provide services to meet the urgent needs of Holocaust survivors to age in place with dignity, comfort, security, and quality of life.

S. 1001

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1001, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to the Government of Iran.

AMENDMENT NO. 934

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 934 intended to be proposed to S. 954, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 939

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 939 intended to be proposed to S. 954, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 940

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. COWAN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 940 intended to be proposed to S. 954, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 961

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 961 intended to be proposed to S. 954, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 965

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 965 proposed to S. 954, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 966

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 966 intended to be proposed to S. 954, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 971

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 971 intended to be proposed to S. 954, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 986

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 986 intended to be proposed to S. 954, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 992

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 992 proposed to S. 954, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 998

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 998 proposed to S. 954, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 1011

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1011 intended to be proposed to S. 954, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

At the request of Mr. JOHANNS, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1011 intended to be proposed to S. 954, supra.

AMENDMENT NO. 1030

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1030 intended to be proposed to S. 954, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. KING (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1007. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include biomass heating appliances for tax credits available for energy-efficient building property and energy property; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I rise today in support of energy innovation, energy independence, national security, and local economies.

The legislation I am introducing, the Biomass Thermal Utilization Act of 2013—known as the BTU Act—would give tax parity to biomass heating systems under sections 25d and 48 of the Internal Revenue Code and would help to encourage a very promising industry.

By adding biomass heating systems to the eligible renewable technologies for residential and commercial tax credits, we can help make clean, homegrown heating more cost effective for hard-working Americans.

By way of example, Maine has the highest home heating oil dependence of any State in the country—and nearly 80 cents of every $1 spent on heating oil goes out of State. Much of this money also leaves the country and goes to nations that are less than friendly with the U.S. Yet we have plenty of renewable heating sources here at home.

In Maine, wood pellet boilers are the most widely used biomass heating systems. Wood pellet boilers run on trees grown in the State, cut by local loggers, processed into pellets in local mills, then purchased and used to heat local homes. Nearly every single heating dollar stays within the local economy. This supports good-paying jobs, working, productive forests, and it helps move the country toward energy independence.

We are not talking about traditional woodstoves here. These are highly innovative, clean-burning systems that are simple to run. They can even be integrated with your smart phone so you can turn the heat up on your way home from work.

In addition, thermal biomass systems—particularly wood pellet boilers—have very small carbon footprints. New trees are planted to replace the trees processed into pellets. These new trees capture the carbon released by the pellets. Compared to fossil fuels, such as home heating oil, this yields an extremely small carbon footprint.

I am excited to offer this legislation and to be joined by Senator COLLINS.

This bill could greatly benefit any State with a strong forestry industry but also States with industries that turn agricultural waste and nonfood stock plants into thermal biomass fuels. I look forward to working with colleagues from around the country to level the playing field for the biomass industry.

Let us work together to keep our energy dollars here at home and create jobs in our backyard.

By Mr. CORNYN:

S. 1013. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, to add procedural requirements for patent infringement suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1013

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Patent Abuse Reduction Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. PLEADING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 29 of title 35, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 281 the following:

''§ 281A. Pleading requirements for patent infringement actions

''In a civil action arising under any Act of Congress relating to patents, a party alleging infringement shall include in the initial complaint, counterclaim, or cross-claim for patent infringement—

''(1) an identification of each patent allegedly infringed;

''(2) an identification of each claim of each patent identified under paragraph (1) that is allegedly infringed;

''(3) for each claim identified under paragraph (2), an identification of each accused apparatus, product, feature, device, method, system, process, function, act, service, or other instrumentality (referred to in this

section as an 'accused instrumentality') alleged to infringe the claim;

''(4) for each accused instrumentality identified under paragraph (3), an identification with particularity, if known, of—

''(A) the name or model number of each accused instrumentality; and

''(B) the name of each accused method, system, process, function, act, or service, or the name or model number of each apparatus, product, feature, or device that, when used, allegedly results in the practice of the claimed invention;

''(5) for each accused instrumentality identified under paragraph (3), an explanation of—

''(A) where each element of each asserted claim identified under paragraph (2) is found within the accused instrumentality;

''(B) whether each such element is infringed literally or under the doctrine of equivalents; and

''(C) with detailed specificity, how the terms in each asserted claim identified under paragraph (2) correspond to the functionality of the accused instrumentality;

''(6) for each claim that is alleged to have been infringed indirectly, a description of—

''(A) the direct infringement;

''(B) any person alleged to be a direct infringer known to the party alleging infringement; and

''(C) the acts of the alleged indirect infringer that contribute to or are inducing the direct infringement;

''(7) a description of the right of the party alleging infringement to assert each—

''(A) patent identified under paragraph (1); and

''(B) patent claim identified in paragraph (2);

''(8) a description of the principal business of the party alleging infringement;

''(9) a list of each complaint filed, of which the party alleging infringement has knowledge, that asserts or asserted any of the patents identified under paragraph (1);

''(10) for each patent identified under paragraph (1), whether such patent is subject to any licensing term or pricing commitments through any agency, organization, standard-setting body, or other entity or community;

''(11) the identity of any person other than the party alleging infringement, known to the party alleging infringement, who—

''(A) owns or co-owns a patent identified under paragraph (1);

''(B) is the assignee of a patent identified under paragraph (1); or

''(C) is an exclusive licensee to a patent identified under paragraph (1);

''(12) the identity of any person other than the party alleging infringement, known to the party alleging infringement, who has a legal right to enforce a patent identified under paragraph (1) through a civil action under any Act of Congress relating to patents or is licensed under such patent;

''(13) the identity of any person with a direct financial interest in the outcome of the action, including a right to receive proceeds, or any fixed or variable portion thereof; and

''(14) a description of any agreement or other legal basis for a financial interest described in paragraph (13).''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 29 of title 35, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 281 the following:

''281A. Pleading requirements for patent infringement actions.''.

(c) REVIEW OF FORM 18.—Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Supreme Court shall review and amend Form 18 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to ensure that Form 18 is consistent with the requirements under section 281A of title 35, United States Code, as added by subsection (a).

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section or the amendments made by this section shall be construed to alter existing law or rules relating to joinder.

SEC. 3. JOINDER OF INTERESTED PARTIES.

Section 299 of title 35, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) JOINDER OF INTERESTED PARTIES.—

''(1) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term 'interested party', with respect to a civil action arising under any Act of Congress relating to patents—

''(A) means a person described in paragraph (11) or (13) of section 281A; and

''(B) does not include an attorney or law firm providing legal representation in the action if the sole basis for the financial interest of the attorney or law firm in the outcome of the action arises from an agreement to provide that legal representation.

''(2) JOINDER OF INTERESTED PARTIES.—In a civil action arising under any Act of Congress relating to patents, the court shall grant a motion by a party defending an infringement claim to join an interested party if the defending party shows that the interest of the plaintiff in any patent identified in the complaint, including a claim asserted in the complaint, is limited primarily to asserting any such patent claim in litigation.

''(3) LIMITATION ON JOINDER.—The court may deny a motion to join an interested party under paragraph (2) if—

''(A) the interested party is not subject to service of process; or

''(B) joinder under paragraph (2) would deprive the court of subject matter jurisdiction or make venue improper.''.

SEC. 4. DISCOVERY LIMITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 29 of title 35, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 300. Discovery in patent infringement suits

''(a) DISCOVERY LIMITATION PRIOR TO CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), in a civil action arising under any Act of Congress relating to patents, if the court determines that a ruling relating to the construction of terms used in a patent claim asserted in the complaint is required, discovery shall be limited, until such ruling, to information necessary for the court to determine the meaning of the terms used in the patent claim, including any interpretation of those terms used to support the claim of infringement.

''(2) DISCRETION TO EXPAND SCOPE OF DISCOVERY.—

''(A) TIMELY RESOLUTION OF ACTIONS.—If, under any provision of Federal law (including the Drug Price Competition and Patent Term Restoration Act (Public Law 98–417)), resolution within a specified period of time of a civil action arising under any Act of Congress relating to patents will have an automatic impact upon the rights of a party with respect to the patent, the court may permit discovery in addition to the discovery authorized under paragraph (1) before the ruling described in paragraph (1) as necessary to ensure timely resolution of the action.

''(B) RESOLUTION OF MOTIONS.—When necessary to resolve a motion properly raised by a party before a ruling relating to the construction of terms (as described in paragraph (1)), the court may allow limited discovery in addition to the discovery authorized under paragraph (1) as necessary to resolve the motion.

''(b) SEQUENCE AND SCOPE; COST-SHIFTING.—

''(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

''(A) the term 'additional discovery' means discovery of evidence other than core documentary evidence; and

''(B) the term 'core documentary evidence', with respect to a civil action arising under any Act of Congress relating to patents—

''(i) subject to clause (ii), includes only documents that—

''(I) relate to the conception, reduction to practice, and application for the asserted patent;

''(II) are sufficient to show the technical operation of the instrumentality identified in the complaint as infringing the asserted patent;

''(III) relate to potentially invalidating prior art;

''(IV) relate to previous licensing or conveyances of the asserted patent;

''(V) are sufficient to show revenue attributable to any claimed invention;

''(VI) are sufficient to show the organizational ownership and structure of each party, including identification of any person that has a financial interest in the asserted patent;

''(VII) relate to awareness of the asserted patent or claim, or the infringement, before the action was filed; and

''(VIII) sufficient to show any marking, lack of marking, or notice of the asserted patent provided to the accused infringer; and

''(ii) does not include computer code or electronic communication, such as e-mail, text messages, instant messaging, and other forms of electronic communication, unless the court finds good cause for including such computer code or electronic communication as core documentary evidence of a particular party under clause (i).

''(2) DISCOVERY SEQUENCE AND SCOPE.—In a civil action arising under any Act of Congress relating to patents, the parties shall discuss and address in the written report filed under rule 26(f)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure the views and proposals of the parties on—

''(A) when the discovery of core documentary evidence should be completed;

''(B) whether the parties will seek additional discovery under paragraph (3); and

''(C) any issues relating to infringement, invalidity, or damages that, if resolved before the additional discovery described in paragraph (3) commences, will simplify or streamline the case, including the identification of any key patent claim terms or phrases to be construed by the court and whether the early construction of any of those terms or phrases would be helpful.

''(3) DISCOVERY COST-SHIFTING.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In a civil action arising under any Act of Congress relating to patents, each party shall be responsible for the costs of producing core documentary evidence within the possession, custody, or control of that party.

''(B) ADDITIONAL DISCOVERY.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—A party to a civil action arising under any Act of Congress relating to patents may seek additional discovery if the party bears the costs of the additional discovery, including reasonable attorney's fees.

''(ii) REQUIREMENTS.—A party shall not be allowed additional discovery unless the party—

''(I) at the time that such party seeks additional discovery, provides to the party from whom the additional discovery is sought payment of the anticipated costs of the discovery; or

''(II) posts a bond in an amount sufficient to cover the anticipated costs of the discovery.

''(C) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) or (B) shall be construed to—

''(i) entitle a party to information not otherwise discoverable under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or any other applicable rule or order;

''(ii) require a party to produce privileged matter or other discovery otherwise limited under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure; or

''(iii) prohibit a court from—

''(I) determining that a request for discovery is excessive, irrelevant, or otherwise abusive; or

''(II) setting other limits on discovery.''.

SEC. 5. COSTS AND EXPENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 285 of title 35, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 285. Costs and expenses

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The court shall award to the prevailing party reasonable costs and expenses, including attorney's fees, unless—

''(1) the position and conduct of the non-prevailing party were objectively reasonable and substantially justified; or

''(2) exceptional circumstances make such an award unjust.

''(b) PROHIBITION ON CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN SETTLEMENTS.—In determining whether an exception under paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a) applies, the court shall not consider as evidence any license taken in settlement of an asserted claim.

''(c) RECOVERY.—If the non-prevailing party is unable to pay reasonable costs and expenses awarded by the court under subsection (a), the court may make the reasonable costs and expenses recoverable against any interested party, as defined in section 299(d).''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections for chapter 29 of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 285 and inserting the following:

''285. Costs and expenses.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Chapter 29 of title 35, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in section 271(e)(4), in the flush text following subparagraph (D), by striking ''attorney fees'' and inserting ''reasonable costs and expenses, including attorney's fees,'';

(B) in section 273(f), by striking ''attorney fees'' and inserting ''reasonable costs and expenses, including attorney's fees,''; and

(C) in section 296(b), by striking ''attorney fees'' and inserting ''reasonable costs and expenses (including attorney's fees)''.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself and Mr. ROCKEFELLER):

S. 1014. A bill to reduce sports-related concussions in youth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, as parents, we can see the scrapes and cuts our children get—the unavoidable byproducts of growing up. A little bit of ointment and some bandages usually do the trick. But what of the injuries we can't see? The ones we can't readily tell, no matter how well we know our kids.

Each year, as many as 3.8 million Americans suffer sports- and recreation-related brain injuries. Some are horrific, deadly, and visible to the naked eye. But the vast majority are concussions caused by an awkward hit, a freak fall, or a routine blow to the head on the field. They cannot be seen, but the damage is there in the very place that houses our minds and for our children their future.

Most susceptible are our young athletes, whose bodies and brains are still growing, with each concussion increasing the likelihood of suffering yet another. This past school year alone, more than 300,000 of our high school athletes were diagnosed with concussions. Since 2005, over 1.3 million concussions have been diagnosed among high school athletes in just the top nine most common sports. However, researchers say these figures likely underestimate—vastly—the true extent of the epidemic because so many head injuries go unreported or ignored. And when a concussion occurs, few ever lose consciousness, and the telltale signs can seem minor in the immediate aftermath. It is only later on, perhaps the next day or weeks thereafter, when the consequences become clearer and more alarming.

The urgency to act only grows the more we learn about brain injuries. Concussions aren't minor bumps and dings. They aren't something kids should just ''play through,'' as some coaches advise. They are injuries to the brain that animate our very existence, and they can impair their cognitive abilities just when our children need a good head on their shoulders. And we, as a society, have already seen the potential tragedies that repeated concussions can bring to athletes—their limbs paralyzed or their lives cut short by the inner demons the injuries eventually bear.

The role of sports, and all of its innate benefits, is an important part of growing up in America. They teach us lessons that can't be taught in the classroom, they make us healthier, and they show us the value of teamwork, grit, and responsibility. But the pervasiveness of concussions and their effects, particularly among children, should no longer be disregarded. And, as policymakers and parents, we must ensure that we are doing everything we can to learn more and safeguard our kids and athletes.

Senator TOM UDALL and I are proud to introduce the Youth Sports Concussion Act, which will help ensure that protective sports equipment take heed of the latest science and are not sold based on false or deceptive premises.

As chairman of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, we have already revealed and investigated bad actors who peddle products with false safety claims to parents of young athletes. Under this legislation, the Federal Trade Commission would be able to go after them with greater force and ensure this practice comes to an end.

This bill would also direct the Consumer Product Safety Commission to review a forthcoming study from the National Academies of Science on youth concussions. Based on the study's recommendations, the CPSC would then be permitted to consider new safety standards for sports equipment if manufacturers fail to come up with their own.

The legislation—I am happy to say—has the strong support of major sports leagues and players associations. Pediatricians, scientists, and consumer groups have endorsed it, too. Our athletes, whether peewee or professional, whether under the lights or on the pitch, inspire and bring Americans together, and their efforts to help pass this sensible bill will surely garner the appreciation of present and future athletes to come.

This fall, some 3 million children under the age of 14 will don their pads and snap on their helmets to play tackle football. For a sport so important—and for lives so precious—to our country, let us make sure we act as soon as we can. The lessons imparted and the fitness gained on the field are moot without the health of our children.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN:

S. 1021. A bill to provide for a Next Generation Cooperative Threat Reduction Strategy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the threat posed by the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction around the globe and to introduce legislation aimed at modernizing the way the United States addresses this critical national security challenge. My bill, the Next Generation Cooperative Threat Reduction Act of 2013, requires the President to establish a multi-year comprehensive and well-resourced regional assistance strategy to coordinate and advance cooperative threat reduction and related nonproliferation efforts in one of the most critical regions to U.S. national security interests: the Middle East and North Africa.

Fifty years ago, in 1963, President Kennedy famously said that he was ''haunted'' by the possibility that the United States could soon face a rapidly growing number of nuclear powers in our world. At the time, he predicted that by 1975, there could be as many as twenty countries with nuclear weapons. However, thanks to strong, forward-thinking and innovative American leadership on the nonproliferation agenda, including efforts like the Nonproliferation Treaty and the Nunn-Lugar program, we have so far averted Kennedy's nuclear nightmare.

Recent WMD-related developments, including Syria's chemical weapons stockpile and Iran's nuclear program, have begun to test the limits of our nonproliferation regime. I am afraid we may be quickly reaching an important crossroads—one where we either prove President Kennedy wrong for a little while longer, or find out that his nightmare prediction was simply a half-century too soon.

As WMD-related materials and know-how continue to spread, the challenge of WMD proliferation is getting more

diffuse and harder to track. Our focus and our resource commitment need to match the severity of this emerging threat. Now is the time for us to recommit to an aggressive nonproliferation agenda and to demonstrate to the world that the U.S. will continue to lead in curbing the threat posed by nuclear, chemical and biological weapons around the world.

We should start in one of the most dangerous, most unstable regions in the world today: the Middle East and North Africa.

Nowhere is the proliferation challenge more glaring than in the countries of the Middle East and North Africa, where political instability and deeply-rooted violent extremism sit atop a complex web of ethnic differences, a history of violence and extremism, robust military capabilities, a growing collection of unsecured conventional and possible WMD-related weapons and a variety of inexperienced and potentially unstable governments brought into power by the Arab Spring.

Continued upheaval in Syria and the threat posed by the Assad regime's substantial chemical weapons stockpile pose a grave challenge to U.S. interests. Iran's continued illicit development of its nuclear program and its movement towards an advanced nuclear weapons capability threatens the U.S. and our allies and could lead to a nuclear arms race in the region. Terrorist groups like Hezbollah, Hamas, and al Qaeda continue to operate throughout the Middle East and North Africa, and their direct ties to the Iranian and Syrian regimes only exacerbates the threat posed by these groups as they seek to acquire weapons of mass destruction or know-how.

Add to these threats the fact that the Arab Spring and continued revolutions across the region have brought popularly elected, yet untested governments into power that possess minimal capability and very little experience in countering WMD proliferation.

In the face of this growing and complex challenge, it is obvious that the Middle East and North African region represents the next generation of WMD-related tests for the United States. Yet, our resources and our programming are not getting ahead of the threat. In fact, the nonpartisan ''Project on U.S. Middle East Nonproliferation Strategy'' estimates that, excluding programs in Iraq, only two percent of last year's nonproliferation-related programming, or approximately $20,000,000 of an estimated $1,000,000,000, was spent in Middle East and North Africa countries.

Luckily for us, we have a successful model for engagement on this issue that we can fall back on. Just over two decades ago, Senators Sam Nunn and Dick Lugar initiated what has proven to be one of the country's most effective foreign policy efforts. The Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction, CTR, Program has led to the successful deactivation of well over 13,000 nuclear warheads, as well as the destruction of over 1,400 intercontinental ballistic missiles and almost 40,000 metric tons of chemical weapon agents. Because of Nunn-Lugar, Ukraine, Kazakhstan, and Belarus are nuclear weapons free and Albania is chemical weapons free.

The principles of Nunn-Lugar can and should be more fully translated into the Middle East and North Africa. Congress has long supported expanding CTR into the Middle East, but it was only last fall that the Administration finally completed the bureaucratic changes necessary to more robustly engage in this region.

It is time we expand and ramp up our CTR efforts to prevent the potential proliferation of WMD-related weapons, technologies, materials, and know-how in this difficult and volatile part of the world. That is why I am introducing the Next Generation Cooperative Threat Reduction Act of 2013, which is aimed at modernizing our CTR and nonproliferation programs and expanding them more comprehensively throughout this region.

The bill calls for the President to develop and implement a multi-year comprehensive regional assistance strategy to coordinate and advance CTR and nonproliferation in the Middle East and North Africa. The strategy requires an integrated, whole-of-government commitment to building on the cooperative threat model demonstrated by Nunn-Lugar's successes, the initiation of new CTR programs with newly elected partners in the region, and plans to ensure burden-sharing and leveraging of additional outside resources.

The bill allows for the support of innovative and creative assistance programs aimed at enhancing the capacity of governments in the region to prevent, detect, and interdict illicit WMD-related trade. Activities could include:

Encouraging and assisting with security and destruction of chemical weapons stockpiles; Promoting the adoption and implementation of enhanced and comprehensive strategic trade control laws and strengthening export controls and border security, including maritime security; Promoting government-to-government engagement among emerging political and public policy leaders, including the possibility of training courses for parliamentarians and national technical advisors; Promoting activities that seek to work with civil society organizations, media representatives, and public diplomacy officials to help develop a culture of nonproliferation responsibility among the general public; The possible establishment of nuclear, chemical, or biological security Centers of Excellence in the Middle East; Supporting, enhancing, or building upon regional nonproliferation programs and institutions already in place, including such multilateral initiatives as the December 2010 Gulf Cooperation Council conference on the implementation of UNSCR 1540 or the Arab Atomic Energy Agency and its Arab Network of Nuclear Regulators; Supporting, enhancing, or building upon previous multilateral initiatives, including the Group of Eight's Global Partnership Against the Spread of Weapons and Materials of Mass Destruction or the White House-led Nuclear Security Summits in 2010 and 2012 to more fully incorporate and include countries of the Middle East and North Africa region; Encouraging countries to adopt and adhere to the IAEA Additional Protocol; Promoting and supporting WMD-related regional confidence-building measures and Track Two regional dialogues on nonproliferation and related issues; Working collaboratively with businesses, foundations, universities, think tanks and other sectors, including the possibility of prizes and challenges to spur innovation in achieving appropriate Middle East and North Africa nonproliferation objectives; Supporting and expanding successful existing Middle East and North Africa partnerships, including the Middle East Consortium for Infectious Disease Surveillance; Promoting the establishment of professional networks that foster voluntary regional interaction on weapons of mass destruction-related issues; or enhancing United States-Europe cooperation on combating proliferation in the Middle East and North Africa region.

The threat posed by WMD-related materials falling into the hands of terrorists remains our greatest and gravest threat. As former Defense Secretary Robert Gates said, ''Every senior leader, when you're asked what keeps you awake at night, it's the thought of a terrorist ending up with a weapon of mass destruction, especially nuclear.''

To date, we have largely kept WMD materials out of terrorists' hands. Unfortunately, however, being successful ''to date'' is not good enough. When it comes to terrorism and WMD in our world, the reality is that the international community cannot afford to make a single mistake. We cannot be complacent because one miscalculation . . . one unprotected border . . . one unsecured facility . . . could all lead to a mushroom cloud somewhere in our world.

We need to remain vigilant, to think ahead, and to anticipate where the next threats will come from and adapt to get ahead of it.

That is why I would urge my colleagues in the Senate to take up and pass the Next Generation Cooperative Threat Reduction Act of 2013. We need to demonstrate that the United States will continue to lead the international community in curbing the threat posed by WMD proliferation. My legislation does just that. I hope the Senate will support this important effort.

Before yielding the floor, I want to thank my colleagues in the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, at the White House and at the Departments of State and Defense who contributed to this legislation. I also want

to give special thanks to the Co-Chairs of the Project on U.S. Middle East Nonproliferation Strategy, including David Albright, Mark Dubowitz, Orde Kittrie, Leonard Spector and Michael Yaffe, whose report, ''U.S. Nonproliferation Strategy for the Changing Middle East,'' served as the inspiration for this legislation.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 152—DESIGNATING NOVEMBER 28, 2013, AS ''NATIONAL HOLOPROSENCEPHALY AWARENESS DAY'' TO INCREASE AWARENESS AND EDUCATION OF THE DISORDER

Mr. COWAN submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 152

Whereas Holoprosencephaly (commonly known as ''HPE'') is a birth defect of the brain in which the prosencephalon (also known as the ''embryonic forebrain'') does not sufficiently develop into 2 hemispheres resulting in a single-lobed brain structure and severe skull and facial defects;

Whereas in most cases of HPE, the malformations are so severe that babies die before birth;

Whereas in less severe cases of HPE, babies are born with normal or near-normal brain development and facial deformities that may affect the eyes, nose, and upper lip;

Whereas the 3 classifications of HPE that vary in severity and impairment to cognitive abilities are Alobar (in which the brain has not divided at all), Semilobar (in which the hemispheres of the brain have somewhat divided), and Lobar (in which there is considerable evidence of separate brain hemispheres);

Whereas HPE affects approximatley 1 out of every 250 pregnancies during early embryo development, with many of those pregnancies ending in miscarriage;

Whereas HPE affects 1 in 10,000-20,000 live births;

Whereas the prognosis for a child diagnosed with HPE depends on the severity of the brain and facial malformations and associated clinical complications, with the most severely affected children living several months or years and the least affected children living a normal life span;

Whereas there is no standard course of treatment for HPE because treatment must be individualized to the unique degree of malformations of each child;

Whereas the Federal Government, acting through the National Institutes of Health and the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Strokes, supports and conducts a wide range of research on normal brain development and recent research has identified specific genes that cause HPE; and

Whereas November 28, 2013, would be an appropriate day to designate as 'National Holoprosencephaly Awareness Day': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of November 28, 2013, as ''National Holoprosencephaly Awareness Day'';

(2) urges Federal agencies—

(A) to continue supporting research to better understand the causes of HPE;

(B) to provide better counseling to families with the genetic forms of HPE; and

(C) to develop new ways to treat, and potentially prevent, HPE; and

(3) calls on the people of the United States, interested groups, and affected persons—

(A) to promote awareness of HPE;

(B) to take an active role in the fight to end the devastating effects of HPE; and

(C) to observe ''National Holoprosencephaly Awareness Day'' with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

Mr. COWAN. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to discuss a rare birth defect of the brain, known as holoprosencephaly or HPE.

I became aware of this rare disorder through the outreach of my constituent, Angel Marie Kelley from Bellingham, MA. Angel has a child living with HPE and has become a resource to others in her community who are touched by this disorder.

HPE occurs during the first few weeks of a pregnancy when the fetal brain does not sufficiently divide into two hemispheres, resulting in severe skull and facial defects. In most cases of HPE, the malformations are so severe that babies die before birth. In less severe cases, babies are born with normal or near-normal brain development and facial deformities that may affect the eyes, nose, and upper lip.

HPE affects about 1 out of every 250 pregnancies during early embryo development, with many of these pregnancies ending in miscarriage. The disorder affects between 1 in 10,000 to 1 in 20,000 live births.

There is no cure or standard course of treatment for HPE. The prognosis for a child diagnosed with the disorder depends on the severity of the brain and facial malformations and associated clinical complications. The most severely affected children could live several months or years and the least affected children are capable of achieving a normal life span. Treatment is symptomatic and supportive and must be individualized to each child's unique degree of malformations.

I would like to recognize the ongoing work of the Federal Government through the National Institutes of Health, NIH, and the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Strokes, NINDS, on HPE. These agencies support and conduct a wide range of innovative and promising research on HPE—recently identifying the specific genes that cause HPE.

I am submitting this resolution today to designate November 28, 2013 as National Holoprosencephaly Awareness Day. This resolution urges Federal agencies to support HPE research, to provide better counseling to families with the genetic forms of HPE, and to develop new ways to treat, and potentially prevent this disorder. It also calls on the people of the United States to promote awareness of this birth defect and to observe National Holoprosencephaly Awareness Day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

I look forward to working with my colleagues in the Senate to pass this important resolution.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1059. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1060. Mr. BARRASSO (for himself and Mr. TOOMEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1061. Mr. COBURN (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. MCCAIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1062. Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1063. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1064. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1065. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1066. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1067. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1068. Mr. JOHANNS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1069. Mr. JOHANNS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1070. Mr. JOHANNS (for himself, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. ROBERTS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1071. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1072. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1073. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1074. Mr. VITTER (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. WICKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1075. Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1076. Mrs. MCCASKILL (for herself, Mr. COBURN, and Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1077. Mr. HEINRICH (for himself, Mr. HELLER, Mr. BENNET, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.