

least once to receive some of the new GI Bill benefits.

What do you think he will tell his friends about the military as a result of this experience? What will his family say? And how much warning did we give this young man that he could no longer count on \$4,500 per year in tuition assistance?

As I said, this young man was 19 years old. Last month the veterans' unemployment rate for those ages 18 to 24 rose again. It is now a very troubling 36.2 percent. We are in the midst of a grave unemployment crisis and now is the time to invest—not divest—in continuing education for our military.

This is not the way we should treat our service men and women. We should keep our commitments, especially those we have made to those who are willing to sacrifice everything for their fellow Americans and the Nation.

I urge my friends and colleagues to support our amendment to require the services to resume tuition assistance the minute this bill passes. It is sponsored by Senators INHOFE and HAGAN, and it is a necessary response to an unnecessarily harsh and short-sighted policy decision.

The sequester is not a thoughtful or balanced approach to cutting spending, and we should find an alternative. But, until that moment occurs, everyone, especially the military services, must reject the impulse to “grab low hanging fruit,” and cut it down, in its entirety, simply because it is more convenient.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I commend the chairwoman and vice chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Senators MIKULSKI and SHELBY, on crafting a strong bill to close out the remaining 6 months of the fiscal year. This bill was developed under difficult circumstances and time constraints, and I really feel they have done a good job of returning some semblance of regular order to this process. I am hopeful this progress will continue in the coming fiscal year.

One of my disappointments with this legislation, however, is that we are not able to fund any new Army Corps of Engineers projects.

The lack of new starts in the Corps is of particular concern to my State, as it impedes progress on the flood control project in Hamilton City, CA. It is a project that could potentially serve as a model for Corp projects throughout the Nation. More importantly, the construction of a new levee is critical for the protection of Hamilton City and Glenn County from catastrophic flooding. The project has been ready for construction for several years now but has been entangled in the new starts prohibition.

It is my hope and intention that for fiscal year 2014 we will have regular order in appropriations, and I will work to support this project moving forward.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I met with FAA Administrator Michael Huerta last week to discuss sequestra-

tion and how it will affect our national aviation network. Sequestration will reduce the FAA's budget by approximately \$600 million in the middle of this fiscal year. The Administrator told me this swift and sudden reduction in funding will have serious consequences to the efficiency of our national aviation system, especially in Illinois. Airport managers throughout the State of Illinois have also registered their serious concerns about the sequestration impact on commercial and general aviation.

The FAA will have to severely reduce service or completely close approximately 180 air traffic control towers across the country. Nine air traffic control towers in Illinois will have their service either eliminated or severely reduced: Alton, Aurora, Bloomington-Normal, Decatur, DuPage, Carbondale, Marion, Springfield and Waukegan. The FAA has also said that overnight air traffic control service at Peoria and Midway airports could be eliminated. These are serious steps that will increase delays, reduce capacity and potentially compromise the safety of the airspace in the areas surrounding these airports.

I will continue to monitor this situation and will work with the FAA and airport managers throughout the State of Illinois to address aviation safety and air traffic delays.

However, the aviation system is not the only harm sequestration will have on this country. The White House estimates sequestration will reduce the readiness of our troops; put up to 10,000 veterans at substantial risk of becoming homeless; drop 70,000 children from Head Start, including 2,700 from Illinois; take nutritional assistance away from 600,000 families because of cuts to WIC; and reduce foreclosure prevention and other counseling to 75,000 fewer households.

Many Republicans have said they are comfortable with allowing sequestration to continue. They think no one will notice what sequestration does to the country. I disagree. These sequestration cuts will have real impact on real people in Illinois. We need to stop sequestration with a balanced solution of budget cuts and revenue. I am pleased we will soon start debating the budget resolution. Budget Chairwoman PATTY MURRAY has produced a budget that will stop sequestration and the negative impacts it will have on our economy, our troops and working families across America.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I will vote for the bill before us because it ensures the continued operation of government. The overall spending in the bill conforms to the Budget Control Act yet provides needed flexibility for

agencies to operate as best they can while under sequestration.

I will continue to seek a comprehensive, bipartisan approach to avoid the harmful effects of sequestration. Any compromise to do so will require both prudent spending cuts and additional revenues. Considering that revenues are necessary as part of the way to alleviate the negative effects of the sequester, this bill is not the appropriate vehicle to address our current budgetary situation. I am hopeful that by passing this bill and ensuring no government shutdown occurs, we can work in a bipartisan and responsible manner to undo sequestration.

This bill does contain important funding for Michigan, including \$210.5 million for Army research on combat vehicle and automotive technologies through the Army Tank and Automotive Research, Development and Engineering Center, TARDEC, in Warren. TARDEC is the Department of Defense's leading laboratory for research and development of advanced military vehicle technologies, including efforts to protect Army vehicles against rocket propelled grenades, improvised explosive devices and explosively formed projectiles; advanced materials for tactical vehicle armor; more efficient engines; fuel cell and hybrid electric vehicles; unmanned ground vehicles; computer simulations for vehicle design and training of Army personnel; and technology partnerships with the automotive industry.

The bill also includes funding for the programs of the Army's TACOM Life Cycle Management Command, LCMC, in Warren. TACOM LCMC is the Army's lead organization for the development and acquisition of ground vehicle combat, automotive and armaments technologies and systems. TACOM LCMC-managed systems include the Abrams main battle tank, Bradley Fighting Vehicle, Stryker Armored Vehicle, Mine Resistant Ambush Protected vehicle, and all Army tactical vehicles, such as the HMMWV and Family of Medium Tactical Vehicles.

The bill provides full funding for transportation programs authorized under MAP-21, the 2-year transportation bill signed into law in July that provides critically needed funding for our Nation's roads and bridges. This is a victory because the CR for the first half of the year, and the House-passed CR, do not include the full funding levels authorized in MAP 21.

The bill also provides needed support for American manufacturing. The Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership Program, MEP, receives level funding at \$128.5 million. It is the only Federal program dedicated to providing technical support and services to small and medium-sized manufacturers. MEP is a nationwide network of proven resources that enables manufacturers to compete globally, supports greater supply chain integration, and provides access to information, training and technologies that improve efficiency, productivity, and profitability.

This program has been used extensively in my home State by the Michigan Manufacturing Technology Center, which operates the Michigan's Manufacturing Extension Partnership Program. MMTC works with manufacturers around the State of Michigan to innovate so they can become more efficient and profitable in order to grow and create jobs.

The bill protects the life and safety of boaters on the Great Lakes by including a provision that denies the administration request to close the U.S. Coast Guard Seasonal Air Facilities in Muskegon. Closing the station would put at risk the large number of boaters on Lake Michigan during the summer. The Muskegon facility has been in place since 1997 and provides an important safety presence during the boating season on Lake Michigan.

During the course of consideration of the Continuing Resolution, the Senate adopted by voice vote an amendment offered by Senators COBURN and MCCAIN that will limit the use of funds of the National Science Foundation for political science research. The amendment was modified before it was adopted under an agreement between the sponsors and Chairman MIKULSKI and represented a significant improvement over the original amendment. The amendment as modified allows for political science research projects to be conducted when the Director of the National Science Foundation certifies those projects as promoting the economic interests or national security of the United States. I am concerned that this amendment will restrict high quality research in critical areas beyond our national security and economic interests and creates a threshold for certifying eligible political science research projects that could eliminate very worthy projects, if it is not applied wisely and thoughtfully. I hope that a broad interpretation will avoid unnecessary restrictions of legitimate research.

I am disappointed that the continuing resolution does not provide for adequate funding for our financial markets regulators, the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission. I worked with a number of my colleagues on an amendment to improve their funding to ensure they have the resources they need to police the markets. Unfortunately that was not adopted.

On balance, while the bill does not contain sufficient funding for many programs, it also contains funding important to Michigan and ensures the continued operation of government. For this reason, I will vote for it.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask the time be equally divided.

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 69 TO AMENDMENT NO. 26

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside and amendment No. 69 be called up.

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

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN], for himself and Mr. MCCAIN, proposes an amendment numbered 69 to amendment No. 26.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To prohibit Urban Area Security Initiative grant recipients from funding projects that do not improve homeland security)

On page 392, line 25, strike "training." and insert the following: "training: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available under paragraph (2) may be used for employee overtime or backfill pay, for security measures at sports facilities used for Major League Baseball spring training, to pay for attendance at conferences, or to purchase computers or televisions."

AMENDMENT NO. 93 TO AMENDMENT 26

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be set aside and amendment No. 93 be called up.

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

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN] proposes an amendment numbered 93 to amendment No. 26.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To transfer appropriations from the National Heritage Partnership Program to fund the resumption of public tours of the White House and visitor services and maintenance at national parks and monuments)

On page 542, strike lines 3 through 21 and insert the following:

REOPENING THE WHITE HOUSE FOR PUBLIC TOURS AND PRESERVING OUR NATIONAL TREASURES

SEC. 1404. Notwithstanding section 1101—

(1) the amount appropriated for the National Recreation and Preservation account shall be reduced by \$8,100,000, which shall be taken from the National Heritage Partnership Program; and

(2) the amount appropriated under section 1401(e) for "National Park Service, Operation of the National Park System" shall be increased by \$6,000,000, which shall be used for expenses related to visitor services and maintenance of national parks, monuments, sites, national memorials, and battlefields, including the White House, Grand Canyon National Park, the Washington Monument, Yellowstone National Park, and the Flight 93 National Memorial.

AMENDMENT NO. 65, AS MODIFIED, TO AMENDMENT NO. 26

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be set aside and amendment No. 65, with modifications, at the desk be called up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN], for himself and Mr. MCCAIN, proposes an amendment numbered 65, as modified, to amendment No. 26.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To prohibit the use of funds to carry out the functions of the Political Science Program in the Division of Social and Economic Sciences of the Directorate for Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences of the National Science Foundation, except for research projects that the Director of the National Science Foundation certifies as promoting national security or the economic interests of the United States)

On page 193, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ (a) None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out the functions of the Political Science Program in the Division of Social and Economic Sciences of the Directorate for Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences of the National Science Foundation, except for research projects that the Director of the National Science Foundation certifies as promoting national security or the economic interests of the United States.

(b) The Director of the National Science Foundation shall publish a statement of the reason for each certification made pursuant to subsection (a) on the public website of the National Science Foundation.

(c) Any unobligated balances for the Political Science Program described in subsection (a) may be provided for other scientific research and studies that do not duplicate those being funded by other Federal agencies.

AMENDMENT NO. 70, AS MODIFIED, TO AMENDMENT NO. 26

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be set aside, and amendment No. 70, as modified, be called up.

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

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN], for himself and Mr. MCCAIN, proposes an amendment numbered 70, as modified, to amendment No. 26.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

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

The amendment is as follows:

After section 573 of title V of division D, insert the following:

SEC. 574. Fourteen days after the Secretary of Homeland Security submits a report required under this division to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Secretary

shall submit a copy of that report to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I want to comment a minute, before I talk about the individual amendments, on the process we have seen.

We are going to have several amendments, and this is well in excess of \$1 trillion in spending. We have had four amendments voted on, and I think unanimous consent will give us seven or eight more. So we are going to have a total of 12 amendments. All but the first one were not tabled, but we are at 60-vote margins, which is fine. But for a bill that spends \$1 trillion, to choke down the Senate in a way that does not allow either side the appropriate opportunity to impact \$1 trillion worth of spending doesn't fit with either the culture or the history of the Senate, and certainly doesn't fit with the agreement going forward and the rules changes we had this year.

On a bill that has \$1 trillion worth of spending, in past history—if you look at the 104th, the 105th, the 103rd Congress—bills of that size would have 70 or 80 amendments, and we are going to choke down to 11 or 12 amendments on this. The question is, Why would we do that? Why would we limit the discussion and the division of thought, manifested through votes, for the American people to actually see what we are doing? There are only two reasons why this is happening. One is—and from a phone call with the President, in his own words, he wants sequester to hurt.

Now, think about that for a minute. And he is my friend. I challenged him on that when he said it to me. But there is a philosophical divide in this country. The Federal Government over the last 10 years has grown 89 percent, while the average median income has declined 5 percent. The reason my colleagues want sequester to hurt and be painful is they want to rationalize that bigger government is better, that we cannot afford to cut a penny out of the Federal budget. So what we do is the Federal Government is doing less with more money while every American is doing more with less money. That goes against the greatest tradition of our country. It is also a prescription for failure for our country when we are willing to sacrifice, in the short term, direct benefits to major segments of our population for a political point.

Nobody has done more oversight on the Federal Government than I have in the last 8 years, and I will tell you, conservatively, out of the discretionary budget, \$250 billion a year is spent that does not positively impact this country in any way. Yet we cannot get up amendments to demonstrate that.

Not only can we not have an amendment up, we cannot even spend the time on it to have a real debate about it. That is because they really do not want to debate these issues of waste, duplication, fraud, and inefficiency.

Then the second reason we are not having amendments, or we are having amendments at 60 votes, is to provide the political cover. Our country is in so much trouble it should not matter what party you are in. What should matter is if we are fixing the long-term problems of our country in such a way as to secure the future of our country.

What we have seen through this process last week and this week is a focus on the short term, a focus on the politically expedient, a focus on the parochial—and from both sides of the aisle. This is not just Democrats, this is Republicans too. Senator AYOTTE can't even get an amendment to eliminate spending for a missile program that is never going to be built. It is never going to be built, but we are going to spend \$360 million on it next year because it is a parochial prize to a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Washington is not sick because it is partisan. Washington is sick because it is political, and it is short term in its thinking. Nobody in their right mind, no matter how much it benefits their State, would say they want to spend \$380 million or \$360 million—I am not sure of the exact amount of money—on a program that is never going to come into fruition unless they are thinking about them and not our country and not the families of our country and not the programs that have to be reformed to save them. Nobody would do that. Yet we have 60 votes on all these amendments we are going to offer because they are going to offer protection for people to vote on them to know that they will not even pass, but they can still get the cover for a vote. They can say: I voted for it but it didn't pass because it has to have 60 votes.

That is the smallest part of the problem. To have to go through what we have gone through over the last 5 or 6 days and only have had four votes says something about this place. I would just proffer that I bet had we had an open amendment process we would have been finished with this bill yesterday.

When I came here, for the first 2 years you could offer an amendment for anything at any time at a 51-vote threshold. So all this time we have wasted in quorum calls or on speaking on issues that have nothing to do with the bill in front of us is because we really do not want to govern. What we want is we do not want the body to do its work and have the input of both sides into a bill—other than in the committee. What we want is a fixed outcome that will allow the administration to make sequester as painful as it can be.

So when you shut down packing plants, when the USDA says they cannot have food inspectors there at the same time the USDA is advertising for social service workers and event planners—which, if you did not hire them, could at least give you 52 people not being furloughed for a week. What is happening to America today is we are

focused inward on the politics rather than our country. We are focused on gaming the system rather than governing. We are focused on all the wrong things because it is all about the next election.

We have our eyes so far off the ball that now every bill that comes to the floor has to have essentially a rules committee of one, which is the majority leader, deciding whether he wants his members to vote on a bill. That doesn't have anything to connect with the history of the Senate. This is no longer the greatest deliberative body in the world because we do not deliberate; we do not have an open amendment process; we are too afraid of our own shadows to cast a vote and think we might have to defend it.

If you cannot defend any and every vote in this body, you do not have any business being here. To stifle debate and to limit amendments in the way this bill has done certainly will not breed any goodwill going forward and certainly does not do service that the American citizens are due.

Mr. President, I will now take some time to talk about the various amendments I have called up. Amendment No. 69 is the first amendment I called up. As the ranking member on Homeland Security and the ranking member on the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, what we know is Homeland Security, in its grants program, through what is called the Urban Area Security Initiative, is out of control. They have not prioritized their funding. They have not put metrics on their funding. They have not controlled their funding.

We put out a report in December 2012 called Safety At Any Price, and we highlighted the problems with this particular grant program. No clear goals, DHS has not established any clear goals for how the funds should be used to improve national security. The 9/11 Commission warned against DHS spending becoming pork spending. UASI, this Urban Area Security Initiative, has become another porkbarrel program providing public safety subsidies to cities such as in my home State, Tulsa.

No. 3, what we found is a tremendous amount of waste in these grants. The lack of clear goals has led States and cities to use this funding on wasteful projects, including paying for overtime for employees; purchasing computers, printers, televisions, underwater robots, bearcats—all the things that do not really connect to national security and the prevention of terrorism.

This amendment prohibits \$500 million allocated for the UASI grant program that has been wasted on items that do not relate to homeland security. It prohibits the use of funds on overtime, backpay—backfill pay, security at Major League baseball parks, spring training camps, attendance at conferences, and the purchase of flat-screen TVs.

The other thing we found in our report is the Department of Homeland

Security doesn't know what this money was spent on. Not only do they not have goals and metrics for what the money is supposed to be spent on, they cannot tell us what the money was spent on because they don't actually have any record of it. We have spent \$35 billion in total on all DH grant programs since 2003. We have spent \$7.1 billion on this program.

What I can tell you is it has helped some communities, I don't doubt that, especially during our tough times. It has filled in. But if we are ever going to get out of the problem we are in as a country in terms of our debt and deficits, we have to have programs that have metrics on them that have to be followed up. The grants have to be followed, and they need to be held to account.

My colleagues, I have no hopes of this passing because most of my colleagues will not look at the research done on this, will not look at the ineffectiveness of it, will not look at the waste, and will vote a party-line vote to defeat this amendment. We will get 45 or 50 votes or 51 or 52, but it will go down. So, consequently, real problems that have been oversighted by the Permanent Committee on Investigations—really oversighted by the Department of Homeland Security—the real solutions to problems will not happen because of the way this place is being run.

Next, I would like to talk about amendment No. 93. Amendment No. 93 follows a recommendation of the President. It is not my recommendation, it is the President's recommendation. What this amendment would do is actually take money that has been directed for expired heritage area authorizations that were not any recommendations of the President—actually the President's recommendation was to cut this money in half—and we are going to do exactly that with this amendment. We are going to cut it by \$8.1 million.

What heritage areas are, when we started them—the 12 heritage areas this is about are at least 16 years old. One of them is 25 years old. The whole idea behind heritage areas was to fund them with a grant program to get them started and then let them run on their own with State and local funds. They have become a dependency program.

The OMB and the President's budget said we ought to eliminate the dependency of these by trimming back the amount of money. Instead of becoming temporary programs directed toward self-sufficiency as originally intended, these national heritage areas have turned into permanent entities that continue to grow in number and funding amount—totally opposite the original authorization intent. In other words, they are parochial based.

As a matter of fact, one of them, the John Chaffee Blackstone River National Heritage, has existed for more than 25 years. They actually thought the funding might get cut, so they cre-

ated another way to pay for it, just as the government had intended for them to do, and they raised the money for it this year. But we are going to fund them anyway in this appropriations package, this Omnibus appropriations package. It is not really a CR, it is an Omnibus appropriations. Of these, 12 have already received \$112 million, more than half the total ever spent on national heritage areas.

So they have been in existence at least 16 years. They should have become self-sufficient. They need to become self-sufficient, and we should not be spending the money. What will we do with the money that will amount to about \$16 million? We will turn that money into opening the tours at the White House, opening Yellowstone National Park and the rest of the parks. In terms of the way that money is spent out, we will be able to take \$6 million or \$7 million of that money and the national parks will open on time.

Most of you haven't heard about this, but in Jackson Hole, WY, and Cody, WY, the citizens of that State are raising private money to plow the snow so Yellowstone National Park can open on time. I want you to see the contrast because it is important to their livelihood and their commerce. They are going to sacrifice personally to get that park open on time. At the same time we are going to send money to 12 national heritage areas that have been dependent on the Federal Government for 16 years.

Tell me what is wrong with that picture. We are going to create a dependency, and then we are going to indirectly tax the people of Wyoming—one of their great areas of commerce, a place where visitors come to Wyoming to see Yellowstone Park—and have them use their own post-tax money to pay for that. That cannot fit with the vision of America that almost everybody else in this country believes in. It doesn't fit.

Other national parks have reported campgrounds that are going to be closed to reduce maintenance. So we are going to take this \$6 million, and we are going to use it to help open these parks and allow the Park Service to have the parks open on time. In the original authorization, it was not supposed to get any money. They should not have been getting money for the last 10 years. Instead of creating a dependency in the program, we are going to take that money and do something for the American people.

The next amendment is amendment No. 65, as modified. And this is one that really gets my goat. The National Science Foundation funds lots of great scientific endeavors in this country. As a matter of fact, they have about four times as many applications for grants as they have money to give out. But they spend a considerable amount of money doing such things as funding "research in political science." In 2008 they spent \$8.6 million funding research in political science, \$10.9 million

in 2009, \$11 million in 2010, \$10.8 million in 2011, and \$10.1 million in 2012. What this amendment does is prohibit the National Science Foundation from wasting Federal resources on political science projects and redirects that to other areas within NSF that are going to give the American people a much greater return on their investment.

Let me give some examples of what they fund: campaigns and elections, citizen support, and emerging and established democracies, bargaining processes, electoral choice, democratization, political change in regimes, transitions. Those are all important things if we were not in a budget and spending crisis. Tell me whether it would be better to have the next new computer chip generation developed through a grant at the National Science Foundation or if the actions of a filibuster in the Senate are more important to the American people. Which one is a greater priority? Which one is more important to the further advancement of this country? I guarantee it is the former and not the latter.

In the years hence, we are going to be making a lot of choices about priorities, and every amendment I am putting out here today is about priorities. Do we fund things that do not adequately or accurately help us in the short term in creating jobs, in being wise and prudent spenders of taxpayers' money, or do we fund things that are a low priority and let things that are high priority suffer? That is basically what this amendment does. It says: Until we get out of this pinch, we should not be spending money to—for example, the \$251,000 used to study Americans' attitudes toward the Senate. We spent a quarter of a million dollars last year studying Americans' attitude toward the Senate; \$106,000 was spent to study the rise of candidate-centered elections over those dominated by political parties; \$47,000 was spent to study the President's level of cooperation with Congress when they utilize Executive orders; \$28,000 was spent to examine the prohibition movement. It has been a long time since we had prohibition in this country. That has to be a priority for us. How about a quarter of a million dollars to investigate how people perceive the political attitudes of others? That has to be important right now. It has to be a priority right now for our country. We spent \$144,000 to track how politicians change their Web sites over time. Who cares? That money—\$144,000—will keep a whole bunch of meat inspectors at meat plants. There will not be any furloughs if we get rid of this kind of stuff. I could go on.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD what I consider nonpriority studies that the NFS has funded.

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

Taxpayers would have realized a better return on their investment in biomedical research than in political science.

While political sciences studies may be interesting to the investigators, as investment in this studies will not yield the same return on investment or benefit to Americans as biomedical research.

Consider what grants NIH may have been able to award in lieu of these ongoing political science investigations:

\$251,525 used to study Americans' attitudes towards the U.S. Senate filibuster from survey results

\$106,868 to study the rise of candidate-centered elections over those dominated by political parties

\$47,783 to study American Presidents' level of cooperation with Congress when they utilize executive orders

\$28,356 to examine the Prohibition movement, in part to help lobbying organizations better understand how to influence policy debates

\$250,000 to investigate how people perceive the political attitudes of others and operate with group-centered mentalities

\$144,609 to track how politicians change their websites over time

\$20,862 to answer the question, "What makes politics interesting?" and to analyze how individuals process messages distributed by mass media

\$259,231 to execute a national survey on "the role of optimism and pessimism in shaping the political beliefs and behavior of Americans"

\$91,016 to study which legislation gets roll call votes and to guess the outcome when bills do

\$23,233 to administer an Internet survey of 1000 people about "how citizens react to public political disagreements"

\$236,422 to study how lobbying campaigns, logrolling and other trades affect bill development over time

These surveys and models are receiving millions of NSF dollars every year, while groundbreaking biomedical science falls to the ground. Why should taxpayers have to contribute to studies of questionable value when so many worthwhile biomedical research projects go unfunded? NCI received 4,143 applications in 2012 for major R01 grants, and only funded 618 of them, leaving thousands of promising ideas unfunded.

Much of political science's studies have not even generated useful data. Political science often involves finding a situation for which researchers can develop a clean model to predict future outcomes. However, yet one Northwestern University political scientist famously noted in the New York Times these models are typically inaccurate.

"It's an open secret in my discipline," wrote Jacqueline Stevens, "in terms of accurate political predictions (the field's benchmark for what counts as science), my colleagues have failed spectacularly and waste colossal amounts of time and money."

Increasing funding for the National Science Foundation has been promoted as a way to bolster our economy, preserve national security, protect the environment, and educate our youth. As a result, the agency has enjoyed strong bipartisan support.

By no longer funding political science and increasing NCI's budget, Congress has an opportunity to continue improving the nation's health and to steward more wisely federal resources.

Mr. COBURN. This is where we should be doing our work. We should be making choices for the American people. We should be making the hard choices that say this is more important than this. We don't have enough money. We are borrowing \$40 million a second, and we are going to fund these kinds of political studies that have no

benefit except to the politicians and the political science professors because they are the ones who will read them. The average American doesn't care. But they do care whether their meat is going to be safe and whether they are going to get meat.

Mark my words, this amendment will go down. It won't be passed because we don't have the courage to make priority choices in the Senate. We don't have the courage to allow the number of amendments, such as this—there should have been 30 or 40 such as this—on the floor to make those choices.

Finally, I will talk about amendment No. 70. This amendment has been modified. The appropriators have requested that Homeland Security-related reports—which are demanded in this bill—come to them. They do appropriate for Homeland Security, but there is an authorizing committee. It happens to be the Homeland Security and Government Affairs Committee. What this amendment says is: If you are going to give information from the administration to appropriations, you might want to think about giving it to the actual committee that has the authority to authorize and change the program.

I hope this will be accepted. We are going to get it 14 days after the appropriators. I don't know what that is all about, but I am willing to concede. I think Senator CARPER and myself ought to see what the administration is saying to the appropriators about programs that are run through the Department of Homeland Security. So of all the amendments we have, I think this is the only one that has any possibility.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for up to 20 minutes.

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, when I was on the floor this morning, I outlined the merits of an amendment I tried to have to this continuing resolution. It is amendment No. 55. It is an amendment that deals with the air traffic Control Tower Program that the Obama administration has indicated will be terminated on April 7. I don't want to go over all the things I talked about this morning, but I do want to talk about how we got to the point we are today in which apparently this amendment is not going to be considered by the Senate.

This morning I indicated how, in my view, important this amendment is. I read from an AP story from Chicago about how air safety was in jeopardy. There were indications that a plane crash which occurred previously would not have occurred if there had been an air traffic control tower present. The complaint by Americans is that our aviation sector is so frustrated by the political brinkmanship which goes on in Washington, DC.

Again, this is an important amendment that is about the safety and security of the American people—particularly those who fly. It is amazing to me that despite the continued efforts to bring this amendment to the floor for consideration—not that I expect any guarantee. There is no such thing as a guarantee that this amendment would pass. But the inability to have it even considered is very troubling and surprising to me.

Last week when we started on the continuing resolution, I was pleased to hear what the majority leader said about the process on the CR. This was not stated years ago or months ago, it was just last week. The majority leader said, when he was talking about the continuing resolution: There will be amendments offered. We are working on a process to consider those amendments. This week we will be off to another opportunity for the Senate to return to regular order, an opportunity for this body to legislate through cooperation, through compromise, as we used to do. This legislation will be a test of the Senate's goodwill. We are anxious to move forward and start doing some legislating. We are going to take all amendments and try to work through them as quickly as we can. I hope we can move forward and set up votes on every one of them.

That is the announcement that was made as we started the continuing resolution. As the majority leader indicated, this legislation will be a test of the Senate's goodwill. I think the Senate has clearly failed the test of goodwill. But more than goodwill, we are failing the American people in taking the steps necessary to secure their safety.

This is not an amendment about me or an amendment about Kansas. Certainly, I am talking about my home State. There is nothing wrong with representing our home State which is affected by the loss of these control towers. There are 43 States—almost all of us—that have control towers. On April 7, they no longer will be operating.

I indicated this previously, that one of the reasons why I thought this amendment, perhaps above others, should be considered is because the Control Tower Program will be eliminated April 7. I am a member of the Appropriations Committee. I am a member of the Subcommittee on Transportation. I will work to see that these programs are continued once we get to the regular appropriation process when the CR is behind us. My colleagues and I will never have the chance to do that because in a matter of just a few short days the control towers will be gone. They will be closed. The lights will be turned off.

So my role as an appropriator and as a Member of the Senate—which I share with 99 other Senators—and the idea that we would then come back and restart a program that has disappeared is not going to happen. In the absence of

this amendment passing—in the absence of this amendment being considered and passing—the ability for me to do my job on behalf of a program that I think matters to the American people disappears.

I have never tried to be a difficult Member. I believe in collegiality. I believe in the goodwill the majority leader talks about. But I cannot imagine what I was supposed to have done. It is an amendment that is germane. I am not here trying to offer an amendment that doesn't matter to the bill at hand. I am not trying to score political points, I am not trying to put Democrats on the line for casting a vote that the voters might object to. There is nothing here that is political or partisan in nature. I did what I thought I was supposed to do.

There are 26 cosponsors of this amendment. More than half are Democrats. The Senators include INHOFE, ROBERTS, BLUMENTHAL, BLUNT, JOHANNIS, KIRK, MANCHIN, HAGAN, KLOBUCHAR, BAUCUS, TESTER, ENZI, VITTER, BOOZMAN, PRYOR, MERKLEY, WYDEN, KAINE, WARNER, AYOTTE, SHAHEEN, RISCH, CRAPO, MURPHY, ROCKEFELLER, and WICKER. If 26 of us in that group can agree upon the value of an amendment, why is it the Senate cannot even take a vote on a germane amendment that is broadly supported? It is broadly supported outside the Chamber of this Senate. The Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, the National Business Aviation Association, National Air Transport Association, Association of Air Medical Services—they believe this is important for the ability of LifeWatch patients—NATCA, the National Air Traffic Controllers Association, and the American Association of Airport Executives.

This is not a provincial issue that MORAN is all about trying to take care of something for himself, nor is it about trying to create political difficulties for anybody. We broadly agree on a bipartisan basis that this amendment should be made in order.

I have been in the Senate for a little more than 2 years. I served for a number of years in the House of Representatives. One of the things I thought was true and why I sought the opportunity to serve in the Senate is that it would be different from the House. Any Member of the Senate ought to be here—whether Republican or Democrat—on behalf of their ability to offer amendments.

We had a debate about changing the rules and the proffer was made that if we would agree to change the rules, amendments would be made in order. I thought that was a positive development.

Now, it seems to me, while I left the House in hopes of having the opportunity to represent my constituents as best as I know how and to represent America as best I know how, somebody stands in my way. I can't find out who that is. I have not talked to a Senator who is not supportive of my amend-

ment. Every conversation I have is, well, I think it is a good idea. I don't know why it is not being made in order. There is no good explanation.

Who sits down and develops the list and decides which amendment is important and which one isn't? This ought to be something that is not turned over to a one-person Rules Committee.

Again, the House and Senate are structured differently. This is a historic body with a legacy of allowing debate, discussion, and amendment. And, again, not for purposes outside even the nature of the bill we are talking about, how can it be controversial to transfer \$50 million in a bill that has more than \$1 trillion of funding, of spending? How can it be so difficult to transfer \$50 million from two accounts—unencumbered balances and a research account—to save air traffic control towers, leave them in place until I at least get the opportunity to work with my colleagues to extend their life through the appropriations and legislative process into the future.

So for a Senator such as myself—I lay awake last night from, I don't know, 3:15 to 4:30 trying to figure out what I could say that would convince my colleagues to support this amendment or to allow whoever is making the decision that it can't even be debated and heard and voted on—I don't know that there are any magic words. It does concern me. It bothers me greatly.

We ought to all be here protecting the rights of each and every other Senator. This is important to us as a legislative body, not to us and our egos as Senators. It is not the sense that we have the right to say everything—we are Senators, we are important and powerful people—it is that on behalf of the American people, a person such as myself who represents 2½ million Kansans ought to have the ability to bring a germane amendment to a bill on the Senate floor.

Had we brought these amendments forward, had we agreed to debate and pass my amendment, we wouldn't be here today still stalled on moving forward to conclude this business and move to the budget. We could have debated the amendments and voted on the germane amendments days ago. But for some reason we once again get bogged down in somebody deciding that this amendment qualifies to be considered and this one doesn't.

So this is another example of where—again, I guess if we were to tell the story to the American people, it would be that today we are going to pass a bill that spends \$1.1 trillion, and we have had four or five amendments offered and perhaps approved, maybe a couple more today.

This bill has not worked its way through the Appropriations Committee. It comes from the House. We take it up immediately. It is written so perfectly that only three or four individual Senators have the opportunity

to alter the bill—not the guarantee to change the bill but the opportunity to suggest to our colleagues whether it makes sense and then cast a vote, yes or no, based upon whether what I am saying has merit. We can't get to the point at which I am given the opportunity to explain on the Senate floor why this amendment is something that is important.

I came to the Senate from the U.S. House of Representatives in hopes that the Senate was different, where individual Members have value unrelated to their relationship with the Speaker or the minority leader of the House, unrelated to my relationship with the members of the Rules Committee. I have not always been the most perfect follower of my political party. I have tried to do what I think is right, and therefore I have not always developed the relationship I needed in the House to be able to get my amendments considered on the House floor.

The Rules Committee is there for a purpose. It is a very unwieldy body, the U.S. House of Representatives, of 435 Members. Here we have 100. Surely, based upon the history, the legacy, the rules of the Senate, we have the ability as Senators, whether we are in favor or disfavor and whether our amendment meets with a person's satisfaction on behalf of the American people, we have the right to represent their interests and have votes taken.

The majority leader said the other day that I am an obstructionist. I lay awake last night thinking, I am not an obstructionist. I am following the rules. The majority leader said this morning that we need to show that sequestration is damaging to the country. I didn't even vote for sequestration, and yet I can't fix a problem that is caused by somebody else's vote. Again, it is so baffling to me how this works.

I finally found somebody who would tell me they oppose my amendment. Today I talked to the Secretary of Transportation, who said: The administration opposes your amendment. So maybe that is the explanation. I have asked my colleagues on both sides of the aisle why I can't—a person who followed the rules, who did what one would think one should do to get an amendment made in order—why can't this amendment be heard?

The only explanation that I guess makes sense is that there are those in Washington, DC, who want to prove we cannot cut spending without consequences that are dramatic. OK, prove that point. Come to the floor. Have the debate about spending, about budgets, about taxes. Have this conversation about whether we can afford to cut spending. Prove it to us. Take the votes. Demonstrate that it can't be done. But to use sequestration as the example for why we can never cut any money from any program, particularly on the amendment I am offering, is dangerous. What it says is, we want to make a political point, as compared to

worrying about the lives of the American people who fly.

So this circumstance in which I find myself—again this morning I lay in bed realizing that the radicalization of Senator MORAN is occurring. The only way, apparently, to get an amendment heard is to be difficult. It is not my personality. It is not my nature. But on behalf of Kansans and Americans, if what it takes is for me to become more difficult to deal with so my amendments are considered—it is not about me personally—so amendments that matter to my constituents and, at least in my view, to America can be heard—you have to make yourself a pain around here if that is what is required in the Senate. I hope that is not the case.

I hope the majority leader is right that this is the path by which we are going to get back to regular order. I want to be a member of the Appropriations Committee that works, debates, and discusses, we listen to witnesses and figure out that we can spend more here, but we have to spend less money here; this program matters, and this one is inefficient.

I voted against sequestration because I don't believe across-the-board cuts are responsible. What that means is that everything deserves the same reduction. There are things that we do well and that are appropriate for the government to be involved in, and there are things that we do poorly and that the government shouldn't be involved in. Yet we treat them all the same. I want to be a member of the Appropriations Committee that says: We are going to evaluate each one of these programs and make decisions about spending, and we are going to choose to spend money here and not here, or the decision will be made by the Senate and the House and the President that we are going to raise revenues so we can spend more money.

But that is not a reason to block this amendment. It is not a reason to say that those people who are going to be traveling out of 179 airports that have control towers—that their lives are going to be less safe and secure and run the potential of loss of life and injury as a result of us trying to prove the point that we apparently can't cut budgets around here because we want to show there is damage to be done when that occurs. That is a very dangerous political point.

Mr. INHOFE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORAN. I yield.

Mr. INHOFE. First of all, as a cosponsor of the amendment, I am glad the Senator is getting around to the merits. Yes, it is a great injustice the Senator is going through right now, not getting his amendment heard. I have to say, though, as probably the only active commercial pilot in here, I jumped on this bill because a lot of people don't realize that the contract towers are just as in need of control as the noncontract towers.

The Senator is aware that the University of Oklahoma in northern Okla-

homa is contracted out. I have gone in there before where they are using all three runways at the same time. It is a huge issue.

But what I want to ask the Senator is, why is it that when the bureaucracy is opposed to something they, No. 1, won't tell you about it; No. 2, they go whispering to the President; No. 3, they go whispering to other people around here?

I went through this same thing, I suggest to my friend from Kansas, when I passed the Pilot's Bill of Rights. I had 67 cosponsors in the Senate, and they wouldn't bring it up. For an entire year they never would bring it up, and we had to rule XIV it on the floor. That is what is wrong. When we have something everybody is for, it is a good thing, but somehow—in this case, I know what it is: the same thing that happened to me. I got mine passed. It took me a year to do it.

Best of luck to the Senator from Kansas. I would only say to him that this is a time to stay in there and fight for this because this is a great example to use. Everything that is being cut in government right now—all of these people who had to wait in line to get in here, there is no reason to do that. Everything people really want and the things that are popular, this is what they cut. So the Senator from Kansas is a victim of that. Just hang in there and try to make it happen.

Mr. MORAN. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma. I know he has great expertise on the topic of aviation and airports and airplanes.

Again, I am here to decry a system that is failing. And while it is personally troublesome to me—it bothers me—it is embarrassing not to be able to accomplish what seems so straightforward and simple. We all like to have victories, but it is not really about me. Every Member of the Senate ought to have the opportunity to present germane amendments and let the will of the Senate—let those 99 other people, as well as me, make a decision based upon the merits, however we all make decisions around here or whether we vote for or against something. This is not about my right as an individual Senator as much as it is about the rights of all of us on behalf of the American people, on behalf of our home State and constituencies, to be able to do our jobs.

If there is a political game afloat that is preventing this amendment from being considered, then I would suggest we have transversed that plane in which we no longer are caring for Americans but we are caring about our own political skills, our own political reelection as compared to what we are here to do.

This place is way too political. This is not a political amendment. It ought to be made in order. Yet, despite all the efforts, it has not occurred.

I hope, in the few minutes that remains, there is still a chance that my unanimous consent request will be

agreed to. I appreciate that others were able—a handful of folks were able to offer their amendments. I think we ought to have more of that, not less. It is about the Senate doing its job; it is not just about Senator MORAN not being able to accomplish his on this particular day.

I appreciate the indulgence of my colleagues.

I yield for the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 115

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I rise to discuss briefly an amendment I have that is going to be voted on later today, but I wish to begin by completely agreeing with the Senator from Kansas. It is extremely unfortunate, to say the very least, that the majority party is so afraid of casting votes, they are now disallowing the most ordinary, sensible, germane amendments that transfer modest sums of money from one account to another account. I am not suggesting that everybody needs to agree with it. I am not sure I agree with the amendment of the Senator from Kansas. But the idea that an amendment such as that shouldn't even have an opportunity to be debated on the Senate floor is amazing.

Let me address the amendment I have introduced. I will start by observing that the bill under consideration today significantly underfunds the Defense Department's operations and maintenance accounts. The Army's subset of this category of funding is underfunded by \$2 billion. That is just the Army alone. This has implications for the safety and readiness of our troops. I am not suggesting that my amendment solves that whole problem—it doesn't, but it makes a modest step in the right direction.

Just quickly, some of the things the operations and maintenance account funds—it is a lot. It is maintenance of ships and tanks and aircrafts. It is avionics and engines and navigation systems. It is artillery. It is all kinds of things our service men and women use to fight and to win and to protect themselves. It gets funded through the operations and maintenance account, and it is not only maintenance of this important equipment, it is also training—training such as unit training when an Army battalion, for instance, trains in an exercise against an opposition force that is modeled after a real-world potential enemy. That kind of training is very important. It gets funded out of this account, the operations and maintenance account, and that account is underfunded. So I would suggest that this is a very important account, and I think there is almost universal acknowledgment that it is being underfunded.

Meanwhile, in the same bill, while we are underfunding our operations and maintenance account, we have a bill that would spend \$60 million forcing the Defense Department to build

biofuels refineries. This forces our Defense Department to build these expensive refineries to make very expensive fuel. How do we know it will be very expensive fuel? How many of us fill up our gas tanks with biofuels? The component we are forced to buy—the ethanol—is part of what drives up the cost of gasoline. The fact is that conventional fuel is much cheaper than these biofuels, but we are going to force the Defense Department to spend a whole lot of money building a refinery, the purpose of which is to produce extremely expensive and inefficient fuel. I would suggest that is a waste of precious resources we can't afford to waste.

Now, the House Defense appropriations bill did not include this, and the Senate Armed Services Committee—these are our experts who analyze this—opposed wasting money this way when they reported the bill out of committee. Unfortunately, when it got to the floor, it got put in, and this is our opportunity to correct it.

Now, some have suggested these biofuel refineries are somehow a solution to the expensive cost of moving fuel to combat zones. The only problem is this item is going to fund the construction of refineries in the United States. They are not going to be in combat zones. So that is just not true.

I would suggest if anyone thinks this is a good idea—to force taxpayers to build expensive, inefficient refineries to produce very expensive fuel—shouldn't it at least happen through the Department of Energy or some other experimental research-oriented institution?

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOOMEY. I will be happy to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. I know something about this being the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee. We went through this.

Is the Senator aware that in one purchase the administration—now, I am talking about the White House—forced the Navy to buy 450,000 gallons of fuel at \$29 a gallon? You can buy it on the open market for \$3 a gallon.

Secondly, I think the Senator does know this because I heard him mention the Department of Energy, when we formed the Department of Energy, they were supposed to do all this stuff.

But I would have to make one observation. We have a President, an administration, that has been cutting dramatically, and we are all concerned about what has happened to our military, our ability to defend ourselves. They do it in three ways. No. 1, they cut; No. 2, they delay; but, No. 3—and this is what we are getting to now—they take the agenda, and in this case this green agenda, and put it not where it should be but under the defense budget. So for every dollar that goes to the green energy programs, the Senator and I would like—since I am cosponsoring the Senator's amendment—

every dollar is something we cannot spend for our fighters in the field.

Mr. TOOMEY. Well, reclaiming my time, I completely agree with the Senator from Oklahoma. We already force our Defense Department to waste enormous amounts of money purchasing fuel that is much more expensive than readily available alternatives. I think that is a very bad idea. And I think it is a bad idea to do even more of that in the form of building these biofuel refinery plants that would further propagate this ill-conceived process.

If you think it is somehow a good idea to do this then, as the Senator from Oklahoma suggests, wouldn't it make sense to at least do this in the Department of Energy rather than wasting precious Defense Department resources at a time when we know we are underfunding the operations and maintenance account? This is the reason for my amendment.

My amendment transfers \$60 million out of the biofuel refinery account in the Defense Department appropriations bill and moves money—the amount permissible under the budget rules—into the operations and maintenance account. This is not a complete solution, I understand that, but it is a modest step in the right direction of providing a little bit more resources to an area that is badly underfunded.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I just would briefly say that I believe Senator MORAN, Senator AYOTTE, and maybe others have good amendments on which they are seeking to vote. I am aware that Senator MORAN's amendment, I believe, has 28 cosponsors—a large number of Democratic cosponsors. Virtually no one seems to be opposed to it, but somehow a decision has been made by the majority leader to not let him have a vote.

I believe we need to understand something very fundamental in the Senate, and we are heading to a crisis on this issue; that is, a duly elected Senator who serves in this body should be able to bring up an amendment that is reasonable, that is germane, and get a vote on it. It is amazing to me that it seems to be now accepted that the majority leader picks and chooses the people who get their amendments.

I think the Moran amendment, from what I have seen and heard about it, would pass. So it is not going to pass. It is going to fail because someone, presumably the leader, has decided they will not get a vote, and it has been killed in that fashion. That is not the

tradition of the Senate. I am worried about that. We cannot continue that way.

To our new Senators—Republicans and Democrats—you need to understand that as a Senator, you have a right to have votes that are legitimate on bills that are legitimately amended. That is where we are, and I am disappointed those votes have not been allowed.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator withhold his suggestion?

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I withhold my suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I rise today in vigorous opposition, and with very deep concern, to an amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma that would prohibit Urban Areas Security Initiative, or UASI, funds from being used to be able to pay local public safety employees overtime and backfill pay.

I share the Senator's commitment to ensuring that homeland security funds are spent wisely. I believe his efforts are in good faith, and I am eager to work with him toward this goal. However, as the threat from al-Qaida has metastasized to the Arabian Peninsula and elsewhere, there are still terrorists whose objective is to inflict wide-scale harm to Americans on our homeland.

New York City remains the No. 1 target for terrorists around the world who want to do us harm. Therefore, we must remain vigilant and continue to provide local law enforcement with all the tools necessary to keep us safe. So as well-intentioned as this amendment may be, law enforcement organizations across the country have been loud and clear: This is simply the wrong prescription at the wrong time.

This amendment is opposed by a range of law enforcement and first responder organizations, including the International Association of Fire Chiefs, the International Association of Firefighters, Major Cities Chiefs Association, Major County Sheriffs' Association, the National Fusion Center Association, the National Homeland Security Coalition, and the U.S. Conference of Mayors.

In fact, I have a letter from our Commissioner Kelly that I ask unanimous consent be printed in the RECORD, along with another letter.

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

THE POLICE COMMISSIONER,  
New York, NY, March 15, 2013.

Hon. THOMAS COBURN,  
Ranking Member, Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COBURN: I am writing to express my concern about an element of your proposed amendment, Number 69, to the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act for FY 2013. This amendment would

prohibit Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI) grant funds from being used to pay local public safety employees overtime and backfill. Such a restriction would jeopardize our collective efforts to safeguard New York City, which has been the target of 16 publicized terrorist plots since September 11, 2001.

The New York City Police Department (NYPD) uses UASI funding to pay for, among other things: overtime expenses associated with members of the Joint Terrorist Task Force working on major terrorism investigations with the FBI; and backfill expenses incurred by sending members of the service to critical counterterrorism training courses, including a course on active shooter response, which they cannot attend during their normal shifts because of regular job responsibilities.

At times of fiscal constraint, it is essential to direct the limited homeland security grant funds available to the programs that are most effective. Without a doubt, the overtime and backfill funding that the NYPD uses to support investigations, training, and deployments are essential to the NYPD's layered approach to security. I appreciate your attention to this matter and the Homeland Security Committee's ongoing efforts to ensure that New York City will continue to benefit from the most robust counterterrorism program possible.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND W. KELLY,  
Police Commissioner.

MARCH 14, 2013.

Hon. BARBARA MIKULSKI,  
Chairwoman,

Hon. RICHARD SHELBY,  
Ranking Member, Committee on Appropriations,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. MARY LANDRIEU,  
Chairwoman,

Hon. DAN COATS,  
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Homeland  
Security, Committee on Appropriations, U.S.  
Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS MIKULSKI, SHELBY, LANDRIEU, AND COATS: We are writing on behalf of local elected officials, major city police chiefs, sheriffs, intelligence professionals, and major fire service organizations to express our strong opposition to the Coburn amendment to the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act for FY 2013. This amendment would prohibit, among other things, Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI) grant funds from being used to pay local public safety employee overtime or backfill. Such a restriction would overturn over a decade's worth of policy and inhibit local security operations at high risk critical infrastructure sites, major events, and along the border. The amendment would also prevent first responders from training and exercising to prevent or respond to terrorist attacks and other major disasters.

Urban areas use UASI grants to pay overtime to local personnel to be operationally ready to respond to a potential terrorist incident and to provide extra security in a heightened threat environment, often based on federal intelligence and at the request of federal officials. This includes protecting critical infrastructure such as nuclear power plants, chemical facilities, public arenas, and water treatment plants during high threat periods.

In addition to protecting critical infrastructure, UASI funded overtime is often used to help pay local responders to secure major events, including National Special Security Events such as the G-8 summit, as well as border security operations at both the northern and southern border. In these high threat environments, additional local

responders coordinate with and support the Department of Homeland Security, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and other federal agency officials. This amendment would hamper this federal, state and local coordination that is vitally important to protecting our homeland.

Prohibiting the use of UASI funds for employee overtime or backfill pay would eliminate critical training and exercises for many urban area first responders. The UASI grants enable first responders, intelligence analysts, and emergency managers to receive the latest training and test their capabilities in exercises by paying for overtime and backfill costs associated with attending the training and exercises. Personnel who would be negatively impacted by a change to this policy include fire fighters, public safety bomb squad members, urban search and rescue team members, intelligence analysts, special weapons and tactics (SWAT) team members, and hazardous materials response team members, among others. With so many public safety agencies short staffed, sending personnel to training and exercises during overtime is often the only option. Ending this ability will directly undermine the Nation's readiness to prevent and respond to the next major terrorist attack, hurricane, or cyber attack.

If we can provide any further information, please contact us through the National Homeland Security Coalition Chair Bob Nations at (901) 222-6702 or bob.nations@shelbycountyttn.gov.

Sincerely,

Congressional Fire Services Institute;  
International Association of Fire  
Chiefs; International Association of  
Fire Fighters; Major Cities Chiefs Association;  
Major County Sheriffs' Association;  
National Fusion Center Association;  
National Homeland Security  
Coalition; The United States Conference of Mayors.

AMENDMENT NO. 26

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Under the leadership of New York City Police Commissioner Raymond Kelly, 16 publicly known terrorist attacks on our city have been thwarted since 9/11. Our local law enforcement must continue to have every tool available to them to remain one step ahead of terrorists at every single turn. Even at a time of fiscal restraint in Washington, protecting our families from the unimaginable should not be a place where we make cuts.

According to Police Commissioner Kelly, this amendment would "jeopardize our collective efforts to safeguard New York City . . ." and that "without a doubt, the overtime and backfill funding that the NYPD uses to support investigations, training and deployments is essential to the NYPD's layered approach to security."

I ask my colleagues to stand with local law enforcement officials, to stand with the American public who have given us the duty to protect them. I urge a "no" vote on this amendment because, if passed, this amendment will put the training and security deployments needed to keep us safe in jeopardy. These are not esoteric programs. We are talking about programs that include counterterrorism training, region-wide planning exercises designed to prepare emergency responses to large and catastrophic events, and boots-on-the-ground secu-

rity measures, including heavy weapons training and intelligence sharing.

These overtime funds actually reduce costs. If the NYPD needed to hire full-time officers or assign current full-time efforts to the specialized patrol and intelligence duties described, they could not afford to do so.

So while I commend my colleagues for attempting to be good stewards of the taxpayers' money, these are cuts that our families cannot afford. We have a solemn duty to protect the American people. That should be our first priority in this body. I ask each and every Member of this body to ask themselves how history will judge them if we fail to live up to that duty.

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. SCHUMER. 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. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to Coburn amendment No. 26 which deals—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is expired.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for an additional 2 minutes to address this amendment.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to Coburn amendment No. 26. What it does is prevent certain types of funding to be given to UASI, which is the lifeblood of New York's antiterror programs. It has gotten rave reviews from people. The person in charge is Ray Kelly, who is very much in the mainstream, right in the center of our fight against terrorism, not only in New York but in the country.

As you know, New York City has more than 100 police officers devoted exclusively to antiterrorism. They work very closely with FBI taskforces and others. Some of this amendment is befuddling. To say that UASI, our antiterror division of the New York City Police Department, could not buy computers, flat screens makes no sense.

The Lower Manhattan Security Initiative is an antiterrorism computer system. It is one of the mainstays of preventing terror. How do we fight modern 21st century terrorism and say they cannot use computers. That makes no sense whatsoever. Make no mistake, if this amendment passes, New York City training and security deployments would be in jeopardy.

Another aspect is we often need to use overtime in our antiterrorism units. For instance, we have to guard bridges and tunnels, particularly when there are threats against them. To have officers constantly changing because of time commitments and time limitations makes no sense whatsoever.

The bottom line is simply New York had a terrible tragedy on 9/11/2001. America rallied to New York's side, of which we are very appreciative. One of the ways, one of the most material and important ways was this U.S. grant. It has been used well. It has received plaudits from around the country. To tie the hands of the very people who are leading the fight on terror and saying they can do this but not this, they can do this but not this, this is the kind of micromanaging for which I think most people in America resent Washington.

I urge that this amendment be roundly defeated.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 69

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to Amendment No. 69 offered by the Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. COBURN.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 39 Leg.]

YEAS—48

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

NAYS—51

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

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 48, the nays are 51. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 93

Under the previous order, there is 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 93 offered by the Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. COBURN.

Who yields time?

The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I would like to speak on the amendment, but I see the sponsor is here. If he has no objection, I will speak, then ask for a vote.

The Coburn amendment proposes to reduce funding for 49 national heritage areas by \$8 million and redirect \$6 million to park operations. It also strikes the reauthorization of 12 areas located across the country, including one in my State of Rhode Island but also in Tennessee, South Carolina, and Georgia, among other States.

The amendment doesn't provide a real fix for the problems with respect to national park funding. Moving \$6 million is not going to make up for the \$134 million cut we have had to impose upon the Park Service.

In addition, there has been some suggestion this would help restore White House tours. Those tours are governed by the Secret Service budget, which is not part of this amendment. So that would not be affected.

These heritage areas are private-public partnerships. They are not national parks. They provide huge economic development. They are located across the country. It is something we should restore, maintain, and not cut.

With that, I would simply add the National Park Conservation Association opposes the amendment, and I ask my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, the average age of the heritage areas in this bill is 16 years. If you look at the original authorization, none of them was supposed to get any Federal money now. As a matter of fact, the Senator's heritage area has planned and raised the money for his area and had an alternative plan to do it.

The fact is, the national parks will open with this amount of money on time this year, so it will make a big difference in Yellowstone and all the rest of the national parks. The National Park Service does have something to do with the White House tours because they can take this money and allocate that. It is not a Secret Service problem, it is a national park problem.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The Acting PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 54, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 40 Leg.]

YEAS—45

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

NAYS—54

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

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. On this vote, the yeas are 45 the nays are 54. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, what is the next regular order?

AMENDMENT NO. 65 TO AMENDMENT NO. 26

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next amendment is Coburn amendment No. 65.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, we have some good news. The good news is that the Senator and I have reached an agreement.

There is an acceptable modification. I didn't know if the Senator wanted to speak on this amendment. May I continue.

This amendment ensures that the NSF funding for political science research is widely used focusing on national security and economic interests. I, therefore, believe we can agree to this amendment with a voice vote.

I ask unanimous consent that the 60-vote threshold be waived for this amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there further debate?

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I request a voice vote.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 65) was agreed to.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider that vote.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 70, AS MODIFIED, TO  
AMENDMENT NO. 26

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next amendment is Coburn amendment No. 70, as modified.

The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I am happy to tell our colleagues we have also worked this out and can take this by voice vote.

I appreciate the cooperation of the Senator from Oklahoma. We have no objection to providing the reports to the committee which he has requested, reports to Homeland Security. However, many of these reports are expenditure plans, and all we ask is that the Appropriations Committee receive them 2 weeks in advance. The Senator has agreed to that, and we have no objection to taking this by voice vote.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I believe we can agree to this amendment with a voice vote, so I ask unanimous consent that the 60-vote threshold be waived for the amendment.

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

Is there further debate?

If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 70) was agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 72, AS MODIFIED, TO  
AMENDMENT NO. 26

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 72 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE], for himself and Mrs. HAGAN, proposes an amendment numbered 72, as modified, to amendment No. 26.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to waive the reading of the amendment.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require the continuation of tuition assistance programs for members of the Armed Forces for the remainder of fiscal year 2013)

At the end of title VIII of division C, add the following:

SEC. 8131. (a) REQUIREMENT TO CONTINUE PROVISION OF TUITION ASSISTANCE FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.—The Secretaries of the military departments shall carry out tuition assistance programs for members of the Armed Forces during the remainder of fiscal year 2013 using amounts specified in subsection (b).

(b) AMOUNTS.—The minimum amount used by the Secretary of a military department

for tuition assistance for members of an Armed Force under the jurisdiction of that Secretary pursuant to subsection (a) shall be not less than—

(1) the amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act for tuition assistance programs for members of that Armed Force, minus

(2) an amount that is not more than the percentage of the reduction required to the Operation and Maintenance account for that Armed Force for fiscal year 2013 by the budget sequester required by section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing and I know some of the Democratic sponsors of the bill, Senator HAGAN and others, would be in agreement to go ahead and accept this by voice vote.

What this does is reverse the decision from the Department of Defense that took away some of the abilities our troops, when they are brought into service, have in terms of subsidizing their tuition. So this would return it to the way it was before.

I have to say quickly and briefly, this is something I have talked about to our troops in the field. Many of them were so alarmed that it was even suggested they would take away the very thing that caused them to enlist in the first place.

I think this is one that is going to enjoy wide bipartisan support for a voice vote, and I ask for its adoption.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mrs. HAGAN. I would like to speak on this amendment. I think it is a very good amendment. We have 100,000 servicemembers in our Active-Duty military who actually utilized this last year, and 50,000 of them received diplomas, certificates, and licenses. It truly does help prepare our servicemembers for a successful transition into the civilian workforce when they choose to leave the military.

This is good news for a recruitment tool and it is good news as a retention tool and I think it is imperative that we continue to offer this tuition assistance benefit to our members.

I certainly want to thank Senator INHOFE for working with me on this issue. I think it is a very good amendment. I also want to thank Senators MIKULSKI, SHELBY, DURBIN, and COCHRAN for helping us reach an agreement and move this amendment forward.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, thanks to the excellent work of both Senators INHOFE and HAGAN, who reached an agreement on this, I believe we can agree to this amendment with another voice vote.

I ask unanimous consent that all time be yielded back and that a 60-vote threshold be waived for this amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 72), as modified was agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 98, AS MODIFIED, TO  
AMENDMENT NO. 26

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I now call up the Mikulski-Shelby amendment No. 98, as modified.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI], for herself and Mr. SHELBY, proposes an amendment numbered 98, as modified, to amendment No. 26.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 378, line 3, strike "a grant for".

On page 580, line 22, strike "0.092 percent" and insert ".01 percent".

On page 585, line 11, strike "through C" and insert "through F".

On page 586, line 16, strike "division C" and insert "division F".

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, this amendment makes technical changes to citations, bill language related to the Department of Homeland Security and an adjustment resulting from a CBO scoring.

I believe we can agree to this amendment with a voice vote, so I ask unanimous consent that the 60-vote threshold be waived for the amendment. I want to thank Senator SHELBY for the excellent work he and his staff have done in cleaning up this bill for the technical aspects.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 98), as modified, was agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 129, AS MODIFIED, TO  
AMENDMENT NO. 26

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 129, as modified.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY], for himself, Ms. MIKULSKI and Mr. SHELBY, proposes an amendment numbered 129, as modified.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following: "Notwithstanding section 1101, section 7054(b) in division I of Public Law 112-74 shall be applied for purposes of this division by inserting before the period in paragraph (2) ; or (3) such assistance, license, sale, or transfer is for the purpose of demilitarizing or disposing of such cluster munitions'."

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this is a technical correction amendment. Current law prohibits transfers of U.S. cluster munitions that do not meet certain reliability requirements.

Years ago Japan purchased U.S. cluster munitions that do not meet such requirements, and that Japan now wants to dispose of. Japan has contracted with a company in Germany to do this. But transferring the cluster munitions to Germany violates the law.

Section 1706(c) of the continuing resolution provides an exception to the prohibition on transfers if the purpose is to dispose of the cluster munitions.

The Leahy amendment #129, which is supported by Senator GRAHAM, fixes a minor drafting error. It is a purely technical amendment which does not affect the substance of section 1706(c).

Mr. President, I suggest we dispose of this amendment by voice vote. It should not be controversial.

I yield back all time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, this too is an amendment I believe we can agree to with a voice vote. Again, I wish to thank Senator LEAHY for the excellent job he did.

I ask unanimous consent that all time be yielded back and the 60-vote threshold be waived for this amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified.

The amendment (No. 129), as modified, was agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore.

The Senator from Arkansas.

AMENDMENT NO. 82 TO AMENDMENT NO. 26

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 82.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR] proposes an amendment numbered 82 to amendment No. 26.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 84, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

SEC. 74. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act—

(1) the amount made available for buildings operations and maintenance expenses in the matter before the first proviso under the

heading "AGRICULTURE BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES AND RENTAL PAYMENTS" under the heading "AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS" in title I shall be \$52,169,000;

(2) the amount made available for necessary expenses to carry out services authorized by the Federal Meat Inspection Act, the Poultry Products Inspection Act, and the Egg Products Inspection Act in the matter before the first proviso under the heading "FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE" under the heading "AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS" in title I shall be \$1,056,427,000; and

(3) the amount made available to provide competitive grants to State agencies in the second proviso under the heading "CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS" under the heading "FOOD AND NUTRITION SERVICE" under the heading "DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS" in title IV shall be \$10,000,000.

Mr. PRYOR. I believe this has been basically agreed to by both sides. I do not think we will require a rollcall vote. I believe we can go by voice vote. I thank my cosponsors. We have had several Senators working on this: Senator COONS, Senator CARPER, Senator HOEVEN—I appreciate his great leadership—Senator MORAN, who relented earlier and said he would not object to this, and also Senator BLUNT. He has done a fantastic job of moving this through.

This is about the Food Safety Inspection Service. Basically this has a very direct impact on the private sector. When these Food Safety Inspection Service employees are furloughed, that means basically the processing plant is furloughed. They have to close for the day because they have to have a food safety inspector there when they are producing.

I think it is agreeable, and I ask unanimous consent, that we do it by voice vote. I thank all of my cosponsors.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 82) was agreed to.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 115, AS MODIFIED, WITHDRAWN

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Durbin second-degree amendment to the Toomey amendment is withdrawn.

There will be 2 minutes of debate on the Toomey amendment, as modified.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

(Purpose: To increase by \$25,000,000 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)

At the end of title VIII of division C, insert the following:

SEC. 8131. (a) ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR O&M FOR ACTIVITIES IN CONUS.—The aggregate amount appropriated by title II of this division for operation and maintenance is hereby

increased by \$25,000,000, with the amount to be available, as determined by the Secretary of Defense, for operation and maintenance expenses of the Department of Defense in connection with programs, projects, and activities in the continental United States.

(b) OFFSET.—The amount appropriated by title III of this division under the heading "DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES" is hereby decreased by \$60,000,000, with the amount of the reduction to be allocated to amounts available under that heading for Advanced Drop in Biofuel Production.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I rise to make the case for this amendment. I think we all know that this bill funds the Defense Operations and Maintenance Account to a very large degree. This is a very important account from which we fund the maintenance of all kinds of military equipment, from trains to tanks to avionics—you name it, it gets funded from this account. So too does a whole lot of training come from this account.

Meanwhile, we have \$60 million going to build a biorefinery that would force the Defense Department to pay too much for fuel. This is about priorities, and it is my suggestion and my amendment to take \$60 million out of this account that would force us to build an inefficient, expensive refinery to make too-expensive fuel and transfer it into this Operations and Maintenance Account that we need.

I appreciate the support of the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee for this amendment, Senator INHOFE, and I urge my colleagues to vote in its favor.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I know Senator UDALL wanted to speak against the Toomey amendment. In his absence, I will comment on the Toomey amendment. I believe the Senator proposes to cut \$60 million from the Advanced Drop-In Biofuels Production Program. He would move \$25 million from these funds to the Operations and Maintenance Account. The Department of Defense recognizes that its dependence on foreign oil supplies presents a real risk to its ability to operate around the world. I agree. As the largest single customer of oil in the world, DOD spent \$17 billion in fiscal 2011 on oil. DOD estimates that for every 25-cent increase in the price of a gallon of oil we incur over \$1 billion in fuel costs. Every time oil prices go up, so does the cost of running the Department of Defense. Imagine if our military were cut off from these supplies.

The Senate has made it clear that there is support for biofuels. The Senate has voted twice in support of the Department of Defense biofuels program during floor consideration of the Armed Services Committee Defense bill. The funds appropriated for this project are available until expended. When the Departments of Energy and Agriculture are able to meet their obligations to fund this program, as required by the National Defense Act,

the Department of Defense will have their funds ready. The Toomey amendment would cut a modest investment to provide security alternatives to petroleum dependence.

I urge the defeat of the amendment.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, this amendment could have a profound impact on our Nation's energy security by reducing funding for efforts that support finding clean energy replacements for oil.

High oil prices and tensions in the Middle East could not present a better national security case for moving quickly away from our military's overwhelming dependence on oil, especially as currently supplied to critical operations and facilities in the Middle East, the Pacific, the Indian Ocean, and elsewhere. The military's dependence on oil is one of its most significant vulnerabilities; as a recent Army release noted, our Nation loses one soldier for every 20 convoys transiting through Afghanistan; fuel comprises 50 percent of the load carried by these convoys.

Last year, the Department of Defense used 4.3 billion gallons of petroleum, and spent about \$20 billion on fuel. I encourage the Department of Defense to continue to support efforts that will lower the risks and future costs to our armed forces by supporting technologies like solar energy at forward operating bases, the production and procurement of advanced biofuels and other clean alternative fuels, and improved energy performance of materials to lighten and improve the capability, load, and endurance of our troops.

I will continue to do everything that I can to help move the Nation toward a safer, cleaner, and more secure energy future.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 115, as modified.

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), is necessarily absent.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 59, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 41 Leg.]

YEAS—40

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

NAYS—59

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

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 26

Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote on the Mikulski-Shelby substitute amendment.

The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, before I speak and have time counted against me, the Senate is not in order.

We are now coming to the last three votes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be in order.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, we have three more votes. The first vote is on the Mikulski-Shelby substitute amendment. This is the bill we have been working on now for 8 days. After that, we will have a vote on cloture, and then we will go to final passage. If we could just have the Senators' attention and if they could stay nearby, we can finish this expeditiously.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be in order.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I now speak on the Mikulski-Shelby substitute amendment, which is pending.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan continuing resolution. It accomplishes many things. First, when we pass this, we will avoid a government shutdown, but we do better than that—we will protect our national security needs, meet compelling human needs, and lay the groundwork for investing in science and technology. Second, we complied with the Budget Control Act—costing no more than \$1 trillion—and it is bipartisan.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 70, nays 29, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 42 Leg.]

YEAS—70

Alexander	Franken	Murkowski
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Murphy
Baucus	Hagan	Murray
Begich	Harkin	Nelson
Bennet	Hatch	Portman
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Pryor
Blunt	Heitkamp	Reed
Boozman	Hirono	Reid
Boxer	Hoeven	Rockefeller
Brown	Isakson	Sanders
Cantwell	Johanns	Schatz
Cardin	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Carper	Kaine	Shaheen
Casey	King	Shelby
Chambliss	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cochran	Landrieu	Thune
Collins	Leahy	Udall (CO)
Coons	Levin	Udall (NM)
Corker	Manchin	Warner
Cornyn	McCaskill	Warren
Cowan	McConnell	Whitehouse
Donnelly	Menendez	Wyden
Durbin	Merkley	
Feinstein	Mikulski	

NAYS—29

Ayotte	Graham	Risch
Barrasso	Grassley	Roberts
Burr	Heller	Rubio
Coats	Inhofe	Scott
Coburn	Johnson (WI)	Sessions
Crapo	Kirk	Tester
Cruz	Lee	Toomey
Enzi	McCain	Vitter
Fischer	Moran	Wicker
Flake	Paul	

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The amendment (No. 26), as modified, as amended, was agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on H.R. 933.

The senior Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, we have just voted, as everybody knows, on the Mikulski-Shelby substitute. Our next vote is a cloture vote. Then, assuming cloture is invoked, we will have final passage. It is my understanding that the House is waiting on this bill. I hope we can get it to them as quickly as we can.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I just want to echo the comments by my vice chairman, Senator SHELBY. It is time to bring this bill to closure, and I would hope we could pass it. I really want to thank Senator SHELBY for the bipartisan tradition in which we have been able to operate, and I hope we get a 60-vote majority and move this bill and this country forward.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the

Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on 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.

Harry Reid, Barbara A. Mikulski, Sherrod Brown, Barbara Boxer, Robert Menendez, Patty Murray, Amy Klobuchar, Debbie Stabenow, Max Baucus, Tim Johnson, Benjamin L. Cardin, John D. Rockefeller IV, Charles E. Schumer, Carl Levin, Thomas R. Carper, Richard J. Durbin, Maria Cantwell.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on H.R. 933, 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, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 63, nays 36, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 43 Leg.]

YEAS—63

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

NAYS—36

Ayotte	Flake	Paul
Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Burr	Grassley	Risch
Chambliss	Hatch	Roberts
Coats	Heller	Rubio
Coburn	Inhofe	Scott
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Sessions
Cornyn	Kirk	Tester
Crapo	Lee	Thune
Cruz	McCain	Toomey
Enzi	McConnell	Vitter
Fischer	Moran	Wicker

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 63, the nays are 36. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

Under the previous order, all postcloture time is yielded back. Under

the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote on passage of H.R. 933, as amended.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Following the statements of Senator MIKULSKI and Senator SHELBY, I would ask to be recognized.

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

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, we are now coming to a vote on final passage of the bill. I am going to thank all of our colleagues who supported cloture to bring the debate to an end. This is indeed a very important moment, because as we moved the bill, we have shown that we have done something pretty terrific in that we have continued a bipartisan tradition of the Appropriations Committee.

I cannot thank my vice chairman, Senator SHELBY, and his staff enough for their cooperation, as well as the Republican leader and the Democratic leader, often giving very wise counsel. We had three principles in this Senate continuing resolution: The House sent us a bill which we felt was skimpy and spartan. We wanted to not only avoid a government shutdown—remember, the full funding of the U.S. Government expires on March 27; we did not want brinkmanship politics; we did not want ultimatum politics. We wanted to be able to move our bill forward protecting national security needs and meeting compelling human needs and complying with the Budget Control Act. This bill will cost no more than 1.3 trillion, the same as the House continuing resolution. It does meet the needs of our constituents.

This bill is co-sponsored by my Vice Chairman, Senator SHELBY, and I am so glad he is my partner. We have worked across the aisle and across the dome to improve the House bill, while at the same time we have kept poison pills out of the bill, in order to prevent a government shutdown.

When we began this process, I had three principles for the Senate CR. First, avoid a government shutdown, while protecting national security needs and also meeting compelling human needs, such as investing in human infrastructure like early childhood education and in research and innovation, so that we can create jobs today and jobs tomorrow. Not shutting down the government allows us to protect the middle class and our fragile economic recovery. Second, comply with the Budget Control Act. The Senate CR provides \$1.043 trillion, the same as the House CR. Third, establish a path to return to regular order for our fiscal year 2014 bills.

This bill meets all three of these principles. We will avoid a shutdown. We are at \$1.043 trillion in total budget authority, as required by the Budget Control Act. We have shown that we can work in a bipartisan manner, to move this bill to final passage.

The bill we will vote on today is five full appropriations bills: Agriculture; Commerce, Justice, Science; Homeland

Security; Defense; and Military Construction and Veterans Affairs.

The remaining seven bills are in the CR: Energy and Water; Financial Services; Interior and Environment; Labor-HHS; State-Foreign Operations; Transportation-HUD; and the Legislative Branch. This means they are provided current funding levels and policies, with some limited changes to fix pressing problems.

This bill has been on the Senate floor for a week. The Senate has debated and voted on amendments to eliminate funding for the Affordable Care Act, cut defense funding for projects in Guam, and cut funding for defense biofuels programs, among others. This afternoon, we accepted a number of amendments by voice vote, again, in a very bipartisan fashion.

I will be the first to admit that this bill is not perfect, but it is the bill that we need right now. I wanted an omnibus to provide complete bills for all the departments and agencies of the government, and not just some. I regret that the bill could not include a ½ percent pay raise for Federal workers, who now face a third year without a pay increase.

This bipartisan bill keeps Americans safe in their communities. The Senate bill provides more than the House CR for State and local first responder grants, providing a \$208 million increase above the House CR, and for fire grants, providing a \$33 million increase above the House CR. The Senate provides more for COPS grants, an \$18 million increase above the House CR, to put a total of 1,400 new police officers on the beat.

When it comes to infrastructure, this bipartisan bill fully funds highways, transit, and road safety programs at the authorized levels, a difference of almost \$700 million above the House CR.

This bipartisan bill also supports the innovation needed to grow the economy and to create jobs today and tomorrow. The Senate bill includes \$174 million more than the House CR for National Science Foundation basic research. That means 400 more grants supporting 5,000 scientists, teachers, students, all of them focused on making new discoveries leading to new products, new companies, and new jobs. For the National Institutes of Health, the Senate contains \$75 million more than the House CR for research on cancer, Alzheimer's, diabetes, and other devastating diseases.

The Senate bill meets compelling human needs. It includes \$33.5 million more than the House CR for Head Start, to help them to implement reforms and improve quality. The Senate bill includes \$250 million more than the House CR for the Women, Infants and Children, a program that provides basic nutrition support for low-income mothers and their children. For homeless assistance grants, the Senate bill contains \$147 million more than the House CR for shelter and housing support for 28,000 more homeless people.

This legislation will put us on the road to a return to regular order for our appropriations bills. I am so proud that we have reached across the aisle and across the dome to come to a bipartisan solution to funding the government for the next 6 months. I thank my Vice Chairman, Senator SHELBY, for his support, in making this possible.

As we start our work on fiscal year 2014 bills, this process should serve as a model, showing that the Congress can get its work done, and can exercise the power of the purse in a bipartisan way.

My vice chairman and I have worked very hard to get to this point to provide a bill that Democrats and Republicans can support. I hope they will join with us to vote for final passage of the Senate CR, and return it to the House, so it can be considered and sent to the President for his signature.

I urge adoption of this bill and thank everyone for their cooperation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SHELBY. We know we are ready to vote. I urge everyone to support this bill. It needs to go to the House. The House, I think, is ready to act on it. This will fund the government through September 30. It is the first big step toward regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the week before last, the House of Representatives sent us this important bill to prevent a government shutdown, to fund the government for the next 6 months. I have said it before, I say it again: I commend Speaker BOEHNER for giving this bill to us at a time where we could do some constructive work on it. The House did their work on time. We are going to do our work on time.

I applaud and commend my counterpart, Senator MCCONNELL. When that bill came from the House, he sat down with me and the two managers of this bill. He said: The House did their work, now we need to do ours. We could not do all the remaining 10 appropriations bills, but we added three. That was good. It would not have happened but for Senator MCCONNELL acknowledging that we needed to get some of this work done. It could not have happened even though Senator MCCONNELL and I thought it was a good idea but for the work of Senator MIKULSKI and Senator SHELBY. They are veteran legislators. They are people who believe in this institution. They know this institution needs to get back where we are doing things the way we used to. The way we used to do things was fund the government in a timely fashion. We have the opportunity to do that now. We are taking care of the next 6 months.

During this 6 months, the government will be functioning because of what we have done here. They will work on having 12 appropriations bills that we will bring to the floor. Everyone should know we are not going to be able to spend a week on every appro-

priations bill, but we need to do all 12 appropriations bills. That is our goal. It is the goal of the two managers of this bill, it is the goal of the Republican leader, and it is my goal. We need to do this.

I so appreciate—I say it again—the work done by the two managers of this bill. They worked in good faith. They both gave up things they believed in for the greater good. They produced a substitute amendment. We had added a few things to it. I know people are disappointed because they wanted to rearrange things differently. I would like to have rearranged things differently. There are things that are happening in Nevada because of the sequester that I would like to have taken out of this bill. They are not good things that are happening either.

I hope this practical, commonsense leadership will be a good sign for our regular appropriations bills and other work in the future. The work done by these two managers should be and is exemplary for what needs to follow. And what is going to follow immediately is our budget. We are going to have a budget debate. It is going to be a good debate.

We have two differently opposed views as to what should happen to this country economically. But that is what the Senate is all about, to allow us to do that. So I say to Senator MURRAY—everyone has heard me talk about how good she is, and I really do believe that—I hope she and Senator SESSIONS are looking at what was done by these two Senators. Senator MIKULSKI and Senator SHELBY have totally different views about how government should operate, but they also have views as to how the legislative process should operate. Legislation is the art of compromise. Everybody here has to understand, you are not going to get everything you want. You cannot throw a monkey wrench into everything just because you do not get what you want on one issue.

We are going to move to the budget. There will be no votes tonight. We have a lot of debate time on this bill, and the two managers are going to determine when the votes will start.

Again, this is a very good day for the Senate. I am very happy we reached this point.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. REID. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 73, nays 26, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 44 Leg.]

YEAS—73

Alexander	Feinstein	Murkowski
Baldwin	Franken	Murphy
Barrasso	Gillibrand	Murray
Baucus	Hagan	Nelson
Begich	Harkin	Pryor
Bennet	Hatch	Reed
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Reid
Blunt	Heitkamp	Rockefeller
Boozman	Hirono	Sanders
Boxer	Hoeben	Schatz
Brown	Isakson	Schumer
Cantwell	Johanns	Sessions
Cardin	Johnson (SD)	Shaheen
Carper	Kaine	Shelby
Casey	King	Stabenow
Chambliss	Klobuchar	Thune
Coats	Landrieu	Udall (CO)
Cochran	Leahy	Udall (NM)
Collins	Levin	Warner
Coons	Manchin	Warren
Corker	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Cornyn	McConnell	Wicker
Cowan	Menendez	Wyden
Donnelly	Merkley	
Durbin	Mikulski	

NAYS—26

Ayotte	Grassley	Portman
Burr	Heller	Risch
Coburn	Inhofe	Roberts
Crapo	Johnson (WI)	Rubio
Cruz	Kirk	Scott
Enzi	Lee	Tester
Fischer	McCain	Toomey
Flake	Moran	Vitter
Graham	Paul	

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The bill (H.R. 933), as amended, was passed.

(The bill will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD).

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. SHELBY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, this is an enormous victory—that we just passed this bill and are now sending it to the House. Again, I wish to thank everyone.

I also wish to say that today is exactly 90 days since I took over the full Committee on Appropriations. During these 90 days, with Senator SHELBY and his staff and the help and support of many people on both sides of the aisle, we were able to pass the Sandy urgent supplemental and we were able to pass the continuing funding resolution. This is pretty good. It shows we can work on a bipartisan basis; that we can actually govern and that we can conduct ourselves with decorum.

I think for all, as they watched the debate that occurred during this last week, they saw civility, they saw sensibility, they saw, yes, differing ideas, but at the end of the day, I think we all agreed on our goal—we want to keep America moving. So I am glad we have moved this bill to the House and we are going to keep our government functioning and keep America moving forward.

Again, I wish to thank everyone for what they have done, and I look forward to moving the other 12 appropriations bills on a regular basis, working, again, on a bipartisan basis across the aisle and across the dome.

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.

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

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

#### CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FISCAL YEAR 2014

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 28, S. Con. Res. 8.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 8) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that any time spent in quorum calls during consideration of S. Con. Res. 8 be equally divided.

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that no amendments be in order for the remainder of today's consideration of S. Con. Res. 8.

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the use of calculators be permitted on the floor during consideration of the budget resolution.

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that staff be permitted to make technical and conforming changes to the resolution, if necessary, consistent with amendments adopted during Senate consideration, including calculating the associated change in the net interest function under section 104, and incorporating the effect of such adopted amendments on the budgetary aggregates under section 101 for Federal revenues, the amount by which Federal revenues should be changed, new budget authority, budget outlays, deficits, public debt, and debt held by the public.

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Finally, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the period of debate for economic goals and policy under section 305(b) of the Con-

gressional Budget Act occur on Thursday, March 21, at a time to be determined by the two managers.

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, we are now on the floor of the Senate with the budget, and I wish to start by thanking my counterpart, Senator SESSIONS, for all his work and his staff's work—and all our staff—to get us to this point this evening that we are debating this bill and this amendment. Senator SESSIONS has been very gracious in working with us. We have gotten to this. We obviously have differences of opinion, but I wish to commend him for the tremendous amount of work he has put into this. It is going to be great to be working with him on the floor.

When I go back home to Washington State, my constituents tell me they are sick and tired of the gridlock and dysfunction in Washington, DC. They can see that our economy is slowly getting back on its feet and businesses are beginning to hire more workers, but my constituents—and people across the country—are very frustrated that the constant political crises are holding our recovery back right when we need to be doing everything possible to support it.

After 2 years of debate about fiscal and economic policy and an election in which voters spoke loudly and clearly, the American people want their elected representatives to stop arguing and reach some solutions. I come to the floor to discuss a budget plan that meets this challenge.

The Senate budget that passed through the Budget Committee last week, with the strong support of all 10 Democrats and 2 Independents, is a responsible and balanced plan that puts the economy first and tackles our deficit and debt responsibly and credibly. I am hopeful that after it passes the Senate, the House of Representatives stands ready to compromise as well, and we can come together around a balanced and bipartisan deal that the American people expect and deserve.

The budget debate is too often discussed in terms of abstract numbers and political winners and losers. But the truth is that budgets are about far more than that. They are about our values and our priorities. They are about our visions for how government should be serving its citizens today and for generations to come, and, most of all, they are about the people across the country whose lives are impacted by the decisions we make.

The budget we will be debating on the floor this week puts those people first. It reflects the progrowth, pro-middle-class agenda that the American people went to the polls in support of last election. I believe it is a strong and responsible vision for building a foundation for growth and restoring the promise of American opportunity.

Our budget is built on three principles. No. 1, we need to protect our fragile economic recovery. We need to

create jobs and invest in long-term growth. No. 2, we need to tackle our deficit and our debt fairly and responsibly. No. 3, we need to keep the promises we have made as a nation to our seniors and our families and our communities.

The highest priority of our budget is to create the conditions for job creation, economic growth, and prosperity built from the middle out, not the top down. We believe that with the unemployment rate that remains stubbornly high and a middle class that has seen their wages stagnate for far too long, we simply cannot afford any threats to our fragile recovery. So this budget fully replaces the cuts from sequestration that threatens 750,000 jobs this year alone and economic growth for years to come, as well as our national security, and the programs families and communities depend on. It replaces those automatic cuts in a fair and responsible way following the precedent that was set in the year-end deal.

Half of the new deficit reduction to replace sequestration comes from responsible spending cuts across the Federal budget and half comes from new savings found through closing loopholes and cutting wasteful spending in the Tax Code that benefits the wealthiest Americans and biggest corporations.

In addition to replacing sequestration with deficit reduction that is far more responsible, our budget follows the advice of experts and economists across the political spectrum who say it makes sense to invest in job creation in the short term while putting ourselves on a strong path to responsible and sustainable deficit and debt reduction over the medium and long term.

We believe that in order to truly tackle our economic and fiscal challenges in the real world and not just make them disappear on paper, we need a strong foundation for growth built from the middle out. So this budget invests in a \$100 billion economic recovery protection plan to put workers back on the job repairing our Nation's highest priority deteriorating infrastructure and fixing our crumbling schools and installing critical educational technology such as broadband that our students need to succeed.

This plan creates an infrastructure bank to leverage public funds with private investment. It invests in our workers by making sure they have the skills and training they need to move into the 3.6 million jobs businesses across the country are trying to fill, and it is fully paid for by closing loopholes and cutting unfair spending in the Tax Code that mainly benefit the well-off and well-connected.

Our budget also makes sure we are not reducing our fiscal deficit while increasing our deficits in education and skills and infrastructure and innovation. While cutting spending responsibly overall, it protects our investments in national, middle-class, and economic priorities, such as our