

one of the broadest coalitions I have ever seen behind any piece of legislation. It is a huge and important coalition. It represents America. It is people who work every day at building the infrastructure, utilizing the infrastructure, and making sure our homes are safe from flooding. The list includes the National Governors Association. It is a rarity to have that kind of a list.

At this point, we are supposed to vote at noon, and we will be back to you with some further comments.

I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2013

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 601, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 601) to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 12 noon will be divided and controlled in the usual form.

Mrs. BOXER. While we discuss how we are going to proceed, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mrs. BOXER. I ask unanimous consent that the time during quorum calls be divided equally.

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

Mrs. BOXER. I note the absence of a quorum.

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

MILITARY SEXUAL ASSAULT

Mrs. HAGAN. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the sexual assault crisis that is facing our military and the need to act immediately to address this problem.

Last week, the Department of Defense released a report estimating that over 26,000 servicemembers—and this includes men and women—were sexu-

ally assaulted in 2012, and this is up from approximately 19,000 in 2010. This is astounding and totally unacceptable.

Even more alarming is the fact the number of cases actually reported remains just a fraction of the total. Only 13 percent of these cases are actually reported. Let me repeat that: Only 13 percent of assaults were actually reported in 2012.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee and a Senator from North Carolina, home to the third largest military population in the country, I find these statistics appalling. The brave servicemembers who put their lives on the line should not have to worry about their personal safety on bases in the United States and around the world. The men and women who are already tasked with so much, who have vowed to serve and protect our country, should feel they are afforded the same protection in return, but they are not.

The stories I hear from our female servicemembers are astounding. One woman marine was raped by an acquaintance, her fellow marine, in her barracks one night. No one heard her cries for help. The next day she did report the assault to her chain of command. An investigation was launched from there. While that investigation was underway, from June to January, she was heavily alienated by her peers. She was called derogatory names, and her sergeant major even told her the assault was her fault because she must have given her rapist a reason to think it was OK. In the end the official investigation found her claim was “unfounded” because there were no witnesses, and she did not know at the time she should have gone to the hospital and had a rape kit analysis done.

Other servicemembers—women who have served on forward operating bases in Afghanistan—have told me they limit their water intake throughout the day so they do not have to use the latrines in the middle of the night and by doing so put themselves at further risk of being assaulted. No one should ever have to deal with those kinds of concerns, especially when they are already putting their lives on the line to protect our Nation.

The Department of Defense has reported that half of all servicemembers who were victims of sexual assault say they are actually afraid to report out of fear of retaliation or that their confidentiality will not be maintained. Others believe reporting the crime will jeopardize their military career. They fear they would not receive opportunities for advancement—opportunities they have earned through service to our country.

This is just totally unacceptable. The men and women of our Armed Forces deserve far more. We have to deal with this problem once and for all, and I am encouraged the National Defense Authorization Act of 2013 includes specific directives to reduce the alarming number of assaults that take place and often go unreported.

Specifically, these provisions include independent review boards to examine how sexual assault cases are handled, the creation of a special victims unit, ensuring convicted offenders are permanently barred from the military, improving how the military collects data on this topic, and several other needed provisions.

During his confirmation process, Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel said he was committed to fully implementing these directives, and I urge Secretary Hagel to report to Congress on the progress made as swiftly as possible. I still believe Congress should and must do more. The steps I believe we should consider are, first, the creation of a special victims counsel that would include advocates who can support victims and help them report incidents of sexual assault.

As I mentioned, too many victims do not come forward because they are either afraid of retaliation, they do not believe their confidentiality will be maintained, or they do not have faith in the military justice system. As in the case of the woman I described who had been raped, she did not know she should have had an analysis of rape actually done. These victims advocates would have given her that advice.

Second, we are fortunate in the Senate to have a number of former prosecutors engaged on this issue. Over the last 20 years, they and their colleagues have made great strides in handling sexual assault cases in the civilian world, and I believe we should take the lessons learned from that process to improve the military's response—lessons including proper training for tackling evidentiary issues and addressing victims' needs.

Third, commanding officers can overturn verdicts of jury trials, as happened in the Air Force earlier this year. These are commanding officers, they are not appellate judges; they are not legally trained. They should not have the authority to overturn a verdict. I believe we should review that authority as it applies to sexual assault cases, something Defense Secretary Hagel has indicated should be a priority.

Finally, we need to explore whether the present Uniform Code of Military Justice is up to the task of addressing the problem of sexual assault. I believe both the Armed Forces and the cause of justice would be well served by a vigorous debate in Congress on whether sexual assault cases can be effectively handled within the chain of command or whether this process needs to occur independently. Significant overhauls of the Uniform Code of Military Justice should not be approached lightly, but we owe it to our servicemembers to think outside the box and consider all possibilities.

These men and women of our military cannot wait another day, and they should not have to wait another day for this problem to be addressed. I urge my colleagues to join me in taking concrete steps to address this issue and to

protect the men and women who sacrifice so much for us each and every day.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, Senators BOXER and VITTER have worked hard for days now to come up with a finite list of amendments to complete work on this very important bill, the Water Resources Development Act. In just a minute I am going to ask consent that we postpone the vote scheduled for 12 today until 2:30. We will come back in session, I hope, at 2:15 today. When we come back in session I want Chairman BOXER to report to the Senate if they have been able to work out an agreement between the two of them. If they have, I want her to ask the consent and when she asks that consent, if there is an agreement, we will work through a number of amendments they have come up with to complete work on this bill.

If there is no agreement at 2:15 when she comes in, then we will vote at 2:30 on cloture. I hope that is not necessary. But I am not going to have any "I'm objecting on behalf of somebody else." If it is not done, I don't care who objects, we are going to move to cloture. That is what I believe should be done.

It is a lot of work to get this agreement. I think tentatively it has been done. We know how things work; one Senator can block all this. I hope that is not the case. I know the block will not come from our side. Senator BOXER has the complete confidence of all members of our conference. They recognize that she has worked hard on this and has done the right thing—as she always does.

I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the motion to invoke cloture on S. 601 be moved to 2:30 p.m.

I will ask, while she is on the floor, the Senator from California, the chairman of the committee, is there anything I have missed in my statement?

Mrs. BOXER. If my friend will yield, through the Chair, I think he has covered it. Basically what I want to make sure people know as they go to their various conference meetings this afternoon is that we have a very fair list. I think it probably has more Republican amendments than Democratic amendments. We have done everything to reach an agreement.

But I also want to support my leader. If there is objection to this important list of amendments, we will go straight to cloture. I want everyone to understand, without this bill there will be no more water infrastructure projects because there is no path forward. Since we ended earmarks, this is the one bill

that will make sure there is a path forward. Without water infrastructure earmarks you cannot keep commerce moving at the ports, you can't do flood control, you can't restore the Everglades or the Chesapeake. I strongly support what my leader is doing but I also hope colleagues will please allow us to move forward, make the cloture vote unnecessary. But we are going to have that cloture vote, if necessary, at 2:30.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the vote on the motion to invoke cloture on S. 601 be moved to 2:30 p.m. this afternoon; that if cloture is invoked, it will be considered as having been invoked at 12 noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

THE BUDGET

Mr. Kaine. Madam President, I rise today to talk about the continuing efforts by a minority of this body to block a Federal budget by blocking a conference with the House to find compromise. I spoke about this one week ago, but the stalemate continues.

Today there was an announcement that in my Commonwealth, 90,000 civilian Department of Defense employees and hundreds of thousands of DOD civilians nationally will be furloughed for 11 days between now and the end of the year. This furlough announcement—along with ample other evidence we have discussed in this body in the last few weeks—demonstrates that budgetary gridlock, budgetary indecision, and budgetary stalling has real-life consequences.

I rise to implore my Senate colleagues to do what is right and to do the job the American public has sent us here to do. This is not only about budgets, it is also about something even bigger than budgets. It is about something fundamental to the entire system of government we have; that is, the willingness to work together to find common ground and find solutions.

I truly view this budgetary stalemate as an attack on compromise. We cannot survive as a Senate or as a Congress or as a nation without finding common ground.

I know the Presiding Officer, like me, was out on the campaign trail a lot in 2012. I heard a repeated critique of this body during the campaign. I heard that this body was unable to produce a budget since 2009. There were some arguments back and forth about whether that was technically accurate. As I looked at it as a candidate, it was at least clear that a normal budgetary order in accordance with the Budget Act of 1974 had not been followed for a number of years.

As a candidate and citizen of the Commonwealth and country, I said: If I have the opportunity to serve in this body, I am going to work with my colleagues to make sure we do the public's business in the way that was contemplated in that statute.

Although I didn't ask, I was assigned to be on the Senate Budget Committee as soon as I got to this body. I immediately made clear—along with many other Members, both newcomers and Members who had been on the committee for a while, including the new committee chair, Senator MURRAY—that this body needed to return to normal budgetary procedures.

It seemed as though over the past few years, Congress tried a lot of other things—supercommittees, sequesters, and continuing resolutions—none of which were working to do the Nation's fiscal business. Along with many Senators of both parties, I said the right strategy for us is to return to normal budgetary procedure. We can make it work just as Congresses in the past have made it work.

I entered the body on January 3—more than 4 months ago—with the profound belief that we needed to embrace the normal procedures about doing a budget. Those normal procedures are known to all. People read in textbooks about how bills become laws. Essentially, in the spring the Senate and House, under normal procedure, would each pass a budget. Those budget bills would likely be significantly different.

Even when the parties controlling the two Houses are the same, the two House budgets are different. There is then some effort to find a compromise between the two differing versions often through use of a conference committee. Once that compromise is found, then that compromise is sent back to each House for a vote, and it then becomes the guidance that is used by the Appropriations Committee to write the bill's appropriating dollars for the next fiscal year. That is the normal process, and it is the way Congress has operated under both parties, under split Houses for many years.

Here is the good news: The Senate Budget Committee embraced this challenge. Chairman MURRAY worked with staff and members of the committee to create a draft budget, and then early in mid-March we had robust committee hearings, a full debate, and a full amendment process about a Senate budget.

In March the committee ultimately considered the chairman's mark for 13 hours, and we had a full amendment process. We voted on over 30 amendments, the majority of which were made by Republican members of the committee. We debated and voted on those amendments. I sat there and voted for a number of the Republican amendments to the budget that then became part of the ultimate committee product.

Republican members offered numerous amendments. In response to an amendment offered by a Republican member, I remember my colleague from Maine, Senator KING, asking: If I vote for your amendment, are you going to vote for this committee budget? The answer was given in public.

The answer was: No. I want you to vote for my amendment, but I am still

going to vote against the budget. I am going to vote against it because the House will produce a Republican budget, the Senate will produce a Democratic budget, and then we can get those two budgets together and find compromise going forward.

That was what was said when we met as a Budget Committee. At the end of the day, the Senate Budget Committee passed that budget in mid-March, and passed it without a single Republican vote. The budget was passed and forwarded to the Senate floor.

I know the Presiding Officer remembers this, as it is emblazoned upon all of our memories. We took the budget to the Senate floor in late March. The budget was the subject of floor activity in this body for 39½ hours. We don't do a lot around here for 39½ hours, but the budget was subject to floor activity and numerous speeches by Senators, just like me, over the course of that week.

The entire body then considered, debated, and voted on nearly 110 amendments to the budget. We passed 77 of the amendments. The amendments that were passed were offered by both Democrats and Republicans. I remember voting for many of the Republican amendments that then became part of the ultimate budget bill. This amendment activity—110 amendments, 77 passing—is significantly greater than has been the norm in earlier Senate deliberations.

At 5 a.m. on the morning of Saturday, March 23, the Senate passed its first budget in 4 years. Not a single Republican voted to support that budget even though many of their amendments had been included either in the committee or in the floor amendment process we had during those hours in late March.

I have done a lot of budgets as a mayor and as a Governor. Along with my colleagues on the Budget Committee, I worked hard in the committee and on the floor. My staff—as well as the Senate Budget Committee staff and the staffers of all the members on that committee—also worked hard on this bill. I am proud we passed a budget on March 23, and I believe firmly if that budget were implemented today, without changing one apostrophe, comma, or punctuation mark, it would do a number of things: It would help create jobs, it would help the economy, and it would deal with our debt and deficit in a fiscally responsible way.

I also understood this: that the Senate budget we passed was not the final product. It was the Senate's best effort to find a budget that would move our economy and our country forward. We knew that budget would be placed in a conference with the House budget. The House passed their budget the same week. We knew there would have to be discussion and compromise in an effort to find common ground, but we did our best version and the House, I assume, feels as though they did their very best version.

The two budgets are very different. I deeply believe the Senate budget is superior and the American people, watching the discussions between the two Houses and comparing them, would reach the same conclusion. But at the very least I know this: The American public are entitled to see that debate and discussion. They are entitled to look at the House budget and look at the Senate budget and compare them, just as the conferees would be comparing. They are entitled to watch that process of dialog and debate and, hopefully, compromise. That is, in fact, what they have sent us here to do, and that is what Congresses have done for many years and decades.

The process of a budget conference would not be an easy one because the two budgets are quite different, but there is no substitute for dialog and compromise. In fact, I think all of us in this body know dialog and compromise at its core are what we are about here.

When the Framers of our Constitution, in article I, set up a legislative branch with two Houses—a bicameral branch—and required that most items to pass through Congress would have to go through both branches, they understood very well what they were doing. They were creating a system of checks and balances that required dialog and listening and compromise in order to do good for the benefit of the Nation. At our very root, a bicameral legislature, existing in a system of checks and balances, with a judiciary and an executive branch, depends upon public servants who are willing to find common ground.

Well, since March 23—nearly 7 weeks—a small minority of Senators, often one at a time, has done all it can to block a budget conference from even beginning and, therefore, to block compromise. As we have taken steps to begin a budget conference with the House leadership to put these two budgets together and find compromise, again and again individual Senators have stood on the floor of this body and, in my view, abused the UC rules to block a conference from even beginning. Even as budgetary indecision and sequester are leading to furloughs, they have blocked a conference from even beginning. Even as we are seeing reductions in the number of people who are able to receive Meals On Wheels or children in Head Start, they have abused Senate rules to block a budget conference from even beginning.

I serve on the Armed Services Committee. We are working on the Defense authorization bill now, and we have the service chiefs come in and talk to us every day about the challenges they are facing, about the degraded readiness. One-third of our air combat command units are standing down because of these budgetary challenges. We hear the steady drumbeat, day in and day out, about degradation in readiness and challenges to our modernization programs. We had a hearing about the Marine Corps this morning. Yet even as

we are hearing this testimony in hearings in the morning and in the afternoon, Members come to this floor and stand and try to block a budget conference from even beginning.

This is very serious. When we are talking about the readiness of our military who are facing challenges—just pick up today's paper and read headlines about Syria or North Korea or Iran—as we are facing continuing challenges in Afghanistan, to have Members in this body block efforts to find compromise is very chilling.

Let's be clear about what this is. This is not just an attack on the budget itself, because those who want to attack the budget voted against it in committee. Those who didn't like the budget had a chance and voted against it on the floor. Even in the event a conference committee would produce a budget compromise, that compromise would come back and those who didn't like that budget would have a chance to vote against it again. That is how we attack a budget. That is how we express disagreement with a budget. A Member stands on the floor of this body and votes against it. The Members have had a chance to do that in committee and on the floor and they will have a chance to do it again at the end of the conference process.

The effort that has been underway in this body since March 23 is not fundamentally an attack on budgets, it is an attack on the whole notion of compromise. To block a conference committee from beginning so House and Senate conferees can sit down and listen to each other and try to iron out their differences is fundamentally an attack on compromise. We have seen that too much in this body. Anyone in this room knows that, if a person is not a hermit, if a person is a member of a family or a member of a parish council or a member of the PTA or part of an organizing group of a Little League, if a person has a business or if a person is elected to a school board or to the Senate—everybody knows if we participate in life, it has to be about compromise. Our Founders knew it and they created a system that relies upon compromise.

What we have seen in this body since March 23, after people had a full opportunity to amend and vote on a budget, is not about a budget, it is an attack on compromise.

I conclude by saying that just as no family can succeed without compromise, just as no community, just as no business, just as no school board, just as no group of people can succeed without compromise, Congress, the Senate, and our Nation cannot succeed without a spirit of compromise.

So I implore and I ask my colleagues to rethink the path they are on, to stand down in this attack upon compromise, to allow the budget to go to conference so we can do the tough work of listening to each other and finding common ground for the good of the American people.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECESS

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

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:35 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. BALDWIN).

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2013—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. What is the order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is considering S. 601.

Mrs. BOXER. We are working on our finite list, and we expect to make our unanimous consent shortly.

I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Ms. LANDRIEU. While we have some down time on the floor to wait for the 2:30 hour—I believe we are going to have some action on the WRDA bill, which is very important—I thought I would take this time to talk about an amendment I have pending on the WRDA bill. It is an amendment that I offered for myself, Senator VITTER, Senator SCHUMER, and Senator MENENDEZ. Several other Senators have expressed their strong support over the weekend on both sides, Republicans and Democrats.

There are many States in the Union, and Louisiana is only one—the State of Florida, the State of California, the State of Mississippi, the State of Alabama, other coastal States and, yes, some inland States—that are going to be terribly disadvantaged if the Landrieu-Vitter amendment does not pass on the WRDA bill. What is going to happen because of a reform bill—parts of it were necessary, but there were some parts that, in my view and in the view of many Senators, should never have passed as part of the flood insurance reform bill.

The reason some of us are fairly exercised about this is the bill itself, the reform bill to reform the Flood Insurance Program of the United States, never came to this floor for debate. It

came out of the Banking Committee, and then it was basically tucked into a larger omnibus bill, which happens sometimes. This is not the only or the first time it has happened. It is very unfortunate that it happened with this bill.

In our haste and in our good intentions to try to put national flood insurance on a more even financial keel, we have put the ability, unfortunately, in this bill for flood insurance rates to go up 20 percent a year on hundreds of thousands of first homes in this country—not second homes, not vacation homes, but first homes. The Landrieu-Vitter amendment doesn't try to solve this whole problem on the WRDA bill. It is going to take a little bit of work, which we can do, working together in good faith on behalf of our constituents.

This is big government at its worst—passing a reform bill and making the cure worse than the disease. In this case, for my constituents and for constituents in Florida, Mississippi, California, and New Jersey, we would have taken the disease as opposed to the cure. The cure is going to kill us. We weren't sure about the disease, but the cure is going to kill us.

Our papers have been editorializing for days since this issue has come to the surface on the WRDA bill. Our largest newspaper or second largest newspaper editorialized this morning and spoke about a quite senior woman—in her eighties—who lives with her daughter, who is in her sixties, in Plaquemines Parish. It is very typical to have families of different generations living together. They were in Plaquemines Parish before the flood insurance measure was ever passed.

We were living in Louisiana before this Nation was a nation. Our people have been down there a long time living on this water. They built their houses centuries—not this couple, but we had houses built centuries before this bill was ever passed. Now, what the law—the cure that is going to kill us—says is that this is their choice: They can elevate their home 18 feet, which probably would cost \$50,000, which they don't have, or their flood insurance will go up to something on the order of \$15,000 or \$20,000 a year, which they can't pay.

One may say: That is too bad. Let them sell the house.

Their house has no value.

This is a dilemma not just for the people of Louisiana but for people from Mississippi, Alabama, California, and New York. We have a solution. The solution I have offered is temporary until we can be smart and think about how to fix this, and it doesn't cost anything.

I am begging Members to allow us this short period of time to get this cure corrected. We can find a way to make this program balance. We don't have to do that today, at this moment. Give us a little breathing room to figure this out. I believe this program

could be self-sustaining. I am not an expert on insurance, but I am very fortunate to serve with colleagues who are. I am sure we can put our heads together and come up with something better than what is coming down like a firehose out there on lots of people in communities in Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama.

My understanding is—the managers are not on the floor—that there are about eight or nine amendments that have been worked out, hopefully, on both sides of the aisle. One of them is the Landrieu-Vitter fix, the flood insurance amendment that has zero cost to the taxpayer—zero. It is a temporary reprieve of rates going up for grandfathered homes, which affects many people in Florida, Louisiana, and in other States as well. It has a zero score. The CBO has testified. We have letters from CBO.

Please give our people this breathing room. I promise that I will work in good faith.

There are probably a few other things that need to be fixed in this flood insurance bill as we find a better way to lower costs to the taxpayer and to provide opportunities for people to live on a mountaintop if they choose, in a valley or on the coast, but to be safely sustainable. We all need to work together as a country. We can find an affordable way for our people—and not just millionaires—to be able to live on the coast. We have to make room for our fishermen, our agriculture, our farmers, and our aquaculture folks who have invested a good amount of money in helping to build more sustainable fisheries for our Nation. We have people who have to live near the water for commerce and trade. Not everybody lives by the water to vacation. Some people live by the water to work, which is an essential part of the work to keep this country moving forward. We have to figure out a way to allow them to do that in an affordable manner without completely undermining the coastal counties of our country.

Senator SCHUMER is on the floor now with some others who also have been working. I thank them for working over the weekend. Let's help them get this list of amendments cleared. One of those amendments will be the Landrieu-Vitter amendment on fixing temporarily—giving some reprieve to thousands of homeowners who are desperate for a signal from us that we get it, we understand. We didn't correct this appropriately. We are going to respond, as a democracy should, and give them a little signal today that as the WRDA bill moves forward, we can fine-tune and modify this flood insurance reform.

I understand we are ready for action on WRDA.

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.