

Their bill is an excellent piece of legislation. It has been endorsed by many members of the national security community. It is a good approach, and it would make our Nation safer. But there are other possible solutions to this urgent challenge. Unfortunately, the critics of the bill have failed to offer any alternatives to secure our Nation's critical infrastructure.

The longer we argue over how to tackle these problems, the longer our powerplants, financial system, and water infrastructure go unprotected. Everyone knows this Congress cannot pass laws that do not have broad bipartisan support. There are 53 of us, 47 of them. So we will need to work together on a bill that addresses the concerns of the lawmakers on both sides of the aisle.

But for that to happen, more of my Republican colleagues need to start taking this threat seriously. It is time for them to participate productively in the conversation instead of just criticizing the current approach. There is room for more good ideas on the table, and I welcome the discussion of any Republican generally interested in being part of the solution.

The national security experts agree. We cannot afford to waste any more time. The question is not whether to act but how quickly we can act. I put everyone on notice. We are going to move to this bill at the earliest possible date.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

Under the previous order, the following hour will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the majority controlling the first half and the Republicans controlling the final half.

The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, before I talk about the production tax credit which brought me to the floor, I wish to associate myself with the leader's remarks.

I have the great privilege to sit on the Armed Services Committee and the Intelligence Committee. The leader has put his finger on what should be a singular focus on the part of the Senate. We have been warned about the threats in the cyber domain. It is time to act. There are plans that are concrete, focused, and have great support. We should act as soon as we possibly can. I wish to thank the leader for bringing that to our attention.

#### WIND POWER'S FUTURE

I rise to talk about a very important issue for the economies of both my State and the entire Nation. That is the future of the wind power industry in the United States and a future that is at risk, I might add, if Congress does not extend the production tax credit for wind. Such inaction jeopardizes U.S. jobs and threatens what is a real bright spot for American manufacturing. Such inaction is not acceptable

to the people in my home State of Colorado, nor, I believe, to Americans more broadly.

Many of us know—I think all my colleagues know—that we have seen the wind industry grow by leaps and bounds over the last few years. According to the Wind Energy Industry Association, the industry has attracted an average of over \$15 billion annually from 2001 to 2011 in private investment in our wind sector in the United States.

In 2009, that figure was \$20 billion, when 10,000 megawatts, the highest annual total to date of wind, was installed. Seventy-five thousand hard-working Americans find good-paying jobs in the wind sector. There are 6,000 of those jobs in Colorado. So I am not unbiased, but when we look around the country, nobody should be unbiased.

Those jobs also have a positive ripple effect on all these communities where they are based. In just over the last 4 years, wind represented 35 percent of all new power capacity in our country, second only to natural gas. With technology advances, wind turbines are now generating 30 percent more electricity per turbine, which means they are producing more energy while driving down cost.

This also means all Americans from the Great Plains to the eastern shores have access to more affordable, reliable, and secure clean energy. That is a win-win. It is little wonder our constituents are demanding we extend the wind production tax credit. I wish to say this industry and the good news that is coming out of it could not have come at a better time for our manufacturing base, which has seen relentlessly tough times over the last few years.

The wind industry is cutting against the grain. It is creating manufacturing jobs at a time when many companies are outsourcing jobs. This chart gives a great picture of what has been happening all over the country. We see every sector of the country where we have wind manufacturing jobs.

At the end of last year, the wind industry included almost 500 manufacturing facilities that employ 30,000 people spanning 43 States. We have wind projects in a vast majority of States—38 out of 50. Last year alone over 100 different wind projects were installed—ranging from a single turbine to over 4,000-megawatt capacity plants.

Back in 2005—7 years ago—we had only five wind turbine manufacturers. But with steady and consistent growth and government policy support and certainty, the number of domestic and international manufacturers grew to 23 at the end of 2011. That is a key factor, the certainty that has been provided that will help this industry continue to grow jobs.

At a time when our economy is still coming back after the 2008 recession, and we are facing stiff competition from other countries, the wind industry is a dynamic example for how we

can grow manufacturing jobs and investment in our country. When I started, I mentioned the wind production tax credit, the PTC. It has been a key factor in this growth, central to this young industry—and it is still a very young industry—and its success in America by helping make wind energy more economical, which is still being commercialized.

This critical tax credit expires at the end of this year. Unless we act now in this Congress to extend the wind production tax credit, we risk losing this industry as well as the jobs, the investment and manufacturing base it creates, to our competitors in China, in Europe, and other countries. That is the last result we need in our economy.

I have come to the floor to urge the Congress to keep our country an open marketplace for innovative energy industries and for new investments. The United States is on the cutting edge of renewable energy technologies and on a path to further secure our energy independence. We have to maintain that momentum by passing an extension of the wind production tax credit.

In fact, it is so important—this extension—that I am planning to come to the Senate floor every morning until we get our act together and extend the PTC—not just for Colorado but for every State in our country. I plan to talk about the importance of wind energy in a different State every time I come to the floor. I look forward to talking about the State of the Presiding Officer, the State of Delaware.

I hear every day from Coloradoans who are incredulous that we have not acted to extend this commonsense tax credit. We need to be reminded that American jobs are at stake if we fail to act.

Simply put, if we don't extend the PTC as soon as possible, the wind industry will shrink significantly in 2013. Estimates are that we can lose almost half of the wind-supported jobs, down from 78,000 in 2012 to 41,000 in 2013.

If we fail to extend this tax credit, total wind investment is projected to drop by nearly two-thirds, from \$15.6 billion in 2012 to \$5.5 billion in 2013. That is simply unacceptable. Luckily, I am not alone in this effort. There is strong bipartisan support in the Senate for the extension of this tax credit. Yes, this is one of those occasions where we are talking about legislation that is supported by Members of both parties.

Senator GRASSLEY, a Republican Senator from Iowa—along with myself and seven other Democrats and Republicans—introduced a bill earlier this year to extend the tax credit. Senator JERRY MORAN, a Republican Senator from Kansas, and I led 12 Members from across the country and both sides of the aisle in urging our Senate leadership to work with us to extend the PTC as soon as possible.

We have not seen that happen yet, Mr. President. Instead of addressing this bipartisan proposal which has been

a proven job creator, Congress has been caught up in partisan fights. Let's do what Americans are demanding. Let's work together to create jobs and strengthen our economy, as well as our energy security. Let's pass the PTC as soon as possible—ASAP.

I will be back tomorrow, and I will talk more specifically about the importance of the PTC to my home State of Colorado. We are home to thousands of renewable energy jobs, including high-paying manufacturing ones. But that could change literally overnight if the PTC is not extended.

For the good of our economy, I ask all of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to work with me. Let's work together to get the PTC extended.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska.

#### CYBERSECURITY

Mr. NELSON of Nebraska. I rise today to discuss an amendment that I am proposing to the 2012 farm bill that we are debating in the Senate. Before I speak to that, I also want to associate myself with the leader's comments about the importance of taking care of our cyber defense, putting ourselves in a position to be able to deflect and deter cyber attack from terrorists and otherwise against our industries and against our Federal Government.

As chairman of the Strategic Forces Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee, cyber command is part of our responsibility. The leader is exactly on target with his comments about the need to move forward to protect our country against future cyber attacks—which we encounter daily—recognizing that we perhaps do know what we know, but we are in that unfortunate position of not knowing what we don't know.

To modernize and move forward is absolutely essential to maintain our vigilance against cyber attacks in the future.

#### DIRECT FARM PAYMENTS

Mr. NELSON of Nebraska. Mr. President, the amendment I wish to talk about today and propose is about fairness. It is about fairness for America's farmers and ranchers and fairness to all taxpayers.

First, I note that one of the key elements of the 2012 farm bill that we drafted in the Senate, and is now on the floor, is about reform. In particular the bill reforms a program of Federal subsidies that have gone to farmers regardless of whether farm prices were high or low.

These subsidies are known as direct farm payments. They were established by the 1996 farm bill as a way to transition producers away from a government-controlled system of agriculture to more market-based agriculture.

These direct farm payments, which are outdated government subsidies, were supposed to be temporary, and the 2012 farm bill takes the necessary step to eliminate them and remove them from the future.

When this change is enacted, farmers will not be paid for crops they are not growing on land they are not planting. Eliminating these direct payments will save \$15 billion over 10 years, which will be used for deficit reduction.

Producers in my State understand that given our Nation's fiscal problems, we have to have shared sacrifice to get the debt and deficit under control. If we end these outdated subsidies, the farm bill establishes that crop insurance will be the focal point of risk management by strengthening crop insurance and expanding access so that farmers are not wiped out by a few days of bad weather or bad prices.

Crop insurance is a shared private-public partnership that maintains the safety net we all need to sustain American agriculture. In my efforts to identify other areas where shared sacrifice for deficit reduction can be pursued, I am proposing an amendment to eliminate another set of government subsidies which are unnecessary and should be eliminated. These subsidies go to just 2 percent of the Nation's livestock producers. They receive substantial taxpayer-paid subsidies for grazing on public lands.

In the interest of fairness to all livestock producers and the taxpayers, we need to reform Federal grazing subsidies. My amendment would require that ranchers pay grazing fees based more closely on the market value for their region when grazing on public lands. Today, the 2 percent of livestock producers grazing on public lands pay far below market value that other market producers are paying.

Given our huge Federal debt and deficit, we can no longer afford to heavily subsidize an elite group of ranchers to graze their cattle on public lands at the taxpayers' expense. These ranchers receive a special deal—Federal “welfare” so to speak—that they don't need, most ranchers can't get, and taxpayers should not be paying for.

It is a matter of fairness to level this playing field, and it will help balance the budget as well. This 2 percent of the country's ranchers have grazing rights on public lands that cost the government, by lost income, \$144 million a year to manage. But the government collects only about \$21 million a year in grazing fees from ranchers, according to a 2005 study by the GAO. That leaves a net cost to taxpayers of more than \$120 million a year. Losing the \$120 million of tax money per year isn't fair to taxpayers, nor is it fair to producers who then are required to subsidize their competition.

This report also found that the two agencies that manage most of the Federal grazing lands—the Bureau of Land Management and the U.S. Forest Service—actually reduced grazing fees during years when grazing fees on private lands increased. Get that: The Federal Government reduced fees on public lands when fees are being raised on private lands.

The GAO found that from 1980 to 2004, BLM and Forest Service fees fell by 40

percent. At the same time, grazing fees charged by private ranchers rose by 78 percent. By an actuary's term, that is disintermediation. One is going one direction and the other another direction.

Furthermore, GAO found if the goals of the grazing fee were to recover expenditures, BLM and the Forest Service would charge \$7.64 and \$12.26 per “animal unit month.” That is much higher—get this—than the current \$1.35-per-animal unit ranchers pay to graze on public lands. That is not fair.

The GAO stated that the formula used to calculate the fee includes ranchers' ability to pay and is not “primarily to recover the agencies' expenditures or to capture the fair market value of forage.” No kidding. That is what they said and what they think this program is all about.

In Nebraska, it costs livestock producers who get this special deal \$1.35 per cow to graze on public lands. But it costs other producers who don't graze on public land an average of \$30 per cow to graze on private land just in northwest Nebraska. It costs an average of \$38 per cow on private land just across all of northern Nebraska. That is according to the University of Nebraska's agriculture economics department.

I note that I am aware others before me have tried to reform Federal grazing fees, and they are saying to me right now: Good luck. Given today's critical need to get our Nation's fiscal house in order, it is time to bring grazing costs on public lands more in line with what it costs producers to graze on private lands. There is no fairness in this disparity.

I urge my colleagues to join me in working to improve the 2012 farm bill reforms by ending unfair and outdated Federal grazing subsidies. Doing so would bring fairness to all livestock producers and have the added benefit of saving taxpayers more than \$2 billion over the next decade—savings that could help pay down the national debt and reduce our deficit in the meantime.

With that, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

#### AGRICULTURE REFORM

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, in a short while—I think this afternoon—we will officially be back on consideration of what is dubbed the farm bill—the Agricultural Reform, Food, and Jobs Act. This is something we do every 5 years to secure the safest, most affordable, reliable food supply in the world. We are very proud of what our farmers and ranchers do.

The largest investment in land and water conservation we make as a country on working lands is made through the farm bill—protecting our Great Lakes, the Chesapeake Bay, and supporting farmers who have environmental challenges and managing those on their lands. So these are very important investments.