

of S. 1392, a bill to provide additional time for the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to issue achievable standards for industrial, commercial, and institutional boilers, process heaters, and incinerators, and for other purposes.

S. 1461

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Florida, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1461, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to clarify the Food and Drug Administration's jurisdiction over certain tobacco products, and to protect jobs and small businesses involved in the sale, manufacturing and distribution of traditional and premium cigars.

S. 1507

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), and the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1507, a bill to provide protections from workers with respect to their right to select or refrain from selecting representation by a labor organization.

S. 1508

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1508, a bill to extend loan limits for programs of the Federal Housing Administration, the government-sponsored enterprises, and the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 1514

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1514, a bill to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to Elouise Pepion Cobell, in recognition of her outstanding and enduring contributions to American Indians, Alaska Natives, and the Nation through her tireless pursuit of justice.

S. 1527

At the request of Mrs. HAGAN, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1527, a bill to authorize the award of a Congressional gold medal to the Montford Point Marines of World War II.

S. 1539

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT), and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1539, a bill to provide Taiwan with critically needed United States-built multirole fighter aircraft to strengthen its self-defense capability against the increasing military threat from China.

S. 1556

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1556, a bill to require an accounting for financial support made to promote the production or use of renewable energy, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 626

At the request of Mr. COBURN, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 626 proposed to H.R. 2832, a bill to extend the Generalized System of Preferences, and for other purposes.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. KIRK, and Mrs. BOXER):  
S. 1582. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to modify provisions relating to beach monitoring, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. President, today I am pleased to join with Senator FRANK LAUTENBERG to introduce the Clean Coastal Environment and Public Health Act of 2011 to help protect the millions of Americans who utilize public beaches each day.

Unfortunately, every year many beaches go unmonitored or face severe delays in receiving test results of levels of contamination in coastal waters. Without proper monitoring and notification, thousands of citizens risk illness due to growing contamination of our coastal waters. Beach closings are a far too regular occurrence along the 52 public Lake Michigan beaches in my home State of Illinois. According to the Illinois Department of Public Health, there were 579 beach closures or contamination advisories last year, an 8 percent increase from 2008. Beach closures greatly affect the health of our children and families—a recent University of Chicago study showed swim bans at Chicago's beaches due to *E. coli* levels cost the local economy \$2.4 million in lost revenue every year. This bipartisan legislation requires rapid testing methods to detect water contamination in 4 hours or less, faster notification and decision about closures and advisories within 2 hours. These measures can help save millions of Americans from hospital bills or unnecessary beach closings.

But we must not ignore the more dangerous toxin which has far reaching consequences for the most vulnerable members our society—our children. Mercury pollution is a serious problem nationwide and is particularly concerning since large amounts can accumulate in fish tissue. Mercury levels in the Great Lakes, particularly in Lake Michigan, are poorly understood. Moving forward, it is critical that we revise the outdated monitoring and testing of this dangerous toxin. This bill also requires the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to up-

date existing monitoring protocols and develop updated testing recommendations for the existence of mercury in Great Lakes coastal waters, sediment and fish.

Protecting the Great Lakes and our coastal waters is one of my top priorities in Congress. I am proud to be the lead cosponsor of this important legislation that addresses a key problem facing our Great Lakes beaches. I urge my colleagues to support this bill to help safeguard our future generations and our most precious natural resource.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. CHAMBLISS)

S. 1583. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax deduction for the purchase, construction, and installation of a safe room or storm shelter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, being from Oklahoma, I can remember back in the days when they called Oklahoma, southern Kansas, northern Texas, and southwestern Missouri tornado alley. I say to my good friend from Oregon that I have been in aviation for many years. I know people who won't even fly airplanes through what we call tornado alley. But by now I think we know that tornadoes are a daily threat to Americans each spring as severe weather rolls across the country. In the past 30 years, over 34,000 tornadoes have touched down somewhere in the country, which means that one touches down, on average, every 8 hours of each day. This chart right here shows that each one of these little green dots represents a tornado.

As we all witnessed once again this spring, many of these tornadoes grow into very voracious and dangerous storms that bring significant harm to property and life. This year, 57 such tornadoes struck 14 States and claimed 550 lives. Alabama was the hardest hit. I can remember when Oklahoma was ranked as the hardest hit. They had over 240 killed. Missouri also suffered heavily with the loss of 157 people in Joplin. I say to my friend from Missouri, who is on the floor, I was up in Joplin right after that happened, down close to the Oklahoma border. It is something you have to witness before you understand it. In my State of Oklahoma where we have more than our fair share of violent tornadoes, this spring's storms resulted in the death of 14 people and the injury of many others. Until you have this happen, and you go on site, which I always make it a point to do—after each tornado in Oklahoma, you go down and talk to the people. You think of little kids looking for their toys and this type of thing, but they are gone and gone for good.

While this year has seen a large number of fatal tornadoes, they are a nationwide threat each spring. Since 1980, 734 tornadoes have claimed 2,462 lives in at least 37 different States, including 126 in my State of Oklahoma. Unfortunately, many of these lost lives

could have been avoided had storm shelters been more widely used.

In the past few months, a number of Oklahomans have asked me if there is a Federal program that promotes the installation of tornado storm shelters. They observed that those individuals who have these storm shelters live through it. They may lose their property, but they live through it. So they think, Well, government gets involved in all of these programs; what are they going to do to help us encourage people to build storm shelters? When I looked into it, I came up emptyhanded despite the fact that hundreds of millions of dollars are obligated each year to mitigate the effects of natural disasters.

Since death is one of the worst effects of natural disasters, one would think tornado storm shelters, which are the safest way to ride out tornadoes, would be a high priority, but only limited funds have been made available in the past, and it has been sporadic and poorly allocated. Most of the funds have been made available through FEMA's Hazardous Mitigation Grant Program, which is a mandatory program that allocates funds to States to help them better prepare for future disasters. States are able to direct some of this money to residential storm shelter construction, but to do this they have to go through a lot of hoops—through a lengthy process of coordinating a program with FEMA. Needless to say, it is a bureaucratic nightmare and hugely expensive.

Oklahoma did this after the devastating tornadoes of May 3, 1999. Fifty people died and many others were injured that day. As the recovery effort took hold, it became clear to public leaders that staggeringly few Oklahomans had storm shelters accessible for their homes. Because of this, Oklahoma's Department of Emergency Management worked with FEMA to create a temporary rebate program to encourage individuals to install storm shelters in their homes. The rebate was worth \$2,000, and the funding cap was set at \$6 million.

Unfortunately, the program didn't perform as well as they would have liked. It was a popular program and funding depleted quickly. But because of the rebate amount, only 3,000 homeowners were able to take advantage of the program, despite its \$6 million funding level. We are talking about in the State of Oklahoma.

Furthermore, because this program was run through FEMA, it had a lot of paperwork requirements and was time consuming for the State to actually formalize. The ultimate decision of who received the rebate rested with FEMA and the Oklahoma Department of Emergency Management and they decided who received the rebate and who did not. If you ask me, that is a pretty expensive, poorly designed program, but that is generally the way FEMA structures these programs when States go to the trouble of requesting them. All told, FEMA's sporadic Haz-

ard Mitigation Grant Program for residential storm shelters has supported the construction of only 15,000 storm shelters at a staggering cost of \$35 million. That is \$2,000 for each storm shelter.

A different approach is needed to encourage a wider group of people to install tornado storm shelters. This would help mitigate the loss of life during tornadoes. To give people the opportunity—I have 20 kids and grandkids. My first concern every time I hear of a tornado coming is for them. That is why we have introduced this bill called the Storm Shelter Tax Relief Act. It provides a tax deduction of up to \$2,500 to any individual who installs a qualified storm shelter. The cost of this deduction is fully offset, which I will explain in a minute, where it is coming from, and there are reductions in other areas of spending.

First, the deduction can be claimed by any taxpayer. If someone in Oklahoma, Kentucky, or Tennessee decides they need a storm shelter at their house, they can pay to have one installed and then claim the incentive by deducting up to \$2,500 from their income when they file their taxes. Claiming this incentive would not require dealing with a big bureaucracy. One doesn't have to fill out the forms. One does not have to go through all the red-tape. That is one of the reasons people don't do it under the existing programs. As I said before, previous programs that have been administered through FEMA place the power of the shelter incentive into the hands of an agency and not a family, not individuals. The agency then decides who does and does not receive the incentive. I think it is best when this middleman can be avoided, and a tax deduction does that. The Tax Code is blind and provides the incentive to anyone who decides in their best judgment that they need a storm shelter.

Lastly, and probably most importantly, the tax deduction is a better allocation of scarce taxpayer resources. A rebate that covers a large portion of a shelter's cost, as the Oklahoma program did, can foster moral hazard. What I mean is that when free money is on the table, people generally take it. In this case, people may take the rebate to buy a storm shelter because it is free, not because it is what they need. A tax deduction doesn't allow this because the actual incentive is much lower in value. No one is going to go out and spend \$2,000 or more on a storm shelter because they get to write that amount off of their taxable income. Nobody does that. A rational individual would only go out to buy a shelter if they know they need one and then it has the added benefit of being deducted from their income, so it is a much better way of approaching it. On the aggregate level, this allows a lot more people to get the incentive at the same cost compared to the rebate programs that have been used in the past. A tax deduction provides a nudge to

taxpayers to take practical steps to stay safe in areas where tornadoes are common. It is a commonsense approach and a better way to use taxpayer resources.

Further, this proposal's \$41 million cost is fully paid for by rescinding funds authorized for storm shelter construction grants through the programs administered through HUD. In other words, we are doing this program and providing countless more shelters at a cost that would merely mean a tax deduction, and it is going to have a lot more people participating in the program. This means that existing unspent HUD funds that are duplicative of other FEMA spending will be redirected to a more effective policy in order to accomplish the same goal: Encourage the installation of more storm shelters to save lives from deadly tornadoes.

Many may wonder why this is something the Federal Government should be doing. In reality, this falls squarely within the purpose of the hazard mitigation priorities of the Federal Government. FEMA defines hazardous mitigation as "any sustained action taken to reduce or eliminate long-term risk to life and property from a hazard event." HMGP regulations state that projects "retrofitting structures . . . to minimize damages from high winds, earthquake, flood, wildfire, or other natural hazards" are eligible for the expenditure of program dollars. The main goal of all this spending is to reduce the likelihood of losses of life and property, and retrofitting buildings to lessen the likelihood of damage caused by tornadoes is an eligible expense. That is what this tax deduction does.

Furthermore, the threat of deadly and dangerous tornadoes stretches far across the Nation. We saw the first map, but this map shows it is not just the tornado alley I referred to right here. With the exception of mountainous areas here, the danger zone is all across America. Not surprisingly, Oklahoma is right in the center. When we look at where deadly tornadoes have occurred during the past 30 years, it is spread across the entire eastern half of the country. All the States in red have had at least one deadly tornado every other year since 1980, and most of them have had even more. This may be surprising, but the threat is real. It needs to be addressed. More tornado storm shelters need to be constructed around the country and Federal policies encouraging this need to be changed. That is why we are introducing the Storm Shelter Tax Relief Act. The number of this bill, I say to my colleagues, is S. 1583. It was introduced today. I think those of us who have lived in these tornado-prone areas—I can tell stories about tornadoes picking up a horse and replacing it, dropping it someplace. In my personal experience, my wife was after me about 50 years ago when we had a place up in the country—we still have the same place—and I had a red Jeep. That

red Jeep was one we had for a long time. She said, How come you don't have that insured? I said, What could happen to a red Jeep in the middle of the country in Oklahoma? Well, a tornado came along, picked up a tree and dropped it right on top of my red Jeep. It cut it in half. So they are totally unpredictable.

I can tell more stories about Moore, OK, when we had our 1999 tornado where everything was devastated on one side of the street and nothing was touched on the other side of the street.

It is an art to understanding where these are coming from. We now have developed that art. There is not a person who could be in the path of a tornado who doesn't have the facilities and the resources to see what is out there and where it is coming. What they don't have is a way, if it is unavoidable, to protect themselves if it hits them. The obvious answer is a storm shelter.

I appreciate the Senator from Missouri, who is going to speak next, cosponsoring this bill. We would like to have more cosponsors. We have every intention of getting this passed.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I am pleased to cosponsor the bill with Senator INHOFE. Between he and I, we may have been to the scenes of more tornadoes than almost anybody else in America who is not a storm chaser. Because of where we live and what we have done, we have had a chance to see the aftermath of many tornadoes. Unlike the floods we have dealt with in our State this year and the hurricanes we have dealt with in other States recently, the tornado is there and you don't get much warning, and that storm shelter needs to be close if you want a chance to get into it. The bill he has drafted and I am proud to cosponsor with him provides an opportunity to get that storm shelter nearby.

#### SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

##### SENATE RESOLUTION 272—DESIGNATING NOVEMBER 1, 2011, AS “NATIONAL JOBS DAY”

Mr. PRYOR (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. DURBIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 272

Whereas people in the United States want to work and contribute to the national economy;

Whereas the national unemployment rate in the United States remains stubbornly above 9 percent;

Whereas the Office of Management and Budget Fiscal Year 2012 Mid-Session Review of the Budget projects that the unemployment rate may stay above 8.3 percent in 2012;

Whereas almost half of unemployed people in the United States have been out of work

for 6 months or more and more than 25,000,000 people in the United States are not able to find a full-time job;

Whereas throughout the history of the United States, in times of crisis, the private sector has come together and helped lead the United States forward;

Whereas the private sector can lead the economic recovery by hiring workers from the United States;

Whereas small and large businesses have the power to fuel growth and help bring the United States back to normal levels of employment;

Whereas uhireU.S. is a national initiative to rally the business community in the United States to come together in its own best interest to hire 1,000,000 workers by the end of 2011;

Whereas employing 1,000,000 more people will increase the demand for the goods and services that businesses need to sell, and increase positive sentiment toward businesses;

Whereas uhireU.S. is supported by many non-governmental organizations; and

Whereas it is important to designate a day for everyone throughout the United States to focus on overcoming the human and economic costs of high unemployment: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) designates November 1, 2011, as “National Jobs Day”;

(2) encourages businesses, starting on November 1, 2011, to pledge to add not less than 1 unemployed worker for each 100 employees; and

(3) supports the goal of the uhireU.S. initiative to put new life into the economy by promoting a wave of business ingenuity that puts 1,000,000 individuals who are jobless back at work by the end of 2011.

##### SENATE RESOLUTION 273—CONGRATULATING THE NUNAKA VALLEY LITTLE LEAGUE JUNIOR GIRLS SOFTBALL TEAM ON THEIR PERFORMANCE IN THE JUNIOR LEAGUE SOFTBALL WORLD SERIES

Mr. BEGICH (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 273

Whereas the Nunaka Valley Little League junior girls softball team is comprised of young women from Anchorage, Alaska who play softball;

Whereas the Nunaka Valley Little League junior girls softball team compiled an impressive record in the 2011 regular season, outscoring opponents 428 to 83;

Whereas the Nunaka Valley Little League junior girls softball team was undefeated in the district and State tournaments on the way to winning the Alaska State Championship;

Whereas the Nunaka Valley Little League junior girls softball team was undefeated in 4 games and won the West Regional Tournament held in Marana, Arizona;

Whereas in August, 2011, the Nunaka Valley Little League junior girls softball team represented the West Region at the Junior League Softball World Series in Kirkland, Washington;

Whereas in 2011, Nunaka Valley Little League junior girls softball team manager Richard Knowles led the team to the Junior League Softball World Series for the second time in 3 years;

Whereas in 2011, the Nunaka Valley Little League junior girls softball team won 4

games and lost just 2 games en route to a third place finish in the Junior League Softball World Series;

Whereas more than 2,000 teams and 30,000 players compete in Junior League Girls Softball each year;

Whereas the Nunaka Valley Little League junior girls softball team finished the 2011 season ranked third in the world;

Whereas the hard work and dedication of the entire Nunaka Valley Little League junior girls softball team and the support of their families led the team to success in 2011;

Whereas Little League softball and baseball has provided a positive athletic experience and fostered teamwork and sportsmanship to millions of children in the United States and around the world; and

Whereas Alaskans everywhere are proud of the Nunaka Valley Little League junior girls athletes, Jacynne Augufa, Leilani Blair, Heather Breslin, Metanoya Fiamme, Morgan Hill, Julia Merritt, Gabrielle Meyerson, Taria Page, Hannah Peterson, Sydney Smith, Lauren Syrup, and Nanea Tali, on the 2011 softball season: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the athletes, parents, and coaching staff of the Nunaka Valley Little League junior girls softball team on an impressive 2011 season; and

(2) respectfully requests the Secretary of the Senate to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to—

(A) the Nunaka Valley Little League President, Greg Davis; and

(B) the Nunaka Valley Little League junior girls softball team manager, Richard Knowles, and coaches Rick Peterson and Richard Hill.

#### AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 627. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2832, to extend the Generalized System of Preferences, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 628. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2832, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 629. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2832, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 630. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2832, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 631. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2832, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 632. Ms. SNOWE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2832, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 633. Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. BAUCUS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2832, supra.

SA 634. Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. COBURN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2832, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 635. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1094, to reauthorize the Combating Autism Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-416); which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 636. Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2832, to extend the Generalized System of Preferences, and for other

purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 637. Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself, Mr. AKAKA, and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 633 submitted by Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. BAUCUS) to the bill H.R. 2832, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 638. Mr. BINGAMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2832, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 639. Mr. NELSON of Florida submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2832, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 640. Mr. DEMINT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2832, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 641. Mr. HATCH proposed an amendment to amendment SA 633 submitted by Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. BAUCUS) to the bill H.R. 2832, supra.

SA 642. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 633 submitted by Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. BAUCUS) to the bill H.R. 2832, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 643. Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2832, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

#### TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 627. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2832, to extend the Generalized System of Preferences, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 33, between lines 7 and 8, insert the following:

**SEC. 231. EFFECTIVE DATE FOR TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE CONTINGENT ON ENACTMENT OF CERTAIN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTING BILLS.**

Notwithstanding section 201(b) or any other provision of this subtitle, the amendments made by this subtitle shall take effect on the date on which the United States–Korea Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act, the United States–Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement Implementation Act, and the United States–Panama Trade Promotion Agreement Implementation Act have been enacted into law.

SA 628. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2832, to extend the Generalized System of Preferences, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 33, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

**SEC. 224. MODIFICATION OF TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.**

(a) TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR WORKERS.—Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2272), as amended by section 211(a), is further amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(iii), by striking “contributed importantly to such workers’ separation or threat of separation and to” and inserting “was a substantial cause of such workers’ separation or threat of separation and of”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking “contributed importantly to” and inserting “was a substantial cause of”;

(2) in paragraph (3)(B) of subsection (b), as redesignated by section 211(a), by striking “contributed importantly to” and inserting “was a substantial cause of”; and

(3) in subsection (c), as redesignated and amended by section 211(a), by striking paragraph (1) and redesignating paragraphs (2) through (4) as paragraphs (1) through (3), respectively.

(b) TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR FIRMS.—Section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2341) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(C), by striking “contributed importantly to such total or partial separation, or threat thereof, and to” and inserting “were a substantial cause of such total or partial separation, or threat thereof, and of”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking subparagraph (A);

(ii) by striking “(B)”; and

(iii) by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and moving such subparagraphs, as so redesignated, 2 ems to the left.

(c) TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR FARMERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 292(c)(3) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2401a(c)(3)) is amended by striking “contributed importantly to” and inserting “was a substantial cause of”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 291 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2401) is amended by striking paragraph (3) and redesignating paragraphs (4) through (7) as paragraphs (3) through (6), respectively.

SA 629. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2832, to extend the Generalized System of Preferences, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

#### TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

**SEC. 301. REPORT ON IMPACT OF FREE TRADE AGREEMENTS ON EMPLOYMENT IN THE UNITED STATES.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which a free trade agreement specified in subsection (b) enters into force, the Secretary of Labor shall submit to Congress a report assessing—

(1) the number of workers dislocated because of the entry into force of that agreement; and

(2) the overall impact of that agreement on employment in the United States.

(b) FREE TRADE AGREEMENTS SPECIFIED.—A free trade agreement specified in this subsection is—

(1) the United States–Korea Free Trade Agreement;

(2) the United States–Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement; or

(3) the United States–Panama Trade Promotion Agreement.

SA 630. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2832, to extend the Generalized System of Preferences, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 21, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

**SEC. 217. PLAN TO LEVERAGE PRIVATE SECTOR RESOURCES TO ASSIST WORKERS ELIGIBLE FOR TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE.**

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of

Labor, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, shall submit to Congress a plan to effectively leverage private sector resources to assist workers who are eligible for trade adjustment assistance under chapter 2 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2271 et seq.) to find employment.

SA 631. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2832, to extend the Generalized System of Preferences, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

#### TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

**SEC. 301. RENEWAL OF DUTY SUSPENSIONS ON COTTON SHIRTING FABRICS AND RELATED PROVISIONS.**

(a) EXTENSIONS.—Each of the following headings of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States is amended by striking everything after “suitable for use in men’s and boys’ shirts” in the article description column and by striking the date in the effective date column and inserting “12/31/2013”:

(1) Heading 9902.52.08 (relating to woven fabrics of cotton).

(2) Heading 9902.52.09 (relating to woven fabrics of cotton).

(3) Heading 9902.52.10 (relating to woven fabrics of cotton).

(4) Heading 9902.52.11 (relating to woven fabrics of cotton).

(5) Heading 9902.52.12 (relating to woven fabrics of cotton).

(6) Heading 9902.52.13 (relating to woven fabrics of cotton).

(7) Heading 9902.52.14 (relating to woven fabrics of cotton).

(8) Heading 9902.52.15 (relating to woven fabrics of cotton).

(9) Heading 9902.52.16 (relating to woven fabrics of cotton).

(10) Heading 9902.52.17 (relating to woven fabrics of cotton).

(11) Heading 9902.52.18 (relating to woven fabrics of cotton).

(12) Heading 9902.52.19 (relating to woven fabrics of cotton).

(13) Heading 9902.52.20 (relating to woven fabrics of cotton).

(14) Heading 9902.52.21 (relating to woven fabrics of cotton).

(15) Heading 9902.52.22 (relating to woven fabrics of cotton).

(16) Heading 9902.52.23 (relating to woven fabrics of cotton).

(17) Heading 9902.52.24 (relating to woven fabrics of cotton).

(18) Heading 9902.52.25 (relating to woven fabrics of cotton).

(19) Heading 9902.52.26 (relating to woven fabrics of cotton).

(20) Heading 9902.52.27 (relating to woven fabrics of cotton).

(21) Heading 9902.52.28 (relating to woven fabrics of cotton).

(22) Heading 9902.52.29 (relating to woven fabrics of cotton).

(23) Heading 9902.52.30 (relating to woven fabrics of cotton).

(24) Heading 9902.52.31 (relating to woven fabrics of cotton).

(b) EXTENSION OF DUTY REFUNDS AND PIMA COTTON TRUST FUND; MODIFICATION OF AFFIDAVIT REQUIREMENTS.—Section 407 of title IV of division C of the Tax Relief and Health Care Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–432; 120 Stat. 3060) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “amounts determined by the Secretary” and all that follows through “5208.59.80” and inserting “amounts received in the general fund that