rise—and rise dramatically in future years with 10,000 baby boomers retiring every day.

Let me repeat that: 10,000 baby boomers are reaching retirement age each day, adding to the cost of Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security.

We have known this was coming for years. We have known it was coming for decades; that an amazing number of people born post-World War II now have worked their way to the point of retirement. This has had an impact on our economy, whether they were babies needing more cribs and diapers, whether they were young children going to elementary school and we needed more schools, going to secondary colleges and universities and we needed to expand those, working their way through the economy, having children—a dramatic impact with this bulge of baby boom babies growing up and working their way through the system. Yet while we knew all this was coming, Congress and the administration repeatedly said: We will deal with this later. It is a crisis, we know, but it is just too tough to deal with now.

What I am afraid of is that this latest report which came out and provided a little bit of relief, a little bit of wiggle room, but it did nothing to solve the long-term problem. What I am concerned about is that this report may be used to basically say we don't have to do anything now.

What is the impact? The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office reported earlier this year that spending on mandatory programs and interest on the debt—because we have to borrow to cover this cost—will consume 91 percent of all Federal revenues 10 years from now. Already it is putting the squeeze on discretionary spending because what this means is that all other spending priorities are being squeezed out by spending on Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security and some of the other mandatory programs.

If we are interested in a strong national defense, in a solid education system, infrastructure and bridges and paving roads, medical research, food and drug safety, homeland security, border security—and other programs, these programs are getting squeezed every day in terms of the amount of resources available.

Why these groups don't form a coalition and come marching through the Halls of Congress and demand that we take action now on runaway mandatory spending, because it is simply wiping out their programs, is beyond me. But it is the nature of the political beast to postpone the tough stuff, to not have to get to the point where they have to tell anybody no because we want everybody to love us so they will vote for us in the next election. It is incomprehensible that we continue to put this off day after day, month after month, year after year, election after election.

I have been around a while. How many times have we heard people say we will do that after the next election? That was the mantra in the 2012 Presidential election. Well, no. You see, the President couldn't step up and do this and the ruling party couldn't step up and do this because we had a Presidential election. They said that as soon as the election takes place, then we will have a period of time where we have been reelected to office or we have new Members coming in and we will not have the pressure of an election before us and we will address this problem.

Here we are now into the sixth month of this year, when everyone knows that the first 100 days of the new administration—or a second-term in this case—is the best time to enact long-term good legislation that addresses major problems—the days are slip-sliding away. The days are counting, and we continue debate and talk about and interject issues here that, yes, have importance but don't begin to rise to the level of importance of the need to address our fiscal situation.

The other thing I don't understand is why the young people of this country aren't standing up and demanding that we take action, because we are taking money away from them. We are diminishing their future. We are leaving them with a debt burden they may not be able to pay.

The International Monetary Fund put out a report recently that to cover current obligations for young people, they—not us—will have to pay either 35 percent more in taxes to keep these mandatory funds alive and solvent or receive 35 percent fewer benefits. This is at a time when our Nation's youth already face an unemployment crisis.

It is unconscionable. It is immoral for us to defer and to delay and to simply say we can't take care of these issues now and then move on through our lives, reap the benefits that come from some of these programs, and then hand it over to our children and say: Good luck. You are either going to pay one-third more in taxes or you are going to get one-third less in benefits, lifetime savings, Social Security for your retirement, health care coverage for your later years. Good luck with that one. But we couldn't summon the will to do it. We couldn't bring ourselves to make the hard choices.

Are we going to step up to the plate and be responsible? What is our legacy going to be for those of us who are serving now? What are we going to tell our children and grandchildren? Will we say sorry, we just weren't able to do it? It was just too tough politically, we are worried about the folks back home that they might not take it the right way. It requires a little bit of sacrifice to reform these programs—actually, to save the programs—before they go broke. But, no, we just couldn't do it. The President? No; kind of AWOL on this, hasn't stepped up. We thought for sure that after reelection, not being elected again, we would get some kind of leadership.

I see it slip-sliding away, and now we are faced with that ultimate day of crisis when it hits and we have to make painful choices because we have no other choice.

So why don't we take the rational approach? Why don't we have leadership that steps up and basically says this is what we need to do? Why don't we put the future of America and the future of our children and grandchildren and succeeding generations ahead of our own political interests? It is selfish not to do so. I think it is unconscionable. I think it is immoral for us to continue doing this.

So I am going to continue to come to the floor as much as I can—I have been doing this all year—and I am going to continue to urge the President to work with us. I am not making this a partisan issue. We are working with people across the aisle who understand this and want to do something about it. But we know we can't get it done without the President taking leadership and standing up and working with us.

There is a little bit going on right now, but here we are, 6 months later, and we are not making the progress we need to make.

In the end, maybe we will pass another patch of legislation—a little patch here, a little patch there—and we will deal with the big thing later. We just can't do it now.

For the sake of the future of this country, for the sake of the future of our children and grandchildren, for living up to our sworn oath to do what is necessary to continue the great story of democracy in this Nation, we need to step up and do this. These reforms are necessary. We all know it. We know the numbers. We know they are unsustainable. We know we must address it.

I urge my colleagues to do whatever is necessary to make the tough choices. Interestingly enough, that legacy, if we stand up to do it, will be worth whatever results or consequences come from our making these decisions.

I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

AGRICULTURE REFORM, FOOD, AND JOBS ACT OF 2013

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 954, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 954) to reauthorize agriculture programs through 2018.

Pending:

Stabenow (for Leahy) amendment No. 998, to establish a pilot program for gigabit Internet projects in rural areas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I see my distinguished ranking member on the floor. We are proceeding in our work on the farm bill this morning.

As we are moving through, we have a lot of discussions going on, working to get agreement on both sides to be able to offer a number of amendments for votes. We certainly are going to do everything we can, working with colleagues on both sides of the aisle. It is critical that we complete our work, ideally, this week.

I appreciate our Senate majority leader understanding what I say over and over, which is this is a jobs bill. Sixteen million people work in this country because of agriculture and the food industry. This is their economic development jobs policy, and it is very important that we complete our work as we have done this last year.

Let me remind colleagues again that 1 year ago—and most of us were here at that time—one year ago we worked very hard. In fact, other than the Budget resolution, I think we may have a record for the most amendments that were voted on, on a piece of legislation. I don't know for sure, but I think it ranks right up there. We voted on 73 different amendments last year. Every one of the substantive amendments that was passed by the Senate is included in the bill that is in front of us, so we start from a bill that was worked on by the entire Senate last year. We are back again working through additional ideas, additional amendments that people are interested in.

It is very important that we complete our work so that, hopefully, when the House brings the bill to the floor—and we are encouraged. We are hearing that within a couple of weeks it will come to the floor of the House—that when they complete their work, we can actually go to conference and get a final bill on the President's desk before September 30, which is what people around the country are counting on us to do.

Farmers and ranchers have to do the job in the morning, whether they feel like it or not, because the job is in front of them. They have to work hard and get it done, and we have to work hard and get our job done. This is the time to complete a 5-year policy, and we intend to do that and get it done in time so the right kinds of decisions can be made.

Let me stress again that this bill is the one bill that has come before the Senate and passed last year that has real deficit reduction in it. We have looked at every page of what is called the farm bill. We have called ours the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs bill because it is just that. It is about reform—reforming policies, cutting waste, fraud and abuse and creating more accountability. It is about food policies for our country, nutrition policies for our country, and it is about jobs.

We have scoured every page and actually in our process ended up cutting over 100 different programs and authorizations by either combining them, cutting down on the duplication and paperwork or eliminating them if they didn't make sense. If it doesn't work anymore, if it doesn't work from the taxpayers' standpoint, if it doesn't work from the standpoint of agricultural policy, we eliminated it.

We took what are currently 11 different definitions of what is ''rural''—we had local mayors, local township officials telling us they appreciate and count on rural development as their economic development arm for grants and loans for small businesses, for water and sewer projects, road projects. Whatever is done in small towns and rural communities across the country, USDA rural development is there supporting those local efforts. But they said could you give us 1 definition of ''rural'' instead of 11, so we can figure out the paperwork and know how to interact with the USDA.

It sounded simple. It wasn't simple. But we have actually gotten it down to one definition, dramatically cut the paperwork and reformed and streamlined the process for local units of government.

We have $24 billion in bipartisan deficit reduction. We have, in fact, put together something that is four times more than required of the across-the-board cuts in what has been dubbed sequestration. So rather than just doing what we are required to do under the law that established sequestration, we have gone four times more and created policies supported by farmers, ranchers, those involved in conservation, and those involved across our country in every part of the farm bill.

We have 12 different titles—and each one could actually be a separate bill if we wanted to—that deal with a wide variety of topics, from our traditional commodities where there is certainly a lot of debate as we have eliminated subsidies called direct payments and moved to crop insurance where it is based on risk. Farmers share in the cost of the insurance. There is no subsidy given. They get help if they have a disaster. If something happens with the weather or there is some other kind of disaster, then, similar to any other kind of insurance, it helps cover the risk, and that is what we are moving to.

Conservation and bringing together 23 different programs; we cut it down to 13, consolidated, streamlined, did a better job with more flexibility for communities and have created a conservation title supported by more than 650 different conservation and environmental organizations across the country.

As to specialty crops, half of the cash receipts of the country roughly are something called fruits and vegetables and other specialty crops. We strengthen those efforts, which are very important—local food systems, farmers markets, areas that are very important in growing and certainly address the health of our country.

I mentioned rural development; an energy title that we have not only focused on in terms of energy efficiency for our farmers on the farm, bioenergy, biofuels, but also a new area of reducing our reliance on petroleum by using agricultural products and byproducts in manufacturing called biobased manufacturing. That is an exciting new area for jobs for us. We are seeing a lot of different possibilities in the area of soybeans. We are seeing soybean oil used to replace petroleum oil in things such as foams. If you buy a number of different vehicles today and certainly in every Ford vehicle I know that is being produced, the new Chevy Volt, and many other automobiles today, you are actually sitting on soybean foam instead of petroleum foam. It is biodegradable. There are a lot of jokes about sitting on soybeans, but the reality is this is something that is creating a market for growers. It is biodegradable, gets us off foreign oil, and is creating jobs. There are a lot of possibilities in this bill for new jobs.

We focus on foreign trade. The one area where we actually have a trade surplus in our country is in agriculture. We are, in fact, feeding the world and working with those around the globe to develop their own food systems. I am very proud of the role American farmers play in addressing hunger around the world as well as international food assistance.

We could go on. The bottom line is that this is a bill with tremendous impact—16 million people in the country directly impacted in terms of their jobs. Every American, if you had breakfast this morning, thank a farmer. If you have lunch today, thank a farmer. If you have dinner today, thank a farmer. We have the safest, most affordable food supply in the world because of a group of people who go out and take the risk against the weather, which is getting tougher and tougher as the climate is changing. They are willing to go out there and continue to be in this business. Our bill supports them with tools to help them manage their risk through insurance, to help them manage their risks on the farm in terms of keeping the soil on the ground as well as protecting our water and protecting our air. Those kinds of tools are critically important as well.

This is a bill we have worked on now twice in the last year—last year, this year—and we are looking forward to having the opportunity to bring this to completion, to work with our House colleagues in a bipartisan way to provide legislation that is good for those directly involved in agriculture and that is good for consumers, that is good for taxpayers as we look at ways to reform our government, to work more efficiently and effectively on fewer dollars.

We look forward to continuing throughout the day working with colleagues. We are hopeful we will have amendments to bring forward, but we do understand we have to move forward and get this done.

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

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H. CON. RES. 25

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, Senate Democrats have been waiting a very long time to go to conference on our budget. In fact, it has now been 73 days. Until recently, we have gotten pretty used to Senate Republicans simply standing and saying no.

For months Republicans have been offering a lot of excuses for why they do not want to go to conference on the budget. They have said they want a preconference ''framework,'' which, by the way, is what a budget is. They have said they would not allow us to go to conference unless we guaranteed that the wealthiest Americans and biggest corporations would be protected from paying a penny more in taxes. They said they did not want a bipartisan conference to take away the leverage they have on the debt ceiling. And then they called for a do-over, which, actually, my ranking member on Budget called for again this morning—to bring up the House budget, have 50 hours of debate, a whole new round of unlimited amendments, go through the process all over, and they did this after they praised the very open and thorough floor debate we had on the Senate budget.

The story keeps changing. But even as some Republicans were focused on finding excuses to move us closer and closer to this crisis rather than have a budget deal, we have a number of Republicans who are now joining with us to call on regular order. Senator COBURN said that blocking conference is ''not a good position to be in.'' Senator BOOZMAN said he would ''very much like to see a conference.'' Senator WICKER said weeks ago that ''by the end of next week, we . . . should be ready to go to conference.'' We have known for a while that blocking regular order—especially after calling for it so eagerly just a matter of months ago—was not sitting well with a number of our Republican colleagues, and now, according to Politico, ''more Republicans appear to favor heading to conference than blocking it.'' I welcome that.

We need to move this to conference. It is the regular order. It will allow us to solve our country's problems, and we truly need a process to allow us to deal with our Nation's problems.

Senator MCCAIN is on the floor, and I thank him because he understands the importance not just for this bill but for all legislation in the Senate that we come here, we compromise, we fight hard for what we believe in, but at the end of the day just saying ''my way or the highway,'' even if you are a small minority, does not move this country to the place where we need it to get to, which is not a crisis-by-management place. I thank him for taking a lead and calling for regular order. He has said that Republican preconditions such as demanding that the conference agree to not raise the debt ceiling or raise taxes are ''absolutely out of line and unprecedented.'' Senator COLLINS joined us on the floor a few weeks ago to say that even though there is a lot we do not see eye to eye on, we should at least go to conference and make our best effort to get a deal. I could not agree more.

The stalling that we have seen is, as some have said on their side, ''a little bizarre'' and ''ironic to say the least,'' especially after, I would remind everyone, 50 hours of debate, innumerable amendments that took us way into the early hours, and we offered everybody the chance to speak. After that session was over, many of our Republican colleagues came to me personally and thanked me for finally having an open process. If they want us to have an open process, then they have to take that process and take it to the next step.

So I am deeply concerned. We are moving toward another manufactured crisis this fall. We have our Appropriations subcommittees that need to move forward. The country is very clearly tired of this country being managed by crisis. We just had a budget hearing this morning in which our witnesses, both Republicans and Democrats alike, said that moving us to a manufactured crisis would impact this economy in a horrific way this fall. We do not need to have that happen.

I want to go to conference. Do I want to have a compromise? Not really. I love where I stand. But I have been here a long time. You do not get everything you want, but you do have to compromise in order to move the country forward. And I am willing to go to conference with my counterpart, Chairman RYAN, who is on a very different page than I am, and find our compromise and be willing to move that forward here in the Congress so we can get to a place that allows us to be able to lead this country again. So I think we are at a very critical point.

I see Senator MCCAIN is on the floor. I would be happy to yield to him for a comment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I understand that one of my colleagues who will object is coming to the floor, so perhaps I would reserve the right to object on his behalf even though I am in stark disagreement. But instead I will just make a comment, and I am sure my colleague on this side of the aisle will voice an objection when he arrives.

Mrs. MURRAY. The Senator is here.

Mr. MCCAIN. He is here.

Mrs. MURRAY. If the Senator will yield, I can go ahead and offer the unanimous consent request at this time and we can move from there.

Mr. MCCAIN. If it is OK with the Senator, because we know what is going to happen, I would like to make remarks, and then the Senator from Florida will make the same argument that was made the last few days, and fortunately I do not have to listen again.

For 4 years Members on this side of the aisle argued strenuously that we were doing a great disservice to the country by not taking up and debating and amending a budget that would then go to conference with the other side of the Capitol, the House of Representatives, and then we would do what we expect and, unfortunately, every family in America has to do, and that is to pass a budget under which we would be guided in our authorization and appropriations process.

Now my colleague from Florida will come to the floor and say that we have amassed a debt because of the budget. But we did not have a budget for 4 years. So how can you argue that the fact that we may go to conference on a budget—that somehow that would be responsible for the debt? Obviously, it is nonsense. Obviously, it is nonsense, just as, frankly, it was nonsense when the same group of Senators said we should not even debate gun measures in light of a tragedy that took place in Connecticut and another tragedy that took place in Tucson, AZ. They did not even want to take up and debate ideas that some of us had to try to keep weapons out of the hands of criminals and the hands of the mentally ill.

So now we have a Senate where we refuse to move forward on issues and have open debate and discussion and votes. I have always believed, in the years I have been here, with Republican and Democratic majorities, that the way we are supposed to function is to say: OK, let's give it our best shot, and let's do the best we can, and let's have votes.

One of our objections against the majority leader was that he would not let us have votes on amendments. We had—I have forgotten how many—votes on the budget that lasted until I believe around 7 o'clock in the morning. So the opponents of moving forward on anything cannot argue we did not have votes on the budget, cannot argue they were blocked from whatever amendment they wanted to have voted on.

So now we are faced with a situation where we will not go to conference. And I want to tell my colleagues who continue to do this that, with my strenuous objections, the majority will become frustrated and the majority

can change the rules of the Senate. They can do that. And I must say that although I would strenuously object to a change in the rules, I can understand the frustration many of my friends on the other side of the aisle feel at a failure of a simple process of going to conference when the majority on the other side of the Capitol is of our party. That is really very difficult to understand, unless you take the word of one of my colleagues who came to the floor and said: I do not trust Democrats, and I do not trust Republicans. Let me repeat what he said: I do not trust Democrats, and I do not trust Republicans. It is not a matter of trusting Democrats or Republicans. What this is a matter of is whether we will go through the legislative process that people sent us here to do. And I have probably lost many more times than I have won, but I have been satisfied in the times that I have lost that I was able to make my argument, put it to the will of the body, and it was either accepted or rejected. That is how people, schoolchildren all over America, expect us to behave. That is the way our Constitution is written. That is what this body is supposed to be about.

So when we have a—by the way, Madam President, this is the last time I am going to come to the floor on this exercise because it is obviously a fruitless kind of effort until something changes, and obviously that is not going to happen in the short term.

My friends will be saying they are Reagan Republicans, they are Reagan Republicans. Well, I was here when Ronald Reagan was President of the United States. President Reagan, rightly or wrongly, passed amnesty for 3 million people who were in this country illegally. Ronald Reagan sat down with Tip O'Neill, and they saved Social Security from bankruptcy. Ronald Reagan sat down with the Democrats, and they agreed on ways of increasing revenues and cutting spending. Ronald Reagan's record is very clear, and by the way, it was one of an assertive role of the United States of America and leadership in the world and not come home to ''fortress America.'' So sometimes when I hear my colleagues here talk about how they are Ronald Reagan Republicans, I do not think Ronald Reagan would have disagreed that we should have a budget, we should have a budget to guide the legislative agenda of the Congress of the United States.

So, as I said, I will not be coming back to the floor again while my colleagues object. And I see my colleague from Utah who was so unfamiliar with what we do here that he claimed it was behind closed doors in back rooms. The fact is that the budget conference is on C–SPAN and open to all.

So I can just say to my colleagues that this is not a proud moment for me, as we block a process that was agreed to and enacted for many, many years; was not enacted for 4 years over the strenuous objections of myself and my colleagues that we did not enact a budget. We enacted a budget after an all-night marathon of vote after vote after vote on literally any issue, and there was not a single vote proposed by my colleagues here that said that we cannot agree to a lifting of the debt limit. Now, the floor was open for that amendment, and I do not know why my colleagues now view this as the criteria for us moving forward on the bill. So I wish them luck, and I will not be coming to the floor again to object to their objection, and we will let the American people make a judgment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Arizona for his very heartfelt remarks. I know he and I do not agree on a lot, but we do agree that we want this country to work because the alternative is not great. The way for this country to work is for us to come together with our differences of opinion and move forward, and that is what the conference committee is all about.

So, Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 33, H. Con. Res. 25; that the amendment which is at the desk, the text of S. Con. Res. 8, the budget resolution passed by the Senate, be inserted in lieu thereof; that H. Con. Res. 25, as amended, be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate; that following the authorization, two motions to instruct conferees be in order from each side: motion to instruct relative to the debt limit and motion to instruct relative to taxes and revenue; that there be 2 hours of debate equally divided between the two leaders or their designees prior to votes in relation to the motions; further, that no amendments be in order to either of the motions prior to the votes, all of the above occurring with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, reserving the right to object, first, I want to thank the Senator from Arizona for protecting my right to object in my absence before I made it to the floor.

Just to set the record straight, I do not think that we object to moving to a budget conference; we object to moving to a budget conference and having the debt limit raised within that conference. So I would ask the Senator if she would consider adding a unanimous consent agreement and that she modify her request so that it not be in order for the Senate to consider a conference report that includes reconciliation instructions to raise the debt limit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, if the Senator heard my request, I said we would consider a motion to instruct relative to the debt limit as part of our agreement to move to conference. So the Senator would be allowed to make his voice heard at that time. I would object to making it a requirement without a vote of the Senate that says the majority agrees with that. So I would object to his amendment and again ask for unanimous consent on the original request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The majority leader.

PROVIDING FOR USE OF THE CATAFALQUE

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to S. Con. Res. 18.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18) providing for the use of the catafalque situated in Exhibition Hall of the Capitol Visitor Center in connection with memorial services to be conducted in the United States Senate Chamber for the Honorable Frank R. Lautenberg, late a Senator from the State of New Jersey.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the concurrent resolution be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

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

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18) was agreed to.

(The concurrent resolution is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions''.)

MEMORIAL OBSERVANCES OF THE HONORABLE FRANK R. LAUTENBERG

Mr. REID. Madam President, I now ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 160.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 160) relative to the memorial observances of the Honorable Frank R. Lautenberg, late a Senator from the State of New Jersey.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to