

wholly irresponsible approach and Congress and the administration must enact fiscally responsible policies that strengthen the middle class by creating jobs, growing the economy and cutting the red tape that continues to hamper the private sector.

#### BUDGET ACT SECTION 114(c)

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I rise to enter into a colloquy with the Senator from Ohio, Mr. PORTMAN, to discuss section 114(c) of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013, which establishes a deficit-neutral reserve fund to replace sequestration.

Before I turn to Senator PORTMAN for his questions, I would like to note that the Senate has relied on reserve funds for nearly 30 years to help it carry out its priorities as part of the annual budget process. In fact, during debate on the 2014 budget resolution, the Senate considered or filed over 300 reserve funds. These included multiple amendments from Members of both parties to create new reserve funds. This particular reserve fund, section 114(c), was included and voted on as part of both the Senate Budget Committee-reported resolution and the Senate-passed budget resolution.

I would now like to turn to my colleague for his questions.

Mr. PORTMAN. I would like to thank the chairman of the Budget Committee for the opportunity to engage in this colloquy with her. As I understand it, the intent of the reserve fund under section 114(c) is to be available to adjust certain budgetary levels for deficit-neutral legislation that would replace sequestration. Do I have that correct?

Mrs. MURRAY. Yes, the bipartisan budget agreement reached between the House and Senate replaces some of the sequester cuts that otherwise would occur in 2014 and 2015. By avoiding sequestration and reaching agreement on bipartisan funding levels for 2014 and 2015, this agreement will provide relief to our families, servicemembers, and the economy. Sequestration, however, continues to remain in place, unmodified, for fiscal years 2016 through 2021. Assuming legislation met the necessary requirements specified in section 114(c), this reserve fund would be available to further address the harmful effects of sequestration.

Mr. PORTMAN. I thank the chairman for her response. There is a concern that the reserve fund in section 114(c) could deprive the minority of an opportunity to require 60 votes for legislation that would modify the statutory limits on discretionary spending and pay for some or all of that cost with new revenue. Is that concern accurate?

Mrs. MURRAY. I thank the Senator for his question. No, that concern is not accurate. While a useful tool to help the Senate carry out its priorities under the budget process, a reserve fund is limited in what it allows me to

do, in my capacity as chairman of the Budget Committee. In general, for legislation that meets the required criteria, reserve funds allow me to revise the levels adopted in a budget resolution and enforced in the Senate, such as committee allocations and the budgetary aggregates.

A reserve fund, however, does not have any impact on the standing rules of the Senate, including the cloture process and the need for 60 votes to end debate. Nothing in the Bipartisan Budget Act would change that process.

A reserve fund also does not waive budget points of order. I can use a reserve fund to revise the committee allocations and budgetary aggregates, such that legislation that meets the criteria of the reserve fund, including deficit neutrality, can be brought into compliance with the allocations and aggregates. But, it does not allow me to waive budget points of order that still may lie against the legislation following the reserve fund adjustment. Budget points of order generally can only be waived by unanimous consent or with 60 votes. Nothing in the Bipartisan Budget Act would change that.

Further, the Senator from Ohio proposed the specific hypothetical example of legislation that would increase the statutory limits on discretionary spending and offset some or all of those costs with new revenue. Recognizing this is a hypothetical scenario, I believe in that situation the legislation would be subject to a 60-vote point of order for violating section 306 of the Congressional Budget Act, which creates a point of order against legislation dealing with matters within the jurisdiction of the Budget Committee that has not been reported out of the Budget Committee. Ultimately, the Parliamentarian of the Senate determines whether points of order under section 306 lie against legislation, but legislation to alter the statutory limits in discretionary spending has historically been within the jurisdiction of the Budget Committee. A reserve fund would have no impact on a section 306 point of order and nothing in the Bipartisan Budget Act would change that.

In addition, legislation increasing the statutory caps on discretionary spending above the existing levels, as the Senator from Ohio outlines in his question, would also violate section 312(b) of the Congressional Budget Act, which prohibits consideration of legislation that would exceed any of the statutory limits on discretionary spending. The reserve fund in 114(c), like other reserve funds, deals only with Senate enforcement and would have no impact on that point of order. Again, nothing in the Bipartisan Budget Act would change that.

Finally, I would suggest to my colleague that legislation originating in the Senate rather than in the House of Representatives that raises revenue would likely be subject to a "blue slip" and returned back to the Senate by the

House of Representatives. Again, nothing in the Bipartisan Budget Act would change that process.

Mr. PORTMAN. I thank the Chairman for her answer. I understand that we were discussing a hypothetical example. I thank her for engaging with me in this colloquy.

#### VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, last night, due to airline flight delays in South Dakota and Minneapolis, I missed the roll call vote on the confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 452, Janet L. Yellen, of California, to be Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of 4 years. Had I been present for this vote, I would have voted no.

Madam President, last night, due to airline flight delays in South Dakota and Minneapolis, I missed the roll call cloture vote on the motion to proceed to S. 1845. Had I been present for this vote, I would have voted no.

#### U.S. CADET NURSE CORPS

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, today I wish to recognize the women of the U.S. Cadet Nurse Corps. Approximately 125,000 American women served as Corps members during World War II, providing comfort and care at hospitals across the country, including in New Hampshire. Most of the former Corps members are now in their eighties, and it is incumbent upon us to ensure that the lessons of their service are remembered for the benefit of future generations.

In March of 1943, Congresswoman Frances P. Bolton of Ohio, a strong believer in the power of nurses in the healing process, introduced legislation to ensure that the supply of nurses in the United States would be large enough to meet the increasing demands of the war effort, especially as large numbers of experienced nurses left the country to serve overseas. The Bolton Act promised a free nursing education in exchange for a commitment to serve in the Cadet Nurse Corps for the duration of the war.

Driven by the immediate need for more nurses, Corps members worked overtime to finish their studies within a compressed study schedule and began to perform nursing duties even before they had formally graduated. This on-the-job training ensured that civilians and recovering servicemembers continued to receive necessary medical care even as much of the medical community was focused on the war front.

Members of the U.S. Cadet Nurse Corps took an oath to dedicate themselves to the triumph of life over death at a time when this perpetual struggle took on previously unseen dimensions. Like many of the American soldiers fighting overseas, these women were predominantly young, recent high school graduates who, when confronted with the call to serve their country,

answered unhesitatingly and in large numbers.

I ask my colleagues in the Senate to join me in thanking all former Cadet Nurse Corps members for their service to the country and for their the selfless commitment to the nursing profession.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

#### PROPOSED AGREEMENT FOR CO-OPERATION BETWEEN THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE IN TAIWAN (AIT) AND THE TAIPEI ECONOMIC AND CULTURAL REPRESENTATIVE OFFICE IN THE UNITED STATES (TECRO) CONCERNING PEACEFUL USES OF NUCLEAR ENERGY—PM 26

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress, pursuant to sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2153(b), (d)) (the "Act"), the text of a proposed Agreement for Cooperation Between the American Institute in Taiwan (AIT) and the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States (TECRO) Concerning Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy (the "Agreement"). I am also pleased to transmit my written approval, authorization, and determination concerning the Agreement, and an unclassified Nuclear Proliferation Assessment Statement (NPAS) concerning the Agreement. (In accordance with section 123 of the Act, as amended by title XII of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-277), a classified annex to the NPAS, prepared by the Secretary of State in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, summarizing relevant classified information, will be submitted to the Congress separately.) The joint memorandum submitted to me by the Secretaries of State and Energy and a letter from the Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) stating the views of the Commission are also enclosed. An addendum to

the NPAS containing a comprehensive analysis of the export control system of Taiwan with respect to nuclear-related matters, including interactions with other countries of proliferation concern and the actual or suspected nuclear, dual-use, or missile-related transfers to such countries, pursuant to section 102A of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 403-1), as amended, is being submitted separately by the Director of National Intelligence.

The proposed Agreement has been negotiated in accordance with the Act and other applicable law. In my judgment, it meets all applicable statutory requirements and will advance the nonproliferation and other foreign policy interests of the United States.

The proposed Agreement provides a comprehensive framework for peaceful nuclear cooperation with the authorities on Taiwan based on a mutual commitment to nuclear nonproliferation. The proposed Agreement has an indefinite term from the date of its entry-into-force, unless terminated by either party on 1 year's written notice. The proposed Agreement permits the transfer of information, material, equipment (including reactors), and components for nuclear research and nuclear power production. The Agreement also specifies cooperation shall be in accordance with the provisions of the Agreement and applicable legal obligations, including, as appropriate, treaties, international agreements, domestic laws, regulations, and/or licensing requirements (such as those imposed by the NRC in accordance with 10 CFR 110 and the Department of Energy in accordance with 10 CFR 810). It does not permit transfers of Restricted Data, sensitive nuclear technology and facilities, or major critical components of such facilities. The proposed Agreement also prohibits the possession of sensitive nuclear facilities and any engagement in activities involving sensitive nuclear technology in the territory of the authorities represented by TECRO. In the event of termination of the proposed Agreement, key nonproliferation conditions and controls continue with respect to material, equipment, and components subject to the proposed Agreement.

Over the last two decades, the authorities on Taiwan have established a reliable record on nonproliferation and on commitments to nonproliferation. While the political status of the authorities on Taiwan prevents them from formally acceding to multilateral nonproliferation treaties or agreements, the authorities on Taiwan have voluntarily assumed commitments to adhere to the provisions of multilateral treaties and initiatives. The Republic of China ratified the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) in 1970 and ratified the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction (the

"Biological Weapons Convention" or "BWC") in 1972. The authorities on Taiwan have stated that they will continue to abide by the obligations of the NPT (i.e., those of a non-nuclear-weapon state) and the BWC, and the United States regards them as bound by both treaties. The authorities on Taiwan follow International Atomic Energy Agency standards and directives in their nuclear program, work closely with U.S. civilian nuclear authorities, and have established relationships with mainland Chinese civilian authorities with respect to nuclear safety. A more detailed discussion of the domestic civil nuclear activities and nuclear nonproliferation policies and practices of the authorities on Taiwan, including their nuclear export policies and practices, is provided in the NPAS and in a classified annex to the NPAS submitted separately. As noted above, an addendum to the NPAS containing a comprehensive analysis of the export control system of the authorities on Taiwan with respect to nuclear-related matters is being submitted to you separately by the Director of National Intelligence.

I have considered the views and recommendations of the interested agencies in reviewing the proposed Agreement and have determined that its performance will promote, and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to, the common defense and security. Accordingly, I have approved the Agreement and authorized its execution and urge the Congress to give it favorable consideration.

This transmission shall constitute a submittal for purposes of both sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Act. My Administration is prepared to begin immediately the consultations with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee as provided in section 123 b. Upon completion of the 30 days of continuous session review provided for in section 123 b., the 60 days of continuous session review provided for in section 123 d. shall commence.

BARACK OBAMA.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, January 7, 2014.

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 1896. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the new markets tax credit and provide designated allocations for areas impacted by a decline in manufacturing; to the Committee on Finance.

#### SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. ALEXANDER,