

sugar-producing industry. Many of these jobs would be lost to subsidized foreign producers who are generally less efficient and less reliable and produce sugar far less safely and responsibly than American sugar producers.

I support Idaho's sugar beet growers as well as sugar growers throughout the country. I am committed to ensuring that they have access to the tools they need to produce an affordable and abundant sugar supply.

The bottom line is not only is this program not a cost to the U.S. taxpayer, it generates revenue to help us reduce our deficit. These are the kinds of programs we need to protect American producers.

I encourage all of my colleagues to oppose the Shaheen amendment.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I oppose the amendment offered by Senator SHAHEEN and others which would phase out the Federal Sugar Program. I would like to share some of my personal history with my colleagues. My grandfather and grandmother emigrated from Japan to work at McBryde Sugar Company on the island of Kauai in 1899. In my office here in Washington, I have a framed copy of the contract on which my grandfather, Asakichi Inouye, placed his "X." The contract includes a photograph of this brave young man and his wife and a little baby boy they are holding, my father.

Nearly a century later, Asakichi Inouye's grandson is proud to be representing the State of Hawaii in the United States Senate. With exception of one, all of Hawaii's sugar plantations are now closed. The Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar Company, HC&S, remains operational on the island of Maui and employs nearly 800 employees. HC&S is Hawaii's largest provider of raw sugar, producing approximately 200,000 tons each year. In addition to the growing and milling of sugarcane, HC&S produces raw sugar, specialty sugar, molasses, and the generation and sale of electricity to help provide power across the island.

I am proud to represent the men and women in Hawaii who still work directly or indirectly for the sugar industry, and their families. These agricultural workers, who are among the world's most productive, have enjoyed collective bargaining for decades and are rewarded for their productivity with good wages, with some of the best health care benefits in the country, and with generous benefits for insurance and retirement. Their safety and their health are bolstered by some of the strictest worker protection rules and highest environmental standards in the Nation, and possibly in the world.

These workers, many of whose families have been in sugar for three or four generations, lead comfortable, but by no means extravagant lives. They can put their children through college and can look forward to a decent retire-

ment, but they are far from wealthy in the monetary sense.

The U.S. sugar policy has ensured American consumers with dependable supplies of reasonably priced sugar, adhering to U.S. standards for food safety and quality. Consumers in other developed countries pay on average 24 percent more for their sugar than American consumers. The U.S. Sugar Program provides no subsidies to American sugar producers. For the past 10 years, the policy has operated at zero cost to taxpayers, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture predicts it will remain at zero cost for the next 10 years, to 2022. In the absence of a U.S. sugar policy, it would eliminate or severely damage the no-taxpayer-cost U.S. sugar policy, and, among other things, shift American jobs overseas. Hawaii's existing sugar producer could potentially close, forcing my constituents to lose their livelihood.

If the U.S. sugar policy were eliminated, our U.S. market would be flooded with subsidized sugar from the world dump market that is less reliable and less safe. The U.S. market would collapse, and efficient American sugar farmers would be driven out of business. Job and incomes losses would devastate rural economies where sugar is grown and harm urban economies where sugar is processed.

Further, if the U.S. sugar policy were eliminated Americans would have to cope with less reliable, less safe, more costly, foreign sugar. American consumers demand consistent quantity and quality. In other words, when consumers go to the grocery store to purchase sugar, they expect a high-quality product that is safe and contaminant free and identical with every purchase. They also expect to find such products on the shelf whenever they want to buy them. This is exactly what the American consumer gets from the U.S. sugar industry—so much so that we take it for granted. Further, in many of these countries, producers operate with labor, environmental, and food safety standards or enforcement that is much less than what American producers routinely meet. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to table Shaheen amendment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now withdraw my motion to proceed to S. 1940.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is withdrawn.

#### AGRICULTURE REFORM, FOOD, AND JOBS ACT OF 2012

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it is my understanding that we are now on S. 3240,

and the motion to recommit with a second-degree amendment numbered 2339 is now pending. Is that right?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3240) to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2017, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Reid (for Stabenow/Roberts) amendment No. 2389, of a perfecting nature.

Reid amendment No. 2390 (to amendment No. 2389), to change the enactment date.

Reid motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, with instructions.

Reid amendment No. 2391, of a perfecting nature.

Reid amendment No. 2392 (to the instructions) amendment No. 2391), to empower States with programmatic flexibility and predictability to administer a supplemental nutrition assistance block grant program under which, at the request of a State agency, eligible households within the State may receive an adequate, or more nutritious, diet.

Reid amendment No. 2393 (to amendment No. 2392), to phase out the Federal Sugar Program.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to table amendment No. 2393. I ask for the yeas and nays on that motion to table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. McCASKILL), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER), and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

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

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 119 Leg.]

#### YEAS—50

Akaka	Gillibrand	Nelson (NE)
Barrasso	Harkin	Nelson (FL)
Baucus	Hoeven	Pryor
Begich	Inouye	Reid
Bennet	Isakson	Risch
Bingaman	Johanns	Roberts
Blunt	Johnson (SD)	Rubio
Boxer	Kerry	Sanders
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Landrieu	Stabenow
Chambliss	Leahy	Tester
Cochran	Levin	Thune
Conrad	Lieberman	Udall (CO)
Crapo	Menendez	Udall (NM)
Enzi	Mikulski	Vitter
Feinstein	Moran	Wicker
Franken	Murray	

#### NAYS—46

Alexander	Carper	Cornyn
Ayotte	Casey	DeMint
Blumenthal	Coats	Durbin
Boozman	Coburn	Graham
Brown (MA)	Collins	Grassley
Brown (OH)	Coons	Hagan
Burr	Corker	Hatch

Heller	Manchin	Shaheen
Hutchison	McCain	Shelby
Inhofe	McConnell	Snowe
Johnson (WI)	Merkley	Toomey
Kohl	Murkowski	Webb
Kyl	Paul	Whitehouse
Lautenberg	Portman	Wyden
Lee	Reed	
Lugar	Sessions	

## NOT VOTING—4

Kirk	Rockefeller
McCaskill	Warner

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to table amendment No. 2392, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be 4 minutes of debate equally divided prior to the vote, and that the time be controlled by Senator STABENOW and Senator PAUL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, our system of helping ensure that no one in our country goes hungry is a noble one. We are now asking to spend \$750 billion on food stamps. When we ask this, we need to remember that recently a woman in Chicago faked the birth of triplets in order to receive \$21,000 in food stamps. We need to remember that millionaires, including Larry Fick, who won \$2 million, is still receiving food stamps because he says he has no income. He has \$2 million but no income. Amanda Clayton won \$1 million recently in the lottery and she was aghast she lost a third of it to taxes. She now has two homes and mortgage payments and doesn't know how can she make it without food stamps. So we are paying millionaires food stamps. Thirty percent of Polk County inmates are getting food stamps.

There has to be some reason. Should you be able to buy junk food on food stamps? Should you get to go to McDonald's on food stamps? This is out of control. It is not about helping those in need, it is about being wise with taxpayer dollars and not giving people \$20,000 a year in food stamps. We need to give only to those who cannot work, those who are infirm, those who are diseased and are not able-bodied. But we are giving to millionaires, and we are paying for junk food and giving to those who go to McDonald's, and it has to stop.

This program has doubled in the last 10 years. We do not have an endless supply of money. I think Americans would be flabbergasted at the amount of money and that some of these programs are duplicative. People getting food stamps for a meal are also getting a free lunch at school. Some of these programs are actually advertising for applicants. In my hometown they ad-

vertise to try to promote people coming in and getting the free lunch during the summertime.

It is not that we won't help people, it is that we need to be conscious of how much money we have and that we help only those who cannot help themselves. I would ask for some reason. The food stamp program is exploding, and I recommend we vote for this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, first of all, I strongly oppose this amendment and urge my colleagues to vote to table it.

I would agree with the Senator from Kentucky that nobody who wins the lottery should get food assistance, and we outright ban it in this bill. We outright ban a number of areas where there has been waste, fraud, and abuse. This bill does more on accountability on food assistance than we have seen in many years. But it also doesn't do what this amendment does, which is block grant funding, cut it, send it back to the States with no requirement it be used for people who truly need it.

I can tell you, coming from Michigan, I have people who have never before in their lives needed help with food assistance. They are mortified; they have paid taxes their whole life and they have never asked for help, but now that the plant has closed, they need some temporary help. Those folks are, on average, getting help for 10 months or less, and they deserve every dollar we can help them with.

I want to make sure that every single dollar goes where it should go. Waste, fraud, and abuse we tackle. But for somebody in this great country who has paid their taxes all their lives and worked all their lives and now needs help to put food on the table for the balance of the month, they need to know we are going to provide a little bit of temporary help.

This amendment is outrageous and would go completely against the commitment we as a country have made to help those who truly need it. I urge we vote yes to table this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) is necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

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

The result was announced—yeas 65, nays 33, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 120 Leg.]

## YEAS—65

Akaka	Baucus	Bennet
Alexander	Beahm	Bingaman

Blumenthal	Hoeven	Nelson (NE)
Boozman	Inouye	Nelson (FL)
Boxer	Johanns	Portman
Brown (MA)	Johnson (SD)	Pryor
Brown (OH)	Kerry	Reed
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Reid
Cardin	Kohl	Roberts
Carper	Landrieu	Rockefeller
Casey	Lautenberg	Sanders
Cochran	Leahy	Schumer
Collins	Levin	Shaheen
Conrad	Lieberman	Snowe
Coons	Lugar	Stabenow
Corker	Manchin	Tester
Durbin	McCaskill	Udall (CO)
Feinstein	Menendez	Udall (NM)
Franken	Merkley	Webb
Gillibrand	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Hagan	Murkowski	Wyden
Harkin	Murray	

## NAYS—33

Ayotte	Graham	McConnell
Barrasso	Grassley	Moran
Blunt	Hatch	Paul
Burr	Heller	Risch
Chambliss	Hutchison	Rubio
Coats	Inhofe	Sessions
Coburn	Isakson	Shelby
Cornyn	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Crapo	Kyl	Toomey
DeMint	Lee	Vitter
Enzi	McCain	Wicker

## NOT VOTING—2

Kirk	Warner
------	--------

The motion was agreed to.

## VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I was unable to vote on the motion to table the Paul amendment No. 2182 this morning due to a family commitment, but should I have been present, I would have voted yea on the motion to table the amendment.

SNAP was effective in helping over 786,157 individuals in my own Commonwealth of Virginia—including children and the elderly—have the resources necessary to purchase healthy food this past year. I believe that turning this program into a State block grant, as Senator PAUL's amendment would have done, would not allow this program to continue to be as effective. SNAP is the bedrock of our national nutrition safety net, serving as a first line of defense against hunger, and during this last economic downturn has made sure that low-income families across the Commonwealth and the country are helped in putting food on the table each night.●

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. MR. President, I now ask unanimous consent the pending motion to recommit be withdrawn; that amendment No. 2390 be withdrawn; that the Stabenow-Roberts amendment, No. 2389, be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be considered original text for the purpose of further amendment; that the following four amendments be the first amendments in order to the bill with no other first-degree amendments in order until these amendments are disposed of: Coburn, No. 2353; Hagan, No. 2366; DeMint, No. 2385; McCaskill, No. 2222; that there be up to 60 minutes of debate equally divided between the two leaders or their designees on each of these amendments; that upon the use or yielding back of this time on all four amendments the

Senate proceed to votes in relation to the amendments in the order listed; that there be no amendments or motions in order to the amendments prior to the votes other than on motions to waive points of order and motions to table; that upon disposition of these amendments, I be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. COBURN. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. I wonder if I might ask the leader a question through the Chair. It would seem to me the process we are planning now is that the leader is deciding what amendments we will vote on and what we will not. I wonder if he would be open to the consideration of us sending up 40 amendments over the next 4 days and coming to an agreement on this, because what we are playing now is a game of low priority amendments versus high priority amendments in the name of saying we are doing something rather than having an open amendment process, which is the tradition of the Senate. My question to him is would he be amenable to have a discussion on a much larger number of amendments so we don't continue to get out of order? This is the first time I remember seeing this list, and this is a very low priority amendment for many.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I wish my friend was near as exercised over the year, 18 months, on getting on a bill. It takes us a week to get on a bill because we have to file motions to invoke cloture every time we proceed to a bill. We could save a lot of time if we could get on a bill. One reason there used to be so much, as he said, tradition—tradition has been spilled into the spillways—is that it was a rare occasion you had to do anything to invoke cloture on a motion to proceed. Now it is what we do every time because the Republicans demand that.

In direct answer to the question, I have worked with Senator ROBERTS and Senator STABENOW. We are trying to get some amendments up. They may be low priority on his part, my friend from Oklahoma, but some people think these are important amendments. The two we just finished, no one can consider those low priority amendments, dealing with foodstamps and with sugar. These are always big deals on this farm bill.

So I say to my friend, Senator ROBERTS and Senator STABENOW are trying to come up with a list. The Republicans are having some kind of a steering meeting or whatever it is now. Maybe the Senator can go and visit with them and try to help us get a list.

I am not going to talk out here about a number, but as we did on the highway bill, we have done it on the FDA bill, come up with some amendments. There is plenty of dead time around here, and

we don't have to spend a lot of time on the amendments themselves. Once we agree to them, we keep on talking about them forever.

To answer the Senator's question, yes, I would be happy if we could get, as we have been trying to get for a long time, an agreed-upon group of amendments. I want to finish the farm bill. I think it is extremely important to our country.

So, I say to my friend, I hope we can work something out. I have told my friend, the junior Senator from Michigan and the chairman of this committee, I would like something so we can enter into an agreement today and start voting on some of these amendments tomorrow.

Ms. STABENOW. Would the leader be willing to yield for a question?

Mr. REID. Yes.

Ms. STABENOW. Thank you very much. To emphasize what the leader indicated earlier, isn't it true that while we are moving forward step by step—before we get a larger universal agreement—as he has said, the leader is open to work with me, Senator ROBERTS, and Members on both sides of the aisle to get a larger list in the range in which the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma has talked about and certainly a list which we would begin to move through?

But while we are doing that, rather than just biding time on the floor, this gives Members an opportunity to debate on issues they care deeply about and continue to move forward.

In fact, is it the leader's desire that we do this and that we are in the process of putting together that larger universe of amendments?

Mr. REID. In response to my friend's question, the reason we had these two votes this morning is while we are working on coming up with a finite list of amendments, why sit around and twiddle our thumbs? At least through this process, we have gotten two major amendments out of the way. They are gone.

If my friend continues his objection, I am going to set up some more votes this way. Listen, this is not my preference for doing these bills. But I say to my friend, I would hope with the concern the Senator has for the finances of this country and how he cares about our country, care a little bit about these motions to proceed which are such a waste of our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I take the leader at his word. I will go back to my caucus and explain that I object to this group of bills, but I would also note we did get two amendments out of the way. The one amendment on sugar that had the potential to pass wasn't the one we chose.

So I come back to the point, never in the history of the Senate, with the rate at which we see now, did we give up our rights to allow the majority leader to decide what amendments will be voted

on or offered. In fact, for the last 3 days, we could have had a great open process of having the floor open for amendments and moved 8 or 10 amendments a day. I understand the conflict. I understand what he is trying to do, and I understand the political ramifications of that.

I will go and seek the counsel and guidance of my caucus and return and give the leader's message.

With that, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. REID. Before my friend leaves the floor, I also look back at the days, as is recounted in Caro's book and as we have heard here, to the days when the majority leader truly did some things. During the days of Lyndon Johnson, we couldn't even have a vote on anything unless he gave the nod. I don't have that power anymore. That has changed over the years, but I would love to be able to have a bill brought to the floor. If we were able to get rid of these senseless motions to proceed that I have to file cloture on, we could spend a lot of time debating and amending these bills, and that is what we need to get to.

Mr. COBURN. If the majority leader would yield, I think the leader could eliminate motions to proceed very easily by saying that every bill that comes to the floor will have an open and honest debate determined by what colleagues and Members would like to debate, but we have not seen that. That is not just the Democratic control of the Senate; we have seen some with the Republican control of the Senate as well.

We are not going to solve that problem now. I will take counsel with my caucus, and I will get back to the leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UDALL of New Mexico). The majority leader.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 2406

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 2406 to the instructions, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes amendment numbered 2406 to the instructions of the motion to recommit S. 3240.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To eliminate certain working lands conservation programs)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

#### SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. ELIMINATION OF CERTAIN WORKING LANDS CONSERVATION PROGRAMS.

(a) CONSERVATION STEWARDSHIP PROGRAM.—Subchapter B of chapter 2 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3838d et seq.) is repealed.

(b) ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY INCENTIVES PROGRAM.—Chapter 4 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa et seq.) is repealed.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2407 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2406

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now call up amendment No. 2407, a second-degree amendment, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 2407 to amendment No. 2406.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To convert all mandatory spending to discretionary spending subject to annual appropriations)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. 12. FUNDING.**

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or any amendment made by this Act, each amount made available by this Act or an amendment made by this Act that is funded through direct spending (as defined in section 250(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900(c))) shall be considered to be an authorization of appropriations for that amount and purpose.

**FLOOD INSURANCE REFORM AND MODERNIZATION ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued**

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 250, S. 1940.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is pending.

The Senator from Montana.

**AGRICULTURE REFORM**

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I rise to talk about the farm bill and recognize the fine work the Senate Agriculture Committee did in bringing this bill forward.

I am disappointed, to say the least, that this bill is bogged down in legislative games. This bill is too important for folks to play politics. If we want to talk about a lack of predictability, this is a prime example. We should be passing a bill and instead games are being played.

Agriculture is the largest industry in Montana. Montana's farmers and ranchers produce the food that powers the Nation. Providing an effective safety net for those of us in production agriculture is important, and it is potentially very costly. It would have been easy for the Senate Agriculture Committee to write a bill that keeps spending at the levels of the last farm bill, but they did not.

This bill recognizes the fiscal challenges we face. It cuts more than \$23 billion, more than double the amount proposed by the Simpson-Bowles Commission.

Due to the good work of the Senate Agriculture Committee, this bill produces meaningful savings and reduces the number of programs at the Department of Agriculture. At the same time the bill preserves a strong safety net for farmers, invests in conservation and nutrition and institutes much needed reforms.

I have offered amendments to address the issues that still face farmers and ranchers around the country. The first is my provision to ensure that farmers will be able to buy public varieties of seeds. My amendment will make sure the Department of Agriculture follows through on the government's commitment to public seed varieties. It ensures that the USDA will devote the resources necessary to support a strong public breeding program and develop public plant and animal varieties. For too long the Agriculture Department has failed to promote public seed varieties. The USDA must support diverse seed research that farmers can adapt to various growing conditions.

My amendment will not solve the problem, but it is a necessary first step to ensure that farmers have a choice of what kind of seeds to purchase.

I have also introduced an amendment that takes a proactive approach to protect our country's livestock producers. Back in 2009, Senator BARRASSO and I wrote a new law to help livestock producers get compensation for losses related to wolves. Any producer will tell us they would rather prevent predation than get compensated for a loss, but losses do happen. A number of States receive some assistance from that program. That is why I have introduced an amendment to help producers protect their livestock from the threat of predation. It is a commonsense solution to support livestock producers who live near protected populations of predators.

Speaking of commonsense amendments, I am also offering what some have called the biggest package of sportsmen's bills in a generation. My sportsmen's act combines over 20 different sportsmen bills. It comes in response to the concerns I have heard as a chairman of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus.

What I hear most often from sportsmen is the importance of access to public lands. That is why this bill dedicates funding to ensure sportsmen's access to some of the best places to hunt and fish in this country.

Some folks might ask why is this important, but hunting and fishing is a way of life in places such as Montana. In fact, one in three Montanans hunts big game and over 50 percent fish. For us, it is not just recreation, it is a critical part of our economy. It drives and sustains jobs.

So Senator THUNE and I, as cochairs of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus, have combined the best bills and ideas from Republicans and Democrats. In addition to preserving access to public lands, it reauthorizes several vital conservation programs and preserves our shooting heritage. That is why it has the support in a wide variety of sportsmen and conservation groups. Neither party has a monopoly on good ideas.

My sportsman's act takes the best from the House bill and the best from both sides of the aisle in the Senate to

move the ball forward for sportsmen and sportswomen in Montana and the Nation. By adding this sportsmen's package to the farm bill, we will conserve some of our most productive habitat, passing on hunting and fishing traditions to future generations and entrusting them to those who care about them the most.

(The further remarks of Mr. TESTER are printed in today's RECORD under "Morning Business.")

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. 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. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, earlier this week I came to the Senate floor to speak about the importance of the forestry title in what is a bipartisan farm bill we are considering right now as I speak.

In my previous remarks, I spoke about a growing emergency in our Nation's forests caused by the largest bark beetle outbreak in our recorded history—an outbreak that is projected to kill nearly every lodgepole pine in Colorado.

I know the Presiding Officer from the neighboring State of New Mexico is experiencing these same conditions in his State. The Forest Service has estimated that 100,000 dead trees are falling in our forests every day. Hard to imagine, but their estimates are such: 100,000 trees every day. That means our landscapes are littered with tinder ready to burn, which, combined with the hot dry summer we are already experiencing, is a recipe for a disastrous fire season.

Mother Nature bats last, which means much of what we face is out of our control. But we can act, and we must act, in order to manage the magnitude of the crisis in our home States.

In some ways—I know the Presiding Officer sees this the same way I do—the forests in Colorado are the canaries in the coal mine that tie us into and identify the effects of a changing climate. Warmer temperatures and drought conditions have exacerbated beetle infestations in our forests, and we are now dealing with an unprecedented combination of explosive fire season events.

There is a raging Colorado wildfire today, as I stand here, in Larimer County—the High Park Fire—and it continues to grow. It has consumed over 46,000 acres. It has claimed the life of a local homeowner, and it is causing devastating effects in the surrounding communities. As of first thing this morning, only 10 percent of the fire had been contained. We have made sure, though, that all available resources are dedicated to this effort. I am told we now have over 1,000 firefighters on site,