Kline if he had withdrawn from service to live a quiet life in peace. Instead, he remained active in the military and continues to work hard to promote a society that respects its veterans and the sacrifices that they have made. Even in his advanced age, he continues to serve as an advocate on behalf of veterans and their families. As a founding member of the Lehigh Valley Military Affairs Council, LVMAC, he has raised money and created scholarships to help the families of those deployed, organized the assembly and shipment of care packages to deployed servicemembers, and assisted veterans in finding meaningful employment.

Major Kline helps veterans of all generations. He fights for the well-being of today’s veterans and recognizes the challenges they face, including PTSD and TBI. Our veterans have paid a high price for our American ideals and freedom. Major Kline has never forgotten what he fought for when he enlisted in the service over 70 years ago. The reason why he fought for his country above the skies of Normandy is the same reason why the young servicemember today fights for his Nation in the hills and mountains of Afghanistan. I cannot express this sentiment any better than Major Kline when he said, “the Greatest Generation will always be embodied in the hearts, minds, and souls of whoever our fighting troops are and wherever they might be.”

I share the story of Major Kline not just because of his heroic actions during the Second World War, but also because of his continued commitment to service. The commitment that a member of our military makes is usually not limited to service during war, but is often for life. Major Kline is a shining example of these principles.

Sequestration and budgetary constraints threaten our defense budget and our support for veterans. We as a nation must ensure that we do not drastically affect the pay, medical care, and family programs of our active, reserve, and retired veterans.

These men and women have served us before, and if Major Kline is any indication, they will continue to serve our communities for generations to come. For this reason and many others, we owe it to our Nation to ensure that our veterans are always supported and never forgotten.●

REMEMBERING MARIELLA POSEY

● Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I would like to pay tribute to an inspired community leader, a passionate political activist and a tireless public servant to the great State of Washington, Ms. Mariella Posey.

Mariella was born June 23, 1936, in Hammond, IN. She was a graduate of Northwestern University, where she took night classes during her 20-year tenure working at World Book in downtown Chicago.

In 1984, Mariella's passion for politics took flight when she began volunteering with Paul Simon's campaign for the U.S. Senate. After a successful election, Mariella packed her bags and moved to Washington, D.C. where she served in the newly minted Illinois Senator's office until December 1996.

Then, in November 1997, Mariella joined my staff as our office manager, where she served the people of the Evergreen State for 12 excellent years until 2009. In the office, she was best known for her meticulous oversight of the budget while relying on her trusty typewriter and adding machine.

However, what she may be most remembered for was her steadfast commitment to the city of Alexandria, serving on the NorthEast Citizens' Association since 1986 and on the board since 1991. Mariella also served as NECA's co-secretary, co-treasurer, co-chair of the Land Use Committee, vice president and as their president. She took on issues large and small—including the location of a new stadium for the Washington Nationals and the Potomac River coal plant.

While she lived a private life, Mariella was not shy about her love for her cats and dogs and could always be found in front of the television at three o'clock watching her favorite show, *As the World Turns*.

Mariella passed away on Jan. 28, 2013 at the age of 76. She is survived by her long-time friend and roommate, Sylvia Sibover. She will be missed dearly by not only myself, but by my staff—both former and current.

I would like to ask my colleagues to join me in paying homage to Mariella Posey. She lived a long and full life and I will always be grateful for her service in the U.S. Senate.●

REMEMBERING FRED KARL

● Mr. NELSON. Madam President, last week the State of Florida lost a dear friend, Fred Karl. I was honored to be asked by Fred's family to participate in his service and would like to share with you what I shared with them:

Listen to what some of the people of Florida have said about Fred Karl. . . .

"His word was his bond. . . ."

"No one questioned his integrity. . . ."

"He was always helping others. . . ."

"He was a legislative reformer who fought but genuinely liked his nemesis, Senator Dempsey Barron. . . ."

"He was idealistic, but a realist. . . ."

These are the thoughts of Floridians who knew and loved Fred Karl and appreciate his exceptional public service.

His smooth, lilting baritone belied the fact that he was a tank commander in World War II in the fierce Battle of the Bulge.

He ran for Governor—as a champion of education—but he couldn't amass the funds to beat Haydon Burns. Education was a passion. No wonder. His mother, Mary Karl, was an educator. Her school, Mary Karl's Vocational School, later became the community college and today is Daytona Beach State College.

He almost died because of medical mistakes in a hospital. The irony was later, when another hospital got into trouble; it was Fred who rescued them.

He was a smart savvy lawyer for almost everyone, more often than not turning around their near destruction toward success.

When Hillsborough County called upon Fred to be their attorney, he was able to restore honesty and integrity to a local government that had suffered from the corruption of its commissioners and judges.

He has been a blessing to the people of Tampa Bay—just as he has been a blessing to the people of Florida while serving in the Legislature and then on the High Court.

I remember Fred running for our state's Supreme Court.

At the time he was campaigning for himself, he was also promoting a constitutional amendment to have justices appointed instead of elected.

He later recalled "on one hand, I was saying please elect me to the court, [on the other] I was saying vote for the amendment that does away with this election." To Fred, it was demeaning to see our judges out there raising campaign money.

He would later say: "Here was somebody aspiring to sit on the Florida Supreme Court and making decisions about life and death and about constitutional matters. . . . and I was out glad-handing and back-slapping like I was running for dog catcher."

Well there's no doubt, Fred Karl was rare. And he always saw public service as one of the highest callings.

He was a public servant we could trust—a man who personified honesty and integrity. . . .

So much so, his counsel was sought from the governor's mansion to the mayors' offices to the suites of Florida's newspaper publishers.

"There's no higher form of public service than the honest practice of politics," Fred said.

And Fred practiced what he preached!

And in so doing, he made a magnificent and cherished contribution to Florida's history.

To so many of us here today, he was our friend. He was our confidant.

But above all he was a devoted husband; a loving father; and, a beloved grandfather and great-grandfather.

May the family be granted strength to bear their loss. And let all of us all be forever grateful that Fred Karl touched our lives.●

SOUTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY JACKRABBITS

● Mr. THUNE. Madam President, today I wish to honor the South Dakota

State University men's and women's basketball teams on winning their respective 2013 Summit League Championships. This marks the Jackrabbits fifth consecutive women's Summit League Title and the men's basketball team's second consecutive Summit League Title. The Jackrabbits are also the only team in Division I to have both their men's and women's teams repeat as conference tournament champions this year.

The SDSU women's basketball team has a long history of success, including winning all five Summit League Tournaments since moving up to NCAA Division I. South Dakota State University, which concluded the regular season with a 22-7 overall record, won the Summit League Conference with a 14-2 record. With the tournament victory the Jackrabbits will go to their fifth NCAA Tournament in as many years.

Certainly, this successful season would not have been possible without the hard work of the players. The members of the 2012-2013 South Dakota State University women's basketball team are: Anne Aamlid, Gabrielle Boever, Mariah Clarin, Chloe Cornemann, Leah Dietel, Ashley Eide, Jessica Hart, Tara Heiser, Katie Lingle, Steph Paluch, Hannah Strop, Megan Stuart, Rachel Walters, and Megan Waytashek.

Although this accomplishment was truly a team effort, I would like to pay special recognition to their coach Aaron Johnston, who in his 13th season recorded his 300th win and became SDSU's all-time winning head coach. Coach Johnston's current record is 315-106. I also would like to congratulate assistant coaches Katie Falco, Mike Jewett, and Carissa Nord.

The SDSU men's basketball team has seen much recent success of its own. The Jacks posted a regular season record of 22-9 en route to its first regular season Summit League Conference championship, with a conference record of 13-3. Also, following a 73-67 win over rival North Dakota State University in the tournament championship, the Jacks have reached the NCAA tournament for the second year in a row.

SDSU's successful season could not have been possible without the dedication and determination of the players. The members of the 2012-2013 South Dakota men's basketball team are: Jake Bittle, Brayden Carlson, Connor Devine, Matt Donlan, Jordan Dykstra, Joey Feilmeier, Tony Fiegen, Marcus Heemstra, Zach Horstman, Cory Jacobsen, Taévaunn Prince, Ruben Silva, Chad White, Joshua White, and Nate Wolters.

Finally, I would like to congratulate Coach Scott Nagy on winning his first Summit League Conference regular season title as well as his second consecutive tournament championship as head coach of the Jackrabbits. I also would like to congratulate assistant coaches Brian Cooley, Austin Hansen, Rob Klinkefus and graduate assistant Nick Goff.

The coaches and student athletes of SDSU's men's and women's basketball team should be very proud of all of their remarkable achievements this season. On behalf of the State of South Dakota, I am honored to congratulate the Jackrabbits on their impressive seasons and wish them the best of luck in the NCAA Tournaments. Go Jacks!•

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:23 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 18. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers' Memorial Service.

H. Con. Res. 19. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby.

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-831. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "U.S. Department of Transportation's Report to Congress and the National Transportation Safety Board Responding to Issues on the National Transportation Safety Board's 2013 Most Wanted List"; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-832. A communication from the Director of Industry Analysis, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Steel Import Monitoring and Analysis System" (RIN0625-AA93) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-833. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Anchorage; Captain of the Port Puget Sound Zone, WA" ((RIN1625-AA01) (Docket No. USCG-2012-0159)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-834. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Artificial Island Anchorage No. 2 Partial Closure, Delaware River; Salem, NJ" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0032)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-835. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Updates to Standards Incorporated by Reference; Reapproved ASTM Standards; Technical Amendment" ((RIN1625-AB98) (Docket No. USCG-2012-0866)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-836. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Inland Waterways Navigation Regulation; Sacramento River" ((RIN1625-AB95) (Docket No. USCG-2012-0952)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-837. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulated Navigation Area; Reporting Requirements for Barges Loaded With Certain Dangerous Cargoes, Inland Rivers, Ninth Coast Guard District; Stay (Suspension)" ((RIN1625-AA11) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0019)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-838. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulated Navigation Area; Housatonic River, Bridge Replacement Operations; Stratford, CT" ((RIN1625-AA11) (Docket No. USCG-2012-0824)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-839. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Security Zone, Potomac and Anacostia Rivers; Washington, DC" ((RIN1625-AA87) (Docket No. USCG-2012-0938)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-840. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; MODU KULLUK; Sitkalidak Island to Kiliuda Bay, Alaska" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2012-1088)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-841. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Grain-Shipments Vessels, Columbia and Willamette Rivers" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0010)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-842. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant

to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Woldenburg Park, Mississippi River, New Orleans, LA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2012-1013)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-843. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Long Island, New York Inland Waterway from East Rockaway Inlet to Shinnecock Canal, NY" ((RIN1625-AA09) (Docket No. USCG-2012-1040)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-844. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Indian Street Bridge Construction, St. Lucie Canal, Palm City, FL" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2012-0828)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-845. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Pacific Northwest Grain Handlers Association Facilities; Columbia and Willamette Rivers" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0011)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-846. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Bridge Demolition Project; Indiana Harbor Canal, East Chicago, Indiana" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2012-0904)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-847. A communication from the Acting Principal Deputy Secretary of Defense (Reserve Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, a notification of a delay in the completion of a report relative to the Fiscal Year 2014 National Guard and Reserve Equipment Appropriation (NGREA) procurement; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-848. A communication from the Associate Director, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Iranian Financial Sanctions Regulations; Final Rule" (31 CFR Part 561) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2012; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-849. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a notice of the continuation of the national emergency with respect to Somalia that was declared in Executive Order 13536 of April 12, 2010; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-850. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a semiannual report detailing telecommunications-related payments made to Cuba pursuant to Department of the Treasury licenses; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-851. A communication from the Chair of the Medicaid and CHIP Payment Access Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report to Congress on

Medicaid and CHIP"; to the Committee on Finance.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, for the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

*Mary Jo White of New York, to be a Member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 5, 2014.

*Richard Cordray of Ohio, to be Director, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection for a term of five years.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

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. TESTER (for himself and Mr. WICKER):

S. 602. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the participation of physical therapists in the National Health Service Corps Loan Repayment Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. JOHANNIS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. BURR, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. COATS, Mr. ISAKSON, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mr. WICKER):

S. 603. A bill to repeal the annual fee on health insurance providers enacted by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HELLER (for himself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 604. A bill to recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel, to relocate to Jerusalem the United States Embassy in Israel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND:

S. 605. A bill to improve Federal dairy programs; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. ENZI):

S. 606. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the rules relating to loans made from a qualified employer plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. LEE):

S. 607. A bill to improve the provisions relating to the privacy of electronic communications; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARDIN:

S. 608. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act and title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to improve coverage for colorectal screening tests under Medicare and private health insurance coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 609. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land

in San Juan County, New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. JOHANNIS (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BURR, Mr. WICKER, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. 610. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to repeal certain limitations on health care benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 611. A bill to make a technical amendment to the Tuf Shur Bien Preservation Trust Area Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 612. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to remove social security account numbers from Medicare identification cards and communications provided to Medicare beneficiaries in order to protect Medicare beneficiaries from identity theft; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BEGICH (for himself and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 613. A bill to increase the mileage reimbursement rate for members of the armed services during permanent change of station and to authorize the transportation of additional motor vehicles of members on change of permanent station to or from nonforeign areas outside the continental United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. COONS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. 614. A bill to require the continuation of tuition assistance programs for members of the Armed Forces for the remainder of fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL:

S. 615. A bill to establish Coltsville National Historical Park in the State of Connecticut, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. MORAN, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 616. A bill to provide incentives to physicians to practice in rural and medically underserved communities and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 617. A bill to provide humanitarian assistance and support a democratic transition in Syria, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. Res. 80. A resolution expressing support for the designation of March 2013 as "National Middle Level Education Month"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. JOHANNIS (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. DONNELLY, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. COONS):

S. Res. 81. A resolution commemorating March 19, 2013, as the 40th anniversary of National Ag Day; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. Con. Res. 9. A concurrent resolution recommending the posthumous award of the Medal of Honor to Sergeant Rafael Peralta; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 20

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 20, a bill to repeal the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act.

S. 109

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 109, a bill to preserve open competition and Federal Government neutrality towards the labor relations of Federal Government contractors on Federal and federally funded construction projects.

S. 132

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 132, a bill to provide for the admission of the State of New Columbia into the Union.

S. 192

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 192, a bill to enhance the energy security of United States allies, and for other purposes.

S. 232

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 232, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices.

S. 296

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) were added as cosponsors of S. 296, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate discrimination in the immigration laws by permitting permanent partners of United States citizens and lawful permanent residents to obtain lawful permanent resident status in the same manner as spouses of citizens and lawful permanent residents and to penalize immigration fraud in connection with permanent partnerships.

S. 330

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 330, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish safeguards and standards of quality for research and transplantation of organs infected with human immunodeficiency virus (HIV).

S. 336

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from South Carolina

(Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 336, a bill to restore States' sovereign rights to enforce State and local sales and use tax laws, and for other purposes.

S. 344

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 344, a bill to prohibit the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from approving the introduction into commerce of gasoline that contains greater than 10-volume-percent ethanol, and for other purposes.

S. 357

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 357, a bill to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty.

S. 370

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 370, a bill to improve and expand geographic literacy among kindergarten through grade 12 students in the United States by improving professional development programs for kindergarten through grade 12 teachers offered through institutions of higher education.

S. 395

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 395, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to provide further protection for puppies.

S. 411

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 411, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 419

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 419, a bill to limit the use of cluster munitions.

S. 427

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 427, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to provide flexibility to school food authorities in meeting certain nutritional requirements for the school lunch and breakfast programs, and for other purposes.

S. 470

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota

(Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 470, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require that the Purple Heart occupy a position of precedence above the new Distinguished Warfare Medal.

S. 554

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) were added as cosponsors of S. 554, a bill to provide for a biennial budget process and a biennial appropriations process and to enhance oversight and the performance of the Federal Government.

S. 579

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

S. 582

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 582, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

S. 597

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 597, a bill to ensure the effective administration of criminal justice.

S. CON. RES. 6

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 6, a concurrent resolution supporting the Local Radio Freedom Act.

S. CON. RES. 7

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 7, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding conditions for the United States becoming a signatory to the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty, or to any similar agreement on the arms trade.

S. RES. 60

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 60, a resolution supporting women's reproductive health.

S. RES. 65

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the names of the Senator from New Hamp-

shire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 65, a resolution strongly supporting the full implementation of United States and international sanctions on Iran and urging the President to continue to strengthen enforcement of sanctions legislation.

AMENDMENT NO. 55

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 55 intended to be proposed to H.R. 933, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and other departments and agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 74

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 74 intended to be proposed to H.R. 933, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and other departments and agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 82

At the request of Mr. JOHANNIS, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 82 intended to be proposed to H.R. 933, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and other departments and agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. MORAN, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 82 intended to be proposed to H.R. 933, supra.

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 82 intended to be proposed to H.R. 933, supra.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. LEE):

S. 607. A bill to improve the provisions relating to the privacy of electronic communications; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today I am pleased to introduce the Electronic Communications Privacy Act Amendments Act of 2013—a bill to strengthen the privacy protections for email and other electronic communications. Last year, the Judiciary Committee favorably reported substantially similar legislation with strong bipartisan support. I thank Republican Senator MIKE LEE for cosponsoring this important privacy bill. Senator LEE and I understand that protecting Americans' privacy rights is something that is important to all Americans, regardless of political party or ideology. I hope that all Senators will support this bill and that

the Senate will pass this privacy legislation this year.

Like many Americans, I am concerned about growing and unwelcome intrusions into our private lives in cyberspace. I also understand that we must update our digital privacy laws to keep pace with these threats and the rapid advances in technology.

When I led the effort to write ECPA 27 years ago, email was a novelty. No one could have imagined the way the Internet and mobile technologies would transform how we communicate and exchange information today. Three decades later, we must update this law to reflect the realities of our time, so that our Federal privacy laws keep pace with American innovation and the changing mission of our law enforcement agencies.

My bill takes several important steps to improve Americans' digital privacy rights, while also promoting new technologies, like cloud computing, and accommodating the legitimate needs of law enforcement. First, the bill requires that the government obtain a search warrant based on probable cause to obtain the content of Americans' email and other electronic communications, when those communications are requested from a third-party service provider. There are balanced exceptions to the warrant requirement to address emergency circumstances and to protect national security under current law.

Second, the bill requires that the government promptly notify any individual whose email content has been accessed via a third-party service provider, and provide that individual with a copy of the search warrant and other details about the information obtained. The bill permits the government to seek a court order temporarily delaying such notice in order to protect the integrity of ongoing government investigations. In addition, the bill permits the government to ask a court to temporarily preclude a service provider from notifying a customer about the disclosure.

The bill contains several important provisions to ensure that the reforms to ECPA do not hinder law enforcement. The bill adds a new notice requirement to the law that requires service providers to notify the government of their intent to inform a customer about a disclosure of electronic communications information at least three business days before giving such notice. Furthermore, to help law enforcement investigate and prosecute corporate wrongdoing, the bill adds civil discovery subpoenas to the existing tools that the government may use to obtain non-content information under ECPA.

In addition, the bill makes clear that the government may also continue to use administrative, civil discovery and grand jury subpoena to obtain corporate email and other electronic communications directly from a corporate entity, when those communications are

contained on an internal email system. Lastly, the bill also provides that the search warrant requirement in the bill does not apply to other Federal criminal or national security laws, including Title III of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1986, commonly known as the Wiretap Act, and the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, 50 U.S.C. § 1801, et seq., commonly known as FISA.

Since I first put forward proposals to update ECPA in early 2011, I have worked to make sure that these updates carefully balance privacy interests, the needs of law enforcement and the interests of our thriving American tech sector. During the past 2 years, I have consulted with many stakeholders from the Federal, state and local law enforcement communities, including—the Department of Justice, the Federal Trade Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, the Association of State Criminal Investigative Agencies, and the National Sheriffs Association. I have also consulted closely with many leaders in the privacy, civil liberties, civil rights and technology communities who support these reforms.

The 113th Congress has an important opportunity to address the digital privacy challenges that Americans face today. We should do so by enacting the commonsense privacy reforms contained in this bill.

When the Senate Judiciary Committee favorably reported the Electronic Communications Privacy Act on September 19, 1986, it did so with the unanimous support of all Democratic and Republican Senators. At the time, the Committee recognized that protecting Americans' privacy rights should not be a partisan issue.

In that bipartisan spirit, I am pleased to join with Senator LEE in urging the Congress to enact these important privacy reforms without delay. Senator LEE and I are joined in this effort by a broad coalition of more than 50 privacy, civil liberties, civil rights and tech industry leaders from across the political spectrum that have also endorsed the ECPA reform effort. I thank the Digital Due Process Coalition, the Digital 4th Coalition and the many other individuals and organizations that have advocated for ECPA reform for their support. I hope that all Members of the Senate will follow their example, so that we can enact this digital privacy bill with strong, bipartisan support.

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. 607

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 "Electronic Communications Privacy Act Amendments Act of 2013".

SEC. 2. CONFIDENTIALITY OF ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS.

Section 2702(a)(3) of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(3) a provider of remote computing service or electronic communication service to the public shall not knowingly divulge to any governmental entity the contents of any communication described in section 2703(a), or any record or other information pertaining to a subscriber or customer of such service."

SEC. 3. ELIMINATION OF 180-DAY RULE; SEARCH WARRANT REQUIREMENT; REQUIRED DISCLOSURE OF CUSTOMER RECORDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2703 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subsections (a), (b), and (c) and inserting the following:

"(a) CONTENTS OF WIRE OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS.—A governmental entity may require the disclosure by a provider of electronic communication service or remote computing service of the contents of a wire or electronic communication that is in electronic storage with or otherwise stored, held, or maintained by the provider only if the governmental entity obtains a warrant issued using the procedures described in the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure (or, in the case of a State court, issued using State warrant procedures) that is issued by a court of competent jurisdiction directing the disclosure.

"(b) NOTICE.—Except as provided in section 2705, not later than 10 business days in the case of a law enforcement agency, or not later than 3 business days in the case of any other governmental entity, after a governmental entity receives the contents of a wire or electronic communication of a subscriber or customer from a provider of electronic communication service or remote computing service under subsection (a), the governmental entity shall serve upon, or deliver to by registered or first-class mail, electronic mail, or other means reasonably calculated to be effective, as specified by the court issuing the warrant, the subscriber or customer—

"(1) a copy of the warrant; and

"(2) a notice that includes the information referred to in clauses (i) and (ii) of section 2705(a)(4)(B).

"(c) RECORDS CONCERNING ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION SERVICE OR REMOTE COMPUTING SERVICE.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), a governmental entity may require a provider of electronic communication service or remote computing service to disclose a record or other information pertaining to a subscriber or customer of the provider or service (not including the contents of communications), only if the governmental entity—

"(A) obtains a warrant issued using the procedures described in the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure (or, in the case of a State court, issued using State warrant procedures) that is issued by a court of competent jurisdiction directing the disclosure;

"(B) obtains a court order directing the disclosure under subsection (d);

"(C) has the consent of the subscriber or customer to the disclosure; or

"(D) submits a formal written request relevant to a law enforcement investigation concerning telemarketing fraud for the name, address, and place of business of a subscriber or customer of the provider or service that is engaged in telemarketing (as defined in section 2325).

“(2) INFORMATION TO BE DISCLOSED.—A provider of electronic communication service or remote computing service shall, in response to an administrative subpoena authorized by Federal or State statute, a grand jury, trial, or civil discovery subpoena, or any means authorized under paragraph (1), disclose to a governmental entity the—

“(A) name;

“(B) address;

“(C) local and long distance telephone connection records, or records of session times and durations;

“(D) length of service (including start date) and types of service used;

“(E) telephone or instrument number or other subscriber number or identity, including any temporarily assigned network address; and

“(F) means and source of payment for such service (including any credit card or bank account number), of a subscriber or customer of such service.

“(3) NOTICE NOT REQUIRED.—A governmental entity that receives records or information under this subsection is not required to provide notice to a subscriber or customer.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(h) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section or in section 2702 shall be construed to limit the authority of a governmental entity to use an administrative subpoena authorized under a Federal or State statute or to use a Federal or State grand jury, trial, or civil discovery subpoena to—

“(1) require an originator, addressee, or intended recipient of an electronic communication to disclose the contents of the electronic communication to the governmental entity; or

“(2) require an entity that provides electronic communication services to the officers, directors, employees, or agents of the entity (for the purpose of carrying out their duties) to disclose the contents of an electronic communication to or from an officer, director, employee, or agent of the entity to a governmental entity, if the electronic communication is held, stored, or maintained on an electronic communications system owned or operated by the entity.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 2703(d) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “A court order for disclosure under subsection (b) or (c)” and inserting “A court order for disclosure under subsection (c)”;

(2) by striking “the contents of a wire or electronic communication, or”.

SEC. 4. DELAYED NOTICE.

Section 2705 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 2705. DELAYED NOTICE.

“(a) DELAY OF NOTIFICATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A governmental entity that is seeking a warrant under section 2703(a) may include in the application for the warrant a request for an order delaying the notification required under section 2703(b) for a period of not more than 180 days in the case of a law enforcement agency, or not more than 90 days in the case of any other governmental entity.

“(2) DETERMINATION.—A court shall grant a request for delayed notification made under paragraph (1) if the court determines that there is reason to believe that notification of the existence of the warrant may result in—

“(A) endangering the life or physical safety of an individual;

“(B) flight from prosecution;

“(C) destruction of or tampering with evidence;

“(D) intimidation of potential witnesses; or

“(E) otherwise seriously jeopardizing an investigation or unduly delaying a trial.

“(3) EXTENSION.—Upon request by a governmental entity, a court may grant 1 or more extensions of the delay of notification granted under paragraph (2) of not more than 180 days in the case of a law enforcement agency, or not more than 90 days in the case of any other governmental entity.

“(4) EXPIRATION OF THE DELAY OF NOTIFICATION.—Upon expiration of the period of delay of notification under paragraph (2) or (3), the governmental entity shall serve upon, or deliver to by registered or first-class mail, electronic mail, or other means reasonably calculated to be effective as specified by the court approving the search warrant, the customer or subscriber—

“(A) a copy of the warrant; and

“(B) notice that informs the customer or subscriber—

“(i) of the nature of the law enforcement inquiry with reasonable specificity;

“(ii) that information maintained for the customer or subscriber by the provider of electronic communication service or remote computing service named in the process or request was supplied to, or requested by, the governmental entity;

“(iii) of the date on which the warrant was served on the provider and the date on which the information was provided by the provider to the governmental entity;

“(iv) that notification of the customer or subscriber was delayed;

“(v) the identity of the court authorizing the delay; and

“(vi) of the provision of this chapter under which the delay was authorized.

“(b) PRECLUSION OF NOTICE TO SUBJECT OF GOVERNMENTAL ACCESS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A governmental entity that is obtaining the contents of a communication or information or records under section 2703 may apply to a court for an order directing a provider of electronic communication service or remote computing service to which a warrant, order, subpoena, or other directive under section 2703 is directed not to notify any other person of the existence of the warrant, order, subpoena, or other directive for a period of not more than 180 days in the case of a law enforcement agency, or not more than 90 days in the case of any other governmental entity.

“(2) DETERMINATION.—A court shall grant a request for an order made under paragraph (1) if the court determines that there is reason to believe that notification of the existence of the warrant, order, subpoena, or other directive may result in—

“(A) endangering the life or physical safety of an individual;

“(B) flight from prosecution;

“(C) destruction of or tampering with evidence;

“(D) intimidation of potential witnesses; or

“(E) otherwise seriously jeopardizing an investigation or unduly delaying a trial.

“(3) EXTENSION.—Upon request by a governmental entity, a court may grant 1 or more extensions of an order granted under paragraph (2) of not more than 180 days in the case of a law enforcement agency, or not more than 90 days in the case of any other governmental entity.

“(4) PRIOR NOTICE TO LAW ENFORCEMENT.—Upon expiration of the period of delay of notice under this section, and not later than 3 business days before providing notice to a customer or subscriber, a provider of electronic communication service or remote computing service shall notify the governmental entity that obtained the contents of a communication or information or records under section 2703 of the intent of the provider of electronic communication service or

remote computing service to notify the customer or subscriber of the existence of the warrant, order, or subpoena seeking that information.

“(c) DEFINITION.—In this section and section 2703, the term ‘law enforcement agency’ means an agency of the United States, a State, or a political subdivision of a State, authorized by law or by a government agency to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, investigation, or prosecution of any violation of criminal law, or any other Federal or State agency conducting a criminal investigation.”.

SEC. 5. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act or an amendment made by this Act shall be construed to apply the warrant requirement for contents of a wire or electronic communication authorized under this Act or an amendment made by this Act to any other section of title 18, United States Code (including chapter 119 of such title (commonly known as the “Wiretap Act”)), the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.), or any other provision of Federal law.

By Mr. CARDIN:

S. 608. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act and title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to improve coverage for colorectal screening tests under Medicare and private health insurance coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Supporting Colorectal Examination and Education Now, SCREEN, Act. This legislation promotes access to colon cancer screenings in an effort to help prevent colorectal cancer, save lives, and reduce costs for families, the Medicare program, and the health care system. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this critical piece of legislation.

Colorectal cancer affects far too many Americans. The rate of colon cancer deaths is shocking—taking the lives of over 50,000 people this year alone, according to the American Cancer Society.

Fortunately, colorectal cancer is highly preventable with screening, and colon cancer screening tests rank among the most effective preventive screenings available. A recent study in the *New England Journal of Medicine* found that removal of precancerous polyps during a screening colonoscopy may reduce colon cancer deaths by over 50 percent. Early detection and intervention are key to preventing colon cancer. Colonoscopy screenings are different from other types of preventive or screening services because pre-cancerous polyps found during a screening are removed during the same visit, thus preventing a potential cancer from developing and helping to ensure detection, intervention, and prevention.

Congress recognized the value of colon cancer screenings and, through bipartisan legislation that I authored in 1998, established a Medicare benefit for screening. The problem is that only half of individuals covered by the Medicare program receive a screening colonoscopy, even though a Medicare

colorectal cancer screening benefit is available. According to the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, CMS, Medicare claims show that only 52 percent of beneficiaries have had a colorectal cancer screening test. Many barriers account for this, including patient education on screenings and operational issues within the Medicare program, but colorectal cancer has become too widespread and we have reached the time to take action to promote prevention and save lives. Ensuring that individuals receive colorectal cancer screening tests is critical to this goal.

In addition, detection and intervention through proper colonoscopy screening should reduce costs to the Medicare program and health care system overall. Once colon cancer develops, the direct costs of treating colon cancer are starting—reaching \$4 billion in 2010. A recent study published in the *New England Journal of Medicine* concluded that colorectal cancer screening has been shown to reduce Medicare long-term costs.

Congress must help promote access to colorectal cancer screenings and help increase the number of persons receiving these life-saving screening tests. The SCREEN Act takes many steps to increase the rate of colorectal cancer screenings and help prevent colon cancer, while also reducing Medicare costs.

The SCREEN Act first waives cost sharing for Medicare beneficiaries receiving colorectal cancer screenings where precancerous polyps are removed during the visit. Currently, Medicare waives cost-sharing for any colorectal cancer screening recommended by the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force, USPSTF. Colorectal cancer screens have a grade “A” recommendation by USPSTF. However, if the doctor finds and removes a precancerous polyp during the visit, the procedure is no longer considered a “screening” for Medicare purposes—and the beneficiary would be forced to pay the Medicare coinsurance. In February 2013, the Administration announced that private insurers participating in State-based health insurance exchanges must waive all cost sharing for colon cancers screenings where a polyp is removed. This bill promotes a similar policy by waiving Medicare cost sharing for diagnostic and screening colorectal cancer tests.

Additionally, the SCREEN Act extends Medicare coverage to include an office visit or consultation so that a Medicare beneficiary may sit down and discuss the screening with a doctor prior to the colonoscopy procedures. One of the major barriers to increasing colorectal cancer screening rates is a patient's lack of knowledge and the “fear of the procedure.” This pre-procedure visit is not only good clinical practice but also would help increase patient utilization of colorectal cancer screening. This visit allows the individual to ask questions about the procedure, assures selection of the proper

screening test, and increases beneficiary education and test preparation. There is no reason for a Medicare beneficiary to be seeing his or her physician for the first time only just before being sedated for the procedure.

The SCREEN Act also provides incentives for Medicare providers to participate in nationally recognized quality improvement registries so that our Medicare beneficiaries are receiving the quality screening they deserve. Congress and other organizations can look to the SCREEN Act as a model for Medicare reimbursement reform as the bill reimburses providers in a budget neutral manner based on the quality of the procedure and not volume of services.

Promoting access to colorectal cancer screening will help ensure detection and intervention of this highly preventable disease and reduce costs to the health care system. I ask my colleagues to join in support of this fight to end colorectal cancer by cosponsoring this important legislation.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 612. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to remove social security account numbers from Medicare identification cards and communications provided to Medicare beneficiaries in order to protect Medicare beneficiaries from identity theft; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today I join my colleague, Senator KIRSTEN GILLIBRAND, to introduce the Social Security Number Protection Act of 2013, a bill that would remove Social Security numbers from Medicare cards to address a leading cause of identity theft among our Nation's seniors.

It is estimated that 11.6 million Americans were victims of identity theft in 2011, up from 10.2 million in 2010. We know that the misuse of Social Security numbers is one of the primary drivers of this crime. In many of these cases, identity thieves obtain them from Medicare cards.

Today, over 49 million beneficiaries carry their Medicare cards with them in their purses and in their wallets. These cards display a Medicare identification number, which consists of their Social Security number with a one- or two-digit code at the end, leaving beneficiaries particularly vulnerable to identity theft should a card be lost, stolen, or left in plain sight.

With identity theft on the rise, we can't make it this easy for thieves. Unfortunately, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Service, CMS, has fallen behind many other public and private organizations in better protecting seniors from identity theft by continuing to display Social Security numbers on Medicare cards. The Department of Defense, the Veterans Administration, and private insurers have all figured out how to transition to individual identification cards that don't include Social Security numbers.

In 2005, I offered an amendment to the Fiscal Year 2006 Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill to require CMS to remove Social Security numbers from Medicare cards. Although my amendment was adopted with a rollcall vote of 98 to 0, the final bill directed CMS to report to Congress on the steps necessary to remove the numbers. CMS provided that report in October 2006.

Six and a half years have passed since CMS first explored taking steps to remove Social Security numbers from Medicare cards. The Inspector General of the Social Security Administration took CMS to task in 2008 for its inaction and confirmed the risk that display of the numbers on Medicare cards poses to seniors. The Social Security inspector concluded that “immediate action is needed to address this significant vulnerability.” CMS has since issued another report, but it has failed to take action.

The Social Security Number Protection Act of 2013 establishes a reasonable timetable—3 years—for CMS to begin removing Social Security numbers from Medicare cards. It also gives CMS flexibility in determining the method by which it makes this change, enabling it to pursue an option that minimizes burdens while maximizing cost effectiveness. The bill also prohibits CMS from displaying Social Security numbers on all written and electronic communications to Medicare beneficiaries.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this important legislation and work with me to advance this long overdue change. CMS already requires that beneficiaries receiving benefits through Medicare Part C and Part D do not display individuals' Social Security numbers. Further, it has 6 years' worth of reports and cost data that it can use as tools to make these changes happen. We should extend this protection to all beneficiaries and help safeguard our Nation's seniors from becoming victims of identity theft in the future as quickly as possible.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 612

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 “Social Security Number Protection Act of 2011”.

SEC. 2. REQUIRING THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES TO PROHIBIT THE DISPLAY OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACCOUNT NUMBERS ON MEDICARE IDENTIFICATION CARDS AND COMMUNICATIONS PROVIDED TO MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall establish and begin to implement procedures to eliminate the unnecessary collection, use, and display of social security account numbers of Medicare beneficiaries.

(b) MEDICARE CARDS AND COMMUNICATIONS PROVIDED TO BENEFICIARIES.—

(1) CARDS.—

(A) NEW CARDS.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall ensure that each newly issued Medicare identification card meets the requirements described in subparagraph (C).

(B) REPLACEMENT OF EXISTING CARDS.—Not later than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall ensure that all Medicare beneficiaries have been issued a Medicare identification card that meets the requirements of subparagraph (C).

(C) REQUIREMENTS.—The requirements described in this subparagraph are, with respect to a Medicare identification card, that the card does not display or electronically store (in an unencrypted format) a Medicare beneficiary's social security account number.

(2) COMMUNICATIONS PROVIDED TO BENEFICIARIES.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall prohibit the display of a Medicare beneficiary's social security account number on written or electronic communication provided to the beneficiary unless the Secretary determines that inclusion of social security account numbers on such communications is essential for the operation of the Medicare program.

(c) MEDICARE BENEFICIARY DEFINED.—In this section, the term "Medicare beneficiary" means an individual who is entitled to, or enrolled for, benefits under part A of title XVIII of the Social Security Act or enrolled under part B of such title.

(d) CONFORMING REFERENCE IN THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT.—Section 205(c)(2)(C) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 405(c)(2)(C)) is amended by adding at the end the following new clause:

"(xi) For provisions relating to requiring the Secretary of Health and Human Services to prohibit the display of social security account numbers on Medicare identification cards and communications provided to Medicare beneficiaries, see section 2 of the Social Security Number Protection Act of 2011."

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 80—EX-PRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF MARCH 2013 AS "NATIONAL MIDDLE LEVEL EDUCATION MONTH"

Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 80

Whereas the National Association of Secondary School Principals, the Association for Middle Level Education, the National Forum to Accelerate Middle Grades Reform, and the National Association of Elementary School Principals have declared March 2013 to be "National Middle Level Education Month";

Whereas schools that educate middle level students are responsible for educating nearly 24,000,000 young adolescents between the ages of 10 and 15, in grades 5 through 9, who are

undergoing rapid and dramatic changes in their physical, intellectual, social, emotional, and moral development;

Whereas those young adolescents deserve challenging and engaging instruction, knowledgeable teachers and administrators who are prepared to provide young adolescents with a safe, challenging, and supportive learning environment, and organizational structures that banish anonymity and promote personalization, collaboration, and social equity;

Whereas the habits and values established during early adolescence have a lifelong influence that directly affects the future health and welfare of the United States;

Whereas research indicates that the academic achievement of a student in eighth grade has a larger impact on the readiness of that student for college at the end of high school than any academic achievement of that student in high school; and

Whereas, in order to improve graduation rates and prepare students to be lifelong learners who are ready for college, a career, and civic participation, it is necessary for the people of the United States to have a deeper understanding of the distinctive mission of middle level education: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors and recognizes the importance of middle level education and the contributions of the individuals who educate middle level students; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States to observe National Middle Level Education Month by visiting and celebrating schools that are responsible for educating young adolescents in the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 81—COMMEMORATING MARCH 19, 2013, AS THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF NATIONAL AG DAY

Mr. JOHANNIS (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. BENNET, Mr. DONNELLY, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. COONS) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 81

Whereas, in 1973, the National Ag Day program was established to increase public awareness of the vital role of agriculture in the United States;

Whereas the agriculture industry is part of the very fabric of the United States, driving the economy, fostering ingenuity, and preserving the deepest values of the people of the United States;

Whereas the average farmer in the United States today feeds nearly 150 people, a dramatic increase from just 25 people per farmer in the 1960s;

Whereas the agriculture industry in the United States produces an incredible variety of meats, grains, fruits, vegetables, dairy, beans, nuts, seeds, and other important foods;

Whereas more than 2,000,000 farmers and ranchers contribute more than \$300,000,000,000 to the United States economy every year; and

Whereas farmers comprise less than 2 percent of the population of the United States, yet produce more than enough food for the people of the United States and hundreds of millions of people around the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the National Ag Day program for its annual celebration of agriculture in the United States;

(2) honors the researchers, entrepreneurs, businesses, and innovators who support farm families in the United States and help drive the agriculture economy; and

(3) celebrates family farmers and ranchers, who are the backbone of food production in the United States and produce the safest, most abundant, and most affordable food supply in the world.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 9—RECOMMENDING THE POSTHUMOUS AWARD OF THE MEDAL OF HONOR TO SERGEANT RAFAEL PERALTA

Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

S. CON. RES. 9

Whereas, in November 2004, the Marine Corps led combat operations to retake the insurgent stronghold of Fallujah, Iraq, as part of Operation Phantom Fury;

Whereas Marine Corps Sergeant Rafael Peralta and thousands of other Marines entered the city of Fallujah, coming into immediate contact with the enemy and engaging in some of the most intense combat in the entire Iraq war;

Whereas Sergeant Peralta, serving with 1st Battalion, 3rd Marines, cleared scores of houses for days, and on November 14, 2004, asked to join an under-strength squad;

Whereas, the following morning, a close-quarter fight erupted as Sergeant Peralta and his squad of Marines cleared their seventh house of the day;

Whereas Sergeant Peralta, attempting to move out of the line of fire, was hit in the back of the head by a fragment from a ricocheted bullet;

Whereas the insurgents, in the process of fleeing the house, threw a fragmentation grenade through a window, landing directly near the head of Sergeant Peralta;

Whereas Sergeant Peralta reached for the grenade and pulled it to his body, absorbing the blast and shielding the other Marines who were only feet away;

Whereas, on November 15, 2004, Sergeant Peralta made the ultimate sacrifice to save the lives of his fellow Marines;

Whereas Sergeant Peralta was posthumously recommended by the Marine Corps and the Department of the Navy for the Medal of Honor;

Whereas 7 eyewitnesses confirmed that Sergeant Peralta smothered the grenade with his body, with 4 of the accounts, taken independently, stating that Sergeant Peralta gathered the grenade with his right arm;

Whereas the historical standard for awarding the Medal of Honor is 2 eyewitness accounts;

Whereas, in 2008, the nomination of Sergeant Peralta for the Medal of Honor was downgraded to the Navy Cross after an independent panel determined that Sergeant Peralta could not deliberately have pulled the grenade to his body due to his head wound, despite 7 eyewitness accounts to the contrary;

Whereas, in 2012, new and previously unconsidered evidence, consisting of combat video and an independent pathology report, was submitted to the Department of the Navy;

Whereas based on the new evidence, a review of the case was initiated;

Whereas, in December 2012, the upgrade from the Navy Cross to the Medal of Honor

for Sergeant Peralta was denied, despite an announcement of the support of the Department of the Navy for the upgrade;

Whereas the citation for the Navy Cross awarded to Sergeant Peralta states, “without hesitation and with complete disregard for his own personal safety, Sergeant Peralta reached out and pulled the grenade to his body, absorbing the brunt of the blast and shielding fellow Marines only feet away”;

Whereas Sergeant Peralta wrote to his brother in the days preceding his death, saying, “I’m proud to be a Marine, a U.S. Marine, and to defend and protect the freedom and Constitution of America. You should be proud of being an American citizen”;

Whereas Sergeant Peralta, who was born in Mexico and immigrated with his family to San Diego, California, enlisted in the Marine Corps on the same morning he received his proof of permanent residence, commonly known as a green card; and

Whereas Sergeant Peralta and his fellow Marines are an inspiration for their service, selflessness, and sacrifice: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That Congress—

(1) honors Sergeant Rafael Peralta, a Mexican-American who enlisted in the Marine Corps on the same day he received his permanent residence status, for his dedication to the Marine Corps and the United States, and for upholding the highest standards of military service;

(2) recognizes that the courage and selfless actions of Sergeant Peralta in combat saved the lives of his fellow Marines;

(3) concurs with the Marine Corps and the Department of the Navy that the actions of Sergeant Peralta are in the spirit and tradition of the Medal of Honor;

(4) maintains that eyewitness accounts confirm that Sergeant Peralta deliberately pulled the grenade to his body and, consistent with previous Medal of Honor awards, the eyewitness accounts should be the leading and deciding factor in evaluating the nomination of Sergeant Peralta for the Medal of Honor; and

(5) recommends that Sergeant Peralta posthumously be awarded the Medal of Honor.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today with Senator RUBIO to submit a resolution recommending the posthumous award of the Medal of Honor to Sergeant Rafael Peralta, United States Marine Corps.

My friend and colleague from California, Representative DUNCAN HUNTER, will introduce this resolution in the House and I am proud to work with him on this important matter.

Our resolution recognizes that Sergeant Peralta’s courageous and selfless actions in combat saved the lives of his fellow Marines.

Our resolution concurs with the Marine Corps and the Department of the Navy that Sergeant Peralta’s actions are in the spirit and tradition of the Medal of Honor; maintains that, consistent with previous Medal of Honor awards, the eyewitness accounts confirm that Sergeant Peralta deliberately pulled the grenade into his body and that eyewitness accounts should be the leading and deciding factor in evaluating Sergeant Peralta’s Medal of Honor nomination; and recommends that Sergeant Peralta be posthumously awarded the Medal of Honor.

Sergeant Peralta was a true American hero.

He was born in Mexico and immigrated as a young child with his family to San Diego, CA.

He embraced his new life and anxiously awaited the opportunity to serve his adopted country and give something back.

In fact, on the very day he received permanent legal resident status in the United States, he joined the United States Marine Corps.

Sergeant Peralta deployed to Iraq as a scout team leader assigned to Alpha Company, 1st Battalion, 3rd Marine Regiment.

In November 2004, Sergeant Peralta and his battalion were involved in intense house-to-house fighting in an effort to reclaim Fallujah, Iraq from insurgents.

After clearing scores of houses for days, he asked to join an under-strength squad.

Upon entering their seventh house of the day, Sergeant Peralta’s squad came into direct contact with insurgents and he was hit in the back of the head by a fragment from a ricocheted bullet.

As insurgents fled the house they threw a grenade through a window which landed near Sergeant Peralta’s head. Despite his wounds, he was able to reach for the grenade and pull it under his body to absorb the blast.

He was killed instantly but his sacrifice saved the lives of his fellow Marines.

For his selflessness and heroism, Sergeant Peralta was recommended for the Medal of Honor by his local commanders, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Now, the historical standard for awarding the Medal of Honor is two eyewitness accounts. Sergeant Peralta has seven.

Seven eyewitnesses gave sworn statements attesting that Sergeant Peralta smothered the grenade and placed it under his body in order to absorb the explosion.

Four of those accounts, taken independently, state that he pulled the grenade to his body with his right arm.

Nevertheless, an independent panel formed by then Secretary of Defense Robert Gates determined that Sergeant Peralta could not have deliberately pulled the grenade to his body because he was immediately incapacitated after being shot in the head.

Secretary Gates agreed with its conclusions and Sergeant Peralta was awarded the Navy Cross instead of the Medal of Honor.

Yet, despite the panel’s findings, the citation for the Navy Cross agrees with the eyewitness accounts and states that “without hesitation and with complete disregard for his own personal safety, Sergeant Peralta reached out and pulled the grenade to his body, absorbing the brunt of the blast and shielding fellow Marines only feet away.”

In fact, his family has refused to accept the Navy Cross and has worked tirelessly to ensure that Sergeant Peralta’s actions are not forgotten and properly recognized with the Medal of Honor.

In 2012, Representative HUNTER submitted new and previously unconsidered evidence, including combat video and an independent pathology report, to the Department of the Navy.

Dr. Vincent DiMaio of San Antonio, Texas volunteered to review the case for Sergeant Peralta’s family and submitted the report.

He concluded that, in all medical probability, Sergeant Peralta was not immediately incapacitated after being shot, and, in fact, reached for the grenade and pulled it under his body.

After a new review of the evidence, the Department of the Navy once again recommended Sergeant Peralta for the Medal of Honor.

Unfortunately, Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta denied the request.

I have the utmost respect for the judgment of Secretary Gates and Secretary Panetta. On this matter, I just take a different view and I urge our new Secretary of Defense, Chuck Hagel, to take another look at this matter.

I do not take the awarding of the Medal of Honor lightly. Indeed, the Medal of Honor is our country’s highest and most prestigious military award.

It says something to me that seven eyewitnesses verified that Sergeant Peralta absorbed the blast of the grenade and saved the lives of his fellow Marines.

It says something to me that the citation for the Navy Cross backs up the eyewitness accounts.

It says something to me that Sergeant Peralta was recommended for the award by his local commanders, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

It says something to me that the Secretary of the Navy has even publicly stated that he believes Sergeant Peralta deserves the Medal of Honor.

Sergeant Peralta gave his life for our country and his fellow Marines. His actions in combat and the evidence make it clear to me that he has gone above and beyond the call of duty and is deserving of the Medal of Honor.

In the days before his death, he wrote to his brother saying “I’m proud to be a Marine, a U.S. Marine, and to defend and protect the freedom and Constitution of America. You should be proud too of being an American citizen.”

Let us honor this American hero and show our pride in being Americans by passing this resolution.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I would like to advise you that the Senate

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources will hold a business meeting on Thursday, March 21, 2013, at 10 a.m., in room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The purpose of the business meeting is to consider the nomination of Sally Jewell to be the Secretary of the Interior.

For further information, please contact Sam Fowler at (202) 224-7571 or Abigail Campbell at (202) 224-4905.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 19, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 19, 2013, at 10 a.m. to conduct an executive session.

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

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 19, 2013, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled "Bipartisan Solutions for Housing Finance Reform?"

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

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. DURBIN. 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 March 19, 2013, at 10 a.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 19, 2013, at 10:30 a.m., in room SD-215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "The President's 2013 Trade Agenda."

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

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. DURBIN. 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 "Can We Do

More to Keep Savings in the Retirement System" on March 19, 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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 19, 2013, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Judicial Nominations."

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 19, 2013, at 2:30 p.m.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ANTITRUST, COMPETITION POLICY, AND CONSUMER RIGHTS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy and Consumer Rights, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 19, 2013, at 10 a.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "The American Airlines/US Airways Merger: Consolidation, Competition, and Consumers."

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGING THREATS AND CAPABILITIES

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 19, 2013, at 2:30 p.m.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OCEANS, ATMOSPHERE, FISHERIES, AND THE COAST GUARD

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries, and the Coast Guard of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 19, 2013, at 10:30 a.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The Committee will hold a hearing entitled, "Developments and Opportunities in U.S. Fisheries Management."

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NEAR EASTERN AND SOUTH AND CENTRAL ASIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 19, 2012, at 10 a.m., to hold a Near Eastern and South and Central Asian Affairs subcommittee

hearing entitled, "Syria's Humanitarian Crisis."

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SECURITIES, INSURANCES, AND INVESTMENT

Mr. DURBIN. 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 March 19, 2013, at 3 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "Streamlining Regulation, Improving Consumer Protection and Increasing Competition in Insurance Markets."

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

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF NATIONAL AG DAY

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to S. Res. 81 submitted earlier today.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows: A resolution (S. Res. 81) commemorating March 19, 2013, as the 40th anniversary of National Ag Day.

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

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 81) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to. (The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MARCH 20, 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, March 20, 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 until later in the day, and that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of H.R. 933, the continuing appropriations bill, with the time until 11:15 a.m. equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Madam President, there will be three rollcall votes in relation to the CR tomorrow at about 11:15 a.m.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:39 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, March 20, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

THE JUDICIARY

PATRICIA E. CAMPBELL-SMITH, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS FOR A TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE LAWRENCE BASKIR, RETIRED.

ELAINE D. KAPLAN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS FOR A TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE CHRISTINE O. C. MILLER, TERM EXPIRED.

MICHAEL KENNY O'KEEFE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE JOAN Z. MCAVOY, RETIRED.

ROBERT D. OKUN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE LINDA KAY DAVIS, RETIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

THOMAS EDWARD PEREZ, OF MARYLAND, TO BE SECRETARY OF LABOR, VICE HILDA L. SOLIS, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

CATHERINE M. RUSSELL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR AT LARGE FOR GLOBAL WOMEN'S ISSUES.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. SUSAN J. HELMS

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. DAVID L. MANN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be brigadier general

COL. ERIK C. PETERSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. BRENTLY F. WHITE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. CHRISTIE L. NIXON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major general

BRIGADIER GENERAL JEFFREY L. BANNISTER
BRIGADIER GENERAL SCOTT D. BERRIEG
BRIGADIER GENERAL GWENDOLYN BINGHAM
BRIGADIER GENERAL JOSEPH A. BRENDLER
BRIGADIER GENERAL CLARENCE K. CHINN
BRIGADIER GENERAL EDWARD F. DORMAN III
BRIGADIER GENERAL TERRY R. FERRELL
BRIGADIER GENERAL CHARLES A. FLYNN
BRIGADIER GENERAL GEORGE J. FRANZ III
BRIGADIER GENERAL CHRISTOPHER K. HAAS
BRIGADIER GENERAL THOMAS A. HORLANDER
BRIGADIER GENERAL THOMAS S. JAMES, JR.
BRIGADIER GENERAL OLE A. KNUTSDON
BRIGADIER GENERAL JONATHAN A. MADDUX
BRIGADIER GENERAL THEODORE D. MARTIN
BRIGADIER GENERAL KEVIN G. O'CONNELL
BRIGADIER GENERAL BARRY L. PRICE
BRIGADIER GENERAL JAMES M. RICHARDSON
BRIGADIER GENERAL MARTIN P. SCHWEITZER

BRIGADIER GENERAL RICHARD L. STEVENS
BRIGADIER GENERAL STEPHEN M. TWITTY
BRIGADIER GENERAL PETER D. UTLEY
BRIGADIER GENERAL GARY J. VOLESKY
BRIGADIER GENERAL DARRYL A. WILLIAMS
BRIGADIER GENERAL MICHAEL E. WILLIAMSON

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. CHARLES M. GURGANUS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. JOHN E. WISSELER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. RONALD L. BAILEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. STEVEN A. HUMMER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. KENNETH J. GLUECK, JR.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. TERRY J. BENEDICT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) JOSEPH W. RIXEY

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

JONATHAN F. POTTER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY NURSE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

HILARIO A. PASCUA
GERARDO C. RIVERA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

JAMES D. PEAKE
ALI K. SONMEZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be colonel

JOHN D. PITCHER

To be lieutenant colonel

CHRISTINA M. CAWLEY
JEANNE C. DILLON
JOHN T. MCDONNOLD

To be major

CHARLES E. CLARK
DEREK A. WOESSNER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

MARK L. ALLISON
RICHARD J. AMOTT
DOUGLAS H. FLEISCHFRESSER
ANTHONY V. JACKSON
RANDALL V. SIMMONS, JR.
JOSEPH J. STREFF

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

PHILLIP E. APPLETON
KEVIN C. BERKMAN
JAMES R. CHAPIN, JR.
CHRISTOPHER W. LUHMAN
FRANCIS P. POLASHEK
KENNETH S. PONS
ERIC C. RIVERS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

JAMES ACEVEDO
ROBYN L. ACKERMAN
MELINDA J. ACUNA
J. E. AHN
STEVEN D. AKERS
OLUWEMIMO AKINBAYO
DEAN H. ALEXANDER
DEATHE A. ALLEN
KENNISHA N. ALLEN
CATHY G. ALSTON
RORI N. ALSTON
JUAN A. AMADOR
ALEXANDER J. AMATO
GREGORY B. ANDREWS
XKOSHAN L. ARNOLD
DEREK L. ASHE
TIMOTHY S. ATKINSON
TERA S. AUTREY
JARROD C. BALLARD
TYRONE E. BANFORD
AUSTIN J. BANKS
AMECA L. BANKS
STEPHEN A. BARAN
JAMES J. BARR
RANDALL S. BARTEL
MARCUS J. BARTLETTE
JOSHUA L. BASTMAN
JOSEPH P. BAUMBACH
STEVEN J. BEAM
HERNANDO BELLO
MICHAEL B. BENDER
SARAH R. BENNETT
JUSTIN T. BERGEN
DENNIS W. BERNACKI
DAVID A. BETANCOURT
THOMAS A. BEYERL
CLARENCE M. BLACKBURN
ADAM G. BLEVINS
PAUL R. BLUMENHAGEN
BRANDON D. BOATWRIGHT
TAMMY S. BOGART
SCOTTY BOLER
ANITA R. BOONE
TARA J. BOWMAN
CORINTHIA A. BOWSER
EARL GLENN A. BOWSER
JUSTIN A. BOYD
GEORGINIA S. BRADSHAW
BRIAN L. BRAITHWAITE
THOMAS D. BREWINGTON
ZACHERY A. BRISCOE
ANDRE O. R. BROWN
JEREMY P. BROWN
JOSEPH L. BROWN
JOSEPH W. BROWN
KEITH W. BROWN
KYLE W. BROWN
PAUL A. BROWN
KEVIN L. BRUMMETT
GUYALD L. BRYANT
WILLIAM F. BRYSON, JR.
HERNAN D. BUENO
ROBERT D. BURGER
JOHN W. BURNETT
ALICIA M. BURROWS
MICHAEL R. CALDWELL
JOEL CALOFIGUEROA
THOMAS M. CAMPEAU
JOSE G. CARDENAS
TONY CARODINE
MICHAEL J. CARROLL
TED L. CHA
NICK J. CHAISSON
TREVOR L. CHAMBERS
JONATHAN C. CHEEK
THOMAS A. CHO
MICHAEL H. CHON
MONICA K. CLAYTON-PROJAS
PAUL E. CLUVERIUS
MICHAEL S. COATS
DANIEL W. COLE
MELISSA C. COMISKEY
CHRISTOPHER D. COOK
COREY A. COOKS
ROBERT M. COOKSEY
BRADLEY J. COOPER
BRICE A. COOPER
CORBIN E. COPELAND
FRANCISCO J. CORDERO

ALBERTO CORDOVA
 NATHANIEL P. COSTA
 ANA M. COWAN
 ALAN CRABTREE
 ROBERT A. CRAPANZANO
 RYAN M. CROSBY
 DANIEL E. CROSS
 PATRICIA D. CRUZ
 JOSEPH H. CULLINGFORD
 MARCIA L. DAILEY
 DEBORAH A. DALEY
 JONATHAN A. DANIELS
 ANDREA B. DARLING
 MICHAEL G. DAVIDSON
 MANDOLYN R. DAVILA
 EDGAR DAVILARIVERA
 BRENT L. DAVIS
 LASHELL Y. DAVIS
 OLIVER E. DAVIS
 TIMOTHY G. DAVIS
 NGOYE N. DAYO
 RYAN M. DEBONIS
 JENNIFER L. DENNIS
 CHRISTOPHER J. DENTON
 SHANE D. DERING
 GUSTAVO DIAZ
 TIMOTHY C. DICK
 JOEL A. DICKEY
 GERARD J. DOW, SR.
 TRAVIS S. DRAYTON
 NICHOLAS R. DRURY
 CHRISTOPHER A. DUCKWORTH
 MARK B. DUDLEY
 MYRON T. DUNFORD
 BENJAMIN R. ECKLOR
 THOMAS H. EDDY
 MEGHAN V. EDERLE
 DANA G. EISENMAN
 JOHN A. ELKO
 PAUL J. ELLIOTT
 JARED S. ELLIS
 MICHELLE L. ELWOOD
 JONATHAN P. EMERY
 ENRIQUE A. ENRIQUEZ
 NKECHUKWUKU U. ENWEFA
 JENNIFER M. ERNEST
 PATRICK O. ESSENBERG
 DANIEL S. EUSEBIO
 JAMES E. FAGER
 NATHAN L. FAHIE
 DARRELL W. FAIR
 ROBERT L. FARMER, JR.
 KEVIN M. FEFFERMAN
 AARON M. FEGLEY
 JONATHAN FERNANDEZ
 LENORA T. FERNANDEZ
 BRIAN C. FIDDERMON
 BOBBY L. FIELDS, JR.
 WILLIAM P. FISHER
 SHEREE L. FITTS
 NOKENS FLEURJEAN
 CHRISTOPHER L. FLORES
 JOSHUA W. FORD
 FELICIA L. FOSTER
 JAIME S. FOSTER
 CHERYL FOSTON
 KENNETH E. FOWLER
 TROY F. FOX
 KARENSA D. FOXX
 EVAN H. FRANCHITTI
 CHRISTOPHER E. FRANKLIN
 MOST L. FRANKLIN
 WALTER J. FRAZIER
 LAURAJANE R. FREELAND
 ROBERT E. FREEMAN, JR.
 JULIA M. FUREMAN
 ROBBY J. GABEHART
 GUSTACIA A. GABRIEL
 MICHAEL V. GALLUCCI
 MICHAEL A. GALLVIN
 TANIA S. GARCIA
 PHILLIP A. GARNER
 FRANKLIN D. R. GARRETT II
 MICHAEL R. GARRETT
 NEWTON GASSANT
 CHRISTIAN L. GATBONTON
 LESTER S. GEBSKI
 ALEJANDRO I. GENTRY
 JAMES E. GERLING
 NATHANIEL B. GILL III
 DESMOND M. GITTENS
 SCOTT D. GLIDDEY
 MICHAEL A. GODDARD
 TIMOTHY G. GODWIN
 DANIEL P. GOEHL
 ANTTINITA R. GRAHAM
 JOSE A. GRANT
 DUSTIN R. GRAY
 MICHAEL B. GRAY
 ALEXANDER C. GRAZIANO
 CHARLES T. GREENE
 TOMETRIUS GREER
 DAVID M. GREGORY
 SCOTT M. GUM
 WILLIAM P. GUMABON
 JESSICA L. GUTIERREZ
 KIMBERLY L. HALE
 MARSHAL K. HAMMEL
 ALISHA C. HAMMETT
 BRADLEY C. HAMRICK
 PETER J. HAN
 YUNSONG HAN
 JEFFREY D. HANCE
 TYWIN M. HANDSON
 SHAUNA N. HANN
 ERIK M. HANSEN
 JEREMY W. HARLAN

BRIAN W. HARPER
 JONATHAN C. HATHAWAY
 MARCUS Q. HATHORN
 JOHN C. HATLEY
 JAMES E. HAYES
 LAKENDRA J. HAYES
 DONALD A. HAYFRON
 JAVA A. HENDERSON
 NATHAN D. HENDRIKS
 EMPERATRIZ HENRIQUEZ
 JUSTIN R. HERBE
 KRISTINE M. HINDS
 TIFFANY N. HINES
 LARRY W. HIRT
 MELISSA L. HOAGLIN
 CHAUNCEY K. HODGE
 KEVIN L. HOFFMAN
 BRIAN L. HOLLANDSWORTH
 CRISTOFFER S. HONAN
 DAVID K. HONG
 AMY N. HOOD
 KEVIN A. HOWELL
 JAMES D. HUBBARD
 MICHAEL J. HUBER
 MAURICE L. HUDSON
 RYAN T. HULSE
 WARREN G. HUMMEL
 RYAN P. HUNT
 DERRICK G. JACKSON
 LOUIS J. JACKSON
 JARED M. JACOBSEN
 IAN J. JARVIS
 RUSTIN S. JESSUP
 CHRISTOPHER C. JO
 HARDY O. JOHNSON
 MARY E. JOHNSON
 ROBERT L. JOHNSON
 JERRY L. JONES
 MICKII D. JONES
 RICHARD E. JONES
 VERSHUNDA J. JONES
 JACQUELYNN D. JORDAN
 JONATHAN W. JUDY
 LAURA L. KEENAN
 JOANN M. KENNEDY
 AARON M. KIA
 JASON S. KIM
 KENNETH M. KIM
 COLTON D. KINNINGER
 JONATHAN E. KIRKLAND
 BOBBY W. KIRKPATRICK
 THOMAS A. KNOTHE
 JOSEPH D. KNOWLTON
 LAUREN A. KOBAN
 MICHAEL G. KOFOD
 EDWIN L. KOLEN
 DANIEL L. KOSTERS
 WENDALL R. KRIEGER
 JOHN C. KUMP
 SEAN S. KWOUN
 BART S. LAJOIE
 CHARLES S. LAWRENCE
 DONALD M. LEE
 JUNG S. LEE
 SHAWANDA N. LEE
 JIMMIE B. LEONARD
 HELEN L. LILLY
 JONATHAN H. LINDSLEY
 LUKE A. LISELL
 FELIX LOPEZ
 LENORE LOPEZ
 SERGIO O. LOPEZGARCIA
 BENJAMIN T. LOVING
 ENRIQUE LOY
 DERRICK E. LUCARELLI
 NICHOLAS J. LUCAS
 PETER C. LUFT
 MARLON J. LYLES
 DONALD C. MACHEN
 ERIC M. MAIA
 RYAN R. MAIN
 CHRISTOPHER G. MANGANARO
 MARISSA B. MANTANONA
 CHRISTOPHER R. MARK
 HARRY MARS
 MICHAEL J. MARTIN
 MICHAEL J. MARTIN
 MICHAEL W. MARTIN
 MICHAEL A. MARTINEZ
 MICHAEL E. MARTINEZ
 RAPHAEL T. MARTINEZ
 CARLOS J. MARTINEZNEVES
 ROGELIO A. MATA
 HILDRED S. MATHEWS
 TROY E. MATHIS
 SHANE T. MATLOCK
 MARK A. MAULDIN
 JOHN R. MAURO
 LORRAINE S. MAURO
 CHRISTOPHER R. MAY
 SHAWN P. MCANIFF
 WENDI L. MCBRIDERSCHLER
 DAVID E. MCCORMICK
 MCFERRIN D. MCDONALD
 HEATHER A. MCDOWGALL
 PHILIP M. MCDOWELL
 JENNIFER A. MCINTYRE
 SCOTT M. MEDLIN
 LUKE W. MEDVEGY
 BILLYJAY N. MERCADO
 ZACHARY C. MERRILL
 TIMOTHY E. MESSER
 AMY C. MILLER
 ERICA L. MILLER
 JASON M. MILLER
 LADSON F. MILLS
 ANTHONY P. MINDERMAN

ALFREDO P. MIRANDA
 REGINALD J. MITCHELL
 THOMAS M. MOHLER
 CHRISTINE G. MOORE
 DAVID B. MOORE
 IZAR MOORE
 NICHOLAS L. MORGAN
 GEOFFERY G. MOSLEY
 BRANDON G. MOTTE
 PETER O. MOUSSEAU
 SHARONDA E. MOZEE
 KEITH M. MUEHLING
 JEREMY T. MUELLER
 JONATHAN R. MULDER
 HEATH A. MULLINS
 ROBERT J. MULLINS
 STEVEN M. NACHOWICZ
 MELISSA A. NAIRNE
 EDINA NASONGKHLA
 ALTON T. NATSON
 BETH A. NELSON
 KEVIN N. NELSON
 NICHOLAS R. NETHERY
 DANIAL L. NEWLON
 MINH V. NGUYEN
 CLYDEADRIAN NICKYSON
 LONNIE G. NIPPER II
 PAUL A. NOCE
 STEPHEN K. NOEL
 JI H. OH
 ROMAN OLESNYCKYJ
 JOHN K. OMOHUNDRO
 RONALD W. OPPERMAN
 JASON M. ORADAT
 MARY E. PACHECO
 MICHAEL A. PACHUCKI
 ERIC R. PAHNKE
 GRAHAM C. PARKER
 TAMMY F. PARKER
 EMMA PARSONS
 DAVID S. PATERSON
 JEREMY C. PAUL
 GUSTAVO A. PAULINO
 JONATHAN R. PEIFER
 WADE PERDUE, JR.
 ANTON L. PERSON
 JANET PETEFOX
 TIMOTHY PETERSEN
 SHAWN O. PEYNARD
 THOMAS H. PFARR
 LUCIANO F. PICCO
 WINFIELD S. PINKSTAFF
 JAVIER F. PLA
 KRISTEN M. PLASSMEYER
 JONATHAN E. L. PLOTKIN
 DEHAVEN W. POLLARD
 EMILY S. POOLE
 RICHARDE T. PRENELL
 PEGGY T. PROCTORMATOS
 ROBERT J. PUENTE
 EDUARDO PUMAREJO
 MICHAEL T. QUIGLEY
 JACOB J. QUINN
 SEAN J. QUINN
 GERSON S. RAMIREZ
 STEVEN A. RAVEIA
 DEAN R. RAY
 WILLIAM T. REASONER
 JIMOS E. REESE
 CHINEKA R. REID
 ANDY REYES
 JULIO J. REYES
 ANTONIO L. REYNOLDS
 MARCELLA A. REYNOLDS
 KIRBY D. RICE
 JOHN J. RICH, JR.
 ROBERT J. RICHARD
 BRYAN E. RIDDLER
 ALPHONSE T. RIDEAU
 ANDREW D. RIECK
 CARLOS J. RIVERA
 JUANANTONIO R. RIVERA
 OLGA L. ROBERSON
 CLEONUS A. ROBERTS
 JOE K. ROBERTS
 SHAWN G. ROBERTSON
 BRANDON K. ROBINSON
 DANIEL B. ROBINSON
 BRUCE U. ROETT, JR.
 DOUGLAS G. ROGERS
 DAVID W. ROLLEN
 JOHN R. ROOD
 JASON T. ROOT
 MARIANO ROSARIO
 BRYSON R. ROSSOL
 ORANDE S. ROY, SR.
 TRAVIS W. RUDGE
 MICAH P. RUE
 ARDREANNA M. RUIZ
 JESSICA L. RUSSELL
 PRESTON J. RUTHERFORD
 TROND R. RUUD
 AMBER L. RYDER
 SUN RYU
 THEODORE P. SAGER
 ARACELIS SALADIN
 ADAM A. SALAZAR
 LAMAR S. SALES
 MANUEL D. J. SANCHEZDIAZ
 JOSHUA M. SANDLER
 MARK A. SCHAUMBURG
 CARISSA A. SCHESSOW
 STEVEN M. SCHNURR
 JULLANE C. SCHWETZ
 ALLISON R. SCOTT
 MARK L. SCOTT, JR.
 CASEY M. SECKENDORF

GARRY L. SEEBURGER
 KODY W. SESSIONS
 AAMER SHEIKH
 JAROD H. SHELTON
 DOUGLAS R. SHONK
 MISHENDA S. SIGGAL
 DANIEL A. SIMONS
 TAYLOR R. SIMPSON
 XEON O. SIMPSON
 MICHAEL J. SKIFF
 SHANNON M. SMART
 JOHN D. SMITH, JR.
 KYLE A. SMITH
 KIMBERLY A. SOER
 JOHN T. SOMMERVOLD
 BRADLEY B. SON
 MICHAEL SPEARS
 RITA E. SPEIGHT
 NICHOLAS J. STACHLER
 JODY E. STACY
 THOMAS K. STAGNARO
 MELISSA J. STEELE
 KEVIN J. STEIN
 JOHN P. STEPNIEWSKI
 SARAH E. STEVENSON
 OLIVER STOLLEY
 JAMES E. STROCKLAND
 BILLY W. STROUTH
 EDWARD P. STRZALKOWSKI
 RYAN D. SUNDERMAN
 JASON A. SUPNET
 DARRELL K. SUTTON
 ANDREW R. SVILOKOS
 HOWARD M. SWANSON, JR.
 ROBERT L. SWEARINGEN
 ABRAHAM T. SWEENEY
 KHAMOY SYSENGCHANH
 HUNG J. TA
 BONITA A. TAPLIN
 LIONEL A. TAYLOR
 CARSON L. TENNEY
 MARK A. TERWILLIGER
 ANTHONY S. THACKER
 EBONY S. THOMAS
 RYAN S. THOMAS
 ADAM R. THOMPSON
 KELLY L. THOMPSON
 RICHARD N. THORNBERG
 RICHMOND P. THORNNTON
 WENDA THROCKMORTON
 DANIEL E. TORRES
 LAWRENCE TORRES
 LAKISHA D. TOUSSAINT
 DANIEL F. TOVERN
 KIMBERLY R. TRICE
 PATRICK A. TURNER
 PHILIP T. TURNER
 DAVID A. VANAKIN
 NICKLAS J. VANSTRAATEN
 VINCENT E. VASSAR
 SHILO S. VELASQUEZ
 EMANUEL VELEZ
 JUDE T. VERGE
 GARY P. WADE
 HOWARD F. WADE
 CHARLES G. WAITES
 BENJAMIN J. WALKER
 MICHAEL C. WALLEY
 CARLOS G. WANDEMBERGH
 DAWN M. WANDEMBERGH
 JOHNNY B. WARD
 AMANDA D. WATKINS
 ADRIAN N. WATTS
 MATTHEW E. WERNERT
 SU C. WHITESSELL
 JOHN C. WHITEHEAD
 SAMUEL L. WIGGINS
 ARON A. WILLIAMS
 BRANDON A. WILLIAMS
 BRYAN F. WILLIAMS
 CHRISTOPHER M. WILLIAMS
 GLANDIS E. WILLIAMS
 JOHN M. WILLIAMS II
 JUNDI J. WILLIAMS
 KATHERINE R. WILLIAMS
 MORTISHA M. WILLIAMS
 SHARRON D. WILLIAMS
 TOBY M. WILLIFORD
 BRENT J. WILSON
 DANIEL C. WILSON
 TAMILA C. WILSON
 ANDRE D. WINDING
 MARK J. WINKER
 MATHIS F. WRIGHT
 MICHELLE R. WYLIE
 LINDA S. WYNN
 LAWRENCE C. YARNALL III
 JAMES H. YAW, JR.
 NICHOLAS P. YERBY
 SHAWN YONKIN
 JOON S. YOON
 PETER S. YOON
 LARRY H. YU
 JEDIDIAH M. ZAFFKE
 THEODORE L. ZAGRANISKI
 MATTHEW A. ZAYD

D011118
 D011138
 D011141
 D011602
 D010946
 D011647
 D011129
 D011313
 D010660
 D011666

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
 UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

GARLAND A. ADKINS III
 FRIEDLANDER R. Z. ALESSI
 CHRISTOPHER M. ALEXANDER
 JESSE R. ALLGEYER
 ROBERT F. ALTMAN
 CRAIG ANDERSON
 JEFFREY G. ANDERSON
 SCOTT T. ANDERSON
 TALON G. ANDERSON
 ANGELETT M. ANDOE
 CREESEY V. ANTOINE
 ALEXANDER N. APOSTLE
 MICHAEL I. APTAKER
 MATTHEW C. ARABIAN
 LUIS F. ARRIOLA
 MATTHEW P. AUBRY
 FRANK G. BAEZ
 TRAVIS R. BAILEY
 ALAN M. BAIRLEY
 CHRISTOPHER J. BALDWIN
 JOHN L. BANNISTER
 HECTOR BARAJAS
 JAVAN A. BARKER
 ANNE M. BARLIEB
 JOHN W. BARLOW
 BRIAN L. BARNETT
 MICHAEL L. BARNETT
 JACOB E. BARTON
 ALLIA BASIC
 STEPHANIE L. BAUGH
 DAVID S. BECKNER
 DAVID W. BELL
 STEVEN C. BELL
 JASON L. BENESH
 JOHN I. BENNER
 BARBARA P. BENSON
 DAVID W. BERGERON
 JOSEPH L. BILLINGSLEY
 ANDREW T. BLICKHAHN
 JAMES M. BLUE
 SRIUS T. BONTEA
 BRIAN P. BOSSE
 MARK A. BOTTORFF
 BRIAN J. BOURQUE
 CHRISTINA M. BOWSER
 EDWARD F. BOYD
 GERALD G. BRADEN
 LAVONE S. BRADSHAW
 AARON S. BRAGG
 ODENE C. BRATHWAITE
 CHRISTOPHER J. BRAUNSTEIN
 CLEOPHUS K. BRELAND
 CAROLYN B. BRONSON
 DAWN E. BROOKS
 GLORI L. BROWN
 JUSTIN L. BROWN
 NATHAN E. BROWN
 SPENCER BROWN
 KERBY K. BRYNAIS
 BLAKE D. BRYANT
 MATTHEW L. BRYANT
 CORTIS B. BURGESS
 ALEXANDER D. BURGOS
 SAMMIE J. BURKES
 ROBERT S. BURNETT
 RUSSELL J. BURNETT
 VALENCE L. BURNS
 DAVID R. BUSTAMANTE
 CHANTALINE P. CABAN
 RYAN J. CALDWELL
 IAN A. CAMPBELL
 MILTON A. CAMPBELL, JR.
 JASON F. CANO
 CHRISTOPHER J. CARBONE
 VICTOR J. CARRERAS
 AMELIA D. CARTER
 CASEY J. CARTER
 DONALD P. CARTER
 RANDALL L. CARTNER
 GARY W. CARTY
 LELAND S. CASE
 ANTHONY R. CATO
 JOSE F. CEPEDARAMOS
 MARLA G. CHAN
 SOKHOM CHHIM
 BEN H. CHOE
 ADAM R. CHRISTENSON
 AARON B. CHRISTIAN
 SCOTT A. CHRISTMAN
 AGNES C. M. CHU
 STEPHEN W. CHU
 DONALD W. CINNAMOND
 JERMAINE A. CLARE
 WYLIE K. CLOUGH
 KIMBERLY D. CLUVERIUS
 JABBAR N. COLBERT
 CLAIRE L. COLONGONZALEZ
 JOHN T. COOLEY
 JOSEPH A. COSCI, JR.
 JEFFREY R. COULTER
 ADIR L. COX
 CHEET W. CRAW
 JAMES M. CREASON
 SAKURA CREEDON
 PENNY S. CROMWELL
 CHRISTOPHER M. CROOKSHANKS
 ANTONIO CRUCET III
 ANGELIC CRUTCHFIELD
 DENNIS M. CURRY
 TODD E. DAHMANN
 GARY A. DALES

RACHELLE L. DANIELS
 CHRISTOPHER R. DARLING
 ERIK M. DAVIS
 JONATHAN M. DAVIS
 JEREMIAH L. DEARING
 DANIEL S. DEATRICK
 CYNTHIA L. DEHNE
 SHALANDA K. DELRIO
 RYAN P. DELANEY
 JOSEPH J. DEMERATH
 LESLY J. DENIS
 BRADLEY D. DENISAR
 MICHAEL T. DENISON
 JASON C. DEROSA
 SETH N. DESLETS
 SHERINA D. DIAMOND
 RENE DIAZ
 BRADLEY W. DIEBOLD
 IAN M. DIETZ
 SHAWN W. DILLINGHAM
 ANTHONY C. DIMMICK
 CHRISTOPHER M. DISHONG
 ANDREW D. DONOVAN
 ANDREW J. DORNSTADTER
 ANDREA G. DOVER
 JACOB R. DRESSEL
 ROBERT L. DROLET
 NOAH M. EBAUGH
 ANTHONY E. EBBING
 MAC H. ECHIPARE III
 MARQUAY EDMONDSON
 MICHAEL D. EDWARDS
 ALEX J. EISMINGER
 ALBERT G. ELAM III
 SUZANNE M. ELDRIDGE
 SANQUANETTA L. ELLIS
 EDWARD T. ENGLAND
 JOEL C. EVANS
 ANDREW P. FABER
 EPEBY A. FALL
 LUCAS B. FALLOT
 MATTHEW S. FECHTER
 STEVEN N. FEIGH
 JARED N. FERGUSON
 KAREEM Y. FERNANDEZ
 MICHAEL C. FISHER
 BRADLEY R. FISHER
 NEAL J. FISHER
 SALVATORE A. FORLENZA
 KRISTOFER D. FOSMOE
 MICHAEL O. FRELAND, JR.
 JEREMY W. FREEMAN
 KENNETH R. FRENCH
 THERESA N. FULLEN
 MINDI C. FURNIER
 JAMES G. FUYFFE
 WALDO D. GALAN
 JACQUELYN R. GALLIHER
 GREGORY S. GALSTAD
 NANCY L. GANDY
 GERARDO GARCIGAUTIERREZ
 TRACY N. GARDNER
 EMMET J. GARIEPY
 CARLOS G. GARTH
 JOHN A. GAUDA
 JOSEPH A. GIBSON
 RICHARD W. GIBSON
 JAMES S. GILL
 CHRISTOPHER M. GIN
 MATTHEW K. GIVENS
 DANIELLE N. GONZALEZ
 RICHARD A. GONZALEZ
 NICHOLAS D. GOSHEN
 FRANCISCA A. GRAHAM
 WILLIAM D. GRATE
 RYAN M. GRAY
 CHRISTOPHER K. GREEN
 KEVIN E. GREEN
 CHRISTIAN M. GREGOIRE
 ADAM A. GREGORY
 JOSHUA J. GRIGG
 BRENDAN M. HAGAN
 JONATHAN D. HALEY
 JASON K. HALUB
 LISA R. HALVORSON
 HENRY HAMA
 RUSSELL W. HAMANN
 ROBERT T. HAMILTON
 PATRICK T. HANSON
 PATRICK K. HARDIN
 BRADLEY J. HARDY
 TIMOTHY B. HARTNETT
 BRIAN J. HATALLA
 ETHAN F. HAYES
 JAMES W. HAYES
 CHRISTOPHER J. HAYMON
 DOUGLAS C. HEALY
 JASON R. HEHL
 SAMUEL A. HEIDER
 MICHAEL W. HEIN
 RICARDO HENRY
 NATHAN P. HEPFLER
 STEVEN E. HERR
 STEVEN J. HERSHFELDT II
 PETER D. HIGBIE
 OLIVER B. HIGHLEY
 JAMES C. HILL
 NATHAN A. HILLEGAS
 JACOB S. HINA
 GREGORY R. HINNERSHITZ
 BENJAMIN T. HOPFER
 DAVID M. HOLBROOK
 DAVID E. HOLBROOKS
 BENJAMIN R. HOPPER
 JESSICA E. HOUK
 DION A. HOUSTON, SR.
 JONATHAN P. HOWARD

RYAN A. HOWRY
 MICHAEL S. HUBBARD
 CLIFTON J. HUBBERT
 MICHAEL R. HUDSON
 BUCK HUGHES
 DENNIS M. HUNT, JR.
 GAYLE A. HUNT
 DEMETRIUS A. HUNTSPOON
 WESLEY T. HUTCHINSON
 NOAH S. HUTTO
 STEPHEN S. HWANG
 CLARENCE D. INGE, JR.
 ELIJAH E. INGRAM
 EVAN J. ISAAC
 JAMES A. JABLONSKI
 JESSICA E. JACCARDGORDON
 CHANE R. JACKSON
 RANDALL D. JACKSON
 JASON D. JAMES
 CHRISTOPHER P. JENKINS
 LOUIS L. JENKINS
 TIMOTHY M. JENKINS
 RICHARD JIMENEZ
 MICHAEL K. JOHN
 AMANDA R. JOHNSON
 CODY R. JOHNSON
 DANIEL W. JOHNSON
 DAVID W. JOHNSON
 JASON M. JOHNSON
 JOSHUA D. JOHNSON
 PURVIS L. JOHNSON
 LEVI C. JONES
 RICHARD C. JONES
 ELVIN JUARBE
 GILBERT JUAREZ
 CELIA JUDD
 JOSEPH C. KACHMAR II
 JIMMY R. KACKLEY
 KEITH M. KACMAR
 PANAGIOTI I. KALOGIROS
 NOELANI N. KALUHIWA
 DEREK M. KAMACHI
 SEAN P. KAUBISCH
 JONATHAN B. KAYL
 JEFFREY D. KEENAN
 JACKIE N. KELLEN
 ROBERT L. KELLY
 FRANKLIN J. KESSLER
 JOSEPH K. KIDDER
 ROSALYN S. KING
 LISA M. KIRBY
 MICHAEL S. KLIPSTEIN
 AQUILA KNOPF
 OWEN W. KOCH
 MICHAEL S. KOLTON
 KELSEY L. KORNEGAY
 JOSEPH J. KOSTURKO IV
 NICHOLAS J. KRAMER
 JAMES H. KRANICH
 STEVEN D. KREGER
 HITOSHI KUMAGAI
 KEITH B. KUMBERT
 WALTER F. LANDGRAF
 RODNEY A. LANDRUM
 MICHAEL LANGAN
 CLARENCE E. LANGLEY III
 DONELL D. LANGLEY
 JAMES G. LAPOINTE
 STACY S. LARDIZABAL
 MATTHEW A. LAROCCO
 JASON R. LATHROP
 MICHAEL J. LATHROP
 LEA J. LATO
 ZEROY LAWSON, JR.
 JULIE A. LAYTON
 MARYCATHERINE LEACH
 SCOTT E. LEE
 RICHARD A. LEHMANN
 MICHAEL G. LEMAY
 ZACHERY B. LEONARD
 ANDREW G. LERCH
 TODD R. LETTLIER
 WAYNE S. LETT
 WAIMAN LEUNG
 KARI E. LEWIS
 JEFFREY Z. LI
 CHRISTIAN A. LIGHTSEY
 DARIN C. LINDON
 RANDALL A. LINNEMANN
 SHAD K. LLOYD
 SHAWN W. LONERGAN
 ADAM S. LOUTZENHISER
 JOHN E. LUCKIE
 ERIK V. LUEDTKE
 PHILLIP H. LUKENS
 SERGEY L. LUZHANSKIY
 JASON C. MACCONNELL
 OMOLOLU O. MAKINDE
 JAMES E. MALONEY
 LAUREN R. MALONEY
 MELISSA S. MANIGAULT
 EINAR D. MANKI
 JOHN P. MANN
 JOSHUA A. MANTZ
 BURKE A. MANWARING
 RENE L. MARCHBANKS
 DAVID C. MARLOW
 HERIBERTO MARRERODELATORRE
 JOHNATHAN P. MARTIN
 ALBA N. MARTINEZRODRIGUEZ
 JASON E. MARTOS
 JOSEPH A. MARTY
 ALICE M. MASON
 TROY E. MASON
 MOHAMED B. MASSAQUOI
 DAVID A. MATTERS
 KEVIN W. MATTHEWS

LEON H. MATTHIAS
 KEVIN J. MCADOO
 BRIAN W. MCCOY
 SCOTT B. MCFARLAND
 RORY M. MCGOVERN
 NICHOLAS J. MCINTEE
 BENJAMIN F. MCKINLEY
 TAMEIKA MCNAUGHTEN
 JONATHAN L. MECHAM
 SCOTT F. MEENEN
 RYAN K. MENTO
 ANDREW J. MERCHANT
 CHEAVIS J. MERITT
 KEVIN T. MERRILL
 MICHAEL W. MEYERS
 JAMES K. MICK
 DARRYL D. MIDDLEBROOK
 TIMOTHY M. MIGLIORE
 ADAM J. MILES
 ADHIMA MILLER
 DAVID T. MILLER
 MARC W. MILLER
 MATTHEW O. MILLER
 MICHAEL A. E. MILLER
 SETH MILLER
 JASON N. MILLS
 GEORGE MIRANDA
 CHRISTIAN M. MITCHELL
 LUKE C. MOEN
 SARAH K. MOFFIT
 MATTHEW D. MOGENSEN
 DANIEL MONROY, JR.
 BYRNISE M. MONTECLARO
 DELANTE E. MOORE
 NATHAN A. MOORE
 ARTHUR V. MORGAN
 BRYAN W. MORGAN
 GEORGE D. MORRISON
 JOSEPH H. MROSZCZYK
 LAURA E. MUIRHEAD
 JOSHUA P. MULFORD
 ROBERT F. MURRAY
 AMY L. NASH
 JAMEY D. NEALY
 ANTHONY C. NELSON
 JESSE M. NESBITT
 ADAM K. NESTOR
 GLEN S. NETTROUR
 BENJAMIN E. NEUSSE
 JACQUELINE M. NEWELL
 CHRISTINE Y. NGAI
 EMANUEL D. NICHOLS
 ANTHONY E. NOCCHI
 MICHAEL A. NORMAND
 JARED K. NYSTROM
 MICHAEL C. OBAL
 BRIAN C. OBMERGA
 DAVID J. OGURA
 KARL M. OLSON
 RIKKI A. OPPERMAN
 GINO R. OREZZOLI
 JOSEPH A. ORR
 JOSEPH O. OWOBYE
 NICHOLAS B. PACE
 MATTHEW J. PACHECO
 MONICA I. PADEN
 ANTHONY J. PALUMBO
 ROBERT W. PARKER
 DAVID M. PATTON
 JOSHUA A. PATTON
 COLBY PEPPON
 JONATHAN Q. PEREZ
 DARIO PEREZBIRRIEL
 THEODORE PERRY
 ALEXANDER D. PERSCHALL
 NYASANU M. PERSON
 BRANDON M. PETRICK
 ANTHONY J. PETROCCHIA III
 ROBERT D. PHILLIPS
 SAYTHALA PHONEXAYPHOVA
 DAVID M. PIERCE
 AARON M. POB
 DOUGLAS J. POLLACK
 NICHOLAS G. POPPEN
 JACOB R. PRATER
 WALTER E. PRATT
 ALAN E. PUENTE
 CONSTANCE G. QUINLAN
 LUIS A. QUINTANA
 MICHAEL A. RANADO
 DAMONICA C. RAY
 SHANNON W. REICKERT
 ANTHONY P. REINHARDT
 MAXIMILLIAN A. RENARD
 KATHRYN R. REYNOLDS
 RONALD R. REZAC
 JENYA M. RHONE
 HEATHER J. RICHARDS
 JAY R. RICHARDSON
 KOURTLAWN D. RICHARDSON
 LUIS D. RIVERAFONSECA
 ADRIAN H. ROBINSON
 EVERLY S. RODRIGUEZ
 EDGAR R. RODRIGUEZ
 WILLIAM RODRIGUEZ
 PAUL RONDO
 JASON P. ROSE
 NANCY J. ROSEN
 KAREN A. ROXBERRY
 SEAN M. RUFOLD
 NATHANIEL K. RUSHING
 FORREST R. RYAN
 JOSHUA B. RYKOWSKI
 KEILA M. SANCHEZERAZO
 JANET C. SAPATUELLIS
 BENJAMIN L. SASS
 LEON R. SATCHELL

ANDREW M. SAWYER
 JEFFREY C. SCHMIZZE
 FRITZ J. SCHULTES
 JOSEPH M. SCHULTZ
 WILLIAM B. SCOTT
 ERIK J. SEDLOCK
 BLAINE S. SELLMAN
 AARON D. SELPH
 PRESTON J. SEXTON
 JASON M. SHAFER
 JUSTIN S. SHAFER
 TEREEMUURA T. SHAMEL
 GARRETT A. SHANNON
 ANDREW K. SHEALY
 MATTHEW R. SHEFTIC
 CLINTON A. SHELBY
 BRANDON C. SHELLEY
 CHAN Y. SHIN
 MARK E. SHUMAN
 NICHOLAS W. SIKES
 JEREMY J. SIMMERMAN
 WILLIAM K. SIMON
 JAMES H. SIMPSON
 DEONAND S. SINGH
 JOSHUA C. SISSON
 GARRETT W. SLACK
 THOMAS M. SLYKHUIS
 AARON T. SMITH
 DANIEL J. SMITH
 MORGAN M. SMITH
 PAUL M. SMITH
 RICHARD K. SMITH
 SYLVAN A. SMITH
 DWIGHT R. SMITHBARROW
 JOHNPAUL A. SMOCK
 STEPHEN T. SNYDER
 JEFFREY S. SODERLING
 LARON C. SOMERVILLE
 VICTOR E. SOMNUK
 JAMES A. SPANNAGEL
 STEVEN S. SPEECE
 MORGAN J. SPRINGGLACE
 JAMAR M. STAGGERS
 DAVID E. STATON
 TIMOTHY K. STEWART
 SHARRON L. STEWART
 BRIAN M. STIERITZ
 KRISTINA L. STOKES
 HENRY C. STRICKLAND, JR.
 KYLE D. STRUNK
 CHRISTOPHER J. STUBBS
 ALEX J. SULLIVAN
 MAIA M. SUSUICO
 JARED D. SUTTON
 JONATHAN R. SWOYER
 VICTORIA S. SZILAGYI
 MINNIE E. TANNER
 GILL T. TATMANTYREE, JR.
 MARLOW M. TAYLOR
 RICHARD C. TELESKO
 BRENT J. TEMPLE
 DANNY P. THEBEAU II
 RYAN S. THIEL
 JOHANNA L. THOMPSON
 MARK E. THOMPSON
 OSCAR D. THOMPSON
 EDWARD W. TIMMONS
 SHAWN E. TOENYES
 MICHAEL S. TOMSIK
 JAMES M. TORRES
 JOSE L. TORRES
 CHRISTOPHER P. TOWNSEND
 SHAUN M. TRINKLE
 SHAWN E. TUCKER
 JESSICA F. TURNER
 LANGE C. TURNER
 ERIC S. TY
 RONALD C. UNDERWOOD
 MATTHEW D. UTLEY
 JOSEPH P. VALLMONT
 SEAN S. VANDENDRIES
 WILLIAM B. VAUGHN, JR.
 THOMAS E. VELD
 JEREMY K. VISKER
 JOHN R. VOS
 JESSTON R. WAGNER
 MATTHEW N. WALENTA
 AMBER M. WALKER
 BENJAMIN S. WALKER
 MERRILL W. WALKER
 MICHAEL S. WALKER
 CHARLES B. WALKER II
 TRAVIS R. WALTER
 JASON R. WARD
 THOMAS B. WARD
 JEFFREY D. WARSTLER, JR.
 DONINE E. WATSON
 JAMES R. WATSON IV
 DANIEL S. WATTERS
 JUSTIN R. WEHREIM
 DANIEL L. WEISS
 RAYMOND J. WELSH
 WILLIAM S. WHITESSEL
 JUDY A. WICKENS
 JOHN F. WIEBELD
 SAMUEL R. WILBOURN
 DAVID D. WILKINSON
 ANNETTE Y. WILLIAMS
 CHRISTIAN D. WILSON
 JAMES C. WILSON
 TIMOTHY C. WILSON, JR.
 JERAMY A. WINK
 BENJAMIN C. WISNIOSKI
 WARREN A. WITHROW
 JAMAR E. WRIGHT
 EINAR J. WULFSBERG
 KYLE M. YANOWSKI

SCOTT J. YARBROUGH
SEAN M. YARROLL
DANIEL R. YOUNG
DEREK R. YOUNG
JONATHAN D. YOUNG, JR.
WOJCIECH ZAJAC
ANDREW P. ZAFF
JOHN D. ZEHNPENNIG
JUSTIN ZEVENBERGEN
LEVI D. ZOK
D010655
D011362
D011552
D010239
D011483
D011366
G010163
G010045
G010093
G010107
G010188

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

STEVEN J. ACKERSON
ANDREA ACOSTAMORALES
AARON E. ADAMS
BRUCE D. ADAMS
STEVEN J. ADAMS
RICHARD O. ADANSI
CASANDRA Z. ADES
CHRISTOPHER C. ADKINS
NATHAN T. ADKINS
JOSHUA J. ABSCHLIMAN
DAVID J. AHERN
LUIS D. ALBINO
LANE M. ALDINGER
CHAD T. ALEXANDER
SETH M. ALLEN
ERICH J. ALMONTE
PAULINA ALVAREZ
NEALY J. AMBRON
GLENY O. ANDERSON
JENNIFER K. ANDERSON
KRISTOPHER E. ANDERSON
KYLE W. ANDERSON
LUCAS R. ANDERSON
MICHAEL D. ANDERSON
THOMAS D. ANGSTADT
PETER A. ANZOVINO
NATHAN P. APFLEBAUM
CHRISTOPHER M. ARATA
GABRIEL A. ARAUJO
MELBOURNE J. ARLEDGE, JR.
JONATHAN B. ARMSTRONG
STEPHAN J. ARNOLD
ANDREW J. ARTIS
ROBERT L. ASHLEY
DANIEL J. ASHMORE
JAMES B. ASHTON
DAMION O. ATCHISON
ROGER ATEA
MARK B. ATKINSON
DEREK C. AUSTIN
LONI R. AYERS
JUSTIN K. BAKAL
GREGORY B. BAKER
WILLIAM C. BAKER
MATTHEW W. BANDI
MATTHEW R. BARINGHAUS
JUSTIN D. BARNES
GARRETT A. BARR
SETH E. BARRETT
MICHAEL A. BARRY
CHRISTOPHER E. BATCHELOR
ROBERT T. BATTY
CORBETT W. BAXTER
JAMES D. BEALL
JAMES M. BEAN
REBECCA E. BEARD
DAVID J. BEAUDOIN
PAUL J. BENFIELD
JACK H. BENFORD
CHAD A. BENNETT
KEITH R. BENOIT
BIXLER C. BENSON
IAN H. BENSON
KRIS J. BERGEMANN
ALEXANDER M. BERTELLI
ADAM T. BET
ANDREW P. BETSON
GREGORY E. BEW
ROBERT J. BICKFORD
CHARLES G. BIES
LORI L. BIGGER
WILLIAM T. BIGGERS II
WILLIAM A. BIGGS, JR.
CHRISTOPHER M. BIGOTT
PATRICK BILLMANN
NICOLA J. BIRCH
DANIEL B. BLANKENHORN
DOUGLAS A. BLEVINS
EDWIN H. BODENHEIM
JOHN M. BOEHNERT
ERIC S. BOENITZ
ANDREW R. BOISSONNEAU
PHILIP J. BOLDT
JOSEPH W. BORG
MARK S. BORN
RACHEL R. BOWERS
BRETT M. BOYLE
JOHN C. BOYLE
TODD F. BRADFORD
ZACHARY D. BRAINARD

DOUGLAS J. BRAZIER, JR.
MARK P. BREUGEM
OBADIAH H. BRIANS
BENJAMIN A. BRIDON
DAVID T. BRIGHT
JARED W. BRITZ
COLBY M. BROADWATER
DAVITT R. BRODERICK
NATHAN E. BROOKSHIRE
GREGORY S. BROWER
JASON C. BRUBAKER
GREGORY G. BRULE
RYAN T. BRUMMOND
CRAIG W. BRYANT
CARMEN T. BUCCI
RUSSELL A. BUCKHALT
JASON M. BUCKINGHAM
RYAN J. BUCKINGHAM
BRADFORD K. BUGADO
ANDY BUISSERETH
CHARLES B. BUNTIN
DONNA J. BUONO
JUAN J. BURGOSROSADO
KYLE D. BURKE
JAMES M. BURNETT
DAVID T. BURTON
RICHARD D. BUSTAMANTE
BRETT M. BUTLER
TIMOTHY A. BUTLER
DANIEL L. BYARS
JOSEPH M. BYERLY
JASON A. BYRD
MARCUS D. BYRNE
DANIEL P. CAFFAREL
RYAN A. CALHOON
DENNIS J. CALL II
PETER J. CALVELLO
MICHAEL T. CAMPBELL
SHAWN R. CAMPBELL
KATHLEEN R. CANDELA
TALGIN L. CANNON
WESLEY R. CANNON
BRIAN P. CANNY
HECTOR E. CANTILLO
JIMMIE L. CANUPP
NATHAN CARPESTANY
EDWIN E. CARCEDOMAZARIEGOS
JACOB T. CARLSLE
ORLANDO CARMONA
JAMES P. CARRIER
HENRY CARTAGENA
BRENT C. CARTER
DAVID W. CARTER
ROBERT D. CARTER
RYAN M. CASE
CHRISTOPHER P. CASPER
PAUL M. CASTILLO
GARRETT D. CATHCART
ROBERTO CELEDON, JR.
CHRISTOPHER W. CHAMBERS
SEAN C. CHANG
STUART C. CHAPMAN
SETH L. CHAPPELL
MATTHEW S. CHASE
ALAN K. W. CHEUNG
DAVID M. CHICCHETTI
AARON W. CHILDERS
ASHLIE H. CHRISTIAN
MARK S. CHRISTENSEN
JOHN W. CHRISTIE
JUSTIN C. CHRONISTER
FREDERICK L. CLAPP III
ALISSA L. CLARK
DANIEL W. CLARK
DAVID W. CLARK
DEREK M. CLARK
EDWARD CLARK III
JAMES A. CLARK
JOHN C. CLARK
MARK W. CLARK
ANTHONY M. CLAS
CORY R. CLAYTON
DAVID M. COCHRANE
BENJAMIN M. COHEN
SAMUEL T. COLBY
STEVEN A. COLEMAN
LOGAN P. COLLINS
CHRISTOPHER T. COLMAN
JAMES B. COMPTON
BRIAN E. CONNOLLY, JR.
HERBERT CONTRERAS
BRIAN S. COOK
CHAVESO L. COOK
CHRISTOPHER M. COOK
CRAIG V. COPPOCK
ALEXANDER B. CORBY
MATTHEW G. COSLER
CHRISTOPHER M. COUCH
DAVID P. COULOMBE
MICHAEL A. COURTRIGHT
BONNIE M. COWLES
DAVID B. COX
CHASE D. CRABTREE
ORLANDO N. CRAIG
PETER S. CROSTHWAITE
STEVEN E. CROWE
JOHN P. CRUZ
BENJAMIN D. CULVER
CAMILLE A. CUNNINGHAM
PATRICK T. CUNNINGHAM
BENJAMIN L. CURTIS
GEORGE H. CUSHMAN V
ZACHARY L. DADISMAN
JAMES D. DAILEY
TAM C. DAM
BRAD M. DANIELO
JAMES R. DANIELS

DAVID M. DARBY
MICHAEL J. DARGAVELL
PETER W. DAVIDOVITCH
ALPHEUS M. DAVIS
CODY S. DAVIS
DAMOND C. DAVIS
COURTNEY J. DEAN
JUAN P. DELGADO
JOHN B. DELOACH
THEODORE C. DEMARIA
JOHN W. DENNEY III
RUSSELL T. DESTREMPES
MICHAEL J. DIFABIO
CHARLES W. DICKHART
ROSS B. DICKMAN
SHAWN D. DILLON
THOMAS P. DIRIENZO
BRIAN C. DODD
JONATHAN E. DOIRON
JOHN R. DOLLARD
SCOTT J. DOLNY
JEFFREY W. DONAHUE
THOMAS A. DOUGLAS
ANDREW K. DOUGLASS
CHRISTIAN B. DRENNEN
JEREMY T. DUFF
JASON P. DUFFY
JOSEPH J. DUMAS
CHRISTOPHER C. DUNCAN
RICHARD W. DUNCAN
STEPHEN J. DUNSFORD
OWEN C. DURHAM
BRIAN J. DYER
MATTHEW G. EASLEY
TRAVIS J. EASTERLING
ELIZABETH S. EATONFERENZI
CASSIDY W. EAVES
FRANKIE A. EDENS, JR.
BRIAN T. EDWARDS
JONATHAN C. EDWARDS
RYAN L. EDWARDS
BURTON D. ESSLER
KYLE T. ELDRIDGE
THOMAS J. ELISON
EDWARD A. ELLINGSON
ERIC E. ELLIOTT
SCOTT T. ELLIOTT
PATRICK J. ENGLAND
JOSE D. ENRIQUEZ
PETER M. ERICKSON
BRETT D. EVANS
CHRISTOPHER D. EVANS
ERIC G. EVANS
MARK A. EVANS
PETER E. P. EVANS
RYAN N. EVANS
THOMAS B. EVERETT
BRIAN M. FALLON
RICHARD L. FARNELL
BRIAN FARRELL
MELODY L. FAULKENBERRY
BENJAMIN D. FEICHT
ERICH W. FEIGE
MICHAEL A. FENNELLS
STEVEN R. FERENZLI
DANIEL M. FERGUSON
ANTIONE C. FERNANDES
AMY E. FERRELL
RICHARD M. FERRELL
DANIEL P. FERRITER
SHAY W. FINLEY
JAMES R. FISCHER
CHAD W. FITZGERALD
BRYAN P. FITZPATRICK
SAMUEL R. FITZPATRICK
GARRY O. FLANDERS
JEFFREY P. FLEMING
JEREMY L. FLIGHT
DAVID B. FLINTON
RICHARD T. FLOER
THOMAS G. FLOOK
BRYAN D. FLYNN
ROBERTO R. FONSECA
MATTHEW T. FORD
RODERICK J. FORMAN
JONATHAN A. FORNES
DAVID P. FORSHA
CHERI J. FORSMAN
ADRIAN L. FOSTER
JOHN T. FOSTER
DANIEL J. FOX
DONALD E. FOX, JR.
SCOTT M. FREDERICK
MATTHEW W. FREEBURG
JACOB W. FRESHOUR
TROY S. FREY
BRADLEY N. FRYE
ANDREW A. FULLER
ANTHONY FUSCELLARO
MICHAEL R. GABRHEL
SCOTT D. GALE
ZANE M. GALYACH
SAMUEL B. GALYK
RONALL L. GARBERTSON
VERONICA GARCIA
BERNARD R. GARDNER
CHRISTOPHER J. GARDNER
JANELLE A. GARNER
BRADLEY C. GATES
KYLE E. GAYLOR
LUIS N. GAYTAN
DEREK J. GEDMINTAS
THOMAS R. GEISINGER
GRAHAM C. GENRICH
CHRISTOPHER E. GEORGE
PETER A. GEORGE
CHRISTOPHER R. GORBANI

JEREMY M. GIBBS
 JAMES M. GIBSON
 BENJAMIN J. GILLESPIE
 MARK D. GILLMAN
 CHRISTOPHER L. GILLULY
 GORDON R. GIMSE
 RYAN S. GLADDING
 ANDREW S. GLENN
 BRIAN K. GLENN
 WILLIAM J. GOLEMBIEWSKI
 BRENNAN S. GOLTRY
 PETER GOMEZ
 MATTHEW A. GONCALVES
 BRIAN F. GRAHAM
 TIMOTHY A. GRAHAM
 JUSTIN C. GRANT
 DANIEL R. GRAY
 NELSON B. GRAY
 DESHANE P. GREASER
 COLIN J. GREATA
 TIMOTHY N. GREEN
 ADAM K. GREENE
 BYRON N. GREENE
 JANELLE M. GREENE
 RYAN GREENING
 CHARLES E. GREER
 CHRISTINA L. GRIGGS
 RANDALL S. GRIGGS
 NICOLAS A. GUILLET
 CHRISTOPHER M. HABERKAMP
 HENRY HAMBLIN, JR.
 PATRICK S. HAMEL
 DEVIN K. HAMMOND
 LOUIS-PHILIPPE L. HAMMOND
 STEVEN T. HAMPSON
 DANIEL R. HAMPTON
 DAVID R. HAMPTON III
 PAUL E. HANEY
 KEVIN HANKTON
 BRIAN HANRAHAN
 JERRE V. HANSBROUGH
 JESSE L. HARDEN
 CHRISTOPHER L. HARRINGTON
 OMAR A. HARRIOTT
 BRIAN J. HARRIS
 WILLIE HARRIS III
 YOLANDA M. HARRIS
 MICHAEL M. HARRISON
 BRIAN D. HARTMAN
 BENJAMIN K. HASSELL
 SCOTT A. HASTINGS
 BRANDON J. HATHORNE
 WADE A. HATZINGER
 JONATHAN L. HAWKINS
 MARK P. HAYES
 SAMUEL L. HAYES, JR.
 CHRISTOPHER A. HAYNES
 JOSHUA C. HAYWARD
 MICHAEL G. HAZELL
 JOHN J. HEIDENREICH
 TIMOTHY J. HEISLER
 RONALD J. HERNANDEZ
 MATTHEW P. HERTZ
 DEBORAH R. HERZOG
 MARCEL M. HICKMAN
 RONALD N. HJDUK, JR.
 ISSAC A. HILLS
 JESSE A. HILL
 SEAN R. HILL
 JOHANN W. HINDERT
 JONATHAN P. HITCHCOCK
 DEVEN S. HOEVERS
 CALVIN R. HOOVER, JR.
 MICHAEL L. HOPKINS
 TIMOTHY J. W. HORN
 CHRISTOPHER P. HORNSBY
 ISAAC S. HOWARD
 LEVITICUS M. HUFF
 JACOB A. HUGHES
 JAMES E. HUGHES
 JARED L. HULL
 KEVIN D. HUMPHRES
 ADRIEN G. HUMPHREYS
 JOHN D. HUNTER
 AUDREY D. HURDLE
 ELISHA A. HUSBAND
 DANIEL A. HUSEK
 ERICA HUSTON
 SUZANNA HUTIN
 MICHAEL F. HUTSON
 TIMOTHY A. IANNACONE
 ALIKA K. ICHINOSE
 TODD K. IMPERIALE
 JOHN C. INTILE
 JAY A. IRELAND
 DESMOND R. JACK
 BENJAMIN R. JACKSON
 LUKE T. JACKSON
 SHAUN F. JACKSON
 ANGEL K. JACKSONGILLESPIE
 LATOYA M. JACKSONMANZEY
 MICHAEL L. JACOBS II
 PAUL M. JACQUES
 ANTHONY JAMES
 MATTHEW M. JAMES
 VERNON J. JAMES
 STEFFANIE M. JEBB
 DAVID M. JENNINGS
 RONALD A. JILLARD
 BOBBY W. JOHNSON
 CAMERON M. JOHNSON
 CAMERON X. JOHNSON
 JAMES M. JOHNSON II
 LEE M. JOHNSON, JR.
 SELWYN JOHNSON
 BRENDAN P. JOLIET
 ANDREW G. JONES

GARY D. JONES
 RAYMOND C. JONES
 RYAN P. JONES
 BRAD C. JORDAN
 ERIK K. JORGENSEN
 JAMES M. KADEL
 JEFFREY M. KAIN
 DAIJIRO KANASE
 OLIVER N. KARP
 SEAN H. KARRELS
 BENJAMIN A. KATZENBERGER
 ROBERT A. KAZMAREK
 AARON L. KEARNEY
 APRIL D. KEARNEY
 MOLLIE G. KEDNEY
 MATTHEW J. KEESLING
 JAMIE L. KELLEY
 MICHAEL J. KELLY
 ROBERT C. KELLY
 RYAN V. KELLY
 MICHAEL R. KELVINGTON
 MICHAEL P. KENDALL
 ERIN L. KENNEDY
 LUCAS J. KENNEDY
 KRISTOPHER W. KERKSICK
 MATTHEW J. KIKTA
 MATTHEW D. KILLORAN
 COURTNEY L. KILUK
 FREDERICK J. KIM
 JAE Y. KIM
 MICHAEL B. KIM
 MIKOLA J. KING
 KYLE L. KIRKPATRICK
 WAUKEMSHA Q. KIRKPATRICK
 BRIAN M. KITCHING
 JASON S. KITTLESEN
 DAVID M. KITZMAN
 BENJAMIN W. KLANDRUD
 JOSHUA M. KLATZKO
 CHRISTOPHER E. KLICH
 ROBERT G. KNAGGS
 JOHNATHON S. KNAPTON
 KURT S. KNOEDLER
 ELIZABETH A. KNOX
 MATTHEW J. KNOX
 ROMAN KOCHEROVSKY
 BRADLEY R. KOERNER
 ROBERT J. KOLB
 KENTON C. KOMIVES
 JASON D. KOO
 ERIC R. KOTTKE
 KORY A. KRAMER
 RYAN R. KROELLS
 COLBY K. KRUG
 DANIEL J. KRUPA
 VINCENT N. KUCHAR
 ANDREW J. KUEN
 CHRISTOPHER P. KUSZANIA
 FRANK J. KUZMINSKI
 EMILY A. LACAILLE
 BRITTON A. LANDRY
 JOSEPH M. LANE
 JAY P. LARDIZABAL
 CALEB G. LAUE
 JEREMY D. LAWHORN
 TIMOTHY J. LAWRENCE
 TIMOTHY W. LAWSON
 LUCAS N. LECOUR
 JE K. LEE
 LOUIS H. LEE
 DAVID A. LEIBOVICH
 JAMES L. LEISTER
 STEVEN H. LESTER
 PETER J. LESZCZYNSKI
 SCOTT D. LEUTHNER
 CHAD P. LEWIS
 MARK A. LICHAK
 PAUL E. LINDBERG
 JASON M. LINGK
 CHARLES B. LINGLE
 KYLE A. LIPOLD
 MICHAEL H. LISCANO
 JEFFREY T. LITTLE
 JOSEPH A. LOAR
 DOUGLAS A. LOCKE
 ROBERT L. LODEWICK
 JOSHUA A. LONG
 DUSTIN L. LONGFELLOW
 VAL H. LOPEZ
 DREW G. LORENTZEN
 BRAD J. LOSNER
 DENNIS A. LOUCK
 THOMAS J. LOUX
 JUENE M. LOWRY
 KEVIN J. LOWTHER
 JACK H. LUCKHARDT
 MICHAEL B. LUNDEBY
 WILLIAM E. LYLES III
 GIOFREY B. LYNCH III
 CHRISTOPHER L. LYON
 DEAN G. LYON
 JEREMY H. LYONS
 MARGARET S. MAASBERG
 JULIE A. MACKNYGHT
 CHAD D. MADDOX
 BENJAMIN MAHER
 CHRISTOPHER T. MAJORS
 JOE B. MALISZEWSKI
 JUSTIN D. MALONE
 JOSHUA J. MANGAS
 QUINCY J. L. MANZEY
 AUSTIN P. MAPLES
 LUIS D. MARIN
 MICHAEL J. MARIN
 CRAIG S. MARKIEWICZ
 JOSEPH L. MARSHALL
 DEREK C. MARTIN

JONATHAN D. MARTIN
 TODD J. MARTIN
 GUILLERMO E. MARTINEZ
 JASON MARTINEZ
 JUAN L. MARTINEZ
 MATTHEW J. MARTINSON
 LAYNE W. MATTHEWS
 ANDREW J. MAXA
 CHADWICK L. MAXEY
 DOUGLAS MAYES II
 ANTHONY MAYNE
 ROBERT C. MCBRIDE
 MICHAEL J. MCCAIVE
 ADAM F. MCCOMBS
 CHRISTOPHER E. MCCONNELL
 WILLIAM K. MCCOY
 BRIAN M. MCCRAY
 JAMES A. MCCUNE, JR.
 JEREMY R. MCDONALD
 ROBERT D. MCDONOUGH
 SEAN D. MCENTEE
 ERICK A. MCFERRAN
 CASSANDRA D. MCGINNIS
 MARY E. MCGOVNEY
 BRENDAN J. MCINTYRE
 TYLER S. MCKEE
 DANIEL C. MCKEEL
 CORY N. MCLAUGHLIN
 JOHN M. MCLAUGHLIN
 RYAN A. MCLAUGHLIN
 JOHN M. MCLEAN II
 SHAWN P. MCNICOL
 MICHAEL R. MEADOR
 CARL D. MEDEIROS
 BENJAMIN D. MEIER
 JASON A. MEIER
 RYAN L. MENDEHNALL
 PAUL J. MENDOZA
 CHRISTOPHER L. MERCADO
 STEPHEN S. MERCER
 BRAD A. MERCIER
 MATTHEW J. MIESKO
 SCOTT M. MESSARE
 ADRIAN A. MESSER
 JUSTIN J. MICHEL
 JUSTIN E. MIDDLETON
 BRIAN R. MILETICH
 AARON J. W. MILLER
 BRIAN G. MILLER
 THOMAS J. MILLER
 RYAN E. MINGKLER
 MARK J. MINGEE
 EDWIN L. MINGES
 BRIAN D. MITCHELL
 DAPHNE C. MITCHELLWRIGHT
 TIMOTHY M. MITROKA
 WESLEY A. MORRIS
 BARRON J. MOFFITT
 BRETT L. MONETTE
 ROBERT W. MONROE
 CHAD A. MONROE
 LEE D. MONZON
 KENNETH E. MORAN
 CHADWICK H. MOREHEAD
 JOHN A. MORGAN
 RYAN L. MORGAN
 SHIGENBU T. MORINAGA
 GABRIEL L. MORRIS
 JOSEF N. MORRIS
 JOHN R. MORROW
 STEPHEN M. MORSE
 PAUL E. MORTON
 MICHAEL H. MOSTAGHNI
 PATRICK J. MOTTO
 RANDY R. MOUNTS
 JILL K. MUDGE
 SONIE L. MUNSON
 CHRISTOPHER A. MYER
 DAVID M. MYERS
 JOSEPH E. MYERS
 DANIEL S. NAAB
 JAMIE O. NASI
 SCOTT A. NATTER
 MICHAEL J. NAU
 PAUL B. NEAL
 IRVIN NELSON III
 SCOTT P. NELSON
 JAMES M. NEMEC
 DAVID W. NEWHOUSE
 ALEX L. NEWSOM
 NDASHA NGANTE
 JOHN D. NGUYEN
 KEN NGUYEN
 DOUGLAS R. NICK
 JOSEPH E. NICKEL
 JOY F. NICKEL
 MICAH A. NIEBAUER
 ROBERT C. NOBLE
 CHRISTOPHER B. NOGLE
 CHRISTOPHER J. NOHLE
 JONATHAN D. NORDIN
 MICHAEL J. NORIEGA
 RYAN R. NUGENT
 DEREK J. OBERG
 NEIL C. OBERLIN
 RYAN J. OCCHIUTTO
 EDWARD M. OCONNELL
 PATRICK R. OCONNOR
 CAROLINE T. O'MALLEY
 NORMAN P. O'NEIL
 MICHAEL C. ORLOFF
 JOHN C. ORTEGON
 MATTHEW J. OSTERGAARD
 TERRENCE J. OWENS
 STEVEN C. PACE
 JAMES B. PACHECO
 BRENT J. PAFFORD

MATTHEW J. PAINTER
SEVERO D. PALACIOS, JR.
MATTHEW N. PALADINO
MARK P. PALMA
ROBERT B. PANTOJA
JAROD V. PARKER
JOSHUA A. PARKER
JEREMY B. PASSUT
MITCHELL A. PAYNE
JOSEPH A. PAZCOGUIN
RICHARD B. PEACOCK
MICHAEL A. PEARCE
JEFFREY R. PEARSON
MARK C. PEER
BEAU D. PENDERGRAFT
MARCUS A. PEREZ
MARIAH J. PEREZ
JAMES E. PERKINS
EVAN T. PERPERIS
BROCK B. PETERS
JOHN A. PETERSON
JONATHAN G. PETERSON
ROBERT J. PETERSON III
ANDREW A. PETRIE
CHRISTOPHER R. PEVEY
JONATHAN E. PFENDER
CHRISTOPHER W. PIERCE
STEVEN E. PIERCE
ZEBULON PIKE
COLE C. PINHEIRO
MATTHEW J. PIOSA
STEPHEN J. POMELLA
EDDIE PORTER, JR.
RYAN W. POST
DAVID T. POWELL
JARED L. POWELL
JOSEPH R. POWER
MICHAEL J. PREDNY
JOHN C. PRINCIPE
JAMES B. PRISOCK
ADAM D. PRYCTOR
MICHAEL A. PROVENCHER
KURT A. PRYOR
ERVIN W. PURVIS
THOMAS J. RADABAUGH
STEPHANIE M. RADFORD
RIMAS A. RADZIUS
ANDRE M. RANDOLPH
DARIUS C. RANDOLPH
JEFFREY P. RAWLINS
JAMES M. RAY
DEREK J. RAYMOND
ASSAD A. RAZA
FRANK D. RAZZANO
BENJAMIN J. RECLA
TERRY F. REDD
GILBERT REDFORD
MARK A. REID
KIP C. REMSBURG
BRIAN A. RETHERFORD
BRIAN P. REVELL
BRIAN D. REYNOLDS
ROBERT E. REYNOLDS
DANIELLE RICHARDSON
JASON L. RICHARDSON
JOHN C. RICHIE
ADAM C. RICHMOND
DONALD J. RIDDLE
DARREN A. RILEY
NICHOLAS S. RINGLER
PATRICK M. RIORDAN
MATTHEW J. RIPKA
MATTHEW P. RISTAU
HEATHER I. RUTCHBY
PEDRO J. RIVERA
BENJAMIN ROARK
CHRISTOPHER B. ROBERTS
GEMA ROBLES
DREW G. RODGERS
CLIFTON E. ROGERS
LAURA J. ROGERS
EARL R. ROLOFF
JOHN P. ROMITO
THOMAS P. J. ROOT
KRISTOPHER E. ROSE
PAUL A. ROTHLSBERGER
DAVID B. ROUSSEAU
JUSTIN M. ROY
LAWRENCE A. RUBAL
CHRISTOPHER G. RUEL
JOSHUA A. RUSSO
ANDREW J. RUSZKIEWICZ
MICHAEL J. RYBACKI
CAMERON J. RYU
PETER S. SALFEETY
RAUL SALINAS
JOHNATHON W. SAMPSEL
DANIEL J. SANCHEZ
JASON D. SANCHEZ
RISSA O. SANCHEZ
MICHAEL L. SANDERS
BRIAN S. SANTOS
STEVEN M. SANTUCCI
JASON M. SARTORI
JOSEPH M. SAWRUK
J. B. SAWYER
MICHAEL B. SCHEER
ROBERT D. SCHEIERN
ADAM A. SCHER
LAWRENCE A. SCHMIDLE
MARK S. SCHMIDT
STEVEN L. SCHMIDT
PHILIP D. SCHNEIDER
EMILY R. SCHNETZLER
ROBERT C. SCHUETTE
ADAM T. SCHULTZ
QUENTON L. SCHULTZ

CHARLES B. SCHUMACHER
BENJAMIN A. SEIPEL
DANIEL P. SEITER
EDWARD L. SELLARS
ANDREW L. SERGENT
DOUG K. SEROTA
LOUISE M. SERPICO
STEVEN P. SEVIGNY
KATHRYN L. SHAW
LAUREN M. SHAW
TREVOR W. SHELLEN
WILLIAM W. SHELTON
LADARRIAN SHERMAN
CHAD W. SHIELDS
SHANE P. SHIPSHOCK
MATTHEW J. SHIRLEY
GEOFFREY M. SHORR
ASHTON R. SHOULTS
LISA L. SHOUSE
JOSHUA L. SHRADER
ROBERT I. SICKLER
JAMES R. SIEBERT
JASON S. SIGLER
BRIAN J. SILVA
DAVID J. SIMMONS
NICHOLAS G. SIMPSON
DOUGLAS S. SIMS
PHILIP J. SINGLETON
EMMANUEL I. SIOSON
JONATHAN D. SLACK
DAMON B. SLAUGHTER
ADAM M. SLEPIAN
LEE A. SMALL III
ANDREW L. SMITH
ANTHONY D. SMITH
BRADLEY W. SMITH
GREGORY R. SMITH
KEVIN E. SMITH
SEAN T. SMITH
JACOB C. SNYDER
PATRICK J. SNYDER
MATTHEW G. SOLLEAU
ELIECER I. SOLANO
ANTON V. SOLTIS
BRANDON R. SOLTWISCH
VLADIMIR R. SOTOSANCHEZ
KYLE M. SPADE
MARTIN J. SPANGLER
MEGAN R. SPANGLER
BENJAMIN C. SPERA
THOMAS J. SPOLIZINO
RICHARD T. STANFORD
AARON P. STARYAK
MICHAEL D. STEELE
SCOTT J. STEPHENS
JENNIFER L. STEVENSON
TODD J. STEVENSON
MELISSA K. STEWART
MICHAEL T. STEWART
TIMOTHY A. STEWART
RYAN T. STIDUM
JACQUELINE K. STILWELL
ANDREW E. STIPP
EDWARD R. STOLTENBERG
ADAM F. STORMS
GARY W. STRATTON II
WALTER N. STRAUPE
JAMES J. STRAVERS
NATHAN L. STRICKLAND
WESLEY V. STRONG
DAVID M. STROUP
DAVID J. STRYSKO
DONALD J. SULPIZIO
RANDALL A. SUMMERHILL
JARED J. SUNSDAHL
BRIAN J. SUPONCIC
TYREK N. SWABY
ERIC P. SWANSON
JACOB J. SWEATLAND
MICHAEL J. SVERTSEN
ERICA L. TAIACAN
STEPHEN S. TALIAFERRO
FAUL F. TANGHE
FORREST M. TAYLOR
JOHNATHAN H. TAYLOR
PATRICK B. TAYLOR
TRAVIS J. TAYLOR
ROBERT M. TEMPLE
JACOB M. TEPLSKY
GEOFFREY A. TERRY
MATTHEW S. TERRY
TIA M. TERRY
LEIF H. THAXTON
CHRISTOPHER R. THOMA
ANTHONY E. THOMAS
KEVIN M. THOMAS
PETER A. THOMAS
JOHN K. THOMPSON
SCOTT D. THORNBURY
DEREK A. THORNTON
JOSHUA H. THYER
ALEX C. TIGNOR
SEAN D. TINKLENBERG
MICHAEL Z. TIONGCO
DAM R. TOBIAS
STEPHEN A. TOLBERT III
JOHN C. TOLIN
FRANK I. TOOMEY
DAMON M. TORRES
RAMON J. TORRESGUZMAN
DANIEL J. TOSHNER
JOHN R. TRAHAN
JAMES D. TRASK
VANCE K. TRENKEL
DOUGLAS M. TRIPPANY II
PO C. TSUI
JOSEPH A. TULL

JASON E. TURNER
MICAH J. TURNER
CRISTOPHER M. ULRICH
MICHAEL J. URSO
JESSIE M. VALDEZ
BRADLEY R. VANCE
JEFFREY M. VANDYKE
MATTHEW B. VANPUTTE
ALAN E. VANSANUN
PATRICK L. VARDARO
KEVIN B. VAUGHAN
MARCO A. VELA
CHRISTOPHER S. VINCENT
ANN J. VOGANSAMPSON
ROGER L. VOGEL III
BEAU S. VOMASTIC
JOHN A. VOTOVICH
ADAM J. WACHOB
LESLIE A. WADDLE
PHILIP M. WAGGONER
MATT D. WAGNER
IAN M. WAGONER
DAREN K. WAJDAK
CHARLES F. WALL
CORY W. WALLACE
ANTHONY J. WARNER
COREY B. WARREN
THOMAS R. WARREN
WILLIAM W. WASH
CHRISTOPHER J. WATKINS
JOSHUA D. WEAKLAND
PATRICK J. WEAVER
GEORGE S. WEBB
WESTON R. WEBB
MICHAEL J. WEIPERT
BENJAMIN A. WELCH
MARK H. WELCH
MICHAEL M. WELLOCK
SIMON P. WELTE
HERMAN B. WEST
GREGORY C. WHEEL
JEREMY W. WHEELER
SEAN M. WHELAN
JOSHUA J. WHIDDON
THOMAS A. WHITEHEAD
THOMAS WHITFIELD II
NATHAN H. WHITNEY
STEPHANIE K. WHITTLE
ERIC J. WICKTORA
SHAUN M. WILD
JOSHUA I. WILES
JOSHUA R. WILHELM
JAMES R. WILLIAMS
JAYSON N. WILLIAMS
KARREEM V. WILLIAMS
MICHAEL S. WILLIAMS
NICHOLAS C. WILLIAMS
THOMAS M. WILLIAMS
JAMES G. WILLIAMSON
KAMILI M. WILLIAMSON
BYRON W. WILSON, JR.
JAMES C. WILTSE
BRADLEY J. WINN
STEPHEN J. WINTER
JOSEPH S. WITMER
JODI L. WITT
SCOTT E. WOHLFORD
KEVIN A. WOLF
ELIZABETH A. WOMBLE
NOBLE B. WONSETTLER
JESSE L. WOOD
WILLIAM W. WOOD
LORILYN M. WOODS
MATTHEW E. WOODS
CLINTON R. WOODY
DAVID C. WOODY
LAMARIUS D. WORKMAN
GARRICK C. WORST
RICHARD A. WUKMIR
PHILIP J. WYANT
SHAILIN YNACAY
SAONG G. YOU
NEIMAN C. YOUNG
TALON C. YOUNG
ANNETTE N. YOUNGBLOOD
JOSEPH A. YURKOVICH
DAVID J. ZALLO
JOHN M. ZDEB
NICHOLAS J. ZIEMBA
CHRISTOPHER W. ZIMMER
DANIEL T. ZIMMER
CHRISTOPHER D. ZOTTER
D010901
D011165
D011284
D010533
D011558
G010128

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

JOSEPH R. PRIMEAUX, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

JEROME R. PILEWSKI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

JEREMY J. AUJERO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

GARY S. PHILLIPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

GENEVIEVE BUENAFLO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

FREDDIE R. HARMON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

CATHERINE W. BOEHME

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

TODD W. MILLS

MARVIN W. WHITING