United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JULY 11, 2013 *No. 99*

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MEADOWS).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 11, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MARK MEADOWS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

Reverend Dr. Paul Binion II, Westside Church of God, Fresno, California, offered the following prayer:

Our Father and Strong God, for this day, and the privileges and opportunities it brings, we say thank You.

May this day not be typical or ordinary in any way, but one that will long be remembered because of what shall transpire in this House: decisions settled, issues resolved, progress made, partisanship minimized, and personal agendas set aside for the good of our constituency.

God, we acknowledge our need of You and Your wisdom and guidance.

Keep us mindful that we serve a people, community, and world that is looking and depending on us to do always what is best for them.

And may we live always cognizant of what You expect from us today, and that is, to do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with You. This we ask in the name of Jesus Christ.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WITTMAN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING PASTOR PAUL BINION II

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, since 1977, Pastor Paul Binion has stood at the helm of one of Fresno's most vibrant churches, the Westside Church of God, and the wonderful congregation that he serves. From offering comfort to families during challenging times, to taking the lead on issues impacting the economically disadvantaged in our area, Pastor Binion has truly left a mark and continues to in our community.

He has urged his congregation to go beyond just knowing the Gospel, but to living them by performing good works for those in need.

Over the nearly 10 years that I've known Paul, I know that he cares. He has overseen efforts to foster interfaith and interchurch dialogue by serving at the head of the West Fresno Ministerial Alliance because he knows that our faith communities have much more in common than whatever divides them.

I'm proud to call Pastor Binion my friend and thank him for his wise words this morning.

Paul, thank you for joining us today to remind us that service, the service that we all involve ourselves with daily on behalf of our constituents, is the highest calling, and must remain the center of our work.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain five further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FURLOUGHS

(Mr. WITTMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, instead of combating terrorism or working to support our troops deployed around the globe, civilian workers across the country are, instead, spending 20 percent of their workweek on a forced furlough.

Furloughed workers face personal and professional challenges, lost income and less time to get the same amount of work done.

From the Associated Press:

Civilian employees, ranging from top-level policy advisers to school teachers and depot workers, will not be answering their phones or responding to emails for 1 day a week.

There is no doubt those who wish harm upon the United States are pleased with these cuts. The administration had flexibility to make other choices and avoid furloughs.

Further, this unfortunate choice may not be over on September 30. Yesterday, Secretary Hagel suggested furloughs may continue under certain circumstances.

Compounding budget cuts are devastating military readiness. I urge the administration to make better choices and for the Congress to work the will of the American people and support our Nation's defense to the fullest.

THE IMPACT OF FURLOUGHS AND SEQUESTRATION

(Mrs. BUSTOS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak out once again against the sequestration-caused furloughs that are punishing workers whom I represent in Illinois.

Sequestration cuts were designed to be so painful and terrible that they would never even take place, but this week they will begin unnecessarily hurting working families across the country. I have repeatedly called on the Defense Department to use the flexibility that Congress gave it, without resorting to furloughs.

As I travel around my district of Illinois, I hear story after story of families who are impacted by these cuts: people like Tom and Michelle Vetter, who both work at the Rock Island Arsenal, and will see a 30 percent cut in their expected income. They now fear being able to pay their mortgage and even sending their son to college;

And people like Darlene Nimmers, who has worked at the Rock Island Arsenal for more than three decades, who now worries about having to put off her well-deserved retirement.

We need to get our fiscal house in order; there's no doubt about that. But it should not be at the expense and the jobs of our hardworking citizens and their ability to support their families.

Please let's come together to cut spending without harming our Nation's economy and our workers.

MR. PRESIDENT, GOVERNMENT DOESN'T KNOW BEST

(Mr. WALBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, the President's decision last week to delay ObamaCare's employer mandate underscored how this law is far too complicated and expensive. Worse yet, it fails Michigan families and businesses.

While this will certainly help our job creators in the short term, without a delay or, better yet, a repeal of the individual mandate, the administration deliberately chose to leave the American people out in the cold. This delay creates even more confusion for Michigan families who are wondering if they will lose their current coverage, be forced into choosing different providers, or be burdened with new high costs.

It becomes clearer and clearer that, without repeal, this law will continue to destroy jobs and slow down our economy. Instead, we need to return to patient-centered care and not the government-knows-best health care system.

I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues in the House to revive our economy, create jobs, and put people first so they can make their own health care decisions.

SHAME ON THE REPUBLICAN MAJORITY

(Mr. BUTTERFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, shame on the Republican majority. Shame on you.

The Rules Committee met last night and is sending us a rule today that has attached to it a bill that we have not seen and have not been able to read. They call it the farm bill. But it appears that, in this farm bill, they have stripped away the nutrition title from the bill.

Mr. Speaker, for years and years we have combined nutrition assistance with support for farmers and ranchers, but this is a rush job. Democrats and the Congressional Black Caucus are appalled that the Republicans are determined to defund food stamps and place vulnerable Americans in a position of not being able to feed their families.

Shame on you. You have removed food stamps, the SNAP program, from this legislation. I don't know where it's going to go. It looks like it's going to die a slow death. It is despicable.

What is it about poor people that you don't like? What is it? Tell us today.

What is it about poor people that you don't like and you don't want to feed their families?

I have the fourth poorest district in the Nation. We do not like it.

OBAMACARE

(Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. Nervous, concerned, complex, train wreck, Third World experience. These are the words used by the Democratic authors of ObamaCare to describe their very own creation.

Mr. Speaker, these aren't new concerns. These are concerns shared by families and businesses across the Nation ever since then-Speaker NANCY PELOSI rushed the bill through Congress so we could ''see what's in it.''

Now that the Democrats and the President can see what's in it, they don't like it either.

As a business owner and job creator of over 42 years, I know businesses can no longer hire or take risks that would grow the economy.

The President's 1-year delay of the employer mandate isn't what businesses or the economy needs. This only delays the meltdown that this complex government overhaul will cause. Business owners, parents, young professionals, senior citizens—all Americans deserve protection from this law and its mandates, its skyrocketing premiums, and its rapidly shrinking selection of coverage plans, not for 1 year, but permanently.

Let's fully repeal the nightmare of ObamaCare. It doesn't work, and it won't work.

SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM AND THE FARM BILL

(Ms. WILSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, SNAP, food stamps, however you phrase it, is fundamental to the nutrition that will supplement millions of Americans: Blacks, Whites, feeble seniors, struggling mothers, disabled veterans, and hungry children.

Mr. Speaker, it was reported to me that there are seniors in my district who eat dog food when their food stamps run out. I was appalled and went to see for myself, and I was dumbfounded. I fixed the situation, but I'm sure that somewhere in America today some poor soul is relying on dog food to take them through the month.

Mr. Speaker, please do not hurt or destroy what is a mainstay in the lives of so many Americans who are just trying to get by. Do not remove nutrition, including the food stamp program, from the farm bill. It's wrong, it's punitive, and it's cruel.

□ 0915

ALL CHILDREN ARE EQUAL ACT

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to inform my colleagues of an important piece of bipartisan legislation that will be introduced later today called the All Children Are Equal Act, or ACE Act. The ACE Act corrects a gross inequity in the way funding formulas are calculated under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Title I was designed to improve the achievement of disadvantaged children.

In order to allocate more funding per title I student to local education agencies, or LEAs, with higher concentrations of poverty, the funding formula weighs the count of eligible students in an LEA. However, the formulas have the perverse effect of directing funds away from all smaller school districts, both urban and rural, towards larger LEAs, regardless of the poverty rate. The ACE Act would gradually decrease the effects of number weighting and return the focus to areas with the highest concentration of poverty, as originally intended under the law.

Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to have Representative SLAUGHTER of New York join me in introducing this important bill. I encourage my colleagues to join us in correcting this fundamental injustice.

STAND FOR SNAP

(Mrs. BEATTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BEATTY. I stand here today in dismay and in disgust. I stand here on this same floor where we have the words, ''In God we trust,'' where we say the Pledge of Allegiance, where my Republican colleagues dare come to this podium and use words like ''train wreck'' and ''work in a bipartisan fashion'' in the same minute, and then today we are confronted with removing SNAP dollars from the farm bill.

I came here to work on a compromise. Members of this great Congressional Black Caucus and Democratic Caucus stand together because we want America to know that we stand for poor families: Black, White, urban, suburban, and, yes, rural.

We ask you to take note today, Mr. Speaker, that Republicans dare come to this floor and tell us that we want to serve the people. Aren't our children, our mothers, and families part of the people? Yes.

We stand for SNAP.

REPEAL OBAMACARE

(Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, last week, the President quietly decided to delay a major part of what many media pundits consider his crowning achievement: ObamaCare. The President is telling businesses that they will be given a year reprieve from complying with ObamaCare's onerous and costly employer mandate. The President is once again picking which laws his administration enforces and which ones he chooses not to. He's also picking winners and losers again. Employers will have another year to comply with the employer mandate, but President Obama has decided that individuals—the middle class—will not be given more time to comply with the individual mandate.

Meanwhile, the economy continues to limp along with businesses, large and small, afraid to hire more workers because the cost of doing business continues to go up without a clear end in sight. High taxes, enormous tax burdens, and the specter of ObamaCare continue to hang over them like a storm cloud. For the good of our Nation, ObamaCare must be repealed and replaced.

INCLUDE NUTRITION ASSISTANCE IN THE FARM BILL

(Ms. SEWELL of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express great disappointment in my Republican colleagues for bringing a version of the farm bill that does not include nutrition assistance.

When I joined this great, august body, I was a member of the Agriculture Committee. The Agriculture Committee, time and time again, reauthorized the farm bill. Bipartisanship was always the hallmark. And this is not the hallmark of what we as Americans stand for.

Our minister today just stood up here with us in prayer and said that we would walk justly, that we would do and love mercifully, and that we would be humbled before God. If we are to truly have those words mean something in America, we must take care of our working families, our needy families, our children, in addition to our farmers.

The farmers that I represent in Alabama do not want a farm bill that does not include nutrition assistance. We cannot provide government subsidies to farmers without providing government assistance to people in poverty. It is not what we as Americans stand for.

If we have no further business in this august body this week, we should go home.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 125, nays 260, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 346]

YEAS—125

Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Clarke
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Costa
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kirkpatrick
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maloney, Carolyn
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Miller, George
Moore
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Schakowsky
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Wilson (FL)

NAYS—260

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Conyers
Cook
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Enyart
Esty
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Honda
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Keating
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson

Owens	Rokita	Terry
Palazzo	Ros-Lehtinen	Thompson (CA)
Pascrell	Roskam	Thompson (PA)
Pastor (AZ)	Ross	Thornberry
Paulsen	Rothfus	Tiberi
Pearce	Royce	Tierney
Perry	Runyan	Tipton
Peters (CA)	Ryan (WI)	Tonko
Peters (MI)	Salmon	Turner
Petri	Sanford	Upton
Pittenger	Scalise	Valadao
Pitts	Schneider	Vela
Poe (TX)	Schock	Wagner
Pompeo	Schweikert	Walberg
Price (GA)	Scott, Austin	Walden
Radel	Sensenbrenner	Walorski
Rahall	Sessions	Weber (TX)
Rangel	Sherman	Welch
Reed	Shuster	Wenstrup
Reichert	Simpson	Westmoreland
Renacci	Sinema	Williams
Ribble	Smith (MO)	Wilson (SC)
Rice (SC)	Smith (NE)	Wittman
Rigell	Smith (TX)	Wolf
Roby	Southerland	Womack
Roe (TN)	Stewart	Woodall
Rogers (AL)	Stivers	Yarmuth
Rogers (KY)	Stockman	Yoder
Rohrabacher	Stutzman	Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—49

Barton	Horsford	Rooney
Bonner	Hunter	Ryan (OH)
Campbell	Jeffries	Sanchez, Loretta
Clay	Kaptur	Sarbanes
Culberson	Kinzinger (IL)	Schiff
DeGette	Langevin	Shimkus
Deutch	Larsen (WA)	Smith (NJ)
Diaz-Balart	Maffei	Titus
Dingell	Markey	Visclosky
Ellmers	Massie	Waxman
Farr	McCarthy (NY)	Webster (FL)
Gallego	Messer	Whitfield
Graves (MO)	Murphy (FL)	Yoho
Grimm	Nadler	Young (AK)
Herrera Beutler	Negrete McLeod	Young (FL)
Hinojosa	Posey	
Holt	Rogers (MI)	

□ 0945

Messrs. HALL, LUCAS and MCINTYRE, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Messrs. GARCIA and KILMER changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. POLIS, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Messrs. DEFAZIO, CROWLEY, MCDERMOTT, and FATTAH changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 346, had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 346, had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

Stated against:

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 346, had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 346, had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2642, FEDERAL AGRICULTURE REFORM AND RISK MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2013

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 295 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 295

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2642) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Worcester, Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 295 provides for a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 2642. However, I think it is important to recognize that while the rule before us today is closed, this legislation, exactly the legislation, has gone through an amendment process on this floor, was debated—just a few weeks ago—debated, discussed, and voted on. The amendments which were agreed to as a result of that process are in this underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today is the exact same language that this body considered in June with two important considerations and exceptions. Unlike last month, this legislation contains a repeal of the 1949 backstop, which means that in the farm bill we will do away with that 1949 law as the backstop to the farm products and legislation. However, it does not include the nutrition programs from the previous bill. We will hear that today.

On the other hand, however, this bill does include the exact same language as the previous bill, including adopted amendments.

Since the House considered a farm bill last month, there has been a great deal of and many conversations, including today with Members, that have raised significant concerns with the language as it was previously drafted. The chief concern was the inclusion of a nutrition policy in the agriculture bill.

Therefore, after careful consideration of all aspects of the issue, the decision was made to consider nutrition and agriculture policy separately. However, I want to be clear: removing the nutrition provisions from this legislation in no way seeks to marginalize the importance of the nutrition programs, nor in any effort are we trying to avoid their reauthorization. Anything that would be said on this floor contrary to that simply would not be true.

I think you would be hard-pressed to find any Member, Republican or Democrat, who does not think that these programs are vitally important, in particular, to women and children. They simply will be considered separately and not in this bill.

Now, the practicality to this, Mr. Speaker, is and was discussed last night in the Rules Committee, that is, that if it is not in this title, and it is not, and if the House does not move forward on a nutrition or SNAP program, then all of these items still go to conference with the United States Senate, and it is contained within the Senate bill and would be fully operational, debatable, and decisions can be made in that conference. In that conference, it is fully authorized and the House would simply not have taken a position.

To assume or to say that we are trying to move a bill without nutrition and to take things away would not be truthful. To say that we would show up at conference without a position of the House of Representatives would be truthful.

Republicans and Democrats, including leadership of both parties, understand and recognize that nutrition and nutrition programs are an essential part of not just government services, but an essential part of a civilization that we agree with as part of the programs from the United States Government. So in no way, in no way, is this intended to be a trick or to be seen that we would not believe, or would believe, that we would show up to do anything to the nutrition program.

It would be stated that the House would show up without a position on those issues, which would mean in reality that the current law would prevail. The House would show up with no position to change any of these items related to food stamps, and thus it would stay as is. So for someone to suggest that Republicans are not going to be supportive of the nutrition programs would simply not, in my opinion, be fairly spoken of.

The House will have an opportunity, however, once we get this done, to move forward a bill that if a decision was made could move to conference.

Today's legislation is an important step in making sure that the agriculture programs provide the American farmers with innovative risk-management tools and so many other things that have been placed in this bill on a bipartisan basis as a result of the work that began with then-Democrat Chairman COLLIN PETERSON when the bill began its writing process and now has

continued on a bipartisan basis with the gentleman, Mr. LUCAS, the chairman of the committee. That is what we are trying to present today.

The bill which we are presenting today has every consideration that I believe is necessary and important about why this House should move forward and support this legislation. Legislation is commonsense, fiscally responsible; and it is a solution to answers that are in the marketplace.

I urge my colleagues to understand not only what we have stated today, but which was testimony last night in an agreement in the Rules Committee. I support the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in opposition to the rule which prohibits Members from offering amendments that would protect the children of America from hunger.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise each Member to confine the unanimous-consent request to a simple declarative statement of the Member's attitude toward the measure. Further embellishments will result in a deduction of time from the yielding Member.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in very strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it takes the safety net away from America's poor families.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts' time will be charged.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it hurts America's children.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts' time will be charged.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, your position as you enunciate is when a person says why they are opposed, that that is beyond the boundaries of the clarity that you say one must offer when he or she is in opposition to the rule?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Members must limit their requests to simple declarative statements. Any other embellishment will be charged.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the Speaker has enunciated the rule; a simple declaratory statement. Clearly, Mr. HASTINGS made a simple declaratory statement as to why he was opposed, and it seems to clearly fall within the ambit of the contemplated statement that a Member can make without time being charged. The Chair has, however, articulated the fact that, without objection, the gentleman's time will be charged. If that is subject to an objection, which I think it probably is not, I would object. But I will also appeal the ruling of the Chair if the Chair continues that ruling, and we will have a vote on that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will evaluate each declarative statement individually. The gentleman's point has been made.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the Speaker for his observation, and I would hope that the declaratory statement, similar to the one being made by Mr. HASTINGS, will clearly not, as it historically, in my view, has not done so, count against the time from the gentleman from Massachusetts.

□ 1000

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. LEE of California. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it increases hunger in America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it increases hunger in America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it takes the safety net away from America's poor families.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it hurts the children of America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it hurts America's children.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. I have finally received a copy of the bill. It appears to have no ''nutrition'' title at all. Is this a printing error?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in total opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it hurts America's children.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY) for a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it increases hunger in America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JOHNSON) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because we are the conscience of the Congress. The majority of the people getting food stamps are not African American.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts' time will be charged.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it takes the safety net away from America's poor families.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it hurts the working poor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it takes the safety net away from America's poor families.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it hurts the working poor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in very strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it increases poverty in America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in total and strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it starves America's children.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts' time will be charged.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WILSON) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it hurts the working poor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it takes food from children, and it increases the number of starving children in America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts' time will be charged.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will state her inquiry.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Referring to your previous ruling, one is allowed to give explanation for one's opposition, and those words are to be counted as part of the unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, a Member is allowed to make a simple declarative statement on a unanimous consent request. The Chair is trying to be fair with this.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Will you declare, Mr. Speaker, what the interpretation is for excessiveness?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will judge each statement as to its simple declarative nature.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. In continuing the parliamentary inquiry, is the amount of passion in your voice in opposition to the idea that this bill creates more starving children?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has not stated a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time the Speaker has charged us for these unanimous consent requests thus far?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has been charged 1¼ minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it contributes to hunger in America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it increases hunger in America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will state her inquiry.

Ms. EDWARDS. Is it in order to amend the underlying bill and the rule that currently provides for billions in subsidies to corporate farms while children and families go hungry, school lunch programs are decimated, and Meals on Wheels is taken from the disabled and senior citizens?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. An amendment to the rule could be offered only if its manager yields for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it takes food and nutrition from working families.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will not this day go down as one of the most shameful days in American history?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it takes the safety net away from America's poor children.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it hurts the working poor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it hurts the working poor, and it violates the longstanding partnership between agriculture producers and our Nation's nutrition programs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts' time will be charged.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Isn't it true, Mr. Speaker, that this rule takes and bifurcates the bill that came out of the authorizing committee and separates it into two separate bills in a way that ultimately hurts the working poor of this country?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is not the role of the Chair to interpret the underlying bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield to the gentlelady from California (Ms. WATERS) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it takes the safety net away from America's poor families and takes food out of the mouths of children.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts' time will be charged.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it significantly increases poverty in America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it increases poverty in America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, as chair of the CHC, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in very strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it hurts America's poor children and senior citizens.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts' time will be charged.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. HOYER. I've been listening, as you've observed, to the judgments.

What the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) just did was to state one sentence, but it had an ''and,'' and he gave a second reason he was opposed. The first reason was that it increased poverty, and the second was that it undermined children. That was in the same sentence. It seems there was little substantive difference between the statement that preceded it for which you did not charge time and the statement of the gentleman from the Hispanic Caucus.

I would like to understand the parliamentary difference that the Speaker perceived in those two statements.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, the gentleman engaged in embellishment.

Mr. HOYER. He stated two reasons he was opposed.

Is it the Chair's ruling that only one reason will be allowed to be articulated by a Member who is in opposition to this bill?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman also prefaced his remarks.

Mr. HOYER. He did do that. He explained to the American public, presumably who is watching this, Mr. Speaker, as to the framework from which he was speaking, that of representing a large group of Hispanic Americans, who have a large number of Representatives in this body.

Can he not explain that he is the person from Maryland, for instance, or the person from some other State?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, the gentleman engaged in embellishment.

□ 1015

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it hurts the working poor, it leaves children without food, and it hurts seniors on an everyday basis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts' time will be charged.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOYER. In explaining your answer to the last parliamentary inquiry, you indicated that the problem was that he embellished by introducing himself as chairman of the Hispanic Caucus. The gentleman from New York who just spoke did not do so, but simply articulated three reasons he was opposed to this bill.

It seems to me that that is certainly within the contemplation of the unanimous-consent request. If we start parsing that people can only articulate one reason, I would suggest to our friends, the Parliamentarians, and to the Speaker, that that will establish a precedent which will be very difficult

and subjective for implementation by the Speaker.

I ask the Speaker to perhaps further explain why Mr. MEEKS' objection was charged to Mr. MCGOVERN's time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is drawing the line at a simple declarative statement. Multiple, simple declarative statements constitute debate.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOYER. There was one declarative sentence. It had two commas in it. If we're going to parse this to that extent, I suggest to the Speaker and, frankly, to those who are advising the Speaker, that we're going down a road which is very dangerous.

Clearly, if there was an extended time, one could understand that. But adding two very short parenthetical phrases is, I think, Mr. Speaker, inconsistent with your previous rulings as to when you would not charge the time against Mr. MCGOVERN.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I understood that when Mr. HINOJOSA introduced himself as representing all of the Hispanic Caucus, when he objected to the underlying bill, that that might be perceived as a greater explanation than the Speaker would think warranted. But Mr. MEEKS' statement, following that immediately, was a simple declarative statement with two parenthetical phrases, not long in nature, explaining why he was objecting. It seems to me that's consistent with the rules and the position of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will continue to evaluate each individual declarative statement and make the judgment with regards to embellishment according to the previously announced standard.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time has been charged against us for these unanimous consent requests thus far?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has been charged 2 minutes total.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may state his inquiry.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Would it be in order for me to ask unanimous consent that the time that has been charged against us be restored?

Mr. SESSIONS. I object to that.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry. I didn't make the request yet.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may make his request.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I ask unanimous consent that the time charged against us be restored given the fact that we are operating under a closed rule on a very important piece of legislation where a lot of Members would like to be heard.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. SESSIONS. There is objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it violates a decade-old principle uniting urban and rural interests together in feeding hungry people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts' time will be charged.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in very strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because veterans in my district, children and patriotic families all across America are hungry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) for a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it increases hunger of our constituents throughout this great country of ours.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to this mean-spirited farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it takes food nutrition from those most vulnerable among us, our children.

Is this what compassionate conservatism is all about?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts' time will be charged.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it increases hunger not only in my congressional district but hunger in all congressional districts in America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it increases hunger in America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) for a unanimous consent request.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, is it the ruling of the Chair that if in stating my request for unanimous consent I state a single reason, it is not charged to the time of the gentleman from Massachusetts; if I state several reasons in the same sentence because I've cited multiple reasons for requesting unanimous consent, that it is charged, assuming I do it dispassionately, quietly?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not respond to hypotheticals.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it increases hunger in America, hurts seniors, and hurts the working poor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts' time will be charged.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it hurts the working poor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr.

CLEAVER) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because, Mr. Speaker, there is a five-decade symbiosis between urban America and the farm community.

I rarely come to this well for a lot of reasons—most of them are negative—because I didn't come to Congress to make an enemy. I came here to make a difference.

I'm not here, Mr. Speaker, trying to put politics above productive policy; ideology above the injured. I'm not here to form a division, but inclusion. I'm not here because I believe in capitulation, but in compromise.

I believe that this bill is doing enormous damage not only to the body politic, but to this Nation, and we, the elected leaders of the United States Congress—this is not some little club. We are the Congress of the United States of America, the most powerful Nation on this planet. We can take care of all of the people.

There are poor children in rural areas that I represent, and I will never turn my back on them and I will never turn my back on children in the urban core.

Mr. Speaker, I object to this bill because this bill is not just going to create tension among us but the people of this country who depend on us. They depend on us. It is not like they can go to an alternative body to redress their concerns. If we are about anything, it is about trying to take care of these people. That's why we're here.

I suffer from vertigo. The only way I can stop from wiggling around and fainting when I get dizzy with vertigo is to keep my eyes on something that doesn't move. I get frustrated and dizzy being in this body, and the only way I can stand up is to keep my eyes on something that doesn't move. And the thing that does not move are the people of the United States, particularly those who are hurting. They don't move. My mind is going to stay right there on people who don't move: the hurt, the wounded—even the will to be an American. We've got to make sure that we take care of everybody in this country, Mr. Speaker.

I will not, I shall not, I cannot be silent as we continue to divide the Nation, and then we think we're doing something good because we're able to say something nasty to somebody. The people of this country deserve better. We deserve better.

I've never attacked people on the basis of their party or their ideology, and I won't do it. I will not do it. But I will not abandon what's right. I will not abandon the things that I keep my eyes on. I will not support this bill.

There are people in rural counties that I represent where Saline County, Missouri, a rural county, has greater poverty than Jackson County, where Kansas City sits.

This is not about trying to destroy some kind of system that we put in place to protect the rural areas. I'm concerned about the rural areas. I was born in Waxahachie, Texas.

My daddy sent my mother to college when I was in the eighth grade. I had never lived in a house with indoor plumbing until I was almost 8 years old. I lived in public housing. My daddy struggled. With a little help, my daddy sent four children through college. We moved out of public housing. My daddy lives in his own house right now in Wichita Falls, Texas.

All people are asking for, in some cases, is just a little help. Who can they turn to? I hope, I actually even pray, that it's the United States Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts' time will be charged.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RANGEL. Were the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri charged to the debate as it relates to the rule?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. RANGEL. And how long was that?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts' time was charged 4½ minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MCGOVERN. So 4½ minutes total for all of the unanimous consent requests?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts was charged 7¼ minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. So 7¼ minutes have been charged to us for unanimous consent requests, notwithstanding the fact that we have a closed rule. I think everybody stayed within the limit maybe with a little bit of an exception.

I ask unanimous consent that our time be reinstated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. SESSIONS. There is objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There is no ruling before the House at this time.

□ 1030

Mr. HOYER. Parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order to move a motion that the time not be charged to Mr. MCGOVERN as the representative, the ranking member, of the Rules Committee, that a motion be in order that we could vote on? Would that be in order, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is not an appropriate motion.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOYER. I am reluctant to move something that the Speaker has advised is not available to us. On the other hand, this is an issue, under my parliamentary inquiry, I would ask my friend, the chairman of the Rules Committee, if he might reconsider his objection.

There are very strong feelings on this bill. This bill was not noted for consideration until last night. This bill comes to the floor with less than 12 hours' preparation; and while I understand the gentleman's view, it would seem not so much because it is the rule but because it is fair, there are strong, deeply held feelings on this bill, I would urge my friend to withdraw his objection. We're talking about probably 5, 6, 7, 8—I don't how much time Mr. CLEAVER took—minutes, so we could have the full 30 minutes of debate on the rule itself. I would ask my friend if he would consider that.

Mr. SESSIONS. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I object. When I receive the time, I will offer an explanation.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

To the gentleman, the minority whip, I would encourage him to please recognize that his request to me, as my dear friend, Mr. MCGOVERN, as we stated last night in the Rules Committee, I would encourage you to please offer me an opportunity to explain not just the position but what I believe is the intent of what we are attempting to do.

Mr. Speaker, in the vote that was held for the farm bill, 171 Republicans voted for it, 62 Republicans voted against it. For the farm bill, 24 Democrats voted for it, 172 Democrats voted against it. This meant that the farm bill did not pass. It did not pass this body; and as a result of the significance of the underlying legislation of the farm bill that does include provisions related to SNAP, the Republican leadership, up to and including the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Ohio; and the majority leader, the gentleman from Virginia, felt it was very important for this body to, as quickly as we returned, to offer a bill that could be passed. With the hope that it could be passed, an analysis of that bill was done; once again, remembering that only 24 Democrats helped to pass the previous bill.

We are attempting to then separate, bifurcate, offer today a rule and the underlying legislation which hopefully

will pass which would go to conference. And the Senate, because they have passed their own farm bill, has included in provisions where they discuss SNAP. As a result of that, that will be included in their bill on a conference measure.

The House simply at this point, if we pass this part, could go to conference—could go to conference—and would be without resolution, would not have passed an amendment or a piece which would discuss it. So, in essence, my conferees, your conferees, our conferees, that would include the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) as well as Mr. LUCAS from Oklahoma, would go to the conference without resolution from this body. That's all we're talking about. It's fully debatable under the conference. We simply would not have made a decision to change existing law. And the change in existing law would mean that the Senate conferees could stick to their position and hold the cut to $4 billion, and we would not have a position to cut a penny.

I believe that this is an honest attempt to get us to go to—by passing part of the farm bill—to get to conference. And the tactics against that are simply to keep us from going to conference where we would show up with whatever we pass.

Now, if I have overstated this or understated this, I would encourage the minority whip to please engage me in a colloquy at this time, and I would yield to the gentleman on the substance of what I have spoken about to feel free to enlighten me, and for us to work through this very important issue.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend for yielding.

First, let me say that this side of the aisle believes the passage of the farm bill is very, very important. It is important for our agricultural interests, for our farmers. We believe it's very important for those who are relying on nutritional programs and support from us. So we share the view and are strongly in favor of the view of passing a farm bill, number one, I tell my friend.

Secondly, I would tell the gentleman, as he well knows, the farm bill, for the past 2 years, has passed out of the committee with a majority of Democrats, and I think maybe unanimous, but certainly the overwhelming majority of Republicans. It passed out last year as a bipartisan bill. It was not brought to the floor. It was not brought to the floor, as the gentleman recalls, because of the controversies on your side, not our side, of the aisle.

Mr. PETERSON, to whom the gentleman referred and the ranking member of the committee, was in support of the farm bill. In fact, he indicated that he thought there would be sufficient Democrats, with Republicans, to pass the farm bill. Very frankly, as the gentleman articulated, you lost 62 votes on your side of the aisle, notwithstanding the fact that you adopted three amendments during the course of consideration of the farm bill that Mr. PETERSON advised would undercut his ability and the Democrats' ability to support the bill.

Very frankly, I tell my friend that what has happened, the farm bill was a bipartisan bill supported by a majority of the Democrats in the committee, as the gentleman knows, and by the ranking Democrat, Mr. PETERSON. It came to the floor, however, and that bipartisanship was undermined by the amendments that were adopted. I think that was to the knowledge of certainly Mr. LUCAS. I know that Mr. LUCAS knew that it was undermining it.

We now find ourselves in a position—and I understand what the gentleman has said trying to get to conference—where there was little or no discussion, certainly not with me, not with Leader PELOSI, about how we could move forward in creating a greater bipartisan coalition, while clearly recognizing there was opposition in your party and opposition in my party. So the way this could have passed in a constructive way, in my view, would have been had we reached a bipartisan compromise.

Unfortunately, as is too frequently the case, we have seen where we have gone to, in my perspective, an ultrapartisan resolution to try to pass this bill and presumably pick up a number of the 62; and you'll need a substantial number of the 62 because we don't believe, as you can tell, that this is a process that we can support. But it is unfortunate because the gentleman is correct, and I respect the gentleman's observation, it's important that we pass a farm bill. But for over half a century, we have passed a farm bill in a bipartisan fashion with consideration from the nutrition people in our country to make sure that those who are without food and are hungry would have food.

Mr. SESSIONS. Reclaiming my time, and I would encourage the gentleman to still stand.

We are now here at a point on the floor where we are, rightly or wrongly, attempting to be forthright and honest about what is in the bill and what our intents are. I would hope that the gentleman would recognize that what we have carefully done is excluded some extraneous pieces which might mean—excluded the things that would cause the bill to fail and would not allow us, because we come to no decision therein of the House, that we could not pass the final bill.

And what we're trying to do is take this to conference without any decision thereon. That is not an indication of a lack of willingness on the part of the Republican leadership or any of our Republican Members. It simply says we could not come to a decision at this point, and what we're trying to do is to move forward so we can get to conference.

The gentleman, I hope, does recognize that the Senate has spoken. Our conferees would be at the table and simply would not have a position that has been taken by this House. In no way would it mean it couldn't be discussed or could not be done.

So I would encourage the gentleman to understand then current law would prevail. The current law would prevail because we have come to no decision therein.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I urge every single Democrat and Republican to oppose this rule and to oppose this bill. This is a closed rule. Closed. No amendments. Closed.

And contrary to the claims by some, this bill is not identical to the bill we voted on a few weeks ago. The Republican majority has, in fact, dramatically changed this farm bill. This 608-page bill, introduced an hour before the Rules Committee met last night, has several major changes that we know about. I say ''know about'' because we really don't know what's in this bill, and we do not know how some of the changes will affect long-term farm policy.

Something new in this bill is the repeal of the 1949 permanent law. What does that mean? What impact will that language have on future farm policy? Who knows. There hasn't been a single hearing on this language; nor has there been a markup. Nothing. Nothing.

This bill also eliminates the entire nutrition title, which includes more than just food stamps. It includes moneys for food banks, emergency food assistance, and food for our senior citizens. The whole title is gone.

Three weeks ago, the farm bill was defeated because Democrats were strongly opposed to the assault on nutrition programs. And, quite frankly, some right wing Republicans voted ''no'' because they oppose nearly all government programs. Rather than trying to moderate the bill by working with Democrats, rather than compromising, Republican leaders have veered sharply to the right trying to win back the Republican Tea Partyers who voted ''no.'' And the result of all of this is the bill before us.

Now, my question is: What were the right wingers in the Republican conference promised in order to change their votes from ''no'' to ''yes''? What is the backroom deal that they have negotiated with the Republican leadership? How deep of a cut in the SNAP program were they promised?

Now, last night in the Rules Committee we were told there's nothing to worry about; that even though title IV was not included in this legislation, it is still conferenceable if the bill were to go to conference with the Senate. We were told that rather than the $20.5 billion cut to SNAP that was in the House bill, that it was possible we could end up with the Senate-passed $4.5 billion cut, or that we could end up with no cuts at all.

□ 1045

Does anybody believe that either of those two scenarios is likely or even possible—in this Congress?

I have great respect for the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, Mr. LUCAS; but I do not trust this Republican leadership.

I spent a great deal of time on this House floor during the debate on this bill a few weeks ago, and I heard Republican speaker after Republican speaker attack SNAP, attack poor people and diminish their struggle. We had nasty amendment after nasty amendment attached to the bill attacking the nutrition programs that benefit the most vulnerable in America. Some of the rhetoric that was spoken on this floor, quite frankly, was offensive.

And leading up to today's vote, I read with great interest the recent quotes from Republican Members, some who called for sunsetting of the food stamp program, and some who called for deeper cuts in the program.

I just want to say, for the RECORD, to my friend from Texas, the 47 million people who are on SNAP are not extraneous. They are important. They are part of our community, and we should not diminish their struggle.

So let's be clear. This attempt to separate the nutrition title from the rest of the farm bill is all about gutting the nutrition title. It's all about going after Americans who are struggling in poverty. It's all about denying the working poor the right to food.

So when we're asked to trust Republican leaders, to give them the benefit of the doubt, I can't. Trust is something that is earned, and the behavior of this Republican House towards programs that help the working poor, the needy, and the vulnerable has been appalling.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bad bill. This is a bad process. It should be defeated.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I've represented my party and my leadership on the floor today in the most sincere way, with an opportunity for me to discuss with senior members, not just of the Rules Committee, but also of the Democratic leadership. And in no way, in no way, is the Republican Party trying to do anything more in this bill that's on here today other than to bifurcate and to pass pieces of legislation that then can go to conference. But we have to find a way to pass the bill.

I would remind my colleagues that 172 Democrats voted against the bill, then passing it to go to conference, and 171 Republicans voted for the bill and sending it to conference.

The height of, really, the work that we do is to gain a chance to have a product, in this case the farm bill, that can then go to conference. It's not hyperbole. It is an actual event that can happen. Because the Senate has done their work and finished their work, we are trying to do the same.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it's sinful, it increases poverty in America, and it takes the food off the table of American families.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts' time will be charged.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman make a point of order?

Mr. HOYER. I make a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. HOYER. The point of order is that, in fact, consistent with your rulings today, that the gentleman's unanimous consent request was not any different, in substance or in length, than the unanimous consent requests that have been made on a number of occasions, and time was not charged. That is inconsistent. It is a subjective judgment, and I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The decision on how and when a Member will be charged in debate is a matter confined to the discretion of the Chair. However, the question of whether the form of a unanimous consent request is in order under the rules is a proper subject for a ruling from the Chair.

In the opinion of the Chair, it is not in order to embellish a unanimous consent request with debate. Remarks in the form of debate are charged to the Member yielding.

The request by the gentleman from Louisiana contained remarks in the nature of debate. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. HOYER. I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand in the judgment of the House?

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the appeal on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 226, noes 196, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 347]

AYES—226

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—196

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison

Engel	Loebsack	Richmond
Enyart	Lofgren	Roybal-Allard
Eshoo	Lowenthal	Ruiz
Esty	Lowey	Ruppersberger
Farr	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Rush
Fattah	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Ryan (OH)
Foster	Lynch	Sánchez, Linda T.
Frankel (FL)	Maffei	Sanchez, Loretta
Fudge	Maloney, Carolyn	Sarbanes
Gabbard	Maloney, Sean	Schakowsky
Gallego	Markey	Schiff
Garamendi	Matheson	Schneider
Garcia	Matsui	Schrader
Grayson	McCollum	Schwartz
Green, Al	McDermott	Scott (VA)
Green, Gene	McGovern	Scott, David
Grijalva	McIntyre	Serrano
Hahn	McNerney	Sewell (AL)
Hanabusa	Meeks	Shea-Porter
Hastings (FL)	Meng	Sherman
Heck (WA)	Michaud	Sinema
Higgins	Miller, George	Sires
Himes	Moore	Slaughter
Hinojosa	Murphy (FL)	Smith (WA)
Honda	Nadler	Speier
Hoyer	Napolitano	Swalwell (CA)
Huffman	Neal	Takano
Israel	Nolan	Thompson (CA)
Jackson Lee	O'Rourke	Thompson (MS)
Jeffries	Owens	Tierney
Johnson (GA)	Pallone	Titus
Johnson, E. B.	Pascrell	Tonko
Jones	Pastor (AZ)	Tsongas
Kaptur	Payne	Van Hollen
Keating	Pelosi	Vargas
Kelly (IL)	Perlmutter	Veasey
Kennedy	Peters (CA)	Vela
Kildee	Peters (MI)	Velázquez
Kilmer	Peterson	Visclosky
Kind	Pingree (ME)	Walz
Kirkpatrick	Pocan	Wasserman Schultz
Kuster	Polis	Waters
Langevin	Price (NC)	Watt
Larsen (WA)	Quigley	Waxman
Larson (CT)	Rahall	Welch
Lee (CA)	Rangel	Wilson (FL)
Levin	Richmond	Yarmuth
Lewis	Roybal-Allard	
Lipinski	Ruiz	

NOT VOTING—12

Broun (GA)	Horsford	Negrete McLeod
Campbell	Hunter	Rogers (MI)
Gutiérrez	McCarthy (NY)	Schweikert
Holt	Moran	Shimkus

□ 1116

Ms. CHU and Ms. SPEIER changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. PERRY, SMITH of Missouri, GARDNER, WALBERG, GERLACH, SANFORD, WEBSTER of Florida, SMITH of Texas, WOODALL and DENHAM, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I will insert in the RECORD the Statement of Administration Policy opposing this bill.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,

Washington, DC, July 10, 2013.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 2642—FEDERAL AGRICULTURE REFORM AND RISK MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2013

(Rep. Lucas, R–OK)

The Administration strongly opposes H.R. 2642, the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013. Because the 608 page bill was made available only this evening, the Administration has had inadequate time to fully review the text of the bill. It is apparent, though, that the bill does not contain sufficient commodity and crop insurance reforms and does not invest in renewable energy, an important source of jobs and economic growth in rural communities across the country. Legislation as important as a Farm Bill should be constructed in a comprehensive approach that helps strengthen all aspects of the Nation. This bill also fails to reauthorize nutrition programs, which benefit millions of Americans—in rural, suburban and urban areas alike. The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program is a cornerstone of our Nation's food assistance safety net, and should not be left behind as the rest of the Farm Bill advances.

If the President were presented with H.R. 2642, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Rules.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I want everybody who may be watching this or in earshot to understand that when the House of Representatives cannot pass a farm bill, we have reached a new low. The reverence in which we hold our farmers is so strong that the farm bill could almost be a part of the Pledge of Allegiance. I want to point out to you that this is the second time that this House is going to likely not be able to pass a farm bill.

I know I don't have to point out to my constituents on both sides of the aisle that the SNAP program, the nutrition program, the school lunch program, the Meals on Wheels and what we do to feed people in this country is also a farm program because, believe it, people, that's where the food comes from. So when you take those programs away, you also hurt the farmers.

We had a pretty offensive attempt here about 3 weeks ago to defund the program. So I do not trust, I'm sorry to say, the majority with trying to do something about this bill. In fact, I'll make a prediction right now. If they decide to bring up the nutrition program as a freestanding bill or anything from the Agriculture Committee, there's not a chance anywhere—it's better stated that way—that that could possibly pass the House simply because we had a lot of explaining here this morning. We were told that the fact that the Republicans took the SNAP and the nutrition program out of it would not be construed by the American people as if they're opposed to feeding people, it's just that they thought it was a piece of extraneous matter that they could deal with maybe in this some other way.

What a tragedy that is for all of us to have to go back home and try to explain to the people that we represent that this House—the most dysfunctional House in history—spending $25 million a week to operate the House of Representatives, that our biggest trick here is to pass a bill here that we know from the outset will never see the light of day. Almost all of them have Statements of Administration Policy that no way in the world would the President ever sign any kind of a bill like that.

Enough already. Enough. We've disgraced ourselves before the country. We have disgraced ourselves in front of the world. Now, we are raising a generation of children right now who have not been adequately——

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlelady an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I will just end up this way: I've been here a while. I've never seen anything this dysfunctional. I really am embarrassed to say today that trying to feed people could be a reason why they would stop the farm bill—which, as I said, has been a bipartisan bill, has gone through like a hot knife through butter ever since we started doing farm bills in the United States. This is the lowest of the low. When we can't pass this, you know, ladies and gentlemen, they can't run the House.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I'm here to tell you that the opportunity for the Rules Committee to put the bill on the floor, as we did several weeks ago, resulted in 172 Democrats voting against the bill, which meant that it did not make it out of the House, and that's why we're here today. We are here today because the bill did not pass. My party and our friends, the Democrats, did not supply enough votes to make sure that we move forward. And my party is here trying to make sure that we get a second shot at passing the farm bill, and that's what we intend to do.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me just say to the gentleman that the reason why we did not support the farm bill was because the farm bill that the Republicans put on the floor would throw 2 million of our fellow citizens off of the food stamp program. The price of the farm bill should not be to make more people hungry in America.

I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I want to say to my friends, the reason the farm bill lost is because 62 of your people wouldn't support your Chairman LUCAS, who pleaded for their support. That's why the farm bill lost. Secondly, it lost because you adopted three amendments that undercut poor people in America. And so your response has been to abandon them altogether so you could get those votes back. Isn't that a shame.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is reminded to address his remarks to the Chair and not to other Members of the body in the second person.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, as has previously been stated, it is the intent of the Republican leadership and this majority party to have a bill that will be available and ready that can pass on what might be considered the SNAP portions of this farm bill.

What we're trying to do today is to pass this bill on the farm portions. And it is a fair opportunity to take up the bill exactly as we were several weeks ago on debate, on the rule, and on the things which passed this House for the will of the House to have its say. That is what we're attempting to do today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in this bill a straight reauthorization of the SNAP program without any cuts; current policy, which would be the same language as the chairman of the Rules Committee has promised would be included in the final product.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Texas yield for such unanimous consent?

Mr. SESSIONS. I would not yield for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this point, it's my privilege to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished Democratic leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his tremendous leadership on behalf of feeding the American people. It seems a very fundamental thing, Biblical in nature, family-wise, and a very important priority for all of us—except maybe not in this House of Representatives.

I want to thank Congresswoman DELAURO for her relentless, persistent advocacy to feed the hungry in our country.

But I rise today—and I've thanked them over and over again—to once again thank the Congressional Black Caucus. When they came to the floor today to speak in the manner that they did against this legislation and for values that our country shares about being a community, they spoke not just for the Congressional Black Caucus and for their constituents, they spoke for America.

They have fought this fight over and over again. The inference to be drawn from their leadership on this is not that the black community is a community that benefits from food stamps. Some people in the community do. Overwhelmingly, there are people in your districts in rural America, there are people in rural America who really need us to pass this legislation. You are taking food out of the mouths of your own poor constituents.

Poverty in America—poverty—I'm saying the word on the floor of the House: poverty, poverty, poverty. Poverty in America seems to be a word that people get nervous about. Poverty in America among our children is something shameful, but it is a reality. It has an impact on children to have the uncertainty in their lives that poverty brings. And when that poverty says to those children, one in four of you are going to sleep hungry tonight, that's just wrong, and it's wrong for America. It is not consistent with our values. It does not represent the sense of community that makes America strong and that makes America great.

So to MARSHA FUDGE, the distinguished chair of the Caucus, to Mr. CLEAVER, the former chair, to Mr. CLYBURN, our distinguished assistant leader, to all of my colleagues in the CBC—and a champion on the poverty issue, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE—I could name all of you because you've all been out there on the forefront of this.

Our democracy is as strong as we are as a people. The middle class is the backbone of America. The aspirations of Americans to become part of the middle class is what we should be addressing in Congress. And what are we doing? One hundred ninety days we've been in this session and no jobs bill yet.

The leadership of the Republican Party says they want regular order. They want regular order. They passed a budget bill. Over 3 months ago, the Senate passed a budget. The regular order would be to go to conference, get rid of the sequester, and to proceed with a bill that invests in America—Mr. HOYER's Make It in America, invest in innovation in America, build the infrastructure of America, create jobs, and to do so in a way that builds community, strengthens the middle class, and grows our economy with jobs.

The distinguished leadership of this Republican Party in the House said they want regular order and they have respect for their committees. Well, the Agriculture Committee, in a bipartisan way, passed a bill out of the committee.

□ 1130

I didn't like the bill. It wouldn't have been a bill I would have written. When Republicans had the leadership, Democrats cooperated, and a bipartisan bill came out of committee.

The rumor was—and I guess it was just a rumor, but it floated—that then it would respect that bill. If they could come out with a bipartisan bill, it would be taken up on the floor.

The bill that we have here—as little we know about it because it emerged in the middle of the night—bears no resemblance to the bill that came out of committee. Actions of the Republican leadership have been disrespectful to the committee process, so don't hand us the regular order argument.

The audacity to split off the nutrition parts of this bill is so stunning it would be shocking, except this is a ''House of shocks.'' I would say it is one of the worst things you have done, but there is such stiff competition for that honor that I can't really fully say that.

But when you take food out of the mouths of babies and you prevent a bill from going forth that addresses our food banks and our nutrition needs and the rest for our country, what are you thinking? Or are you thinking—or are you thinking?

I thank you, CBC, for your leadership on this. I thank you, JIM MCGOVERN and ROSA DELAURO, and all of you, because this is a fight that you are making for every person in America to live in a country of values, of values that include our faith. Our faith tells us that to minister to the needs of God's creation is an act of worship; to ignore those needs, as this bill does, is to dishonor the God who made us.

This is very wrong. This, even in this place, crosses a threshold that we should never go past—should never go past. This is totally out of the question.

I am a mom. One of the reasons I am involved in politics is I see this as an extension of my role as a mother of five kids, and now many grandchildren. God blessed us. But what drove me to this was that I saw all that my kids had, all the opportunity, all the love, all the concern, all of the rest of it; and I thought the best thing that we could all do is to make sure that our children, for their own welfare, grew up in a country where all of America's children were treated with respect as we meet their needs. That's just not happening here today.

I call upon our friends in the faith community, and they are here on this issue, as well as most of the farmers groups and all the rest. There is nobody—there is nobody outside this body who supports this bill who cares about the values that we all profess to have within these walls.

Again, taking food out of the mouths of babies, that's a good policy? I don't think so. Vote ''no'' on this rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are again reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to other Members of the body.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, the opportunity, once again, as I stated at the very top of this rule that we began several hours ago, is that the Republican leadership and the Republican membership have great respect for men and women who have fallen on hard times. We have great respect for the millions of people who have lost their jobs and continue to lose their jobs—full-time jobs that have gone to part-time jobs. We recognize that our country is facing very difficult times and more difficult each and every day.

It is our hope through this bill, and a following opportunity, to make sure that the entire piece parts of the will of this body go directly to the conference and meet with the Senate. That is what we are attempting to do today. For Members to ensure that we get to a conference with a complete part of this bill, that is why we are here today and will be here in the immediate future.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD a letter from Bob Stallman, the president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, in opposition to this bill.

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, DC, July 11, 2013.

Hon. * * *,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REP. * * *: The American Farm Bu-

reau Federation is our nation's largest general farm organization, representing more than 6 million member families in all 50 states and Puerto Rico. Our members represent the grassroots farmers and ranchers who produce the wide range of food and fiber crops for our customers here and around the world. To achieve this, farmers and ranchers depend on the variety of programs such as risk management, conservation, credit and rural development contained in H.R. 2642 that is scheduled to be voted on by the full House today.

Last night the House Rules Committee approved the rule for considering H.R. 2642, which also includes separating the nutrition title from the remaining provisions of H.R. 1947, a complete farm bill that was reported out of the House Agriculture Committee by a 36–10 bipartisan vote.

We are very disappointed in this action. The ''marriage'' between the nutrition and farm communities and our constituents in developing and adopting comprehensive farm legislation has been an effective, balanced arrangement for decades that has worked to ensure all Americans and the nation benefits. In spite of reports to the contrary, this broad food and farm coalition continues to hold strong against partisan politics. In fact, last week, more than 530 groups representing the farm, conservation, credit, rural development and forestry industries urged the House to not split the bill. Similar communications were relayed from the nutrition community. Yet today, in spite of the broad-based bipartisan support for keeping the farm bill intact, you will vote on an approach that seeks to affect a divorce of this longstanding partnership. It is frustrating to our members that this broad coalition of support for passage of a complete farm bill appears to have been pushed aside in favor of interests that have no real stake in this farm bill, the economic vitality and jobs agriculture provides or the customers farmers and ranchers serve.

We are quite concerned that without a workable nutrition title, it will prove to be nearly impossible to adopt a bill that can be successfully conferenced with the Senate's version, approved by both the House and Senate and signed by the President.

We are also very much opposed to the repeal of permanent law contained in H.R. 2642. This provision received absolutely no discussion in any of the process leading up to the passage of the bill out of either the House or Senate Agriculture Committees. To replace permanent law governing agricultural programs without hearing from so much as a single witness on what that law should be replaced with is not how good policy is developed.

As recently as last December, the threat of reverting to permanent law was the critical element that forced Congress to pass an extension of the current farm bill when it proved impossible to complete action on the new five-year farm bill—an action that not only provided important safety net programs for this year, it ensured Congress would have time this year to consider comprehensive reforms that contribute billions to deficit reduction.

We urge you to oppose the rule as well to vote against final passage of this attempt to split the farm bill and end permanent law provisions for agriculture.

Sincerely,

BOB STALLMAN,
President.

Mr. MCGOVERN. At this time, I would like to yield 3 minutes to a leader on this issue, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, a vote for this bill is a vote to end nutrition programs in America. Members on the other side of the aisle have already expressed that this morning. Imagine referring to the nutrition title of the farm bill as extraneous—extraneous. Dealing with hunger, dealing with people who have fallen on those hard times, dealing with their food insecurity and their being hungry and kids going to bed hungry every night in this Nation is extraneous. But that says it all. That tells you where their values are.

Before we consider the content of this legislation, take a minute to review what just has happened. Shortly before 8 p.m. last night, the majority posted a 608-page bill online and announced a meeting at 9 to consider the bill. The majority violated their own rule of allowing at least 3 days to review legislation before a vote.

I have a copy of the bill right here. This is the bill—608 pages. Have my colleagues read all of the 608 pages? Have they taken the time to know what is in it? Do they understand that in 2014, in fact, that what they have done adds to the deficit? No.

Instead, we are recklessly pushing forward this partisan bill designed to inflict great harm. And even more pernicious is the substance of this bill, which throws millions of American families aside. This removes the entire nutrition title from the farm bill with no indication that the majority intends to take up those programs in the near future.

Let's be clear about what this means. Food stamps are the critical central strand of our social safety net—our country's most important effort to deal with hunger—helping over 47 million Americans: nearly half of them are children; 99 percent of recipients live below the poverty line; and 75 percent of households receiving this aid include a child, a senior citizen, or an individual with a disability. These are the individuals and the people that this Republican majority has just called extraneous. They are not extraneous.

The bill before us would mean the death knell of the food stamp program and the other nutrition programs that have been part of the farm bill for decades. This bill is immoral, and it is a serious risk to our society.

532 farm groups sent the Speaker a letter opposing the splitting off of nutrition programs. Bishop Stockton and other religious leaders wrote a letter calling food stamps ''one of the most effective and important Federal programs to combat hunger in the Nation,'' and ''a crucial part of the farm bill,'' relieving ''pressure on overwhelmed parishes, charities, food banks, pantries, and other emergency food providers.'' Yet this bill provides the way to gut the food stamp program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlelady an additional 15 seconds.

Ms. DELAURO. Historically, the farm bill has been a safety net for farmers and families. It has enjoyed bipartisan support up until now until this majority has rent that support asunder.

A vote for this bill is a vote to end nutrition programs in America, to break the longstanding bipartisan compact that the farm bill represented for decades. It takes food out of the mouths of hungry children, seniors, veterans, and the disabled. It is immoral. These people are not extraneous.

I urge my colleagues to reject this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman's time has expired.

Members are reminded to confine their remarks to the time allocated to them.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, last night we had the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, Mr. LUCAS, who approached the committee and said he would like for us to consider this bill on farm bill portions. He indicated that he would follow up and had every intent to follow up with a companion part, the separation of these, which would be the SNAP portions.

Today, we are attempting to offer the bill on the farm policy, and we are doing that. We intend to be able to put these items together and move them forward. I have great confidence, not only in Mr. LUCAS, but also in every Member of this body who understands firsthand that women and children and those who have fallen on hard times do need the SNAP program. We intend to make sure that that is properly taken care of.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill, which cuts off nutrition assistance to millions of Americans, including thousands of Rhode Islanders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule; and to the total elimination of funding for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) in the underlying Farm Bill.

Three weeks ago, the House voted down the Republican-led Farm Bill, rejecting its draconian cuts to SNAP as unnecessarily harmful. The bill before us today contains virtually the same farm provisions, only this time it omits any and all funding for nutrition assistance. Splitting agricultural and nutrition policy sets a terrible precedent. In fact, over 500 agricultural groups oppose this bill, as do environmental and animal welfare advocates.

In the wealthiest nation in human history, it is unconscionable that every American cannot afford life's basic necessities. SNAP helps millions of Americans living in poverty put food

on the table. Eighty percent of the households receiving SNAP earn below the federal poverty level, making it a vital form of assistance for working families.

Last month, I proudly joined a group of my Democratic colleagues in taking the SNAP challenge, a commitment to living on no more than $4.50 in daily food costs. Every member of Congress should experience what it's like to subsist on such a paltry sum and should understand the impact of the decisions we make on the lives of the constituents we represent.

When we take food off of the plates of hungry children, we have a moral obligation to fully comprehend the consequences of those actions. Under this bill, thousands of Rhode Island families will see their SNAP benefits evaporate. This isn't a solution; it's a bait and switch that I cannot support.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and reject the underlying bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it hurts America's children.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and underlying bill because it takes food and nutrition from working families and veterans and seniors and children and the disabled and many others in need.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts' time will be charged.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will state her parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you could tell us whether it would be in order to allow the majority to amend the underlying bill that provides for agricultural subsidies to prohibit Members of Congress who receive financial benefits payments and taxpayer subsidies from the underlying legislation from actually voting on the legislation from which they directly profit financially? Would that be in order for the majority to amend the bill for that purpose?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The majority manager is in charge of the pending resolution.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I have a further parliamentary inquiry.

Would it be appropriate to ask the majority to make an amendment to the bill to prohibit Members who receive taxpayer subsidies from benefiting financially and to prohibit them from voting on the underlying legislation from which they profit financially?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot speculate, but the majority manager may yield for an amendment to the resolution.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to a great leader on issues dealing with poverty and hunger, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong opposition to this rule and the underlying Republican bill.

The partisan bill before us is an abomination and shows just how out of touch, out of control, this extreme Tea Party-controlled Congress is. I can't say, though, that I am surprised. I am sad to say that this House has reached a very shameful new low.

This bill also violates decades of bipartisan support for a delicate balance between America's nutrition programs, farm conservation, and other priorities. This partisan bill also fails to reauthorize nutrition programs, which benefit millions of Americans in rural and urban areas across our country. The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program is our Nation's first line of defense against hunger and among the most effective forms of economic stimulus.

Republicans say they want to decrease poverty and hunger—I hear this all the time on our committees—yet they do just the opposite.

□ 1145

Be assured this bill will increase poverty and hunger. It is a moral disgrace. Nobody wants this Republican bill to move forward—not the 532 companies and organizations from every congressional district that have urged this Congress to not break apart the farm bill, not the administration which issued a veto threat last night, and certainly not the millions of low-income and poor people and working families with children and seniors who continue to struggle from the impact of the Great Recession.

Enough is enough. This is un-American. It's a shame and a disgrace. It's not only on days that we worship that we must remember to do unto others as you would have them do unto you.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN).

Mr. STUTZMAN. Thank you, Chairman SESSIONS, for yielding, and thank you for all of the hard work that you do in the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I am a farmer. I love to farm. It's in my blood. I farmed before I came to Congress, and I'll farm when I leave.

So, as a fourth-generation farmer, today I rise to say we have an historic opportunity to legislate responsibly and reform prudently when it comes to farm policy and food stamp policy. We, together, can defeat business as usual in Washington, D.C. For the first time in 40 years of farm policy, the House has an opportunity to enact landmark reform in ag policy and to separate the farm bill. Because of policy dating back to the Carter administration, 80 percent of the last trillion-dollar farm bill went to food stamps. I don't believe that's right, and as a farmer, I can tell you it doesn't serve farmers well. Believe it or not, it doesn't serve the needs of those who need help in this country either.

A year ago, I began to call on Congress to separate the farm bill. Our goal has been to reform ag and food stamp policy so that they can really help the folks they were intended to help. Farm policy and food stamp policy should not be mixed. They should stand on their own merits. As Congress immorally sinks our country into debt by $17 trillion, taxpayers deserve an honest conversation in order to find solutions to help Americans who really need help.

Together, we can get this done and pass the first farm-only farm bill in 40 years. Today, we can pass a bill that sends a clear message that the days of deceptively named budget-busting bills are over. By splitting the bill, we can give taxpayers an honest look at how Washington spends our money. We've made progress by eliminating direct payments, but there is more work ahead, so splitting the farm bill is the next logical step on the path to real reform in farm policy and in helping those who genuinely need help.

I am proud to vote for this legislation, and I thank all of those who put such hard work into it. As a fourth-generation farmer, I am proud to vote for the first farm-only farm bill in 40 years.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. CICILLINE. Is it proper to offer an amendment at this time or at some future time on the underlying bill that would preclude Members of Congress who receive financial benefits, payments, or subsidies from the underlying legislation from voting on this bill from which they directly profit financially?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. An amendment to the rule may only be offered if the majority manager yields for such purpose.

Mr. CICILLINE. I ask the majority manager if he would yield for such an amendment.

Mr. SESSIONS. All time yielded is for the purpose of debate only, and I will not yield for that purpose.

Mr. CICILLINE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SESSIONS. I do not know that the gentleman has been yielded that time by his manager.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has reserved, and the gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD a statement from the Club for Growth which is in opposition to this bill and which indicates they will score this vote.

KEY VOTE ALERT—''NO'' ON ''FARM ONLY'' BILL (H.R.)

The Club for Growth strongly opposes the ''Farm-Only'' bill and urges all House members to oppose it. We believe floor consideration of the bill could happen as early as this week. The vote on final passage will be included in the Club's 2013 Congressional Scorecard.

Breaking up the unholy alliance between agricultural policy and the food stamp program within the traditional farm bill is an excellent decision on behalf of House leadership. However, the whole purpose of splitting up the bill is to enact true reform that reduces the size and scope of government. Sadly, this ''farm-only'' bill does not do that, especially under an anticipated closed rule. It is still loaded down with market-distorting giveaways to special interests with no path established to remove the government's involvement in the agriculture industry.

Worse, we highly suspect that this whole process is a ''rope-a-dope'' exercise. We think House leadership is splitting up the farm bill only as a means to get to conference with the Senate where a bicameral backroom deal will reassemble the commodity and food stamp titles, leaving us back where we started. Unless our suspicions are proven unwarranted, we will continue to oppose this bill.

Our Congressional Scorecard for the 113th Congress provides a comprehensive rating of how well or how poorly each member of Congress supports pro-growth, free-market policies and will be distributed to our members and to the public.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. The only thing that this House will do when it votes today is defeat starving children. It will again put starving children in the abyss of the uncaring attitude of my friends who for the first time in decades are separating the heart line of the farm bill—the nutrition program, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, the food stamps program.

I am glad to stand with the Democratic Caucus and the Congressional Black Caucus and others to be able to say that hunger is silent. There are no children at that microphone on this floor today, standing over here, telling you that their bellies are protruding because they have not eaten. There is no one on this floor today who goes to a summer program and who did not eat because the breakfast program is tied to the school, and they are out of school, and summer brings about hunger. There is no one who has told you that families have an extra $300 bill in the summertime to feed their children, and for those who do not have it, no one has told you that the lack of protein in a diet leads to the disease and decay of teeth and bone for the very children that we say are the priority of this place.

In decades, you have never separated the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program—a $20 billion cut, a $3 billion cut, making it $23 billion in cuts. You will never put that on the floor. You will slide it through because all the folks want is a piece of a sound bite at home to say they believe in deficit reduction.

I believe in the life of the children. I believe in growing our children. Vote ''no.''

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired. The gentlewoman from Texas is out of order. The gentlewoman from Texas is reminded to address her remarks to the Chair and not to other Members of the body. Members are reminded to confine their remarks to the time allotted to them.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN), who is a farmer, very clearly, I believe, spoke about the intent of this bill, and that is that we are going to talk about farm policy.

There are revisions and changes that update not only Federal farm policy, but they are done on a bipartisan basis. The gentlemen on both sides of the aisle—the ranking member and the chairman of the Agriculture Committee—have worked very closely on this, and I believe that what is on the floor today offers an opportunity to debate that and to see if we can pass it. That's what we are trying to do.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, apparently, it was not enough for the House majority to decimate the nutrition title the last time we considered the farm bill a few weeks ago with the $20 billion cut. When they couldn't get the majority of Republicans to vote for it because it just wasn't cut enough, they just eliminated the entire nutrition title—the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, the Emergency Food Assistance Program, the Commodity Supplemental Food Program. These are fancy names and acronyms for the programs that allow seniors, young children, and the disabled to stock their food pantries. I can't wrap my mind around the shameful nature of this moment, a moment when we are moving forward with the farm bill and leaving behind 47 million of our Nation's hungry.

Now, it has been asserted, Mr. Speaker, that the House leadership is not attempting to starve vulnerable families but merely wants to expedite the passage of the all-important agricultural components of the bill by removing the extraneous nutrition title. Since 1965, we have reauthorized our antihunger programs alongside our agriculture-related policies in a marriage; but at this moment, the House has filed for divorce, and the primary breadwinner is abandoning two-thirds of the family, consisting of children—young, babies—the elderly, and the disabled. H.R. 2642 is a deadbeat majority's proposal to avoid child support, elderly subsidies, and food assistance to the disabled of 47 million people.

What kind of message are we sending with the passage of this bill? We are telling our Nation's hungry that Congress is willing to turn a blind eye and that food is an extraneous concern of the Congress.

Mr. SESSIONS. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on behalf of the people of the Virgin Islands in strong opposition to this farm bill. It hurts children and families in our country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to this farm bill rule and underlying bill because it cruelly takes food away from poor children, the elderly, and the disabled.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts' time will be charged.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it increases hunger in our country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts' time will be charged.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to this farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it increases hunger in America, and it punishes all of

those who rely on the SNAP program in this country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I object. I can't agree to a unanimous consent that this increases hunger in America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is not recognized for the purpose of debate.

Objection to the gentleman from Pennsylvania's request was heard.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WATT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. WATT. Whose time got charged with the last two unanimous consent requests? Both were one sentence, and you're saying they were charged.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts' time has been charged.

Mr. WATT. Would the Speaker explain to the House why that is the case.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Any request that is accompanied by remarks that are in the nature of debate is charged, not the unanimous consent request itself, but the remarks that follow the unanimous consent request that are in the nature of debate.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Speaker, I object to that ruling, and I would ask the Speaker to reverse it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There is no ruling pending at this time. There is nothing for the gentleman to object formally to.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the time of the two previous speakers who asked for unanimous consent not be charged to the time of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's motion is not in order. There is no motion that can achieve that end.

Mr. WATT. I ask unanimous consent to restore the time to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. GOHMERT. Objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. I am not yielding for that purpose.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 138, nays 265, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 348]

YEAS—138

Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—265

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blackburn
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Esty
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Keating
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sherman
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—31

Becerra
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Broun (GA)
Campbell
Cole
DeFazio
Gingrey (GA)
Gosar
Grijalva
Hartzler
Holt
Horsford
Hunter
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
King (IA)
Kirkpatrick
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Meeks
Negrete McLeod
O'Rourke
Pelosi
Rogers (MI)
Rush
Schweikert
Shimkus
Sires
Smith (NJ)
Tonko

□ 1220

Messrs. PETRI and GOWDY changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. YARMUTH and Mrs. LOWEY changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 348 I was unavoidably absent. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, July 11, 2013, I missed rollcall vote No. 348 for unavoidable reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: rollcall No. 348: "nay" (on motion to adjourn).

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, July 11, 2013, I was unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: On rollcall No. 348, "nay."

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, on July 11, 2013, I was unavoidably detained and was not present for rollcall vote number 348. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced

that the Senate has passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 251. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal features of the electric distribution system of the South Utah Valley Electric Service District, and for other purposes.

H.R. 254. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to facilitate the development of hydroelectric power on the Diamond Fork System of the Central Utah Project.

The message also announced that the Senate agreed to the amendment of the House to a Senate amendment on a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 588. An act to provide for donor contribution acknowledgements to be displayed at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Visitor Center, and for other purposes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2642, FEDERAL AGRICULTURE REFORM AND RISK MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it will increase hunger in America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

Mr. GOHMERT. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it takes food nutrition away from working families.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. GOHMERT. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts will state his point of parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Am I understanding the gentleman's objection correctly that what he is doing is not even giving Members on our side the courtesy of stating their statement in the RECORD?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state a proper parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I'm trying to understand what the objection means of the gentleman from Texas. Does that mean that the statement that the gentleman from Massachusetts just made will not appear in the RECORD?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The objection was to the unanimous consent request.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this point I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), my good friend, for a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it hurts the working poor and takes food and nutrition from hardworking families.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

Mr. GOHMERT. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from Nevada (Ms. TITUS) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it takes the safety net away from America and Nevada's poor families.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill and the underlying rule because it increases hunger and poverty in America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia?

Mr. GOHMERT. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

I think it is extremely unfortunate that Members on the other side of the aisle would deny Members on this side of the aisle the ability to insert written materials in the RECORD. In all my years here, I have never seen such a discourteous gesture.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am proud to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that the Republican Tea Party has a national agenda that is playing out right here in this Chamber today. You are attempting to defund food stamps—yes, you are—and place poor people, which includes children and the elderly and veterans, in a position that none of you would want to be in.

When it was time to reauthorize the farm bill, Republicans cut $16 billion in food stamps. And what happened? The Speaker refused to schedule the bill for floor action, not because the cuts were too deep, but because they were not deep enough. And so the Ag Committee made deeper cuts, this time $20 billion in cuts. When the bill was debated, Republicans then added mean-spirit amendments that doomed the bill. Now you bring us another bill with no nutrition title at all.

We cannot stand by and be silent when Republicans take these actions that offend what we are as Americans. We can do better than this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not directly to other Members of the body in the second person.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the relentless focus on the nutrition programs at risk; but remember, this is going to be the costliest farm bill in history. It contains no reform. It concentrates Federal cash on the largest, most profitable agribusiness. It shortchanges conservation, guts protection for wetlands, prairies, and forests. It rewards government dependency, not innovation.

You have managed to unite the Environmental Working Group, the Farm Bureau, and the Club for Growth in opposition. Congratulations.

Please reject the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I believe it's important for us to understand what's in the bill, and I'd like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS), the chairman of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I would have preferred to focus my time in the general debate, and that's still my intention. The rule debate historically, as we all know in this body, is more of a partisan discussion, generally less focused on the details of the bill than the intensity of the process or the perspective by which the next action takes place. I understand that.

But I would say to my friends, and I will go into greater detail on this in just a little bit, remember what you are about to vote on, a rule to enable us to proceed to a vote entails, is consideration of a bill that took two markups over 2 years in committee, where 100 amendments were considered in both markups, a process by which a bill to the floor a couple of weeks ago subject to another 100 amendments, tremendous debate, tremendous discussion, yet a bill that could not quite get the muster of both the left and the right.

□ 1230

So we wound up a little short in the middle. What you're voting on today is the farm bill farm bill. It's what a lot of the folks back home have said for years they want: consider every issue on its own merit. Well, now, we're about to vote for a rule that will make that possible.

But in the farm bill farm bill, we achieve savings in the commodity title, do away with the direct payments, that thing that's caused such great angst—people getting money for not doing anything. That's gone, a substantial number of billions of dollars in savings.

Now, the committee had the spirit to believe that every part of the existing farm bill policy should save resources, so we save money in the conservation title, $6 billion. We consolidate programs. We refocus.

I would say to all my friends on the floor, vote for the rule. Give us a chance to proceed to the bill so that we can consider a farm bill farm bill.

I can assure all of you that I have given my word to the members of the Rules Committee, to Members on each side of this Chamber that the committee will work hard to achieve a consensus on a nutrition bill. I don't know what kind of a consensus that will be yet. It probably won't satisfy both of my friends on each side of the room to the extreme.

But we, in good faith, did our work. Give us a chance to consider the merits of our reform-minded bill. Give us a chance, then, to address the nutrition title. Let the place work. Let the place work.

I thank the chairman of the Rules Committee for yielding some time to me. I ask my colleagues to vote for this.

I would tell you, if anything, part of the biggest problem with the bill 2 weeks ago was we saved money everywhere; and for some reason, no one ever wants to give anything up in this place.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LUCAS. Sometimes you have to have reform. Sometimes you have to do things differently. But at least the Ag Committee chose to make the reforms across our jurisdiction, to make everybody have a stake in the savings.

I know that's contrary to how the place works; but for one time, maybe, this session, or this day, or this year, or this decade, let's try it the old way. Let's try and look at the issue. Let's try to be fair and equitable to everyone, and let's do the legislative work to get, ultimately, to where we need to be.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to insert in the RECORD the letter from Taxpayers for Common Sense against this bill. I'd like to also insert in the RECORD a letter from over 500 farm groups and conservation groups that oppose this bill.

I also want to point out to my colleagues, the CBO estimates that this bill, as written, will add $1.3 billion to the deficit in 2014.

HOUSE LEADERSHIP PROPOSES OUTSPENDING SENATE IN FARM BILL

Fresh on the heels of losing a Farm Bill vote on the Floor because the rushed bill did not cut spending enough, House leadership is floating another plan to keep the checks flowing to agriculture special interests: strip out nutrition programs and pass an Ag-only Farm Bill that spends more than one passed by a Democrat-controlled Senate. In fact it would spend drastically more than either the comparable portions of the President's FY14 budget request or Rep Paul Ryan's FY14 budget (which called for $38 billion and $31 billion in savings, respectively).

That's right, the Republican House majority leadership is pushing a bill that would save less than they promised, President Obama proposed, or the Senate adopted.

The Ag-only Farm Bill shows just how resistant House lawmakers are to reining in our nation's deficits.

House Ag-only Farm Bill Savings: $12.8 billion.

Senate Ag-only Farm Bill Savings: $13.9 billion.

Splitting nutrition and agriculture programs into separate bills is a good idea, but only because it would break the Ag-Urban unholy alliance that logrolled over attempts to reform both programs. To deny amendments and reforms would make bifurcation virtually meaningless. Each bill must be open to robust debate to ensure taxpayers are footing the bill for only the most cost-effective, accountable, transparent, and responsive safety net for farmers and the hungry poor.

An Ag-only Farm Bill the likes of H.R. 1947 is the opposite of reform. It would:

Cannibalize savings to create new generous shallow loss entitlement programs.

Resurrect goverment-set target prices that are higher than in the Senate bill.

Exclude all common sense steps toward right-sizing the federally subsidized crop insurance program—which was estimated to cost taxpayers a record $14 billion in FY12. No means testing to exclude millionaire businessmen, no limit on subsidies, zero cuts to insurance company delivery subsidies, and no transparency on who is benefiting from taxpayer spending.

Increase spending on subsidized crop insurance by $9 billion.

But that's not all, the House bill would:

Increase FY14 spending by $1.34 billion above the current baseline.

Only save $3.9 billion over the life of the actual bill (FY14–18) with the rest ($9 billion) occurring after this farm bill expires in FY18.

If Congress simply eliminated direct payments and the failed Average Crop Revenue Election (ACRE) program (which nearly everyone agrees needs to happen), taxpayers would save nearly $50 billion. Adding in a few common sense reforms to the highly subsidized crop insurance program (instead of shoveling $9 billion in new special interest subsidies) would easily save taxpayers $100 billion or more.

Splitting the bill should be used to get better reforms out of both nutrition programs and the rest of the farm bill instead of just using it as a tactic to get to a conference committee to protect agriculture and nutrition's sacred cows. Simply divorcing the two with no opportunity for additional reforms isn't acceptable when our nation faces a $16.8 trillion debt. Instead of eventually sticking taxpayers with a trillion dollar farm bill that barely puts a dent in the deficit, lawmakers need to go back to the drawing board and come up with a fiscally responsible solution that enacts a more cost-effective, accountable, transparent, and responsive farm safety net.

JULY 2, 2013.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: America's agriculture, conservation, rural development, finance, forestry, energy and crop insurance companies and organizations strongly urge you to bring the Farm Bill (H.R. 1947, the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013) back to the Floor as soon as possible. This important legislation supports our nation's farmers, ranchers, forest owners, food security, natural resources and wildlife habitats, rural communities, and the 16 million Americans whose jobs directly depend on the agriculture industry.

Farm bills represent a delicate balance between America's farm, nutrition, conservation, and other priorities, and accordingly require strong bipartisan support. It is vital for the House to try once again to bring together a broad coalition of lawmakers from both sides of the aisle to provide certainty for farmers, rural America, the environment and our economy in general and pass a five-year farm bill upon returning in July. We believe that splitting the nutrition title from the rest of the bill could result in neither farm nor nutrition programs passing, and urge you to move a unified farm bill forward.

Thank you for your support. We look forward to our continued dialogue as the process moves forward and stand ready to work with you to complete passage of the new five-year Farm Bill before the current law expires again on September 30, 2013.

Sincerely,

1st Farm Credit Services, 25x'25, Advanced Biofuels Association, Ag Credit, ACA, AgChoice, AgGeorgia, AgHeritage Farm Credit Services, AgriBank, Agriculture Council of Arkansas, Agriculture Energy Coalition.

Agricultural Retailers Association, AgriLand, Agri-Mark, Inc., AgCarolina, AgCountry, AgFirst, AgPreference, AgSouth, AgStar Financial Services, ACA, AgTexas, Alabama Ag Credit, Alabama Cotton Commission, Alabama Dairy Producers, Alabama Farm Credit, Alabama Farmers Cooperative, Alabama Farmers Federation.

Alabama Pork Producers, Alaska Farmers Union, American AgCredit, American Agriculture Movement, American Association of Avian Pathologists, American Association of Bovine Practitioners, American Association of Crop Insurers, American Association of Small Ruminant Practitioners, American Association of Veterinary Laboratory Diagnosticians, American Bankers Association, American Beekeeping Federation, American Biogas Council, American Coalition for Ethanol, American Cotton Shippers Association, American Crystal Sugar Company, American Dairy Science Association.

American Farm Bureau Federation, American Farmers and Ranchers Mutual Insurance Company, American Farmland Trust, American Feed Industry Association, American Fruit and Vegetable Processors and Growers Coalition, American Forest Foundation, American Forest Resource Council, American Forests, American Honey Producers Association, American Malting Barley Association, American Pulse Association, American Public Works Association, American Sheep Industry Association, American Society of Agronomy, American Sugar Alliance, American Sugar Cane League.

American Sugarbeet Growers Association, American Society of Farm Managers and

Rural Appraisers, American Soybean Association, American Veterinary Medical Association, Animal Agriculture Coalition, Animal Health Institute, WAArborOne, Archery Trade Association, Arizona Farm Bureau Federation, Arizona Bioindustry Association, Arizona Wool Producers Association, Arkansas Farm Bureau, Arkansas Farmers Union, Arkansas Rice Federation, Arkansas Rice Producers' Group, Arkansas State Sheep Council.

Associated Logging Contractors—Idaho, Associated Milk Producers, Inc., Associated Oregon Loggers, Association of American Veterinary Medical Colleges, Association of Equipment Manufacturers, Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, Association of Veterinary Biologics Companies, Badgerland Financial, Bio Nebraska Life Sciences Association, BioForward, Biotechnology Industry Organization, Black Hills Forest Resource Association, Bongard's Creamery, Boone and Crockett Club, Bowhunting Preservation Alliance, Calcot.

California Agricultural Irrigation Association, California Association of Resource Conservation Districts, California Association of Winegrape Growers, California Avocado Commission, California Canning Peach Association, California Farm Bureau Federation, California Farmers Union, California Forestry Association, California Pork Producers Association, California Wool Growers Association, Calvin Viator, Ph.D. and Associates, LLC, The Campbell Group, Can Manufacturers Institute, Canned Food Alliance, Cape Fear Farm Credit, Capital Farm Credit.

Carolina Cotton Growers Cooperative, Catch-A-Dream Foundation, Catfish Farmers of America, Central Kentucky, ACA, Ceres Solutions LLP, Chrisholm Trail Farm Credit, CHS, Inc., CoBank, Colonial Farm Credit, Colorado BioScience Association, Colorado Farm Bureau, Colorado Timber Industry Association, Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation, Connecticut Forest & Park Association, Connecticut United for Research Excellence, Inc., The Conservation Fund.

Continental Dairy Products, Inc, Cooperative Credit Company, Cooperative Network, Cora-Texas Mfg. Co., Inc., Corn Producers Association of Texas, Cotton Growers Warehouse Association, Council for Agricultural Science and Technology, Crop Insurance and Reinsurance Bureau, Crop Insurance Professionals Association, Crop Science Society of America, CropLife America, Dairy Farmers of America, Dairy Farmers Working Together, Dairy Producers of Utah, Dairylea Cooperative Inc., Darigold, Inc.

Delta Council, Delta Waterfowl, Deltic Timber Corporation, Ducks Unlimited, DUDA (A. Duda & Sons, Inc.), Eastern Regional Conference of Council of State Governments, Empire State Forest Products Association, Environmental and Energy Study Institute, Environmental Law & Policy Center, Family Farm Alliance, Family Forest Foundation—Washington, Farm Credit Bank of Texas, Farm Credit Banks Funding Corporation, Farm Credit Council, Farm Credit Council Services, Farm Credit East.

Farm Credit MidSouth, Farm Credit of Central Florida, Farm Credit of Central Oklahoma, Farm Credit of Enid, Farm Credit of Florida, Farm Credit of Maine, Farm Credit of Ness City, Farm Credit of New Mexico, Farm Credit of North West Florida, Farm Credit of Southern Colorado, Farm Credit of SW Kansas, Farm Credit of Western Arkansas, Farm Credit of Western Kansas, Farm Credit of Western Oklahoma, Farm Credit Services of America, Farm Credit Services of Illinois.

Farm Credit South, Farm Credit Virginias, Farm Credit West, Farmer Mac, FarmFirst Dairy Cooperative, FCS Financial, FCS of America, FCS of Colusa-Glenn, FCS of East/Central Oklahoma, FCS of Hawaii, FCS of Illinois, FCS of Mandan, FCS of Mid-America, FCS of North Dakota, FCS of Southwest, Federation of Animal Science Societies.

First District Association, First FCS, First South Farm Credit, FLBA of Kingsburg, Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association, Florida Sugar Cane League, Forest Investment Associates, Forest Landowners Association, Forest Products National Labor Management Committee, Forest Resource Association Inc., Fresno-Madera Farm Credit, Frontier Farm Credit, Fruit Growers Supply Company, Georgia Agribusiness Council, Georgia Farm Bureau Federation, Georgia Forestry Association.

Georgia Pork Producers Association, Giustina Resources, LLC, Global Forest Partners LP, GMO Renewable Resources, Great Plains Ag Credit, Great Plains Canola Association, Green Diamond Resource Company, Greenstone, GROWMARK, Inc, Growth Energy, Hancock Timber Resource Group, Hardwood Federation, Hawaii Farmers Union, Hawaii Sugar Farmers, Heritage Land Bank, Holstein Association USA.

Idaho Ag Credit, Idaho Dairymen's Association, Idaho Farmers Union, Idaho Forest Group, Idaho Forest Owners Association, Idaho Grain Producers Association, Illinois Biotechnology Industry Organization—iBIO®, Illinois Farm Bureau, Illinois Farmers Union, Illinois Pork Producers Association, Independent Beef Association of North Dakota, Independent Community Bankers of America, Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc., Indiana Farmers Union, Indiana Health Industry Forum, Innovative Mississippi—Strategic Biomass Solutions.

Intermountain Forest Association, Intertribal Agriculture Council, Iowa Farm Bureau Federation, Iowa Farmers Union, Iowa Pork Producers Association, Iowa Sheep Industry Association, IowaBio, Irrigation Association, Irving Woodlands, LLC, Izaak Walton League of America, John Deere Crop Insurance, Kansas Cooperative Council, Kansas Dairy, Kansas Farm Bureau, Kansas Farmers Union, Kansas Grain Sorghum Producers Association.

Kansas Pork Association, Kansas Sheep Association, Kentucky Forest Industries Association, Kentucky Pork Producers Association, Land Improvement Contractors of America, Land O'Lakes, Land Stewardship Project, Land Trust Alliance, Lone Rock Timber Management Co., Longview Timber LLC, Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation, Inc., Louisiana Forest Association, Louisiana Rice Growers Association, Louisiana Rice Producers' Group, Louisiana Sugar Cane Cooperative, Inc., Lula-Westfield, LLC.

Maryland & Virginia Milk Producers Cooperative, Maryland Association of Soil Conservation Districts, Maryland Farm Bureau, Inc., Maryland Grain Producers Association, Maryland Sheep Breeders' Association, Inc., Massachusetts Farm Bureau Federation, Inc., Massachusetts Forest Alliance, MassBio, MBG Marketing/The Blueberry People, Michigan Agri-Business Association, Michigan Farm Bureau, Michigan Farmers Union, Michigan Pork Producers Association, Michigan Sugar Company, Michigan-California Timber Company, Mid-West Dairymen's Co.

MidAtlantic Farm Credit, Midwest Dairy Coalition, Midwest Environmental Advocates, Midwest Food Processors Association, Milk Producers Council, Minn-Dak Farmers Cooperative, Minnesota Canola Council, Minnesota Corn Growers Association, Minnesota Farm Bureau Federation, Minnesota Farmers Union, Minnesota Forest Industries, Minnesota Grain & Feed Association, Minnesota Lamb & Wool Producers, Minnesota Pork Producers Association, Minnesota Timber Producers Association, Mississippi River Trust.

Missouri Coalition for the Environment, Missouri Dairy Association, Missouri Farm Bureau Federation, Missouri Farmers Union, Missouri Pork Association, Missouri Sheep Producers, Missouri Soybean Association, The Molpus Woodlands Group, Montana Grain Growers Association, Montana Farmers Union, Mule Deer Foundation, National Association of Counties, National Association of State Departments of Agriculture, National All-Jersey, National Alliance of Forest Owners, National Association for the Advancement of Animal Science.

National Association of Clean Water Agencies, National Association of Conservation Districts, National Association of Farmer Elected Committees, National Association of Federal Veterinarians, National Association of Forest Service Retirees, National Association of FSA County Office Employees, National Association of Resource Conservation & Development Councils, National Association of State Conservation Agencies, National Association of State Foresters, National Association of University Forest Resource Programs, National Association of Wheat Growers, National Barley Growers Association, National Bobwhite Conservation Initiative, National Catholic Rural Life Conference, National Coalition for Food and Agricultural Research, National Conservation District Employees Association.

National Corn Growers Association, National Cotton Council, National Cotton Ginners' Association, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, National Farmers Union, National Farm to School Network, National Grange, National Grape Cooperative Association, Inc., National Milk Producers Federation, National Network of Forest Practitioners, National Pork Producers Council, National Renderers Association, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, National Sorghum Producers, National Sunflower Association, National Trappers Association.

National Wild Turkey Federation, National Woodland Owners Association, Nebraska Cooperative Council, Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation, Nebraska Farmers Union, Nebraska Pork Producers Association, Nevada Farm Bureau Federation, Nevada Wool Growers Association, New England Farmers Union, New Jersey Farm Bureau, New Mexico Farm and Livestock Bureau, New Mexico Sorghum Association, New York Farm Bureau, Inc., New York Forest Owners Association, Nexsteppe, North American Grouse Partnership.

North Carolina Farm Bureau Federation, Inc, North Carolina Forestry Association, North Carolina Pork Council, North Dakota Farmers Union, North Dakota Lamb & Wool Producers, North Dakota Pork Producers Council, Northarvest Bean Growers Association, Northeast Dairy Farmers Cooperatives, Northeast States Association for Agricultural Stewardship, Northern California Farm Credit, Northern Canola Growers Association, Northern Forest Center, Northern Pulse Growers Association, Northwest Dairy Association, Northwest Farm Credit Services, Novozymes North America Inc.

Ocean Spray Cranberries, Inc., Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, Inc., Ohio Farmers Union, Ohio Pork Producers Council, Oklahoma Agribusiness Retailers Association, Oklahoma Agricultural Cooperative Council, Oklahoma Farmers Union, Oklahoma Grain & Feed Association, Oklahoma Pork Council, Oklahoma Seed Trade Association, Oklahoma Sorghum Association, Oklahoma Wheat Growers Association, Oregon Association of Nurseries, Oregon Cherry Growers, Inc., Oregon Dairy Farmers Association, Oregon Farmers Union.

Oregon Sheep Growers Association, Oregon Small Woodland Association, Oregon Women

in Timber, Orion the Hunter's Institute, Panhandle-Plains Land Bank, Partners for Sustainable Pollination, Pennsylvania Farm Bureau, Pennsylvania Farmers Union, Pennsylvania Forest Products Association, Pheasants Forever, Plains Cotton Cooperative Association, Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., Plum Creek Timber Company, Pollinator Partnership, Pope and Young Club, Port Blakely Tree Farms, LP.

Potlatch Corporation, Prairie Rivers Network, Premier Farm Credit, Puerto Rico Farm Credit, Quality Deer Management Association, Quail Forever, Rayonier Inc., Red Gold, Inc, Red River Forests, LLC, Red River Valley Sugarbeet Growers Association, Renewable Fuels Association, Resource Management Service, LLC, Rhode Island Sheep Cooperative, Rio Grande Valley Sugar Growers, Rocky Mountain Farmers Union, Rolling Plains Cotton Growers, Inc.

Ruffed Grouse Society, The Rural Broadband Association, Rural Community Assistance Partnership, Select Milk Producers, Inc. Seneca Foods, Shasta Forests Timberlands, LLC, Sidney Sugars, Inc., Sierra Pacific Industries, Society of American Foresters, Soil and Water Conservation Society, Soil Science Society of America, South Carolina Farm Bureau Federation, South Dakota Association of Cooperatives, South Dakota Biotech Association, South Dakota Farmers Union, South Dakota Pork Producers.

South Dakota Wheat Growers, South East Dairy Farmers Association, Southeastern Lumber Manufacturers Association, South Texas Cotton and Grain Association, Southeast Milk Inc., Southern Cotton Growers, Inc., Southern Minnesota Beet Sugar Cooperative, Southern Peanut Farmers Federation, Southern Rolling Plains Cotton Growers Association of Texas, Southern States Cooperative, Inc., Southwest Council of Agribusiness, Southwest Georgia Farm Credit, St. Albans Cooperative, Staplcotn, State Agriculture and Rural Leaders, Sugar Cane Growers Cooperative of Florida.

Sustainable Forest Initiative, Sustainable Northwest, Tennessee Clean Water Network, Tennessee Farm Bureau Federation, Tennessee Forestry Association, Tennessee Renewable Energy & Economic Development Council, Texas Ag Finance, Texas Agricultural Cooperative Council, Texas Farmers Union, Texas Forestry Association, Texas Healthcare and Bioscience Institute, Texas Land Bank, Texas Pork Producers Association, Texas Rice Producers Legislative Group, Texas Sheep & Goat Raisers' Association, Timberland Investment Resources.

Timber Products Company, The Amalgamated Sugar Company, The Bank of Commerce, The Nature Conservancy, The Small Woodland Owners Association of Maine, Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership, Trust for Public Land, United Dairymen of Arizona, United FCS, U.S. Animal Health Association, U.S. Beet Sugar Association, U.S. Canola Association, U.S. Cattlemen's Association, U.S. Dry Bean Council, U.S. Pea & Lentil Trade Association, U.S. Rice Producers Association.

U.S. Sportsmen's Alliance, USA Dry Pea & Lentil Council, USA Rice Federation, Utah Farmers Union, Utah Wool Growers Association, Virginia Farm Bureau Federation, Virginia Forestry Association, Virginia Grain Producers Association, Virginia Pork Industry Board, Virginia Nursery & Landscape Association, Virginia State Dairymen's Association, Washington Biotechnology & Biomedical Association, Washington Farm Bureau, Washington Farmers Union.

Washington State Council of Farmer Cooperatives, Washington State Dairy Federation, Welch Foods Inc., A Cooperative, Wells Timberland REIT, Western AgCredit, Western Growers, Western Pea & Lentil Growers, Western Peanut Growers Association, Western Pennsylvania Conservancy, Western Sugar Cooperative, Western United Dairymen, The Westervelt Company, Weyerhaeuser Company, Whitetails Unlimited, Inc.

Wild Sheep Foundation, Wildlife Forever, Wildlife Management Institute, Wildlife Mississippi, Wisconsin Agri-Business Association, Wisconsin Farmers Union, Wisconsin Paper Council, Wisconsin Pork Association, Wisconsin Woodland Owners Association, Women Involved in Farm Economics, World Wildlife Fund, Wyoming Sugar Company, Yankee Farm Credit, Yosemite Farm Credit.

Mr. MCGOVERN. At this point I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, this is a shameful day. The House Republican leadership has decided again to abandon all efforts to come to a bipartisan agreement on the farm bill. Instead, they've launched an attack—on the working poor, veterans, children and seniors who rely on the nutrition program—in a desperate attempt to win political points with their conservative base.

After an embarrassing, chaotic defeat of their last proposal, they've decided to make a bad situation even worse. This proposal strips out the entire nutrition title, putting families and children at risk of going hungry.

They made a clear choice to protect generous subsidies for agriculture corporations at the expense of the hungry and the working poor.

Make no mistake: today, House Republicans are telling hungry children, food banks struggling to meet the needs of their communities, and low-income seniors who depend on food assistance that their needs don't matter.

And I urge my colleagues to understand that for 180,000 Rhode Islanders who benefit from this nutrition program, they are not extraneous. This is disgraceful, it's immoral, and it's contrary to our values as a Nation.

I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this shameful proposal.

Mr. SESSIONS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield for a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it takes food nutrition from working families.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOHMERT. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to yield for a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it takes food nutrition from working families.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

Mr. GOHMERT. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time. I have no additional speakers except myself when I close.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I'm the final speaker on our side, so I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, this is about our values. This is about what we stand for.

The constant attacks by some of my Republican friends, by many on the other side of the aisle, on SNAP, on poor people, on the vulnerable is just plain wrong. And, quite frankly, it's offensive.

Three weeks ago, this farm bill failed in this House because the Republicans cannot govern. You know, you are in control. Sixty-two of your Members, including five committee chairs, voted ''no.''

To suggest that somehow Democrats should have carried this bill is ludicrous because I want to make one thing clear: we are not going to vote for a bill that sticks it to poor people, and that's exactly what this bill does.

The bill that you had on the floor that threw 2 million people off SNAP was unacceptable, and we could not vote for that.

There are 50 million people in this country who are hungry; 17 million of them are children. Millions of people who are on SNAP work for a living. They go to work every day; but they earn so little, they still qualify for this benefit.

These are our neighbors. These are our brothers; these are our sisters. Please do not turn your backs on them. Please do not turn your backs on these people. We are a better country than that.

Please don't be so callous, because that's what this is about, when you throw 2 million people off this benefit, or even more. Because we have no idea what was promised to get votes on this current bill right now. We have no idea how much you're going to cut the SNAP program or whether you're going to sunset it, because none of us know what was decided in the Republican Conference.

But when you cut people who are poor, when you deny them the benefit of food, which should be a right in this country, that is callous. That is cruel. We should not be doing that.

We should be about helping people, not hurting people. So have a heart.

Where's your conscience?

What makes this country great, what makes America great is that we've had a tradition for caring for the least among us. That's why we're so angry over here, because all of a sudden it seems like we're turning our backs on the poor.

There used to be a bipartisan consensus when it came to making sure that the hungry in this country get enough to eat. There's a long history of bipartisanship on this.

All of a sudden this has become a partisan issue, and the target, so that you can try to balance the budget, has been placed right on the programs like SNAP, nutrition programs, programs that feed our senior citizens, provide our children meals in schools.

You've even gone after WIC. Enough. Enough. We can do better. We can have a bipartisan farm bill if you will move over to our side and understand that we have an obligation to take care of the most vulnerable.

So vote ''no'' on this rule. Vote ''no'' on the underlying bill. We can do so much better.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair, not to other Members of the body in the second person.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time.

I believe that the gentleman from Oklahoma represents not just the conscience of my party, but also of the Members of the House of Representatives. I think he well and faithfully is attempting to do his job; and it is this body today that will have an opportunity, after hearing the gentleman from Oklahoma speak about not just his desire, but his leadership on behalf of the Agriculture Committee.

As he approached the Rules Committee last night, he spoke very clearly and eloquently and said it is his desire to have the farm bill farm bill, as he calls it, to be able to be before this body today where we can pass good and wise farm bill policy.

He also stated, before not only all the Members, but also in testimony that he presented to the committee, that it is his intent to follow up today's bill, farm bill farm bill, with a nutrition program bill that he would bring to the Rules Committee for this House to consider.

This man has worked on a bipartisan basis and, I believe, should have the admiration and respect of this body. But more importantly, the gentleman placed his word of what he's trying to do before this body. I think he is a sincere and honest man.

It is my intent, as the chairman of the Rules Committee, as it was last night, to say to this body today, this bill, farm bill farm bill, that is before you does appropriate and good things for farmers and for people who make a living and provide this country with the agriculture and products it needs. We are trying to make sure that that is faithfully and well done today.

I believe the gentleman from Oklahoma deserves the respect of this body, and I would ask for each and every one of us to please vote ''yes'' on this rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 223, noes 195, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 349]

AYES—223

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—195

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—16

Broun (GA)
Campbell
Carson (IN)
Cassidy
Gohmert
Holt
Horsford
Hunter
Kaptur
Lummis
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Rogers (MI)
Schweikert
Shimkus

□ 1300

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL AGRICULTURE REFORM AND RISK MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2013

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 295, I call up the bill (H.R. 2642) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018,

and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 295, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2642

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

SEC. 2. DEFINITION OF SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.

In this Act, the term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Agriculture.

TITLE I—COMMODITIES

Subtitle A—Repeals and Reforms

SEC. 1101. REPEAL OF DIRECT PAYMENTS.

(a) REPEAL.—Sections 1103 and 1303 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8713, 8753) are repealed.

(b) CONTINUED APPLICATION FOR 2013 CROP YEAR.—Sections 1103 and 1303 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8713, 8753), as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, shall continue to apply through the 2013 crop year with respect to all covered commodities (as defined in section 1001 of that Act (7 U.S.C. 8702)) and peanuts on a farm.

(c) CONTINUED APPLICATION FOR 2014 AND 2015 CROP YEARS.—Subject to this subtitle, the amendments made by sections 1603 and 1604 of this Act, and sections 1607 and 1611 of this Act, section 1103 of the Food, Conservation and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8713), as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, shall continue to apply through the 2014 and 2015 crop years with respect to upland cotton only (as defined in section 1001 of that Act (7 U.S.C. 8702)), except that, in applying such section 1103, the term ''payment acres'' means the following:

(1) For crop year 2014, 70 percent of the base acres of upland cotton on a farm on which direct payments are made.

(2) For crop year 2015, 60 percent of the base acres of upland cotton on a farm on which direct payments are made.

SEC. 1102. REPEAL OF COUNTER-CYCLICAL PAYMENTS.

(a) REPEAL.—Sections 1104 and 1304 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8714, 8754) are repealed.

(b) CONTINUED APPLICATION FOR 2013 CROP YEAR.—Sections 1104 and 1304 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8714, 8754), as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, shall continue to apply through the 2013 crop year with respect to all covered commodities (as defined in section 1001 of that Act (7 U.S.C. 8702)) and peanuts on a farm.

SEC. 1103. REPEAL OF AVERAGE CROP REVENUE ELECTION PROGRAM.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 1105 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8715) is repealed.

(b) CONTINUED APPLICATION FOR 2013 CROP YEAR.—Section 1105 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8715), as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, shall continue to apply through the 2013 crop year with respect to all covered commodities (as defined in section 1001 of that Act (7 U.S.C. 8702)) and peanuts on a farm for which the irrevocable election under section 1105 of that Act was made before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 1104. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle and subtitle B:

(1) ACTUAL COUNTY REVENUE.—The term ''actual county revenue'', with respect to a covered commodity for a crop year, means the amount determined by the Secretary under section 1107(c)(4) to determine whether revenue loss coverage payments are required to be provided for that crop year.

(2) BASE ACRES.—The term ''base acres'', with respect to a covered commodity and cotton on a farm, means the number of acres established under sections 1101 and 1302 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 7911, 7952) or sections 1101 and 1302 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8711, 8752), as in effect on September 30, 2013, subject to any adjustment under section 1105 of this Act. For purposes of making payments under subsections (b) and (c) of section 1107, base acres are reduced by the payment acres calculated in section 1101(c).

(3) COUNTY REVENUE LOSS COVERAGE TRIGGER.—The term ''county revenue loss coverage trigger'', with respect to a covered commodity for a crop year, means the amount determined by the Secretary under section 1107(c)(5) to determine whether revenue loss coverage payments are required to be provided for that crop year.

(4) COVERED COMMODITY.—The term ''covered commodity'' means wheat, oats, and barley (including wheat, oats, and barley used for haying and grazing), corn, grain sorghum, long grain rice, medium grain rice, pulse crops, soybeans, other oilseeds, and peanuts.

(5) EFFECTIVE PRICE.—The term ''effective price'', with respect to a covered commodity for a crop year, means the price calculated by the Secretary under section 1107(b)(2) to determine whether price loss coverage payments are required to be provided for that crop year.

(6) EXTRA LONG STAPLE COTTON.—The term ''extra long staple cotton'' means cotton that—

(A) is produced from pure strain varieties of the Barbadense species or any hybrid of the species, or other similar types of extra long staple cotton, designated by the Secretary, having characteristics needed for various end uses for which United States upland cotton is not suitable and grown in irrigated cotton-growing regions of the United States designated by the Secretary or other areas designated by the Secretary as suitable for the production of the varieties or types; and

(B) is ginned on a roller-type gin or, if authorized by the Secretary, ginned on another type gin for experimental purposes.

(7) FARM BASE ACRES.—The term ''farm base acres'' means the sum of the base acreage for all covered commodities and cotton on a farm in effect as of September 30, 2013, and subject to any adjustment under section 1105.

(8) MEDIUM GRAIN RICE.—The term ''medium grain rice'' includes short grain rice.

(9) MIDSEASON PRICE.—The term ''midseason price'' means the applicable national average market price received by producers for the first 5 months of the applicable marketing year, as determined by the Secretary.

(10) OTHER OILSEED.—The term ''other oilseed'' means a crop of sunflower seed, rapeseed, canola, safflower, flaxseed, mustard seed, crambe, sesame seed, or any oilseed designated by the Secretary.

(11) PAYMENT ACRES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraphs (B) through (D), the term ''payment acres'', with respect to the provision of price loss coverage payments and revenue loss coverage payments, means—

(i) 85 percent of total acres planted for the year to each covered commodity on a farm; and

(ii) 30 percent of total acres approved as prevented from being planted for the year to each covered commodity on a farm.

(B) MAXIMUM.—The total quantity of payment acres determined under subparagraph (A) shall not exceed the farm base acres.

(C) REDUCTION.—If the sum of all payment acres for a farm exceeds the limits established under subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall reduce the payment acres applicable to each crop proportionately.

(D) EXCLUSION.—The term ''payment acres'' does not include any crop subsequently planted during the same crop year on the same land for which the first crop is eligible for payments under this subtitle, unless the crop was approved for double cropping in the county, as determined by the Secretary.

(12) PAYMENT YIELD.—The term ''payment yield'' means the yield established for counter-cyclical payments under section 1102 or 1302 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 7912, 7952), section 1102 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8712), as in effect on September 30, 2013, or under section 1106 of this Act, for a farm for a covered commodity.

(13) PRICE LOSS COVERAGE.—The term ''price loss coverage'' means coverage provided under section 1107(b).

(14) PRODUCER.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''producer'' means an owner, operator, landlord, tenant, or sharecropper that shares in the risk of producing a crop and is entitled to share in the crop available for marketing from the farm, or would have shared had the crop been produced.

(B) HYBRID SEED.—In determining whether a grower of hybrid seed is a producer, the Secretary shall—

(i) not take into consideration the existence of a hybrid seed contract; and

(ii) ensure that program requirements do not adversely affect the ability of the grower to receive a payment under this title.

(15) PULSE CROP.—The term ''pulse crop'' means dry peas, lentils, small chickpeas, and large chickpeas.

(16) REFERENCE PRICE.—The term ''reference price'', with respect to a covered commodity for a crop year, means the following:

(A) Wheat, $5.50 per bushel.

(B) Corn, $3.70 per bushel.

(C) Grain sorghum, $3.95 per bushel.

(D) Barley, $4.95 per bushel.

(E) Oats, $2.40 per bushel.

(F) Long grain rice, $14.00 per hundredweight.

(G) Medium grain rice, $14.00 per hundredweight.

(H) Soybeans, $8.40 per bushel.

(I) Other oilseeds, $20.15 per hundredweight.

(J) Peanuts $535.00 per ton.

(K) Dry peas, $11.00 per hundredweight.

(L) Lentils, $19.97 per hundredweight.

(M) Small chickpeas, $19.04 per hundredweight.

(N) Large chickpeas, $21.54 per hundredweight.

(17) REVENUE LOSS COVERAGE.—The term ''revenue loss coverage'' means coverage provided under section 1107(c).

(18) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(19) STATE.—The term ''State'' means—

(A) a State;

(B) the District of Columbia;

(C) the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; and

(D) any other territory or possession of the United States.

(20) TEMPERATE JAPONICA RICE.—The term ''temperate japonica rice'' means rice that is grown in high altitudes or temperate regions of high latitudes with cooler climate conditions, in the Western United States, as determined by the Secretary.

(21) TRANSITIONAL YIELD.—The term ''transitional yield'' has the meaning given the term in section 502(b) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1502(b)).

(22) UNITED STATES.—The term ''United States'', when used in a geographical sense, means all of the States.

(23) UNITED STATES PREMIUM FACTOR.—The term ''United States Premium Factor'' means the percentage by which the difference in the United States loan schedule premiums for Strict Middling (SM) 1⅛-inch upland cotton and for Middling (M) 1$^{3}/_{32}$-inch upland cotton exceeds the difference in the applicable premiums for comparable international qualities.

SEC. 1105. BASE ACRES.

(a) ADJUSTMENT OF BASE ACRES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide for an adjustment, as appropriate, in the base acres for covered commodities and cotton for a farm whenever any of the following circumstances occurs:

(A) A conservation reserve contract entered into under section 1231 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831) with respect to the farm expires or is voluntarily terminated.

(B) Cropland is released from coverage under a conservation reserve contract by the Secretary.

(C) The producer has eligible oilseed acreage as the result of the Secretary designating additional oilseeds, which shall be determined in the same manner as eligible oilseed acreage under section 1101(a)(1)(D) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8711(a)(1)(D)).

(2) SPECIAL CONSERVATION RESERVE ACREAGE PAYMENT RULES.—For the crop year in which a base acres adjustment under subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (1) is first made, the owner of the farm shall elect to receive price loss coverage or revenue loss coverage with respect to the acreage added to the farm under this subsection or a prorated payment under the conservation reserve contract, but not both.

(b) PREVENTION OF EXCESS BASE ACRES.—

(1) REQUIRED REDUCTION.—If the sum of the base acres for a farm, together with the acreage described in paragraph (2) exceeds the actual cropland acreage of the farm, the Secretary shall reduce the base acres for 1 or more covered commodities or cotton for the farm so that the sum of the base acres and acreage described in paragraph (2) does not exceed the actual cropland acreage of the farm.

(2) OTHER ACREAGE.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the Secretary shall include the following:

(A) Any acreage on the farm enrolled in the conservation reserve program or wetlands reserve program (or successor programs) under chapter 1 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3830 et seq.).

(B) Any other acreage on the farm enrolled in a Federal conservation program for which payments are made in exchange for not producing an agricultural commodity on the acreage.

(C) If the Secretary designates additional oilseeds, any eligible oilseed acreage, which shall be determined in the same manner as eligible oilseed acreage under subsection (a)(1)(C).

(3) SELECTION OF ACRES.—The Secretary shall give the owner of the farm the opportunity to select the base acres for a covered commodity or cotton for the farm against which the reduction required by paragraph (1) will be made.

(4) EXCEPTION FOR DOUBLE-CROPPED ACREAGE.—In applying paragraph (1), the Secretary shall make an exception in the case of double cropping, as determined by the Secretary.

(c) REDUCTION IN BASE ACRES.—

(1) REDUCTION AT OPTION OF OWNER.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The owner of a farm may reduce, at any time, the base acres for any covered commodity or cotton for the farm.

(B) EFFECT OF REDUCTION.—A reduction under subparagraph (A) shall be permanent and made in a manner prescribed by the Secretary.

(2) REQUIRED ACTION BY SECRETARY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall proportionately reduce base acres on a farm for covered commodities and cotton for land that has been subdivided and developed for multiple residential units or other nonfarming uses if the size of the tracts and the density of the subdivision is such that the land is unlikely to return to the previous agricultural use, unless the producers on the farm demonstrate that the land—

(i) remains devoted to commercial agricultural production; or

(ii) is likely to be returned to the previous agricultural use.

(B) REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary shall establish procedures to identify land described in subparagraph (A).

SEC. 1106. PAYMENT YIELDS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT AND PURPOSE.—For the purpose of making payments under this subtitle, the Secretary shall provide for the establishment of a yield for each farm for any designated oilseed for which a payment yield was not established under section 1102 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8712) in accordance with this section.

(b) PAYMENT YIELDS FOR DESIGNATED OILSEEDS.—

(1) DETERMINATION OF AVERAGE YIELD.—In the case of designated oilseeds, the Secretary shall determine the average yield per planted acre for the designated oilseed on a farm for the 1998 through 2001 crop years, excluding any crop year in which the acreage planted to the designated oilseed was zero.

(2) ADJUSTMENT FOR PAYMENT YIELD.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The payment yield for a farm for a designated oilseed shall be equal to the product of the following:

(i) The average yield for the designated oilseed determined under paragraph (1).

(ii) The ratio resulting from dividing the national average yield for the designated oilseed for the 1981 through 1985 crops by the national average yield for the designated oilseed for the 1998 through 2001 crops.

(B) NO NATIONAL AVERAGE YIELD INFORMATION AVAILABLE.—To the extent that national average yield information for a designated oilseed is not available, the Secretary shall use such information as the Secretary determines to be fair and equitable to establish a national average yield under this section.

(3) USE OF COUNTY AVERAGE YIELD.—If the yield per planted acre for a crop of a designated oilseed for a farm for any of the 1998 through 2001 crop years was less than 75 percent of the county yield for that designated oilseed, the Secretary shall assign a yield for that crop year equal to 75 percent of the county yield for the purpose of determining the average under paragraph (1).

(4) NO HISTORIC YIELD DATA AVAILABLE.—In the case of establishing yields for designated oilseeds, if historic yield data is not available, the Secretary shall use the ratio for dry peas calculated under paragraph (2)(A)(ii) in determining the yields for designated oilseeds, as determined to be fair and equitable by the Secretary.

(c) EFFECT OF LACK OF PAYMENT YIELD.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT BY SECRETARY.—If no payment yield is otherwise established for a farm for which a covered commodity is planted and eligible to receive price loss coverage payments, the Secretary shall establish an appropriate payment yield for the covered commodity on the farm under paragraph (2).

(2) USE OF SIMILARLY SITUATED FARMS.—To establish an appropriate payment yield for a covered commodity on a farm as required by paragraph (1), the Secretary shall take into consideration the farm program payment yields applicable to that covered commodity for similarly situated farms. The use of such data in an appeal, by the Secretary or by the producer, shall not be subject to any other provision of law.

(d) SINGLE OPPORTUNITY TO UPDATE YIELDS USED TO DETERMINE PRICE LOSS COVERAGE PAYMENTS.—

(1) ELECTION TO UPDATE.—At the sole discretion of the owner of a farm, the owner of a farm shall have a 1-time opportunity to update the payment yields on a covered commodity-by-covered-commodity basis that would otherwise be used in calculating any price loss coverage payment for covered commodities on the farm.

(2) TIME FOR ELECTION.—The election under paragraph (1) shall be made at a time and manner to be in effect for the 2014 crop year as determined by the Secretary.

(3) METHOD OF UPDATING YIELDS.—If the owner of a farm elects to update yields under this subsection, the payment yield for a covered commodity on the farm, for the purpose of calculating price loss coverage payments only, shall be equal to 90 percent of the average of the yield per planted acre for the crop of the covered commodity on the farm for the 2008 through 2012 crop years, as determined by the Secretary, excluding any crop year in which the acreage planted to the crop of the covered commodity was zero.

(4) USE OF COUNTY AVERAGE YIELD.—If the yield per planted acre for a crop of the covered commodity for a farm for any of the 2008 through 2012 crop years was less than 75 percent of the average of the 2008 through 2012 county yield for that commodity, the Secretary shall assign a yield for that crop year equal to 75 percent of the average of the 2008 through 2012 county yield for the purposes of determining the average yield under paragraph (3).

(5) EFFECT OF LACK OF PAYMENT YIELD.—

(A) ESTABLISHMENT BY SECRETARY.—For purposes of this subsection, if no payment yield is otherwise established for a covered commodity on a farm, the Secretary shall establish an appropriate updated payment yield for the covered commodity on the farm under subparagraph (B).

(B) USE OF SIMILARLY SITUATED FARMS.—To establish an appropriate payment yield for a covered commodity on a farm as required by subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall take into consideration the farm program payment yields applicable to that covered commodity for similarly situated farms. The use of such data in an appeal, by the Secretary or by the producer, shall not be subject to any other provision of law.

SEC. 1107. FARM RISK MANAGEMENT ELECTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) PAYMENTS REQUIRED.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), if the Secretary determines that payments are required under subsection (b)(1) or (c)(2) for a covered commodity, the Secretary shall make payments for that covered commodity available under such subsection to producers on a farm pursuant to the terms and conditions of this section.

(2) PROHIBITION ON PAYMENTS; EXCEPTIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, a producer on a farm may not receive price loss coverage payments or revenue loss coverage payments if the sum of the planted acres of covered commodities on the farm is 10 acres or less, as determined by the Secretary, unless the producer is—

(A) a socially disadvantaged farmer or rancher (as defined in section 355(e) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 2003(e))); or

(B) a limited resource farmer or rancher, as defined by the Secretary.

(b) PRICE LOSS COVERAGE.—

(1) PAYMENTS.—For the 2014 crop year and each succeeding crop year, the Secretary shall make price loss coverage payments to producers on a farm for a covered commodity if the Secretary determines that—

(A) the effective price for the covered commodity for the crop year; is less than

(B) the reference price for the covered commodity for the crop year.

(2) EFFECTIVE PRICE.—The effective price for a covered commodity for a crop year shall be the higher of—

(A) the midseason price; or

(B) the national average loan rate for a marketing assistance loan for the covered commodity in effect for such crop year under subtitle B.

(3) PAYMENT RATE.—The payment rate shall be equal to the difference between—

(A) the reference price for the covered commodity; and

(B) the effective price determined under paragraph (2) for the covered commodity.

(4) PAYMENT AMOUNT.—If price loss coverage payments are required to be provided under this subsection for the 2014 crop year or any succeding crop year for a covered commodity, the amount of the price loss coverage payment to be paid to the producers on a farm for the crop year shall be equal to the product obtained by multiplying—

(A) the payment rate for the covered commodity under paragraph (3);

(B) the payment yield for the covered commodity; and

(C) the payment acres for the covered commodity.

(5) TIME FOR PAYMENTS.—If the Secretary determines under this subsection that price loss coverage payments are required to be provided for the covered commodity, the payments shall be made beginning October 1, or as soon as practicable thereafter, after the end of the applicable marketing year for the covered commodity.

(6) SPECIAL RULE FOR BARLEY.—In determining the effective price for barley in paragraph (2), the Secretary shall use the all-barley price.

(7) SPECIAL RULE FOR TEMPERATE JAPONICA RICE.—The Secretary shall provide a reference price with respect to temperate japonica rice in an amount equal to 115 percent of the amount established in subparagraphs (F) and (G) of section 1104(16) in order to reflect price premiums.

(c) REVENUE LOSS COVERAGE.—

(1) AVAILABLE AS AN ALTERNATIVE.—As an alternative to receiving price loss coverage payments under subsection (b) for a covered commodity, all of the owners of the farm may make a one-time, irrevocable election on a covered commodity-by-covered-commodity basis to receive revenue loss coverage payments for each covered commodity in accordance with this subsection. If any of the owners of the farm make different elections on the same covered commodity on the farm, all of the owners of the farm shall be deemed to have not made the election available under this paragraph.

(2) PAYMENTS.—In the case of owners of a farm that make the election described in paragraph (1) for a covered commodity, the Secretary shall make revenue loss coverage payments available under this subsection for the 2014 crop year and each succeeding crop year if the Secretary determines that—

(A) the actual county revenue for the crop year for the covered commodity; is less than

(B) the county revenue loss coverage trigger for the crop year for the covered commodity.

(3) TIME FOR PAYMENTS.—If the Secretary determines under this subsection that revenue loss coverage payments are required to be provided for the covered commodity, payments shall be made beginning October 1, or as soon as practicable thereafter, after the end of the applicable marketing year for the covered commodity.

(4) ACTUAL COUNTY REVENUE.—The amount of the actual county revenue for a crop year of a covered commodity shall be equal to the product obtained by multiplying—

(A) the actual county yield, as determined by the Secretary, for each planted acre for the crop year for the covered commodity; and

(B) the higher of—

(i) the midseason price; or

(ii) the national average loan rate for a marketing assistance loan for the covered commodity in effect for such crop year under subtitle B.

(5) COUNTY REVENUE LOSS COVERAGE TRIGGER.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The county revenue loss coverage trigger for a crop year for a covered commodity on a farm shall equal 85 percent of the benchmark county revenue.

(B) BENCHMARK COUNTY REVENUE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The benchmark county revenue shall be the product obtained by multiplying—

(I) subject to clause (ii), the average historical county yield as determined by the Secretary for the most recent 5 crop years, excluding each of the crop years with the highest and lowest yields; and

(II) subject to clause (iii), the average national marketing year average price for the most recent 5 crop years, excluding each of the crop years with the highest and lowest prices.

(ii) YIELD CONDITIONS.—If the historical county yield in clause (i)(I) for any of the 5 most recent crop years, as determined by the Secretary, is less than 70 percent of the transitional yield, as determined by the Secretary, the amounts used for any of those years in clause (i)(I) shall be 70 percent of the transitional yield.

(iii) REFERENCE PRICE.—If the national marketing year average price in clause (i)(II) for any of the 5 most recent crop years is lower than the reference price for the covered commodity, the Secretary shall use the reference price for any of those years for the amounts in clause (i)(II).

(6) PAYMENT RATE.—The payment rate shall be equal to the lesser of—

(A) the difference between—

(i) the county revenue loss coverage trigger for the covered commodity; and

(ii) the actual county revenue for the crop year for the covered commodity; or

(B) 10 percent of the benchmark county revenue for the crop year for the covered commodity.

(7) PAYMENT AMOUNT.—If revenue loss coverage payments under this subsection are required to be provided for the 2014 crop year or any succeeding crop year of a covered commodity, the amount of the revenue loss coverage payment to be provided to the producers on a farm for the crop year shall be equal to the product obtained by multiplying—

(A) the payment rate under paragraph (6); and

(B) the payment acres of the covered commodity on the farm.

(8) DUTIES OF THE SECRETARY.—In providing revenue loss coverage payments under this subsection, the Secretary—

(A) shall ensure that producers on a farm do not reconstitute the farm of the producers to void or change the election made under paragraph (1);

(B) to the maximum extent practicable, shall use all available information and analysis, including data mining, to check for anomalies in the provision of revenue loss coverage payments;

(C) to the maximum extent practicable, shall calculate a separate county revenue loss coverage trigger for irrigated and nonirrigated covered commodities and a separate actual county revenue for irrigated and nonirrigated covered commodities;

(D) shall assign a benchmark county yield for each planted acre for the crop year for the covered commodity on the basis of the yield history of representative farms in the State, region, or crop reporting district, as determined by the Secretary, if—

(i) the Secretary cannot establish the benchmark county yield for each planted acre for a crop year for a covered commodity in the county in accordance with paragraph (5); or

(ii) the yield determined under paragraph (5) is an unrepresentative average yield for the county (as determined by the Secretary); and

(E) to the maximum extent practicable, shall ensure that in order to be eligible for a payment under this subsection, the producers on the farm suffered an actual loss on the covered commodity for the crop year for which payment is sought.

(d) ANNUAL REPORT.—The Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report annually containing an evaluation of the impact of price loss coverage and revenue loss coverage—

(1) on the planting, production, price, and export of covered commodities; and

(2) on the cost of each commodity program.

(e) CAP ON TOTAL OBLIGATIONS AND EXPENDITURES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the total amount of price loss coverage payments and revenue loss coverage payments made under this section during the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2020 shall not exceed $16,956,500,000. Producer agreements required by section 1108 shall specifically state that payments made under this section shall be reduced as necessary to comply with this subsection.

SEC. 1108. PRODUCER AGREEMENTS.

(a) COMPLIANCE WITH CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) REQUIREMENTS.—Before the producers on a farm may receive payments under this subtitle with respect to the farm, the producers shall agree, during the crop year for which the payments are made and in exchange for the payments—

(A) to comply with applicable conservation requirements under subtitle B of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3811 et seq.);

(B) to comply with applicable wetland protection requirements under subtitle C of title XII of that Act (16 U.S.C. 3821 et seq.); and

(C) to effectively control noxious weeds and otherwise maintain the land in accordance with sound agricultural practices, as determined by the Secretary.

(2) COMPLIANCE.—The Secretary may issue such rules as the Secretary considers necessary to ensure producer compliance with the requirements of paragraph (1).

(3) MODIFICATION.—At the request of the transferee or owner, the Secretary may modify the requirements of this subsection if the modifications are consistent with the objectives of this subsection, as determined by the Secretary.

(b) TRANSFER OR CHANGE OF INTEREST IN FARM.—

(1) TERMINATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a transfer of (or change in) the interest of the producers on a farm for which payments under this subtitle are provided shall result in the termination of the payments, unless the transferee or owner of the acreage agrees to assume all obligations under subsection (a).

(B) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The termination shall take effect on the date determined by the Secretary.

(2) EXCEPTION.—If a producer entitled to a payment under this subtitle dies, becomes incompetent, or is otherwise unable to receive the payment, the Secretary shall make the payment in accordance with rules issued by the Secretary.

(c) ACREAGE REPORTS.—As a condition on the receipt of any benefits under this subtitle or subtitle B, the Secretary shall require producers on a farm to submit to the Secretary annual acreage reports with respect to all cropland on the farm.

(d) TENANTS AND SHARECROPPERS.—In carrying out this subtitle, the Secretary shall provide adequate safeguards to protect the interests of tenants and sharecroppers.

(e) SHARING OF PAYMENTS.—The Secretary shall provide for the sharing of payments made under this subtitle among the producers on a farm on a fair and equitable basis.

Subtitle B—Marketing Loans

SEC. 1201. AVAILABILITY OF NONRECOURSE MARKETING ASSISTANCE LOANS FOR LOAN COMMODITIES.

(a) DEFINITION OF LOAN COMMODITY.—In this subtitle, the term ''loan commodity'' means wheat, corn, grain sorghum, barley, oats, upland cotton, extra long staple cotton, long grain rice, medium grain rice, peanuts, soybeans, other oilseeds, graded wool, nongraded wool, mohair, honey, dry peas, lentils, small chickpeas, and large chickpeas.

(b) NONRECOURSE LOANS AVAILABLE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For the 2014 crops and each succeeding annual crops of each loan commodity, the Secretary shall make available to producers on a farm nonrecourse marketing assistance loans for loan commodities produced on the farm.

(2) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The marketing assistance loans shall be made under terms and conditions that are prescribed by the Secretary and at the loan rate established under section 1202 for the loan commodity.

(c) ELIGIBLE PRODUCTION.—The producers on a farm shall be eligible for a marketing assistance loan under subsection (b) for any quantity of a loan commodity produced on the farm.

(d) COMPLIANCE WITH CONSERVATION AND WETLANDS REQUIREMENTS.—As a condition of the receipt of a marketing assistance loan under subsection (b), the producer shall comply with applicable conservation requirements under subtitle B of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3811 et seq.) and applicable wetland protection requirements under subtitle C of title XII of that Act (16 U.S.C. 3821 et seq.) during the term of the loan.

(e) SPECIAL RULES FOR PEANUTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—This subsection shall apply only to producers of peanuts.

(2) OPTIONS FOR OBTAINING LOAN.—A marketing assistance loan under this section, and loan deficiency payments under section 1205, may be obtained at the option of the producers on a farm through—

(A) a designated marketing association or marketing cooperative of producers that is approved by the Secretary; or

(B) the Farm Service Agency.

(3) STORAGE OF LOAN PEANUTS.—As a condition on the approval by the Secretary of an individual or entity to provide storage for peanuts for which a marketing assistance loan is made under this section, the individual or entity shall agree—

(A) to provide the storage on a nondiscriminatory basis; and

(B) to comply with such additional requirements as the Secretary considers appropriate to accomplish the purposes of this section and promote fairness in the administration of the benefits of this section.

(4) STORAGE, HANDLING, AND ASSOCIATED COSTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—To ensure proper storage of peanuts for which a loan is made under this section, the Secretary shall pay handling and other associated costs (other than storage costs) incurred at the time at which the peanuts are placed under loan, as determined by the Secretary.

(B) REDEMPTION AND FORFEITURE.—The Secretary shall—

(i) require the repayment of handling and other associated costs paid under subparagraph (A) for all peanuts pledged as collateral for a loan that is redeemed under this section; and

(ii) pay storage, handling, and other associated costs for all peanuts pledged as collateral that are forfeited under this section.

(5) MARKETING.—A marketing association or cooperative may market peanuts for which a loan is made under this section in any manner that conforms to consumer needs, including the separation of peanuts by type and quality.

(6) REIMBURSABLE AGREEMENTS AND PAYMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—The Secretary may implement any reimbursable agreements or provide for the payment of administrative expenses under this subsection only in a manner that is consistent with those activities in regard to other loan commodities.

SEC. 1202. LOAN RATES FOR NONRECOURSE MARKETING ASSISTANCE LOANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of the 2014 crop year and each succeeding crop year, the loan rate for a marketing assistance loan under section 1201 for a loan commodity shall be equal to the following:

(1) In the case of wheat, $2.94 per bushel.

(2) In the case of corn, $1.95 per bushel.

(3) In the case of grain sorghum, $1.95 per bushel.

(4) In the case of barley, $1.95 per bushel.

(5) In the case of oats, $1.39 per bushel.

(6) In the case of base quality of upland cotton, for the 2014 crop year and each succeeding crop year, the simple average of the adjusted prevailing world price for the 2 immediately preceding marketing years, as determined by the Secretary and announced October 1 preceding the next domestic plantings, but in no case less than $0.47 per pound or more than $0.52 per pound.

(7) In the case of extra long staple cotton, $0.7977 per pound.

(8) In the case of long grain rice, $6.50 per hundredweight.

(9) In the case of medium grain rice, $6.50 per hundredweight.

(10) In the case of soybeans, $5.00 per bushel.

(11) In the case of other oilseeds, $10.09 per hundredweight for each of the following kinds of oilseeds:

(A) Sunflower seed.

(B) Rapeseed.

(C) Canola.

(D) Safflower.

(E) Flaxseed.

(F) Mustard seed.

(G) Crambe.

(H) Sesame seed.

(I) Other oilseeds designated by the Secretary.

(12) In the case of dry peas, $5.40 per hundredweight.

(13) In the case of lentils, $11.28 per hundredweight.

(14) In the case of small chickpeas, $7.43 per hundredweight.

(15) In the case of large chickpeas, $11.28 per hundredweight.

(16) In the case of graded wool, $1.15 per pound.

(17) In the case of nongraded wool, $0.40 per pound.

(18) In the case of mohair, $4.20 per pound.

(19) In the case of honey, $0.69 per pound.

(20) In the case of peanuts, $355 per ton.

(b) SINGLE COUNTY LOAN RATE FOR OTHER OILSEEDS.—The Secretary shall establish a single loan rate in each county for each kind of other oilseeds described in subsection (a)(11).

SEC. 1203. TERM OF LOANS.

(a) TERM OF LOAN.—In the case of each loan commodity, a marketing assistance loan under section 1201 shall have a term of 9 months beginning on the first day of the first month after the month in which the loan is made.

(b) EXTENSIONS PROHIBITED.—The Secretary may not extend the term of a marketing assistance loan for any loan commodity.

SEC. 1204. REPAYMENT OF LOANS.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—The Secretary shall permit the producers on a farm to repay a marketing assistance loan under section 1201 for a loan commodity (other than upland cotton, long grain rice, medium grain rice, extra long staple cotton, peanuts and confectionery and each other kind of sunflower seed (other than oil sunflower seed)) at a rate that is the lesser of—

(1) the loan rate established for the commodity under section 1202, plus interest (determined in accordance with section 163 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7283));

(2) a rate (as determined by the Secretary) that—

(A) is calculated based on average market prices for the loan commodity during the preceding 30-day period; and

(B) will minimize discrepancies in marketing loan benefits across State boundaries and across county boundaries; or

(3) a rate that the Secretary may develop using alternative methods for calculating a repayment rate for a loan commodity that the Secretary determines will—

(A) minimize potential loan forfeitures;

(B) minimize the accumulation of stocks of the commodity by the Federal Government;

(C) minimize the cost incurred by the Federal Government in storing the commodity;

(D) allow the commodity produced in the United States to be marketed freely and competitively, both domestically and internationally; and

(E) minimize discrepancies in marketing loan benefits across State boundaries and across county boundaries.

(b) REPAYMENT RATES FOR UPLAND COTTON, LONG GRAIN RICE, AND MEDIUM GRAIN RICE.—The Secretary shall permit producers to repay a marketing assistance loan under section 1201 for upland cotton, long grain rice, and medium grain rice at a rate that is the lesser of—

(1) the loan rate established for the commodity under section 1202, plus interest (determined in accordance with section 163 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7283)); or

(2) the prevailing world market price for the commodity, as determined and adjusted by the Secretary in accordance with this section.

(c) REPAYMENT RATES FOR EXTRA LONG STAPLE COTTON.—Repayment of a marketing assistance loan for extra long staple cotton shall be at the loan rate established for the commodity under section 1202, plus interest (determined in accordance with section 163 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7283)).

(d) PREVAILING WORLD MARKET PRICE.—For purposes of this section and section 1207, the Secretary shall prescribe by regulation—

(1) a formula to determine the prevailing world market price for each of upland cotton, long grain rice, and medium grain rice; and

(2) a mechanism by which the Secretary shall announce periodically those prevailing world market prices.

(e) ADJUSTMENT OF PREVAILING WORLD MARKET PRICE FOR UPLAND COTTON, LONG GRAIN RICE, AND MEDIUM GRAIN RICE.—

(1) RICE.—The prevailing world market price for long grain rice and medium grain rice determined under subsection (d) shall be adjusted to United States quality and location.

(2) COTTON.—The prevailing world market price for upland cotton determined under subsection (d)—

(A) shall be adjusted to United States quality and location, with the adjustment to include—

(i) a reduction equal to any United States Premium Factor for upland cotton of a quality higher than Middling (M) 1 3/32-inch; and

(ii) the average costs to market the commodity, including average transportation costs, as determined by the Secretary; and

(B) may be further adjusted, during the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and ending on July 31, 2019, if the Secretary determines the adjustment is necessary—

(i) to minimize potential loan forfeitures;

(ii) to minimize the accumulation of stocks of upland cotton by the Federal Government;

(iii) to ensure that upland cotton produced in the United States can be marketed freely and competitively, both domestically and internationally; and

(iv) to ensure an appropriate transition between current-crop and forward-crop price quotations, except that the Secretary may use forward-crop price quotations prior to July 31 of a marketing year only if—

(I) there are insufficient current-crop price quotations; and

(II) the forward-crop price quotation is the lowest such quotation available.

(3) GUIDELINES FOR ADDITIONAL ADJUSTMENTS.—In making adjustments under this subsection, the Secretary shall establish a mechanism for determining and announcing the adjustments in order to avoid undue disruption in the United States market.

(f) REPAYMENT RATES FOR CONFECTIONERY AND OTHER KINDS OF SUNFLOWER SEEDS.—The Secretary shall permit the producers on a farm to repay a marketing assistance loan under section 1201 for confectionery and each other kind of sunflower seed (other than oil sunflower seed) at a rate that is the lesser of—

(1) the loan rate established for the commodity under section 1202, plus interest (determined in accordance with section 163 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7283)); or

(2) the repayment rate established for oil sunflower seed.

(g) PAYMENT OF COTTON STORAGE COSTS.—Effective for the 2014 crop year and each succeeding crop year, the Secretary shall make cotton storage payments available in the same manner, and at the same rates as the Secretary provided storage payments for the 2006 crop of cotton, except that the rates shall be reduced by 10 percent.

(h) REPAYMENT RATE FOR PEANUTS.—The Secretary shall permit producers on a farm to repay a marketing assistance loan for peanuts under section 1201 at a rate that is the lesser of—

(1) the loan rate established for peanuts under section 1202(a)(20), plus interest (determined in accordance with section 163 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7283)); or

(2) a rate that the Secretary determines will—

(A) minimize potential loan forfeitures;

(B) minimize the accumulation of stocks of peanuts by the Federal Government;

(C) minimize the cost incurred by the Federal Government in storing peanuts; and

(D) allow peanuts produced in the United States to be marketed freely and competitively, both domestically and internationally.

(i) AUTHORITY TO TEMPORARILY ADJUST REPAYMENT RATES.—

(1) ADJUSTMENT AUTHORITY.—In the event of a severe disruption to marketing, transportation, or related infrastructure, the Secretary may modify the repayment rate otherwise applicable under this section for marketing assistance loans under section 1201 for a loan commodity.

(2) DURATION.—Any adjustment made under paragraph (1) in the repayment rate for marketing assistance loans for a loan commodity shall be in effect on a short-term and temporary basis, as determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 1205. LOAN DEFICIENCY PAYMENTS.

(a) AVAILABILITY OF LOAN DEFICIENCY PAYMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (d), the Secretary may make loan deficiency payments available to producers on a farm that, although eligible to obtain a marketing assistance loan under section 1201 with respect to a loan commodity, agree to forgo obtaining the loan for the commodity in return for loan deficiency payments under this section.

(2) UNSHORN PELTS, HAY, AND SILAGE.—

(A) MARKETING ASSISTANCE LOANS.—Subject to subparagraph (B), nongraded wool in the form of unshorn pelts and hay and silage derived from a loan commodity are not eligible for a marketing assistance loan under section 1201.

(B) LOAN DEFICIENCY PAYMENT.—Effective for the 2014 crop year and each succeeding crop year, the Secretary may make loan deficiency payments available under this section to producers on a farm that produce unshorn pelts or hay and silage derived from a loan commodity.

(b) COMPUTATION.—A loan deficiency payment for a loan commodity or commodity referred to in subsection (a)(2) shall be equal to the product obtained by multiplying—

(1) the payment rate determined under subsection (c) for the commodity; by

(2) the quantity of the commodity produced by the eligible producers, excluding any quantity for which the producers obtain a marketing assistance loan under section 1201.

(c) PAYMENT RATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a loan commodity, the payment rate shall be the amount by which—

(A) the loan rate established under section 1202 for the loan commodity; exceeds

(B) the rate at which a marketing assistance loan for the loan commodity may be repaid under section 1204.

(2) UNSHORN PELTS.—In the case of unshorn pelts, the payment rate shall be the amount by which—

(A) the loan rate established under section 1202 for ungraded wool; exceeds

(B) the rate at which a marketing assistance loan for ungraded wool may be repaid under section 1204.

(3) HAY AND SILAGE.—In the case of hay or silage derived from a loan commodity, the payment rate shall be the amount by which—

(A) the loan rate established under section 1202 for the loan commodity from which the hay or silage is derived; exceeds

(B) the rate at which a marketing assistance loan for the loan commodity may be repaid under section 1204.

(d) EXCEPTION FOR EXTRA LONG STAPLE COTTON.—This section shall not apply with respect to extra long staple cotton.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE FOR PAYMENT RATE DETERMINATION.—The Secretary shall determine the amount of the loan deficiency payment to be made under this section to the producers on a farm with respect to a quantity of a loan commodity or commodity referred to in subsection (a)(2) using the payment rate in effect under subsection (c) as of the date the producers request the payment.

SEC. 1206. PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF LOAN DEFICIENCY PAYMENTS FOR GRAZED ACREAGE.

(a) ELIGIBLE PRODUCERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Effective for the 2014 crop year and each succeeding crop year, in the case of a producer that would be eligible for a loan deficiency payment under section 1205 for wheat, barley, or oats, but that elects to use acreage planted to the wheat, barley, or oats for the grazing of livestock, the Secretary shall make a payment to the producer under this section if the producer enters into an agreement with the Secretary to forgo any other harvesting of the wheat, barley, or oats on that acreage.

(2) GRAZING OF TRITICALE ACREAGE.—Effective for the 2014 crop year and each succeeding crop year, with respect to a producer on a farm that uses acreage planted to triticale for the grazing of livestock, the Secretary shall make a payment to the producer under this section if the producer enters into an agreement with the Secretary to forgo any other harvesting of triticale on that acreage.

(b) PAYMENT AMOUNT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount of a payment made under this section to a producer on a farm described in subsection (a)(1) shall be equal to the amount determined by multiplying—

(A) the loan deficiency payment rate determined under section 1205(c) in effect, as of the date of the agreement, for the county in which the farm is located; by

(B) the payment quantity determined by multiplying—

(i) the quantity of the grazed acreage on the farm with respect to which the producer elects to forgo harvesting of wheat, barley, or oats; and

(ii)(I) the payment yield in effect for the calculation of price loss coverage under subtitle A with respect to that loan commodity on the farm; or

(II) in the case of a farm without a payment yield for that loan commodity, an appropriate yield established by the Secretary in a manner consistent with section 1106(c) of this Act.

(2) GRAZING OF TRITICALE ACREAGE.—The amount of a payment made under this section to a producer on a farm described in subsection (a)(2) shall be equal to the amount determined by multiplying—

(A) the loan deficiency payment rate determined under section 1205(c) in effect for wheat, as of the date of the agreement, for the county in which the farm is located; by

(B) the payment quantity determined by multiplying—

(i) the quantity of the grazed acreage on the farm with respect to which the producer elects to forgo harvesting of triticale; and

(ii)(I) the payment yield in effect for the calculation of price loss coverage under subtitle A with respect to wheat on the farm; or

(II) in the case of a farm without a payment yield for wheat, an appropriate yield established by the Secretary in a manner consistent with section 1106(c) of this Act.

(c) TIME, MANNER, AND AVAILABILITY OF PAYMENT.—

(1) TIME AND MANNER.—A payment under this section shall be made at the same time and in the same manner as loan deficiency payments are made under section 1205.

(2) AVAILABILITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish an availability period for the payments authorized by this section.

(B) CERTAIN COMMODITIES.—In the case of wheat, barley, and oats, the availability period shall be consistent with the availability period for the commodity established by the Secretary for marketing assistance loans authorized by this subtitle.

(d) PROHIBITION ON CROP INSURANCE INDEMNITY OR NONINSURED CROP ASSISTANCE.—A 2014 crop or succeeding annual crop of wheat, barley, oats, or triticale planted on acreage that a producer elects, in the agreement required by subsection (a), to use for the grazing of livestock in lieu of any other harvesting of the crop shall not be eligible for an indemnity under a policy or plan of insurance authorized under the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.) or noninsured crop assistance under section 196 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7333).

SEC. 1207. SPECIAL MARKETING LOAN PROVISIONS FOR UPLAND COTTON.

(a) SPECIAL IMPORT QUOTA.—

(1) DEFINITION OF SPECIAL IMPORT QUOTA.—In this subsection, the term ''special import quota'' means a quantity of imports that is not subject to the over-quota tariff rate of a tariff-rate quota.

(2) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The President shall carry out an import quota program beginning on August 1, 2014, as provided in this subsection.

(B) PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.—Whenever the Secretary determines and announces that for any consecutive 4-week period, the Friday through Thursday average price quotation for the lowest-priced United States growth, as quoted for Middling (M) 1$\frac{3}{32}$-inch cotton, delivered to a definable and significant international market, as determined by the Secretary, exceeds the prevailing world market price, there shall immediately be in effect a special import quota.

(3) QUANTITY.—The quota shall be equal to the consumption during a 1-week period of cotton by domestic mills at the seasonally adjusted average rate of the most recent 3 months for which official data of the Department of Agriculture are available or, in the absence of sufficient data, as estimated by the Secretary.

(4) APPLICATION.—The quota shall apply to upland cotton purchased not later than 90 days after the date of the Secretary's announcement under paragraph (2) and entered into the United States not later than 180 days after that date.

(5) OVERLAP.—A special quota period may be established that overlaps any existing quota period if required by paragraph (2), except that a special quota period may not be established under this subsection if a quota period has been established under subsection (b).

(6) PREFERENTIAL TARIFF TREATMENT.—The quantity under a special import quota shall be considered to be an in-quota quantity for purposes of—

(A) section 213(d) of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act (19 U.S.C. 2703(d));

(B) section 204 of the Andean Trade Preference Act (19 U.S.C. 3203);

(C) section 503(d) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463(d)); and

(D) General Note 3(a)(iv) to the Harmonized Tariff Schedule.

(7) LIMITATION.—The quantity of cotton entered into the United States during any marketing year under the special import quota established under this subsection may not exceed the equivalent of 10 weeks' consumption of upland cotton by domestic mills at the seasonally adjusted average rate of the 3 months immediately preceding the first special import quota established in any marketing year.

(b) LIMITED GLOBAL IMPORT QUOTA FOR UPLAND COTTON.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) DEMAND.—The term ''demand'' means—

(i) the average seasonally adjusted annual rate of domestic mill consumption of cotton during the most recent 3 months for which official data of the Department of Agriculture are available or, in the absence of sufficient data, as estimated by the Secretary; and

(ii) the larger of—

(I) average exports of upland cotton during the preceding 6 marketing years; or

(II) cumulative exports of upland cotton plus outstanding export sales for the marketing year in which the quota is established.

(B) LIMITED GLOBAL IMPORT QUOTA.—The term ''limited global import quota'' means a quantity of imports that is not subject to the over-quota tariff rate of a tariff-rate quota.

(C) SUPPLY.—The term ''supply'' means, using the latest official data of the Department of Agriculture—

(i) the carry-over of upland cotton at the beginning of the marketing year (adjusted to 480-pound bales) in which the quota is established;

(ii) production of the current crop; and

(iii) imports to the latest date available during the marketing year.

(2) PROGRAM.—The President shall carry out an import quota program that provides that whenever the Secretary determines and announces that the average price of the base quality of upland cotton, as determined by the Secretary, in the designated spot markets for a month exceeded 130 percent of the average price of the quality of cotton in the markets for the preceding 36 months, notwithstanding any other provision of law, there shall immediately be in effect a limited global import quota subject to the following conditions:

(A) QUANTITY.—The quantity of the quota shall be equal to 21 days of domestic mill consumption of upland cotton at the seasonally adjusted average rate of the most recent 3 months for which official data of the Department of Agriculture are available or, in the absence of sufficient data, as estimated by the Secretary.

(B) QUANTITY IF PRIOR QUOTA.—If a quota has been established under this subsection during the preceding 12 months, the quantity of the quota next established under this subsection shall be the smaller of 21 days of domestic mill consumption calculated under subparagraph (A) or the quantity required to increase the supply to 130 percent of the demand.

(C) PREFERENTIAL TARIFF TREATMENT.—The quantity under a limited global import quota shall be considered to be an in-quota quantity for purposes of—

(i) section 213(d) of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act (19 U.S.C. 2703(d));

(ii) section 204 of the Andean Trade Preference Act (19 U.S.C. 3203);

(iii) section 503(d) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463(d)); and

(iv) General Note 3(a)(iv) to the Harmonized Tariff Schedule.

(D) QUOTA ENTRY PERIOD.—When a quota is established under this subsection, cotton may be entered under the quota during the 90-day period beginning on the date the quota is established by the Secretary.

(3) NO OVERLAP.—Notwithstanding paragraph (2), a quota period may not be established that overlaps an existing quota period

or a special quota period established under subsection (a).

(c) ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE TO USERS OF UPLAND COTTON.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary shall, on a monthly basis, make economic adjustment assistance available to domestic users of upland cotton in the form of payments for all documented use of that upland cotton during the previous monthly period regardless of the origin of the upland cotton.

(2) VALUE OF ASSISTANCE.—Effective beginning on August 1, 2013, the value of the assistance provided under paragraph (1) shall be 3 cents per pound.

(3) ALLOWABLE PURPOSES.—Economic adjustment assistance under this subsection shall be made available only to domestic users of upland cotton that certify that the assistance shall be used only to acquire, construct, install, modernize, develop, convert, or expand land, plant, buildings, equipment, facilities, or machinery.

(4) REVIEW OR AUDIT.—The Secretary may conduct such review or audit of the records of a domestic user under this subsection as the Secretary determines necessary to carry out this subsection.

(5) IMPROPER USE OF ASSISTANCE.—If the Secretary determines, after a review or audit of the records of the domestic user, that economic adjustment assistance under this subsection was not used for the purposes specified in paragraph (3), the domestic user shall be—

(A) liable for the repayment of the assistance to the Secretary, plus interest, as determined by the Secretary; and

(B) ineligible to receive assistance under this subsection for a period of 1 year following the determination of the Secretary.

SEC. 1208. SPECIAL COMPETITIVE PROVISIONS FOR EXTRA LONG STAPLE COTTON.

(a) COMPETITIVENESS PROGRAM.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall carry out a program—

(1) to maintain and expand the domestic use of extra long staple cotton produced in the United States;

(2) to increase exports of extra long staple cotton produced in the United States; and

(3) to ensure that extra long staple cotton produced in the United States remains competitive in world markets.

(b) PAYMENTS UNDER PROGRAM; TRIGGER.—Under the program, the Secretary shall make payments available under this section whenever—

(1) for a consecutive 4-week period, the world market price for the lowest priced competing growth of extra long staple cotton (adjusted to United States quality and location and for other factors affecting the competitiveness of such cotton), as determined by the Secretary, is below the prevailing United States price for a competing growth of extra long staple cotton; and

(2) the lowest priced competing growth of extra long staple cotton (adjusted to United States quality and location and for other factors affecting the competitiveness of such cotton), as determined by the Secretary, is less than 134 percent of the loan rate for extra long staple cotton.

(c) ELIGIBLE RECIPIENTS.—The Secretary shall make payments available under this section to domestic users of extra long staple cotton produced in the United States and exporters of extra long staple cotton produced in the United States that enter into an agreement with the Commodity Credit Corporation to participate in the program under this section.

(d) PAYMENT AMOUNT.—Payments under this section shall be based on the amount of the difference in the prices referred to in subsection (b)(1) during the fourth week of the consecutive 4-week period multiplied by the amount of documented purchases by domestic users and sales for export by exporters made in the week following such a consecutive 4-week period.

SEC. 1209. AVAILABILITY OF RECOURSE LOANS FOR HIGH MOISTURE FEED GRAINS AND SEED COTTON.

(a) HIGH MOISTURE FEED GRAINS.—

(1) DEFINITION OF HIGH MOISTURE STATE.—In this subsection, the term ''high moisture state'' means corn or grain sorghum having a moisture content in excess of Commodity Credit Corporation standards for marketing assistance loans made by the Secretary under section 1201.

(2) RECOURSE LOANS AVAILABLE.—For the 2014 crop and each succeeding annual crop of corn and grain sorghum, the Secretary shall make available recourse loans, as determined by the Secretary, to producers on a farm that—

(A) normally harvest all or a portion of their crop of corn or grain sorghum in a high moisture state;

(B) present—

(i) certified scale tickets from an inspected, certified commercial scale, including a licensed warehouse, feedlot, feed mill, distillery, or other similar entity approved by the Secretary, pursuant to regulations issued by the Secretary; or

(ii) field or other physical measurements of the standing or stored crop in regions of the United States, as determined by the Secretary, that do not have certified commercial scales from which certified scale tickets may be obtained within reasonable proximity of harvest operation;

(C) certify that the producers on the farm were the owners of the feed grain at the time of delivery to, and that the quantity to be placed under loan under this subsection was in fact harvested on the farm and delivered to, a feedlot, feed mill, or commercial or on-farm high-moisture storage facility, or to a facility maintained by the users of corn and grain sorghum in a high moisture state; and

(D) comply with deadlines established by the Secretary for harvesting the corn or grain sorghum and submit applications for loans under this subsection within deadlines established by the Secretary.

(3) ELIGIBILITY OF ACQUIRED FEED GRAINS.—A loan under this subsection shall be made on a quantity of corn or grain sorghum of the same crop acquired by the producer equivalent to a quantity determined by multiplying—

(A) the acreage of the corn or grain sorghum in a high moisture state harvested on the farm of the producer; by

(B) the lower of the farm program payment yield used to make payments under subtitle A or the actual yield on a field, as determined by the Secretary, that is similar to the field from which the corn or grain sorghum was obtained.

(b) RECOURSE LOANS AVAILABLE FOR SEED COTTON.—For the 2014 crop and each succeeding annual crop of upland cotton and extra long staple cotton, the Secretary shall make available recourse seed cotton loans, as determined by the Secretary, on any production.

(c) REPAYMENT RATES.—Repayment of a recourse loan made under this section shall be at the loan rate established for the commodity by the Secretary, plus interest (determined in accordance with section 163 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7283)).

SEC. 1210. ADJUSTMENTS OF LOANS.

(a) ADJUSTMENT AUTHORITY.—Subject to subsection (e), the Secretary may make appropriate adjustments in the loan rates for any loan commodity (other than cotton) for differences in grade, type, quality, location, and other factors.

(b) MANNER OF ADJUSTMENT.—The adjustments under subsection (a) shall, to the maximum extent practicable, be made in such a manner that the average loan level for the commodity will, on the basis of the anticipated incidence of the factors, be equal to the level of support determined in accordance with this subtitle and subtitle C.

(c) ADJUSTMENT ON COUNTY BASIS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may establish loan rates for a crop for producers in individual counties in a manner that results in the lowest loan rate being 95 percent of the national average loan rate, if those loan rates do not result in an increase in outlays.

(2) PROHIBITION.—Adjustments under this subsection shall not result in an increase in the national average loan rate for any year.

(d) ADJUSTMENT IN LOAN RATE FOR COTTON.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may make appropriate adjustments in the loan rate for cotton for differences in quality factors.

(2) TYPES OF ADJUSTMENTS.—Loan rate adjustments under paragraph (1) may include—

(A) the use of non-spot market price data, in addition to spot market price data, that would enhance the accuracy of the price information used in determining quality adjustments under this subsection;

(B) adjustments in the premiums or discounts associated with upland cotton with a staple length of 33 or above due to micronaire with the goal of eliminating any unnecessary artificial splits in the calculations of the premiums or discounts; and

(C) such other adjustments as the Secretary determines appropriate, after consultations conducted in accordance with paragraph (3).

(3) CONSULTATION WITH PRIVATE SECTOR.—

(A) PRIOR TO REVISION.—In making adjustments to the loan rate for cotton (including any review of the adjustments) as provided in this subsection, the Secretary shall consult with representatives of the United States cotton industry.

(B) INAPPLICABILITY OF FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to consultations under this subsection.

(4) REVIEW OF ADJUSTMENTS.—The Secretary may review the operation of the upland cotton quality adjustments implemented pursuant to this subsection and may make further adjustments to the administration of the loan program for upland cotton, by revoking or revising any adjustment taken under paragraph (2).

(e) RICE.—The Secretary shall not make adjustments in the loan rates for long grain rice and medium grain rice, except for differences in grade and quality (including milling yields).

Subtitle C—Sugar

SEC. 1301. SUGAR PROGRAM.

(a) CONTINUATION OF CURRENT PROGRAM AND LOAN RATES.—

(1) SUGARCANE.—Section 156(a)(5) of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7272(a)(5)) is amended by striking ''the 2012 crop year'' and inserting ''the 2012 crop year and each succeeding crop year''.

(2) SUGAR BEETS.—Section 156(b)(2) of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7272(b)(2)) is amended by striking ''each of the 2009 through 2012 crop years'' and inserting ''the 2009 crop year and each succeeding crop year''.

(3) EFFECTIVE PERIOD.—Section 156(i) of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7272(i)) is repealed.

(b) FLEXIBLE MARKETING ALLOTMENTS FOR SUGAR.—

(1) SUGAR ESTIMATES.—Section 359b(a)(1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1359bb(a)(1)) is amended by striking ''each of the 2008 through 2012 crop years'' and inserting ''the 2008 crop year and each succeeding crop year''.

(2) EFFECTIVE PERIOD.—Section 359i(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1359ii(a)) is amended by striking ''only for the 2008 through 2012 crop years'' and inserting ''for the 2008 crop year and each succeeding crop year''.

Subtitle D—Dairy

PART I—DAIRY PRODUCER MARGIN INSURANCE PROGRAM

SEC. 1401. DAIRY PRODUCER MARGIN INSURANCE PROGRAM.

Subtitle E of title I of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8771 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 1511. DAIRY PRODUCER MARGIN INSURANCE PROGRAM.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) ACTUAL DAIRY PRODUCER MARGIN.—The term 'actual dairy producer margin' means the difference between the all-milk price and the average feed cost, as calculated under subsection (b)(2).

''(2) ALL-MILK PRICE.—The term 'all-milk price' means the average price received, per hundredweight of milk, by dairy producers for all milk sold to plants and dealers in the United States, as reported by the National Agricultural Statistics Service.

''(3) AVERAGE FEED COST.—The term 'average feed cost' means the average cost of feed used by a dairy operation to produce a hundredweight of milk, determined under subsection (b)(1) using the sum of the following:

''(A) The product determined by multiplying—

''(i) 1.0728; by

''(ii) the price of corn per bushel.

''(B) The product determined by multiplying—

''(i) 0.00735; by

''(ii) the price of soybean meal per ton.

''(C) The product determined by multiplying—

''(i) 0.0137; by

''(ii) the price of alfalfa hay per ton.

''(4) CONSECUTIVE 2-MONTH PERIOD.—The term 'consecutive 2-month period' refers to the 2-month period consisting of the months of January and February, March and April, May and June, July and August, September and October, or November and December, respectively.

''(5) DAIRY PRODUCER.—The term 'dairy producer' means an individual or entity that directly or indirectly (as determined by the Secretary)—

''(A) shares in the risk of producing milk; and

''(B) makes contributions (including land, labor, management, equipment, or capital) to the dairy operation of the individual or entity that are at least commensurate with the share of the individual or entity of the proceeds of the operation.

''(6) MARGIN INSURANCE PROGRAM.—The term 'margin insurance program' means the dairy producer margin insurance program required by this section.

''(7) PARTICIPATING DAIRY PRODUCER.—The term 'participating dairy producer' means a dairy producer that registers under subsection (d)(2) to participate in the margin insurance program.

''(8) PRODUCTION HISTORY.—The term 'production history' means the quantity of annual milk marketings determined for a dairy producer under subsection (e)(1).

''(9) UNITED STATES.—The term 'United States', in a geographical sense, means the 50 States.

''(b) CALCULATION OF AVERAGE FEED COST AND ACTUAL DAIRY PRODUCER MARGINS.—

''(1) CALCULATION OF AVERAGE FEED COST.—The Secretary shall calculate the national average feed cost for each month using the following data:

''(A) The price of corn for a month shall be the price received during that month by agricultural producers in the United States for corn, as reported in the monthly Agriculture Prices report by the Secretary.

''(B) The price of soybean meal for a month shall be the central Illinois price for soybean meal, as reported in the Market News–Monthly Soybean Meal Price Report by the Secretary.

''(C) The price of alfalfa hay for a month shall be the price received during that month by agricultural producers in the United States for alfalfa hay, as reported in the monthly Agriculture Prices report by the Secretary.

''(2) CALCULATION OF ACTUAL DAIRY PRODUCER MARGINS.—The Secretary shall calculate the actual dairy producer margin for each consecutive 2-month period by subtracting—

''(A) the average feed cost for that consecutive 2-month period, determined in accordance with paragraph (1); from

''(B) the all-milk price for that consecutive 2-month period.

''(c) ESTABLISHMENT OF DAIRY PRODUCER MARGIN INSURANCE PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall establish and administer a dairy producer margin insurance program for the purpose of protecting dairy producer income by paying participating dairy producers margin insurance payments when actual dairy producer margins are less than the threshold levels for the payments.

''(d) ELIGIBILITY AND REGISTRATION OF DAIRY PRODUCERS FOR MARGIN INSURANCE PROGRAM.—

''(1) ELIGIBILITY.—All dairy producers in the United States shall be eligible to participate in the margin insurance program.

''(2) REGISTRATION PROCESS.—

''(A) REGISTRATION.—

''(i) ANNUAL REGISTRATION.—On an annual basis, the Secretary shall register all interested dairy producers in the margin insurance program.

''(ii) MANNER AND FORM.—The Secretary shall specify the manner and form by which a dairy producer shall register for the margin insurance program.

''(B) TREATMENT OF MULTI-PRODUCER OPERATIONS.—If a dairy operation consists of more than 1 dairy producer, all of the dairy producers of the operation shall be treated as a single dairy producer for purposes of—

''(i) purchasing margin insurance; and

''(ii) payment of producer premiums under subsection (f)(4).

''(C) TREATMENT OF PRODUCERS WITH MULTIPLE DAIRY OPERATIONS.—If a dairy producer operates 2 or more dairy operations, each dairy operation of the producer shall require a separate registration to participate and purchase margin insurance.

''(3) TIME FOR REGISTRATION.—

''(A) EXISTING DAIRY PRODUCERS.—During the 1-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this section, and annually thereafter, a dairy producer that is actively engaged in a dairy operation as of that date may register with the Secretary to participate in the margin insurance program.

''(B) NEW ENTRANTS.—A dairy producer that has no existing interest in a dairy operation as of the date of enactment of this section, but that, after that date, establishes a new dairy operation, may register with the Secretary during the 180-day period beginning on the date on which the dairy operation first markets milk commercially to participate in the margin insurance program.

''(4) RETROACTIVITY.—

''(A) NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY OF RETROACTIVE PROTECTION.—Not later than 30 days after the effective date of this section, the Secretary shall publish a notice in the Federal Register to inform dairy producers of the availability of retroactive margin insurance, subject to the condition that interested producers must file a notice of intent (in such form and manner as the Secretary specifies in the Federal Register notice) to participate in the margin insurance program.

''(B) RETROACTIVE MARGIN INSURANCE.—

''(i) AVAILABILITY.—If a dairy producer files a notice of intent under subparagraph (A) to participate in the margin insurance program before the initiation of the sign-up period for the margin insurance program and subsequently signs up for the margin insurance program, the producer shall receive margin insurance retroactive to the effective date of this section.

''(ii) DURATION.—Retroactive margin insurance under this paragraph for a dairy producer shall apply from the effective date of this section until the date on which the producer signs up for the margin insurance program.

''(C) NOTICE OF INTENT AND OBLIGATION TO PARTICIPATE.—In no way does filing a notice of intent under this paragraph obligate a dairy producer to sign up for the margin insurance program once the program rules are final, but if a producer does file a notice of intent and subsequently signs up for the margin insurance program, that dairy producer is obligated to pay premiums for any retroactive margin insurance selected in the notice of intent.

''(5) RECONSTITUTION.—The Secretary shall ensure that a dairy producer does not reconstitute a dairy operation for the sole purpose of purchasing margin insurance.

''(e) PRODUCTION HISTORY OF PARTICIPATING DAIRY PRODUCERS.—

''(1) DETERMINATION OF PRODUCTION HISTORY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall determine the production history of the dairy operation of each participating dairy producer in the margin insurance program.

''(B) CALCULATION.—Except as provided in subparagraphs (C) and (D), the production history of a participating dairy producer shall be equal to the highest annual milk marketings of the dairy producer during any 1 of the 3 calendar years immediately preceding the registration of the dairy producer for participation in the margin insurance program.

''(C) UPDATING PRODUCTION HISTORY.—So long as a participating producer remains registered, the production history of the participating producer shall be annually updated based on the highest annual milk marketings of the dairy producer during any one of the 3 immediately preceding calendar years.

''(D) NEW PRODUCERS.—If a dairy producer has been in operation for less than 1 year, the Secretary shall determine the initial production history of the dairy producer under subparagraph (B) by extrapolating the actual milk marketings for the months that the dairy producer has been in operation to a yearly amount.

''(2) REQUIRED INFORMATION.—A participating dairy producer shall provide all information that the Secretary may require in order to establish the production history of the dairy operation of the dairy producer.

''(3) TRANSFER OF PRODUCTION HISTORY.—

''(A) TRANSFER BY SALE.—

''(i) REQUEST FOR TRANSFER.—If an existing dairy producer sells an entire dairy operation to another party, the seller and purchaser may jointly request that the Secretary transfer to the purchaser the interest of the seller in the production history of the dairy operation.

''(ii) TRANSFER.—If the Secretary determines that the seller has sold the entire dairy operation to the purchaser, the Secretary shall approve the transfer and, thereafter, the seller shall have no interest in the production history of the sold dairy operation.

''(B) TRANSFER BY LEASE.—

''(i) REQUEST FOR TRANSFER.—If an existing dairy producer leases an entire dairy operation to another party, the lessor and lessee may jointly request that the Secretary transfer to the lessee for the duration of the term of the lease the interest of the lessor in the production history of the dairy operation.

''(ii) TRANSFER.—If the Secretary determines that the lessor has leased the entire dairy operation to the lessee, the Secretary shall approve the transfer and, thereafter, the lessor shall have no interest for the duration of the term of the lease in the production history of the leased dairy operation.

''(C) COVERAGE LEVEL.—A purchaser or lessee to whom the Secretary transfers a production history under this paragraph may not obtain a different level of margin insurance coverage held by the seller or lessor from whom the transfer was obtained.

''(D) NEW ENTRANTS.—The Secretary may not transfer the production history determined for a dairy producer described in subsection (d)(3)(B) to another person.

''(4) MOVEMENT AND TRANSFER OF PRODUCTION HISTORY.—

''(A) MOVEMENT AND TRANSFER AUTHORIZED.—Subject to subparagraph (B), if a dairy producer moves from 1 location to another location, the dairy producer may maintain the production history associated with the operation.

''(B) NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—A dairy producer shall notify the Secretary of any move of a dairy operation under subparagraph (A).

''(C) SUBSEQUENT OCCUPATION OF VACATED LOCATION.—A party subsequently occupying a dairy operation location vacated as described in subparagraph (A) shall have no interest in the production history previously associated with the operation at that location.

''(f) MARGIN INSURANCE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—At the time of the registration of a dairy producer in the margin insurance program under subsection (d) and annually thereafter during the duration of the margin insurance program, an eligible dairy producer may purchase margin insurance.

''(2) SELECTION OF PAYMENT THRESHOLD.—A participating dairy producer purchasing margin insurance shall elect a coverage level in any increment of $0.50, with a minimum of $4.00 and a maximum of $8.00.

''(3) SELECTION OF COVERAGE PERCENTAGE.—A participating dairy producer purchasing margin insurance shall elect a percentage of coverage, equal to not more than 80 percent nor less than 25 percent, of the production history of the dairy operation of the participating dairy producer.

''(4) PRODUCER PREMIUMS.—

''(A) PREMIUMS REQUIRED.—A participating dairy producer that purchases margin insurance shall pay an annual premium equal to the product obtained by multiplying—

''(i) the percentage selected by the dairy producer under paragraph (3);

''(ii) the production history applicable to the dairy producer; and

''(iii) the premium per hundredweight of milk, as specified in the applicable table under subparagraph (B) or (C).

''(B) PREMIUM PER HUNDREDWEIGHT FOR FIRST 4 MILLION POUNDS OF PRODUCTION.—For the first 4,000,000 pounds of milk marketings included in the annual production history of a participating dairy operation, the premium per hundredweight corresponding to each coverage level specified in the following table is as follows:

''Coverage Level	Premium per Cwt.
$4.00	$0.00
$4.50	$0.01
$5.00	$0.02
$5.50	$0.035
$6.00	$0.045
$6.50	$0.09
$7.00	$0.18
$7.50	$0.60
$8.00	$0.95

''(C) PREMIUM PER HUNDREDWEIGHT FOR PRODUCTION IN EXCESS OF 4 MILLION POUNDS.—For milk marketings in excess of 4,000,000 pounds included in the annual production history of a participating dairy operation, the premium per hundredweight corresponding to each coverage level is as follows:

''Coverage Level	Premium per Cwt.
$4.00	$0.030
$4.50	$0.045
$5.00	$0.066
$5.50	$0.11
$6.00	$0.185
$6.50	$0.29
$7.00	$0.38
$7.50	$0.83
$8.00	$1.06

''(D) TIME FOR PAYMENT.—

''(i) FIRST YEAR.—As soon as practicable after a dairy producer registers to participate in the margin insurance program and purchases margin insurance, the dairy producer shall pay the premium determined under subparagraph (A) for the dairy producer for the first calendar year of the margin insurance.

''(ii) SUBSEQUENT YEARS.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—When the dairy producer first purchases margin insurance, the dairy producer shall also elect the method by which the dairy producer will pay premiums under this subsection for subsequent years in accordance with 1 of the schedules described in subclauses (II) and (III).

''(II) SINGLE ANNUAL PAYMENT.—The participating dairy producer may elect to pay 100 percent of the annual premium determined under subparagraph (A) for the dairy producer for a calendar year by not later than January 15 of the calendar year.

''(III) SEMI-ANNUAL PAYMENTS.—The participating dairy producer may elect to pay—

''(aa) 50 percent of the annual premium determined under subparagraph (A) for the dairy producer for a calendar year by not later than January 15 of the calendar year; and

''(bb) the remaining 50 percent of the premium by not later than June 15 of the calendar year.

''(5) PRODUCER PREMIUM OBLIGATIONS.—

''(A) PRO-RATION OF FIRST YEAR PREMIUM.—A participating dairy producer that purchases margin insurance after initial registration in the margin insurance program shall pay a pro-rated premium for the first calendar year based on the date on which the producer purchases the coverage.

''(B) SUBSEQUENT PREMIUMS.—Except as provided in subparagraph (A), the annual premium for a participating dairy producer shall be determined under paragraph (4) for each year in which the margin insurance program is in effect.

''(C) LEGAL OBLIGATION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clauses (ii) and (iii), a participating dairy producer that purchases margin insurance shall be legally obligated to pay the applicable premiums for the entire period of the margin insurance program (as provided in the payment schedule elected under paragraph (4)(B)), and may not opt out of the margin insurance program.

''(ii) DEATH.—If the dairy producer dies, the estate of the deceased may cancel the margin insurance and shall not be responsible for any further premium payments.

''(iii) RETIREMENT.—If the dairy producer retires, the producer may request that Secretary cancel the margin insurance if the producer has terminated the dairy operation entirely and certifies under oath that the producer will not be actively engaged in any dairy operation for at least the next 7 years.

''(6) PAYMENT THRESHOLD.—A participating dairy producer with margin insurance shall receive a margin insurance payment whenever the average actual dairy producer margin for a consecutive 2-month period is less than the coverage level threshold selected by the dairy producer under paragraph (2).

''(7) MARGIN INSURANCE PAYMENTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall make a margin insurance protection payment to each participating dairy producer whenever the average actual dairy producer margin for a consecutive 2-month period is less than the coverage level threshold selected by the dairy producer under paragraph (2).

''(B) AMOUNT OF PAYMENT.—The margin insurance payment for the dairy operation of a participating dairy producer shall be determined as follows:

''(i) The Secretary shall calculate the difference between—

''(I) the coverage level threshold selected by the dairy producer under paragraph (2); and

''(II) the average actual dairy producer margin for the consecutive 2-month period.

''(ii) The amount determined under clause (i) shall be multiplied by—

''(I) the percentage selected by the dairy producer under paragraph (3); and

''(II) the lesser of—

''(aa) the quotient obtained by dividing—

''(AA) the production history applicable to the producer under subsection (e)(1); by

''(BB) 6; and

''(bb) the actual quantity of milk marketed by the dairy operation of the dairy producer during the consecutive 2-month period.

''(g) EFFECT OF FAILURE TO PAY PREMIUMS.—

''(1) LOSS OF BENEFITS.—A participating dairy producer that is in arrears on premium payments for margin insurance—

''(A) remains legally obligated to pay the premiums; and

''(B) may not receive margin insurance until the premiums are fully paid.

''(2) ENFORCEMENT.—The Secretary may take such action as is necessary to collect premium payments for margin insurance.

''(h) USE OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION.—The Secretary shall use the funds, facilities, and the authorities of the Commodity Credit Corporation to carry out this section.

''(i) PROGRAM START DATE.—The Secretary shall conduct the margin insurance program beginning on October 1, 2013.''.

SEC. 1402. RULEMAKING.

(a) PROCEDURE.—The promulgation of regulations for the initiation of the margin insurance program, and for administration of the margin insurance program, shall be made—

(1) without regard to chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code (commonly known as the Paperwork Reduction Act);

(2) without regard to the Statement of Policy of the Secretary of Agriculture effective July 24, 1971 (36 Fed. Reg. 13804), relating to notices of proposed rulemaking and public participation in rulemaking; and

(3) subject to subsection (b), pursuant to section 553 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) SPECIAL RULEMAKING REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) INTERIM RULES AUTHORIZED.—With respect to the margin insurance program, the Secretary may promulgate interim rules under the authority provided in subparagraph (B) of section 553(b) of title 5, United States Code, if the Secretary determines such interim rules to be needed. Any such interim rules for the margin insurance program shall be effective on publication.

(2) FINAL RULES.—With respect to the margin insurance program, the Secretary shall promulgate final rules, with an opportunity for public notice and comment, no later than 21 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) INCLUSION OF ADDITIONAL ORDER.—Section 143(a)(2) of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7253(a)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''Subsection (b)(2) does not apply to the authority of the Secretary under this subsection.''.

PART II—REPEAL OR REAUTHORIZATION OF OTHER DAIRY-RELATED PROVISIONS

SEC. 1411. REPEAL OF DAIRY PRODUCT PRICE SUPPORT AND MILK INCOME LOSS CONTRACT PROGRAMS.

(a) REPEAL OF DAIRY PRODUCT PRICE SUPPORT PROGRAM.—Section 1501 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8771) is repealed.

(b) REPEAL OF MILK INCOME LOSS CONTRACT PROGRAM.—Section 1506 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8773) is repealed.

SEC. 1412. REPEAL OF DAIRY EXPORT INCENTIVE PROGRAM.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 153 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (15 U.S.C. 713a–14) is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 902(2) of the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7201(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking subparagraph (D); and

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (E) and (F) as subparagraphs (D) and (E), respectively.

SEC. 1413. EXTENSION OF DAIRY FORWARD PRICING PROGRAM.

Section 1502(e) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8772(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''2015'' and inserting ''2021''.

SEC. 1414. EXTENSION OF DAIRY INDEMNITY PROGRAM.

Section 3 of Public Law 90–484 (7 U.S.C. 4501) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 1415. EXTENSION OF DAIRY PROMOTION AND RESEARCH PROGRAM.

Section 113(e)(2) of the Dairy Production Stabilization Act of 1983 (7 U.S.C. 4504(e)(2)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 1416. REPEAL OF FEDERAL MILK MARKETING ORDER REVIEW COMMISSION.

Section 1509 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–246; 122 Stat. 1726) is repealed.

PART III—EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 1421. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This subtitle and the amendments made by this subtitle shall take effect on October 1, 2013.

Subtitle E—Supplemental Agricultural Disaster Assistance Programs

SEC. 1501. SUPPLEMENTAL AGRICULTURAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ELIGIBLE PRODUCER ON A FARM.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''eligible producer on a farm'' means an individual or entity described in subparagraph (B) that, as determined by the Secretary, assumes the production and market risks associated with the agricultural production of crops or livestock.

(B) DESCRIPTION.—An individual or entity referred to in subparagraph (A) is—

(i) a citizen of the United States;

(ii) a resident alien;

(iii) a partnership of citizens of the United States; or

(iv) a corporation, limited liability corporation, or other farm organizational structure organized under State law.

(2) FARM-RAISED FISH.—The term ''farm-raised fish'' means any aquatic species that is propagated and reared in a controlled environment.

(3) LIVESTOCK.—The term ''livestock'' includes—

(A) cattle (including dairy cattle);

(B) bison;

(C) poultry;

(D) sheep;

(E) swine;

(F) horses; and

(G) other livestock, as determined by the Secretary.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(b) LIVESTOCK INDEMNITY PAYMENTS.—

(1) PAYMENTS.—For fiscal year 2012 and each succeeding fiscal year, the Secretary shall use such sums as are necessary of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation to make livestock indemnity payments to eligible producers on farms that have incurred livestock death losses in excess of the normal mortality, as determined by the Secretary, due to—

(A) attacks by animals reintroduced into the wild by the Federal Government or protected by Federal law, including wolves and avian predators; or

(B) adverse weather, as determined by the Secretary, during the calendar year, including losses due to hurricanes, floods, blizzards, disease, wildfires, extreme heat, and extreme cold.

(2) PAYMENT RATES.—Indemnity payments to an eligible producer on a farm under paragraph (1) shall be made at a rate of 75 percent of the market value of the applicable livestock on the day before the date of death of the livestock, as determined by the Secretary.

(3) SPECIAL RULE FOR PAYMENTS MADE DUE TO DISEASE.—The Secretary shall ensure that payments made to an eligible producer under paragraph (1) are not made for the same livestock losses for which compensation is provided pursuant to section 10407(d) of the Animal Health Protection Act (7 U.S.C. 8306(d)).

(c) LIVESTOCK FORAGE DISASTER PROGRAM.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) COVERED LIVESTOCK.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), the term ''covered livestock'' means livestock of an eligible livestock producer that, during the 60 days prior to the beginning date of a qualifying drought or fire condition, as determined by the Secretary, the eligible livestock producer—

(I) owned;

(II) leased;

(III) purchased;

(IV) entered into a contract to purchase;

(V) is a contract grower; or

(VI) sold or otherwise disposed of due to qualifying drought conditions during—

(aa) the current production year; or

(bb) subject to paragraph (3)(B)(ii), 1 or both of the 2 production years immediately preceding the current production year.

(ii) EXCLUSION.—The term ''covered livestock'' does not include livestock that were or would have been in a feedlot, on the beginning date of the qualifying drought or fire condition, as a part of the normal business operation of the eligible livestock producer, as determined by the Secretary.

(B) DROUGHT MONITOR.—The term ''drought monitor'' means a system for classifying drought severity according to a range of abnormally dry to exceptional drought, as defined by the Secretary.

(C) ELIGIBLE LIVESTOCK PRODUCER.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The term ''eligible livestock producer'' means an eligible producer on a farm that—

(I) is an owner, cash or share lessee, or contract grower of covered livestock that provides the pastureland or grazing land, including cash-leased pastureland or grazing land, for the livestock;

(II) provides the pastureland or grazing land for covered livestock, including cash-leased pastureland or grazing land that is physically located in a county affected by drought;

(III) certifies grazing loss; and

(IV) meets all other eligibility requirements established under this subsection.

(ii) EXCLUSION.—The term ''eligible livestock producer'' does not include an owner, cash or share lessee, or contract grower of livestock that rents or leases pastureland or grazing land owned by another person on a rate-of-gain basis.

(D) NORMAL CARRYING CAPACITY.—The term ''normal carrying capacity'', with respect to each type of grazing land or pastureland in a county, means the normal carrying capacity, as determined under paragraph (3)(D)(i), that would be expected from the grazing land or pastureland for livestock during the normal grazing period, in the absence of a drought or fire that diminishes the production of the grazing land or pastureland.

(E) NORMAL GRAZING PERIOD.—The term ''normal grazing period'', with respect to a county, means the normal grazing period during the calendar year for the county, as determined under paragraph (3)(D)(i).

(2) PROGRAM.—For fiscal year 2012 and each succeeding fiscal year, the Secretary shall use such sums as are necessary of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation to provide compensation for losses to eligible livestock producers due to grazing losses for covered livestock due to—

(A) a drought condition, as described in paragraph (3); or

(B) fire, as described in paragraph (4).

(3) ASSISTANCE FOR LOSSES DUE TO DROUGHT CONDITIONS.—

(A) ELIGIBLE LOSSES.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—An eligible livestock producer may receive assistance under this subsection only for grazing losses for covered livestock that occur on land that—

(I) is native or improved pastureland with permanent vegetative cover; or

(II) is planted to a crop planted specifically for the purpose of providing grazing for covered livestock.

(ii) EXCLUSIONS.—An eligible livestock producer may not receive assistance under this subsection for grazing losses that occur on land used for haying or grazing under the conservation reserve program established under subchapter B of chapter 1 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831 et seq.).

(B) MONTHLY PAYMENT RATE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), the payment rate for assistance under this paragraph for 1 month shall, in the case of drought, be equal to 60 percent of the lesser of—

(I) the monthly feed cost for all covered livestock owned or leased by the eligible livestock producer, as determined under subparagraph (C); or

(II) the monthly feed cost calculated by using the normal carrying capacity of the eligible grazing land of the eligible livestock producer.

(ii) PARTIAL COMPENSATION.—In the case of an eligible livestock producer that sold or otherwise disposed of covered livestock due to drought conditions in 1 or both of the 2 production years immediately preceding the current production year, as determined by the Secretary, the payment rate shall be 80 percent of the payment rate otherwise calculated in accordance with clause (i).

(C) MONTHLY FEED COST.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The monthly feed cost shall equal the product obtained by multiplying—

(I) 30 days;

(II) a payment quantity that is equal to the feed grain equivalent, as determined under clause (ii); and

(III) a payment rate that is equal to the corn price per pound, as determined under clause (iii).

(ii) FEED GRAIN EQUIVALENT.—For purposes of clause (i)(II), the feed grain equivalent shall equal—

(I) in the case of an adult beef cow, 15.7 pounds of corn per day; or

(II) in the case of any other type of weight of livestock, an amount determined by the Secretary that represents the average number of pounds of corn per day necessary to feed the livestock.

(iii) CORN PRICE PER POUND.—For purposes of clause (i)(III), the corn price per pound shall equal the quotient obtained by dividing—

(I) the higher of—

(aa) the national average corn price per bushel for the 12-month period immediately preceding March 1 of the year for which the disaster assistance is calculated; or

(bb) the national average corn price per bushel for the 24-month period immediately preceding that March 1; by

(II) 56.

(D) NORMAL GRAZING PERIOD AND DROUGHT MONITOR INTENSITY.—

(i) FSA COUNTY COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall determine the normal carrying capacity and normal grazing period for each type of grazing land or pastureland in the county served by the applicable committee.

(II) CHANGES.—No change to the normal carrying capacity or normal grazing period established for a county under subclause (I) shall be made unless the change is requested by the appropriate State and county Farm Service Agency committees.

(ii) DROUGHT INTENSITY.—

(I) D2.—An eligible livestock producer that owns or leases grazing land or pastureland that is physically located in a county that is rated by the U.S. Drought Monitor as having a D2 (severe drought) intensity in any area of the county for at least 8 consecutive weeks during the normal grazing period for the county, as determined by the Secretary, shall be eligible to receive assistance under this paragraph in an amount equal to 1 monthly payment using the monthly payment rate determined under subparagraph (B).

(II) D3.—An eligible livestock producer that owns or leases grazing land or pastureland that is physically located in a county that is rated by the U.S. Drought Monitor as having at least a D3 (extreme drought) intensity in any area of the county at any time during the normal grazing period for the county, as determined by the Secretary, shall be eligible to receive assistance under this paragraph—

(aa) in an amount equal to 3 monthly payments using the monthly payment rate determined under subparagraph (B);

(bb) if the county is rated as having a D3 (extreme drought) intensity in any area of the county for at least 4 weeks during the normal grazing period for the county, or is rated as having a D4 (exceptional drought) intensity in any area of the county at any time during the normal grazing period, in an amount equal to 4 monthly payments using the monthly payment rate determined under subparagraph (B); or

(cc) if the county is rated as having a D4 (exceptional drought) intensity in any area of the county for at least 4 weeks during the normal grazing period, in an amount equal to 5 monthly payments using the monthly rate determined under subparagraph (B).

(4) ASSISTANCE FOR LOSSES DUE TO FIRE ON PUBLIC MANAGED LAND.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—An eligible livestock producer may receive assistance under this paragraph only if—

(i) the grazing losses occur on rangeland that is managed by a Federal agency; and

(ii) the eligible livestock producer is prohibited by the Federal agency from grazing the normal permitted livestock on the managed rangeland due to a fire.

(B) PAYMENT RATE.—The payment rate for assistance under this paragraph shall be equal to 50 percent of the monthly feed cost for the total number of livestock covered by the Federal lease of the eligible livestock producer, as determined under paragraph (3)(C).

(C) PAYMENT DURATION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), an eligible livestock producer shall be eligible to receive assistance under this paragraph for the period—

(I) beginning on the date on which the Federal agency excludes the eligible livestock producer from using the managed rangeland for grazing; and

(II) ending on the last day of the Federal lease of the eligible livestock producer.

(ii) LIMITATION.—An eligible livestock producer may only receive assistance under this paragraph for losses that occur on not more than 180 days per year.

(5) NO DUPLICATIVE PAYMENTS.—An eligible livestock producer may elect to receive assistance for grazing or pasture feed losses due to drought conditions under paragraph (3) or fire under paragraph (4), but not both for the same loss, as determined by the Secretary.

(d) EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE FOR LIVESTOCK, HONEY BEES, AND FARM-RAISED FISH.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For fiscal year 2012 and each succeeding fiscal year, the Secretary shall use not more than $20,000,000 of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation to provide emergency relief to eligible producers of livestock, honey bees, and farm-raised fish to aid in the reduction of losses due to disease (including cattle tick fever), adverse weather, or other conditions, such as blizzards and wildfires, as determined by the Secretary, that are not covered under subsection (b) or (c).

(2) USE OF FUNDS.—Funds made available under this subsection shall be used to reduce losses caused by feed or water shortages, disease, or other factors as determined by the Secretary.

(3) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Any funds made available under this subsection shall remain available until expended.

(e) TREE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) ELIGIBLE ORCHARDIST.—The term ''eligible orchardist'' means a person that produces annual crops from trees for commercial purposes.

(B) NATURAL DISASTER.—The term ''natural disaster'' means plant disease, insect infestation, drought, fire, freeze, flood, earthquake, lightning, or other occurrence, as determined by the Secretary.

(C) NURSERY TREE GROWER.—The term ''nursery tree grower'' means a person who produces nursery, ornamental, fruit, nut, or Christmas trees for commercial sale, as determined by the Secretary.

(D) TREE.—The term ''tree'' includes a tree, bush, and vine.

(2) ELIGIBILITY.—

(A) LOSS.—Subject to subparagraph (B), for fiscal year 2012 and each succeeding fiscal year, the Secretary shall use such sums as are necessary of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation to provide assistance—

(i) under paragraph (3) to eligible orchardists and nursery tree growers that planted trees for commercial purposes but lost the trees as a result of a natural disaster, as determined by the Secretary; and

(ii) under paragraph (3)(B) to eligible orchardists and nursery tree growers that have a production history for commercial purposes on planted or existing trees but lost the trees as a result of a natural disaster, as determined by the Secretary.

(B) LIMITATION.—An eligible orchardist or nursery tree grower shall qualify for assistance under subparagraph (A) only if the tree mortality of the eligible orchardist or nursery tree grower, as a result of damaging weather or related condition, exceeds 15 percent (adjusted for normal mortality).

(3) ASSISTANCE.—Subject to paragraph (4), the assistance provided by the Secretary to eligible orchardists and nursery tree growers for losses described in paragraph (2) shall consist of—

(A)(i) reimbursement of 65 percent of the cost of replanting trees lost due to a natural disaster, as determined by the Secretary, in excess of 15 percent mortality (adjusted for normal mortality); or

(ii) at the option of the Secretary, sufficient seedlings to reestablish a stand; and

(B) reimbursement of 50 percent of the cost of pruning, removal, and other costs incurred by an eligible orchardist or nursery tree grower to salvage existing trees or, in the case of tree mortality, to prepare the land to replant trees as a result of damage or tree mortality due to a natural disaster, as determined by the Secretary, in excess of 15 percent damage or mortality (adjusted for normal tree damage and mortality).

(4) LIMITATIONS ON ASSISTANCE.—

(A) DEFINITIONS OF LEGAL ENTITY AND PERSON.—In this paragraph, the terms ''legal entity'' and ''person'' have the meaning given those terms in section 1001(a) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308(a)).

(B) AMOUNT.—The total amount of payments received, directly or indirectly, by a person or legal entity (excluding a joint venture or general partnership) under this subsection may not exceed $125,000 for any crop year, or an equivalent value in tree seedlings.

(C) ACRES.—The total quantity of acres planted to trees or tree seedlings for which a person or legal entity shall be entitled to receive payments under this subsection may not exceed 500 acres.

(f) PAYMENT LIMITATIONS.—

(1) DEFINITIONS OF LEGAL ENTITY AND PERSON.—In this subsection, the terms ''legal entity'' and ''person'' have the meaning given those terms in section 1001(a) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308(a)).

(2) AMOUNT.—The total amount of disaster assistance payments received, directly or indirectly, by a person or legal entity (excluding a joint venture or general partnership) under this section (excluding payments received under subsection (e)) may not exceed $125,000 for any crop year.

(3) DIRECT ATTRIBUTION.—Subsections (e) and (f) of section 1001 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308) or any successor provisions relating to direct attribution shall apply with respect to assistance provided under this section.

SEC. 1502. NATIONAL DROUGHT COUNCIL AND NATIONAL DROUGHT POLICY ACTION PLAN.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COUNCIL.—The term ''Council'' means the National Drought Council established by this section.

(2) DROUGHT.—The term ''drought'' means a natural disaster that is caused by a deficiency in precipitation—

(A) that may lead to a deficiency in surface and subsurface water supplies (including rivers, streams, wetlands, ground water, soil moisture, reservoir supplies, lake levels, and snow pack); and

(B) that causes or may cause—

(i) substantial economic or social impacts; or

(ii) physical damage or injury to individuals, property, or the environment.

(3) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term ''Indian tribe'' has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b).

(4) MEMBER.—The term ''member'', with respect to the National Drought Council, means a member of the Council specified or appointed under this section or, in the absence of the member, the member's designee.

(5) MITIGATION.—The term ''mitigation'' means a short- or long-term action, program, or policy that is implemented in advance of or during a drought to minimize any risks and impacts of drought.

(6) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(7) STATE.—The term ''State'' means the several States, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the United States Virgin Islands.

(8) TRIGGER.—The term ''trigger'' means the thresholds or criteria that must be satisfied before mitigation or emergency assistance may be provided to an area—

(A) in which drought is emerging; or

(B) that is experiencing a drought.

(9) WATERSHED.—The term ''watershed'' means a region or area with common hydrology, an area drained by a waterway that drains into a lake or reservoir, the total area above a given point on a stream that contributes water to the flow at that point, or the topographic dividing line from which surface streams flow in two different directions. In no case shall a watershed be larger than a river basin.

(10) WATERSHED GROUP.—The term ''watershed group'' means a group of individuals, formally recognized by the appropriate State or States, who represent the broad scope of relevant interests within a watershed and who work together in a collaborative manner to jointly plan the management of the natural resources contained within the watershed.

(b) EFFECT OF SECTION.—This section does not affect—

(1) the authority of a State to allocate quantities of water under the jurisdiction of the State; or

(2) any State water rights established as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) NATIONAL DROUGHT COUNCIL.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture a council to be known as the ''National Drought Council''.

(2) MEMBERSHIP.—

(A) COMPOSITION.—The Council shall be composed of—

(i) the Secretary (or the designee of the Secretary);

(ii) the Secretary of Commerce (or the designee of the Secretary of Commerce);

(iii) the Secretary of the Army (or the designee of the Secretary of the Army);

(iv) the Secretary of the Interior (or the designee of the Secretary of the Interior);

(v) the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (or the designee of the Director);

(vi) the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (or the designee of the Administrator);

(vii) 4 members appointed by the Secretary, in coordination with the National Governors Association, each of whom shall be the Governor of a State (or the designee of the Governor) and who collectively shall represent the geographic diversity of the Nation;

(viii) 1 member appointed by the Secretary, in coordination with the National Association of Counties;

(ix) 1 member appointed by the Secretary, in coordination with the United States Conference of Mayors;

(x) 1 member appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, in coordination with Indian tribes, to represent the interests of tribal governments; and

(xi) 1 member appointed by the Secretary, in coordination with the National Association of Conservation Districts, to represent local soil and water conservation districts.

(B) DATE OF APPOINTMENT.—The appointment of each member of the Council shall be made not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) TERM; VACANCIES.—

(A) TERM.—A non-Federal member of the Council appointed under paragraph (2) shall be appointed for a term of two years.

(B) VACANCIES.—A vacancy on the Council—

(i) shall not affect the powers of the Council; and

(ii) shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment was made.

(C) TERMS OF MEMBERS FILLING VACANCIES.—Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which the member's predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of that term.

(4) MEETINGS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Council shall meet at the call of the co-chairs.

(B) FREQUENCY.—The Council shall meet at least semiannually.

(5) QUORUM.—A majority of the members of the Council shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number may hold hearings or conduct other business.

(6) COUNCIL LEADERSHIP.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—There shall be a Federal co-chair and non-Federal co-chair of the Council.

(B) APPOINTMENT.—

(i) FEDERAL CO-CHAIR.—The Secretary shall be the Federal co-chair.

(ii) NON-FEDERAL CO-CHAIR.—The non-Federal members of the Council shall elect, on a biannual basis, a non-Federal co-chair of the Council from among the members appointed under paragraph (2).

(d) DUTIES OF THE COUNCIL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Council shall—

(A) not later than one year after the date of the first meeting of the Council, develop a comprehensive National Drought Policy Action Plan that—

(i)(I) delineates and integrates responsibilities for activities relating to drought (including drought preparedness, mitigation, research, risk management, training, and emergency relief) among Federal agencies; and

(II) ensures that those activities are coordinated with the activities of the States, local governments, Indian tribes, and neighboring countries;

(ii) is consistent with—

(I) this Act and other applicable Federal laws; and

(II) the laws and policies of the States for water management;

(iii) is integrated with drought management programs of the States, Indian tribes, local governments, watershed groups, and private entities; and

(iv) avoids duplicating Federal, State, tribal, local, watershed, and private drought preparedness and monitoring programs in existence on the date of enactment of this Act;

(B) evaluate Federal drought-related programs in existence on the date of enactment of this Act and make recommendations to Congress and the President on means of eliminating—

(i) discrepancies between the goals of the programs and actual service delivery;

(ii) duplication among programs; and

(iii) any other circumstances that interfere with the effective operation of the programs;

(C) make recommendations to the President, Congress, and appropriate Federal agencies on—

(i) the establishment of common interagency triggers for authorizing Federal drought mitigation programs; and

(ii) improving the consistency and fairness of assistance among Federal drought relief programs;

(D) encourage and facilitate the development of drought preparedness plans under subtitle C, including establishing the guidelines under this section;

(E) based on a review of drought preparedness plans, develop and make available to the public drought planning models to reduce water resource conflicts relating to water conservation and droughts;

(F) develop and coordinate public awareness activities to provide the public with access to understandable and informative materials on drought, including—

(i) explanations of the causes of drought, the impacts of drought, and the damages from drought;

(ii) descriptions of the value and benefits of land stewardship to reduce the impacts of drought and to protect the environment;

(iii) clear instructions for appropriate responses to drought, including water conservation, water reuse, and detection and elimination of water leaks;

(iv) information on State and local laws applicable to drought; and

(v) opportunities for assistance to resource-dependent businesses and industries in times of drought; and

(G) establish operating procedures for the Council.

(2) CONSULTATION.—In carrying out this subsection, the Council shall consult with groups affected by drought emergencies.

(3) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—

(A) ANNUAL REPORT.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the first meeting of the Council, and annually thereafter, the Council shall submit to Congress a report on the activities carried out under this section.

(ii) INCLUSIONS.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—The annual report shall include a summary of drought preparedness plans.

(II) INITIAL REPORT.—The initial report submitted under subparagraph (A) shall include any recommendations of the Council.

(B) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than seven years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Council shall submit to Congress a report that recommends—

(i) amendments to this section; and

(ii) whether the Council should continue.

(e) POWERS OF THE COUNCIL.—

(1) HEARINGS.—The Council may hold hearings, meet and act at any time and place, take any testimony and receive any evidence that the Council considers advisable to carry out this section.

(2) INFORMATION FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Council may obtain directly from any Federal agency any information that the Council considers necessary to carry out this section.

(B) PROVISION OF INFORMATION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), on request of the Secretary or the non-Federal co-chair of the Council, the head of a Federal agency may provide information to the Council.

(ii) LIMITATION.—The head of a Federal agency shall not provide any information to the Council that the Federal agency head determines the disclosure of which may cause harm to national security interests.

(3) POSTAL SERVICES.—The Council may use the United States mail in the same manner and under the same conditions as other agencies of the Federal Government.

(4) GIFTS.—The Council may accept, use, and dispose of gifts or donations of services or property.

(f) COUNCIL PERSONNEL MATTERS.—

(1) COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS.—

(A) NON-FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.—A member of the Council who is not an officer or employee of the Federal Government shall serve without compensation.

(B) FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.—A member of the Council who is an officer or employee of the United States shall serve without compensation in addition to the compensation received for services of the member as an officer or employee of the Federal Government.

(2) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—A member of the Council shall be allowed travel expenses at rates authorized for an employee of an agency under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from the home or regular place of business of the member in the performance of the duties of the Council.

(g) TERMINATION OF COUNCIL.—The Council shall terminate at the end of the eighth fiscal year beginning on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Subtitle F—Administration

SEC. 1601. ADMINISTRATION GENERALLY.

(a) USE OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall use the funds, facilities, and authorities of the Commodity Credit Corporation to carry out this title.

(b) DETERMINATIONS BY SECRETARY.—A determination made by the Secretary under this title shall be final and conclusive.

(c) REGULATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary and the Commodity Credit Corporation, as appropriate, shall promulgate such regulations as are necessary to implement this title and the amendments made by this title.

(2) PROCEDURE.—The promulgation of the regulations and administration of this title and the amendments made by this title and sections 10003 and 10016 of this Act shall be made—

(A) pursuant to section 553 of title 5, United States Code, including by interim rules effective on publication under the authority provided in subparagraph (B) of subsection (b) of such section if the Secretary determines such interim rules to be needed and final rules, with an opportunity for notice and comment, no later than 21 months after the date of the enactment of this Act;

(B) without regard to chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Paperwork Reduction Act''); and

(C) without regard to the Statement of Policy of the Secretary of Agriculture effective July 24, 1971 (36 Fed. Reg. 13804), relating to notices of proposed rulemaking and public participation in rulemaking.

(d) ADJUSTMENT AUTHORITY RELATED TO TRADE AGREEMENTS COMPLIANCE.—

(1) REQUIRED DETERMINATION; ADJUSTMENT.—If the Secretary determines that expenditures under this title that are subject to the total allowable domestic support levels under the Uruguay Round Agreements (as defined in section 2 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501)) will exceed the allowable levels for any applicable reporting period, the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, make adjustments in the amount of the expenditures during that period to ensure that the expenditures do not exceed the allowable levels.

(2) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—Before making any adjustment under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report describing the determination made under that paragraph and the extent of the adjustment to be made.

SEC. 1602. REPEAL OF PERMANENT PRICE SUPPORT AUTHORITY.

(a) AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938.—

(1) REPEALS.—The following provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 are repealed:

(A) Parts II through V of subtitle B of title III (7 U.S.C. 1326 et seq.).

(B) Subtitle D of title III (7 U.S.C. 1379a et seq.).

(C) Title IV (7 U.S.C. 1401 et seq.).

(2) INAPPLICABILITY TO UPLAND COTTON.—Section 377 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1377) is amended by striking ''was not fully planted'' and inserting ''was not fully planted: *Provided further*, That effective on the date of the enactment of the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013, this section shall not apply to upland cotton''.

(b) AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949.—The following provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949 are repealed:

(1) Section 101 (7 U.S.C. 1441).

(2) Section 103(a) (7 U.S.C. 1444(a)).

(3) Section 105 (7 U.S.C. 1444b).

(4) Section 107 (7 U.S.C. 1445a).

(5) Section 110 (7 U.S.C. 1445e).

(6) Section 112 (7 U.S.C. 1445g).

(7) Section 115 (7 U.S.C. 1445k).

(8) Section 201 (7 U.S.C. 1446).

(9) Title III (7 U.S.C. 1447 et seq.).

(10) Title IV (7 U.S.C. 1421 et seq.), other than sections 404, 412, and 416 (7 U.S.C. 1424, 1429, and 1431).

(11) Title V (7 U.S.C. 1461 et seq.).

(12) Title VI (7 U.S.C. 1471 et seq.).

(c) SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN QUOTA PROVISIONS.—The joint resolution entitled ''A joint resolution relating to corn and wheat marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended'', approved May 26, 1941 (7 U.S.C. 1330, 1340), is repealed.

SEC. 1603. PAYMENT LIMITATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1001 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

''(3) LEGAL ENTITY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'legal entity' means—

''(i) an organization that (subject to the requirements of this section and section 1001A) is eligible to receive a payment under a provision of law referred to in subsection (b), (c), or (d);

''(ii) a corporation, joint stock company, association, limited partnership, limited liability company, limited liability partnership, charitable organization, estate, irrevocable trust, grantor of a revocable trust, or other similar entity (as determined by the Secretary); and

''(iii) an organization that is participating in a farming operation as a partner in a general partnership or as a participant in a joint venture.

''(B) EXCLUSION.—The term 'legal entity' does not include a general partnership or joint venture.'';

(2) by striking subsections (b) through (d) and inserting the following:

''(b) LIMITATION ON PAYMENTS FOR COVERED COMMODITIES AND PEANUTS.—The total amount of payments received, directly or indirectly, by a person or legal entity for any crop year for 1 or more covered commodities and peanuts under title I of the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013 may not exceed $125,000, of which—

''(1) not more than $75,000 may consist of marketing loan gains and loan deficiency payments under subtitle B of title I of the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013; and

''(2) not more than $50,000 may consist of any other payments made for covered commodities and peanuts under title I of the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013.

''(c) SPOUSAL EQUITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsection (b), except as provided in paragraph (2), if a person and the spouse of the person are covered by paragraph (2) and receive, directly or indirectly, any payment or gain covered by this section, the total amount of payments or gains (as applicable) covered by this section that the person and spouse may jointly receive during any crop year may not exceed an amount equal to twice the applicable dollar amounts specified in subsection (b).

''(2) EXCEPTIONS.—

''(A) SEPARATE FARMING OPERATIONS.—In the case of a married couple in which each spouse, before the marriage, was separately engaged in an unrelated farming operation, each spouse shall be treated as a separate person with respect to a farming operation brought into the marriage by a spouse, subject to the condition that the farming operation shall remain a separate farming operation, as determined by the Secretary.

''(B) ELECTION TO RECEIVE SEPARATE PAYMENTS.—A married couple may elect to receive payments separately in the name of each spouse if the total amount of payments and benefits described in subsection (b) that the married couple receives, directly or indirectly, does not exceed an amount equal to twice the applicable dollar amounts specified in those subsections.'';

(3) in paragraph (3)(B) of subsection (f), by adding at the end the following:

''(iii) IRREVOCABLE TRUSTS.—In promulgating regulations to define the term 'legal entity' as the term applies to irrevocable trusts, the Secretary shall ensure that irrevocable trusts are legitimate entities that have not been created for the purpose of avoiding a payment limitation.''; and

(4) in subsection (h), in the second sentence, by striking ''or other entity'' and inserting ''or legal entity''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 1001 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308) is amended—

(A) in subsection (e), by striking ''subsections (b) and (c)'' each place it appears in paragraphs (1) and (3)(B) and inserting ''subsection (b)'';

(B) in subsection (f)—

(i) in paragraph (2), by striking ''Subsections (b) and (c)'' and inserting ''Subsection (b)'';

(ii) in paragraph (4)(B), by striking ''subsection (b) or (c)'' and inserting ''subsection (b)'';

(iii) in paragraph (5)—

(I) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''subsection (d)''; and

(II) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''subsection (b), (c), or (d)'' and inserting ''subsection (b)''; and

(iv) in paragraph (6)—

(I) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''Notwithstanding subsection (d), except as provided in subsection (g)'' and inserting ''Except as provided in subsection (f)''; and

(II) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''subsections (b), (c), and (d)'' and inserting ''subsection (b)'';

(C) in subsection (g)—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) by striking ''subsection (f)(6)(A)'' and inserting ''subsection (e)(6)(A)''; and

(II) by striking ''subsection (b) or (c)'' and inserting ''subsection (b)''; and

(ii) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking ''subsections (b) and (c)'' and inserting ''subsection (b)''; and

(D) by redesignating subsections (e) through (h) as subsections (d) through (g), respectively.

(2) Section 1001A of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308–1) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking ''subsections (b) and (c) of section 1001'' and inserting ''section 1001(b)''; and

(B) in subsection (b)(1), by striking ''subsection (b) or (c) of section 1001'' and inserting ''section 1001(b)''.

(3) Section 1001B(a) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308–2(a)) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking ''subsections (b) and (c) of section 1001'' and inserting ''section 1001(b)''.

(c) APPLICATION.—The amendments made by this section shall apply beginning with the 2014 crop year.

SEC. 1603A. PAYMENTS LIMITED TO ACTIVE FARMERS.

Section 1001A of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308–1) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(2)—

(A) by striking ''or active personal management'' each place it appears in subparagraphs (A)(i)(II) and (B)(ii); and

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking '', as applied to the legal entity, are met by the legal entity, the partners or members making a significant contribution of personal labor or active personal management'' and inserting ''are met by partners or members making a significant contribution of personal labor, those partners or members''; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

''(A) the landowner share-rents the land at a rate that is usual and customary;'';

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) the share of the payments received by the landowner is commensurate with the share of the crop or income received as rent.'';

(B) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking ''active personal management or'';

(C) in paragraph (5)—

(i) by striking ''(5)'' and all that follows through ''(A) IN GENERAL.—A person'' and inserting the following:

''(5) CUSTOM FARMING SERVICES.—A person'';

(ii) by inserting ''under usual and customary terms'' after ''services''; and

(iii) by striking subparagraph (B); and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(7) FARM MANAGERS.—A person who otherwise meets the requirements of this subsection other than (b)(2)(A)(i)(II) shall be considered to be actively engaged in farming, as determined by the Secretary, with respect to the farming operation, including a farming operation that is a sole proprietorship, a legal entity such as a joint venture or general partnership, or a legal entity such as a corporation or limited partnership, if the person—

''(A) makes a significant contribution of management to the farming operation necessary for the farming operation, taking into account—

''(i) the size and complexity of the farming operation; and

''(ii) the management requirements normally and customarily required by similar farming operations;

''(B)(i) is the only person in the farming operation qualifying as actively engaged in farming by using the farm manager special class designation under this paragraph; and

''(ii) together with any other persons in the farming operation qualifying as actively engaged in farming under subsection (b)(2) or as part of a special class under this subsection, does not collectively receive, directly or indirectly, an amount equal to more than the applicable limits under section 1001(b);

''(C) does not use the management contribution under this paragraph to qualify as actively engaged in more than 1 farming operation; and

''(D) manages a farm operation that does not substantially share equipment, labor, or management with persons or legal entities that with the person collectively receive, directly or indirectly, an amount equal to more than the applicable limits under section 1001(b).''.

SEC. 1604. ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME LIMITATION.

(a) LIMITATIONS AND COVERED BENEFITS.—Section 1001D(b) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308–3a(b)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking ''LIMITATIONS'' and inserting ''LIMITATIONS ON COMMODITY AND CONSERVATION PROGRAMS'';

(2) by striking paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting the following new paragraphs:

''(1) LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a person or legal entity shall not be eligible to receive any benefit described in paragraph (2) during a crop, fiscal, or program year, as appropriate, if the average adjusted gross income of the person or legal entity exceeds $950,000.

''(2) COVERED BENEFITS.—Paragraph (1) applies with respect to a payment or benefit under subtitle A, B, or E of title I, or title II of the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013, title II of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002, title II of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008, title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985, section 524(b) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1524(b)), or section 196 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7333).''.

(b) ELIMINATION OF UNUSED DEFINITIONS.—Paragraph (1) of section 1001D(a) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308–3a(a)) is amended to read as follows:

''(1) AVERAGE ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME.—In this section, the term 'average adjusted gross income', with respect to a person or legal entity, means the average of the adjusted gross income or comparable measure of the person or legal entity over the 3 taxable years preceding the most immediately preceding complete taxable year, as determined by the Secretary.''.

(c) INCOME DETERMINATION.—Section 1001D of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308–3a) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (c); and

(2) by redesignating subsections (d), (e), and (f) as subsections (c), (d), and (e), respectively.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 1001D of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308–3a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2)—

(A) by striking ''subparagraph (A) or (B) of''; and

(B) by striking '', the average adjusted gross farm income, and the average adjusted gross nonfarm income'';

(2) in subsection (a)(3), by striking '', average adjusted gross farm income, and average adjusted gross nonfarm income'' both places it appears;

(3) in subsection (c) (as redesignated by subsection (c)(2) of this section)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking '', average adjusted gross farm income, and average adjusted gross nonfarm income'' both places it appears; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''paragraphs (1)(C) and (2)(B) of subsection (b)'' and inserting ''subsection (b)(2)''; and

(4) in subsection (d) (as redesignated by subsection (c)(2) of this section)—

(A) by striking ''paragraphs (1)(C) and (2)(B) of subsection (b)'' and inserting ''subsection (b)(2)''; and

(B) by striking '', average adjusted gross farm income, or average adjusted gross nonfarm income''.

(e) EFFECTIVE PERIOD.—Subsection (e) of section 1001D of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308–3a), as redesignated by subsection (c)(2) of this section, is repealed.

(f) LIMITATION ON APPLICABILITY.—Section 1001(d) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: ''or title I of the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013''.

(g) TRANSITION.—Section 1001D of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308–3a), as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, shall apply with respect to the 2013 crop, fiscal, or program year, as appropriate, for each program described in paragraphs (1)(C) and (2)(B) of subsection (b) of that section (as so in effect on that day).

SEC. 1605. GEOGRAPHICALLY DISADVANTAGED FARMERS AND RANCHERS.

Section 1621(d) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8792(d)) is amended by striking ''each of fiscal years 2009 through 2012'' and inserting ''fiscal year 2009 and each succeeding fiscal year''.

SEC. 1606. PERSONAL LIABILITY OF PRODUCERS FOR DEFICIENCIES.

Section 164 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7284) is amended by striking ''and title I of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of

2008'' each place it appears and inserting ''title I of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8702 et seq.), and title I of the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013''.

SEC. 1607. PREVENTION OF DECEASED INDIVIDUALS RECEIVING PAYMENTS UNDER FARM COMMODITY PROGRAMS.

(a) RECONCILIATION.—At least twice each year, the Secretary shall reconcile Social Security numbers of all individuals who receive payments under this title, whether directly or indirectly, with the Commissioner of Social Security to determined if the individuals are alive.

(b) PRECLUSION.—The Secretary shall preclude the issuance of payments to, and on behalf of, deceased individuals that were not eligible for payments.

SEC. 1608. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

(a) MISSING PUNCTUATION.—Section 359f(c)(1)(B) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1359ff(c)(1)(B)) is amended by adding a period at the end.

(b) ERRONEOUS CROSS REFERENCE.—

(1) AMENDMENT.—Section 1603(g) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–246; 122 Stat. 1739) is amended in paragraphs (2) through (6) and the amendments made by those paragraphs by striking ''1703(a)'' each place it appears and inserting ''1603(a)''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This subsection and the amendments made by this subsection take effect as if included in the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–246; 122 Stat. 1651).

(c) CONTINUED APPLICABILITY OF APPROPRIATIONS GENERAL PROVISION.—Section 767 of division A of Public Law 108–7 (7 U.S.C. 7911 note; 117 Stat. 48) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking ''sections 1101 and 1102 of Public Law 107–171'' and inserting ''subtitle A of title I of the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013''; and

(B) by striking ''such section 1102'' and inserting ''such subtitle''; and

(2) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following new subsection:

''(b) This section, as amended by section 1608(c) of the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013, shall take effect beginning with the 2014 crop year.''.

SEC. 1609. ASSIGNMENT OF PAYMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The provisions of section 8(g) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590h(g)), relating to assignment of payments, shall apply to payments made under this title.

(b) NOTICE.—The producer making the assignment, or the assignee, shall provide the Secretary with notice, in such manner as the Secretary may require, of any assignment made under this section.

SEC. 1610. TRACKING OF BENEFITS.

As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary may track the benefits provided, directly or indirectly, to individuals and entities under titles I and II and the amendments made by those titles.

SEC. 1611. SIGNATURE AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out this title and title II and amendments made by those titles, if the Secretary approves a document, the Secretary shall not subsequently determine the document is inadequate or invalid because of the lack of authority of any person signing the document on behalf of the applicant or any other individual, entity, general partnership, or joint venture, or the documents relied upon were determined inadequate or invalid, unless the person signing the program document knowingly and willfully falsified the evidence of signature authority or a signature.

(b) AFFIRMATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this section prohibits the Secretary from asking a proper party to affirm any document that otherwise would be considered approved under subsection (a).

(2) NO RETROACTIVE EFFECT.—A denial of benefits based on a lack of affirmation under paragraph (1) shall not be retroactive with respect to third-party producers who were not the subject of the erroneous representation of authority, if the third-party producers—

(A) relied on the prior approval by the Secretary of the documents in good faith; and

(B) substantively complied with all program requirements.

SEC. 1612. IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) STREAMLINING.—In implementing this title, the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable—

(1) seek to reduce administrative burdens and costs to producers by streamlining and reducing paperwork, forms, and other administrative requirements;

(2) improve coordination, information sharing, and administrative work with the Risk Management Agency and the Natural Resources Conservation Service; and

(3) take advantage of new technologies to enhance efficiency and effectiveness of program delivery to producers.

(b) MAINTENANCE OF BASE ACRES AND PAYMENT YIELDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall maintain, for each covered commodity and upland cotton, base acres and payment yields on a farm established under—

(A)(i) in the case of covered commodities and upland cotton, sections 1101 and 1102 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 7911, 7912); and

(ii) in the case of peanuts, section 1302 of that Act (7 U.S.C. 7952); and

(B)(i) in the case of covered commodities and upland cotton, sections 1101 and 1102 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8711, 8712); and

(ii) in the case of peanuts, section 1302 of that Act (7 U.S.C. 8752).

(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR LONG GRAIN AND MEDIUM GRAIN RICE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall maintain separate base acres for long grain rice and medium grain rice.

(B) LIMITATION.—In carrying out this paragraph, the Secretary shall use the same total base acres and payment yields established with respect to rice under sections 1108 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8718), as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, subject to any adjustment under section 1105.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary shall make available to the Farm Service Agency to carry out this title $100,000,000.

SEC. 1613. PROTECTION OF PRODUCER INFORMATION.

(a) PROHIBITION OF PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF PROTECTED INFORMATION.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the Secretary, any officer or employee of the Department of Agriculture, any contractor or cooperator of the Department, and any officer or employee of another Federal agency shall not disclose—

(1) information submitted by a producer or owner of agricultural land to the Federal Government pursuant to title I or II of this Act; or

(2) other information provided by a producer or owner of agricultural land concerning the agricultural operation, farming or conservation practices, or the land itself in order to participate in programs of the Department of Agriculture or other Federal agencies.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Information described in subsection (a) may be disclosed if—

(1) the information is required to be made publicly available under any other provision of Federal law;

(2) the producer or owner of agricultural land who provided the information has lawfully publicly disclosed the information;

(3) the producer or owner of agricultural land who provided the information consents to the disclosure; or

(4) the information is disclosed to the Attorney General, to the extent necessary, to ensure compliance and law enforcement.

(c) NOTICE OF DISCLOSURE.—Any disclosure of information pursuant to an exception provided in subsection (b) shall be reported to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate within 24 hours after the disclosure.

(d) PRODUCER DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''producer'' has the meaning given that term in section 1104(14) of this Act.

TITLE II—CONSERVATION

Subtitle A—Conservation Reserve Program

SEC. 2001. EXTENSION AND ENROLLMENT REQUIREMENTS OF CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM.

(a) EXTENSION.—Section 1231(a) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831(a)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

(b) ELIGIBLE LAND.—Section 1231(b) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking ''the date of enactment of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008'' and inserting ''the date of the enactment of the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013'';

(2) by striking paragraph (2) and redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2);

(3) by inserting before paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

''(3) grasslands that—

''(A) contain forbs or shrubland (including improved rangeland and pastureland) for which grazing is the predominant use;

''(B) are located in an area historically dominated by grasslands; and

''(C) could provide habitat for animal and plant populations of significant ecological value if the land is retained in its current use or restored to a natural condition;'';

(4) in paragraph (4)(C), by striking ''filterstrips devoted to trees or shrubs'' and inserting ''filterstrips or riparian buffers devoted to trees, shrubs, or grasses''; and

(5) by striking paragraph (5) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(5) the portion of land in a field not enrolled in the conservation reserve in a case in which—

''(A) more than 50 percent of the land in the field is enrolled as a buffer or filterstrip, or more than 75 percent of the land in the field is enrolled as a conservation practice other than as a buffer or filterstrip; and

''(B) the remainder of the field is—

''(i) infeasible to farm; and

''(ii) enrolled at regular rental rates.''.

(c) PLANTING STATUS OF CERTAIN LAND.—Section 1231(c) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831(c)) is amended by striking ''if'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''if, during the crop year, the land was devoted to a conserving use.''.

(d) ENROLLMENT.—Subsection (d) of section 1231 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831) is amended to read as follows:

''(d) ENROLLMENT.—

''(1) MAXIMUM ACREAGE ENROLLED.—The Secretary may maintain in the conservation reserve at any one time during—

''(A) fiscal year 2014, no more than 27,500,000 acres;

''(B) fiscal year 2015, no more than 26,000,000 acres;

''(C) fiscal year 2016, no more than 25,000,000 acres;

''(D) fiscal year 2017, no more than 24,000,000 acres; and

''(E) fiscal year 2018, no more than 24,000,000 acres.

''(2) GRASSLANDS.—

''(A) LIMITATION.—For purposes of applying the limitations in paragraph (1), no more than 2,000,000 acres of the land described in subsection (b)(3) may be enrolled in the program at any one time during the 2014 through 2018 fiscal years.

''(B) PRIORITY.—In enrolling acres under subparagraph (A), the Secretary may give priority to land with expiring conservation reserve program contracts.

''(C) METHOD OF ENROLLMENT.—In enrolling acres under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall make the program available to owners or operators of eligible land on a continuous enrollment basis with one or more ranking periods.''.

(e) DURATION OF CONTRACT.—Section 1231(e) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831(e)) is amended by striking paragraphs (2) and (3) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN LAND.—In the case of land devoted to hardwood trees, shelterbelts, windbreaks, or wildlife corridors under a contract entered into under this subchapter, the owner or operator of the land may, within the limitations prescribed under paragraph (1), specify the duration of the contract.''.

(f) CONSERVATION PRIORITY AREAS.—Section 1231(f) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''watershed areas of the Chesapeake Bay Region, the Great Lakes Region, the Long Island Sound Region, and other'';

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''WATERSHEDS.—Watersheds'' and inserting ''AREAS.—Areas''; and

(3) in paragraph (3), by striking ''a watershed's designation—'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''an area's designation if the Secretary finds that the area no longer contains actual and significant adverse water quality or habitat impacts related to agricultural production activities.''.

SEC. 2002. FARMABLE WETLAND PROGRAM.

(a) EXTENSION.—Section 1231B(a)(1) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831b(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''; and

(2) by striking ''a program'' and inserting ''a farmable wetland program''.

(b) ELIGIBLE ACREAGE.—Section 1231B(b)(1)(B) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831b(b)(1)(B)) is amended by striking ''flow from a row crop agriculture drainage system'' and inserting ''surface and subsurface flow from row crop agricultural production''.

(c) ACREAGE LIMITATION.—Section 1231B(c)(1)(B) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831b(c)(1)(B)) is amended by striking ''1,000,000'' and inserting ''750,000''.

(d) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The heading of section 1231B of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831b) is amended to read as follows: ''**FARMABLE WETLAND PROGRAM**.''.

SEC. 2003. DUTIES OF OWNERS AND OPERATORS.

(a) LIMITATION ON HARVESTING, GRAZING, OR COMMERCIAL USE OF FORAGE.—Section 1232(a)(8) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3832(a)(8)) is amended by striking ''except that'' and all that follows through the semicolon at the end of the paragraph and inserting ''except as provided in subsection (b) or (c) of section 1233;''.

(b) CONSERVATION PLAN REQUIREMENTS.—Subsection (b) of section 1232 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3832) is amended to read as follows:

''(b) CONSERVATION PLANS.—The plan referred to in subsection (a)(1) shall set forth—

''(1) the conservation measures and practices to be carried out by the owner or operator during the term of the contract; and

''(2) the commercial use, if any, to be permitted on the land during the term.''.

(c) RENTAL PAYMENT REDUCTION.—Section 1232 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3832) is amended by striking subsection (d).

SEC. 2004. DUTIES OF THE SECRETARY.

Section 1233 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3833) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 1233. DUTIES OF THE SECRETARY.

''(a) COST-SHARE AND RENTAL PAYMENTS.—In return for a contract entered into by an owner or operator under the conservation reserve program, the Secretary shall—

''(1) share the cost of carrying out the conservation measures and practices set forth in the contract for which the Secretary determines that cost sharing is appropriate and in the public interest; and

''(2) for a period of years not in excess of the term of the contract, pay an annual rental payment in an amount necessary to compensate for—

''(A) the conversion of highly erodible cropland or other eligible lands normally devoted to the production of an agricultural commodity on a farm or ranch to a less intensive use;

''(B) the retirement of any base history that the owner or operator agrees to retire permanently; and

''(C) the development and management of grasslands for multiple natural resource conservation benefits, including to soil, water, air, and wildlife.

''(b) SPECIFIED ACTIVITIES PERMITTED.—The Secretary shall permit certain activities or commercial uses of land that is subject to a contract under the conservation reserve program in a manner that is consistent with a plan approved by the Secretary, as follows:

''(1) Harvesting, grazing, or other commercial use of the forage in response to a drought or other emergency created by a natural disaster, without any reduction in the rental rate.

''(2) Consistent with the conservation of soil, water quality, and wildlife habitat (including habitat during nesting seasons for birds in the area), and in exchange for a reduction of not less than 25 percent in the annual rental rate for the acres covered by the authorized activity—

''(A) managed harvesting and other commercial use (including the managed harvesting of biomass), except that in permitting managed harvesting, the Secretary, in coordination with the State technical committee—

''(i) shall develop appropriate vegetation management requirements; and

''(ii) shall identify periods during which managed harvesting may be conducted, such that the frequency is not more than once every three years;

''(B) routine grazing or prescribed grazing for the control of invasive species, except that in permitting such routine grazing or prescribed grazing, the Secretary, in coordination with the State technical committee—

''(i) shall develop appropriate vegetation management requirements and stocking rates for the land that are suitable for continued routine grazing; and

''(ii) shall identify the periods during which routine grazing may be conducted, such that the frequency is not more than once every two years, taking into consideration regional differences such as—

''(I) climate, soil type, and natural resources;

''(II) the number of years that should be required between routine grazing activities; and

''(III) how often during a year in which routine grazing is permitted that routine grazing should be allowed to occur; and

''(C) the installation of wind turbines and associated access, except that in permitting the installation of wind turbines, the Secretary shall determine the number and location of wind turbines that may be installed, taking into account—

''(i) the location, size, and other physical characteristics of the land;

''(ii) the extent to which the land contains wildlife and wildlife habitat; and

''(iii) the purposes of the conservation reserve program under this subchapter.

''(3) The intermittent and seasonal use of vegetative buffer practices incidental to agricultural production on lands adjacent to the buffer such that the permitted use does not destroy the permanent vegetative cover.

''(c) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES ON GRASSLANDS.—For eligible land described in section 1231(b)(3), the Secretary shall permit the following activities:

''(1) Common grazing practices, including maintenance and necessary cultural practices, on the land in a manner that is consistent with maintaining the viability of grassland, forb, and shrub species appropriate to that locality.

''(2) Haying, mowing, or harvesting for seed production, subject to appropriate restrictions during the nesting season for critical bird species in the area.

''(3) Fire presuppression, fire-related rehabilitation, and construction of fire breaks.

''(4) Grazing-related activities, such as fencing and livestock watering.

''(d) RESOURCE CONSERVING USE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning on the date that is 1 year before the date of termination of a contract under the program, the Secretary shall allow an owner or operator to make conservation and land improvements that facilitate maintaining protection of enrolled land after expiration of the contract.

''(2) CONSERVATION PLAN.—The Secretary shall require an owner or operator carrying out the activities described in paragraph (1) to develop and implement a conservation plan.

''(3) RE-ENROLLMENT PROHIBITED.—Land improved under paragraph (1) may not be re-enrolled in the conservation reserve program for 5 years after the date of termination of the contract.''.

SEC. 2005. PAYMENTS.

(a) TREES, WINDBREAKS, SHELTERBELTS, AND WILDLIFE CORRIDORS.—Section 1234(b)(3)(A) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3834(b)(3)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by inserting ''and'' after the semicolon;

(2) by striking clause (ii); and

(3) by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (ii).

(b) ANNUAL RENTAL PAYMENTS.—Section 1234(c) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3834(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''or other eligible lands'' after ''highly erodible cropland'' both places it appears; and

(2) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(2) METHODS OF DETERMINATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The amounts payable to owners or operators in the form of rental

payments under contracts entered into under this subchapter may be determined through—

''(i) the submission of bids for such contracts by owners and operators in such manner as the Secretary may prescribe; or

''(ii) such other means as the Secretary determines are appropriate.

''(B) GRASSLANDS.—In the case of eligible land described in section 1231(b)(3), the Secretary shall make annual payments in an amount that is not more than 75 percent of the grazing value of the land covered by the contract.''.

(c) PAYMENT SCHEDULE.—Subsection (d) of section 1234 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3834) is amended to read as follows:

''(d) PAYMENT SCHEDULE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, payments under this subchapter shall be made in cash in such amount and on such time schedule as is agreed on and specified in the contract.

''(2) ADVANCE PAYMENT.—Payments under this subchapter may be made in advance of determination of performance.''.

(d) PAYMENT LIMITATION.—Section 1234(f) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3834(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking '', including rental payments made in the form of in-kind commodities,'';

(2) by striking paragraph (3); and

(3) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (2).

SEC. 2006. CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS.

(a) EARLY TERMINATION BY OWNER OR OPERATOR.—Section 1235(e) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3835(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(A)—

(A) by striking ''The Secretary'' and inserting ''During fiscal year 2014, the Secretary''; and

(B) by striking ''before January 1, 1995,'';

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

''(C) Land devoted to hardwood trees.

''(D) Wildlife habitat, duck nesting habitat, pollinator habitat, upland bird habitat buffer, wildlife food plots, State acres for wildlife enhancement, shallow water areas for wildlife, and rare and declining habitat.

''(E) Farmable wetland and restored wetland.

''(F) Land that contains diversions, erosion control structures, flood control structures, contour grass strips, living snow fences, salinity reducing vegetation, cross wind trap strips, and sediment retention structures.

''(G) Land located within a federally-designated wellhead protection area.

''(H) Land that is covered by an easement under the conservation reserve program.

''(I) Land located within an average width, according to the applicable Natural Resources Conservation Service field office technical guide, of a perennial stream or permanent water body.''; and

(3) in paragraph (3), by striking ''60 days after the date on which the owner or operator submits the notice required under paragraph (1)(C)'' and inserting ''upon approval by the Secretary''.

(b) TRANSITION OPTION FOR CERTAIN FARMERS OR RANCHERS.—Section 1235(f) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3835(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''DUTIES'' and all that follows through ''a beginning farmer'' and inserting ''TRANSITION TO COVERED FARMER OR RANCHER.—In the case of a contract modification approved in order to facilitate the transfer of land subject to a contract from a retired farmer or rancher to a beginning farmer'';

(B) in subparagraph (A)(i), by inserting '', including preparing to plant an agricultural crop'' after ''improvements'';

(C) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''the farmer or rancher'' and inserting ''the covered farmer or rancher''; and

(D) in subparagraph (E), by striking ''section 1001A(b)(3)(B)'' and inserting ''section 1001''; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''requirement of section 1231(h)(4)(B)'' and inserting ''option pursuant to section 1234(c)(2)(A)(ii)''.

(c) FINAL YEAR CONTRACT.—Section 1235 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3835) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsections:

''(g) FINAL YEAR OF CONTRACT.—The Secretary shall not consider an owner or operator to be in violation of a term or condition of the conservation reserve contract if—

''(1) during the year prior to expiration of the contract, the land is enrolled in the conservation stewardship program; and

''(2) the activity required under the conservation stewardship program pursuant to such enrollment is consistent with this subchapter.

''(h) LAND ENROLLED IN AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION EASEMENT PROGRAM.—The Secretary may terminate or modify a contract entered into under this subchapter if eligible land that is subject to such contract is transferred into the agricultural conservation easement program under subtitle H.''.

SEC. 2007. CONVERSION OF LAND SUBJECT TO CONTRACT TO OTHER CONSERVING USES.

Section 1235A of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3835a) is repealed.

SEC. 2008. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this subtitle shall take effect on October 1, 2013, except the amendment made by section 2001(d), which shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) EFFECT ON EXISTING CONTRACTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this subtitle shall not affect the validity or terms of any contract entered into by the Secretary of Agriculture under subchapter B of chapter 1 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831 et seq.) before October 1, 2013, or any payments required to be made in connection with the contract.

(2) UPDATING OF EXISTING CONTRACTS.—The Secretary shall permit an owner or operator of land subject to a contract entered into under subchapter B of chapter 1 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831 et seq.) before October 1, 2013, to update the contract to reflect the activities and uses of land under contract permitted under the terms and conditions of section 1233(b) of that Act (as amended by section 2004), as determined appropriate by the Secretary.

Subtitle B—Conservation Stewardship Program

SEC. 2101. CONSERVATION STEWARDSHIP PROGRAM.

(a) REVISION OF CURRENT PROGRAM.—Subchapter B of chapter 2 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3838d et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

''Subchapter B—Conservation Stewardship Program

''SEC. 1238D. DEFINITIONS.

''In this subchapter:

''(1) AGRICULTURAL OPERATION.—The term 'agricultural operation' means all eligible land, whether or not contiguous, that is—

''(A) under the effective control of a producer at the time the producer enters into a contract under the program; and

''(B) operated with equipment, labor, management, and production or cultivation practices that are substantially separate from other agricultural operations, as determined by the Secretary.

''(2) CONSERVATION ACTIVITIES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'conservation activities' means conservation systems, practices, or management measures.

''(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term 'conservation activities' includes—

''(i) structural measures, vegetative measures, and land management measures, including agriculture drainage management systems, as determined by the Secretary; and

''(ii) planning needed to address a priority resource concern.

''(3) CONSERVATION STEWARDSHIP PLAN.—The term 'conservation stewardship plan' means a plan that—

''(A) identifies and inventories priority resource concerns;

''(B) establishes benchmark data and conservation objectives;

''(C) describes conservation activities to be implemented, managed, or improved; and

''(D) includes a schedule and evaluation plan for the planning, installation, and management of the new and existing conservation activities.

''(4) ELIGIBLE LAND.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'eligible land' means—

''(i) private or tribal land on which agricultural commodities, livestock, or forest-related products are produced; and

''(ii) lands associated with the land described in clause (i) on which priority resource concerns could be addressed through a contract under the program.

''(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term 'eligible land' includes—

''(i) cropland;

''(ii) grassland;

''(iii) rangeland;

''(iv) pasture land;

''(v) nonindustrial private forest land; and

''(vi) other agricultural areas (including cropped woodland, marshes, and agricultural land used or capable of being used for the production of livestock), as determined by the Secretary.

''(5) PRIORITY RESOURCE CONCERN.—The term 'priority resource concern' means a natural resource concern or problem, as determined by the Secretary, that—

''(A) is identified at the national, State, or local level as a priority for a particular area of a State;

''(B) represents a significant concern in a State or region; and

''(C) is likely to be addressed successfully through the implementation of conservation activities under this program.

''(6) PROGRAM.—The term 'program' means the conservation stewardship program established by this subchapter.

''(7) STEWARDSHIP THRESHOLD.—The term 'stewardship threshold' means the level of management required, as determined by the Secretary, to conserve and improve the quality and condition of a natural resource.

''SEC. 1238E. CONSERVATION STEWARDSHIP PROGRAM.

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT AND PURPOSE.—During each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018, the Secretary shall carry out a conservation stewardship program to encourage producers to address priority resource concerns in a comprehensive manner—

''(1) by undertaking additional conservation activities; and

''(2) by improving, maintaining, and managing existing conservation activities.

''(b) EXCLUSIONS.—

''(1) LAND ENROLLED IN OTHER CONSERVATION PROGRAMS.—Subject to paragraph (2),

the following land (even if covered by the definition of eligible land) is not eligible for enrollment in the program:

''(A) Land enrolled in the conservation reserve program, unless—

''(i) the conservation reserve contract will expire at the end of the fiscal year in which the land is to be enrolled in the program; and

''(ii) conservation reserve program payments for land enrolled in the program cease before the first program payment is made to the applicant under this subchapter.

''(B) Land enrolled in a wetland easement through the agricultural conservation easement program.

''(C) Land enrolled in the conservation security program.

''(2) CONVERSION TO CROPLAND.—Eligible land used for crop production after October 1, 2013, that had not been planted, considered to be planted, or devoted to crop production for at least 4 of the 6 years preceding that date shall not be the basis for any payment under the program, unless the land does not meet the requirement because—

''(A) the land had previously been enrolled in the conservation reserve program;

''(B) the land has been maintained using long-term crop rotation practices, as determined by the Secretary; or

''(C) the land is incidental land needed for efficient operation of the farm or ranch, as determined by the Secretary.

''SEC. 1238F. STEWARDSHIP CONTRACTS.

''(a) SUBMISSION OF CONTRACT OFFERS.—To be eligible to participate in the conservation stewardship program, a producer shall submit to the Secretary a contract offer for the agricultural operation that—

''(1) demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the producer, at the time of the contract offer, meets or exceeds the stewardship threshold for at least 2 priority resource concerns; and

''(2) would, at a minimum, meet or exceed the stewardship threshold for at least 1 additional priority resource concern by the end of the stewardship contract by—

''(A) installing and adopting additional conservation activities; and

''(B) improving, maintaining, and managing existing conservation activities across the entire agricultural operation in a manner that increases or extends the conservation benefits in place at the time the contract offer is accepted by the Secretary.

''(b) EVALUATION OF CONTRACT OFFERS.—

''(1) RANKING OF APPLICATIONS.—In evaluating contract offers submitted under subsection (a), the Secretary shall rank applications based on—

''(A) the level of conservation treatment on all applicable priority resource concerns at the time of application;

''(B) the degree to which the proposed conservation activities effectively increase conservation performance;

''(C) the number of applicable priority resource concerns proposed to be treated to meet or exceed the stewardship threshold by the end of the contract;

''(D) the extent to which other priority resource concerns will be addressed to meet or exceed the stewardship threshold by the end of the contract period;

''(E) the extent to which the actual and anticipated conservation benefits from the contract are provided at the least cost relative to other similarly beneficial contract offers; and

''(F) the extent to which priority resource concerns will be addressed when transitioning from the conservation reserve program to agricultural production.

''(2) PROHIBITION.—The Secretary may not assign a higher priority to any application because the applicant is willing to accept a lower payment than the applicant would otherwise be eligible to receive.

''(3) ADDITIONAL CRITERIA.—The Secretary may develop and use such additional criteria that the Secretary determines are necessary to ensure that national, State, and local priority resource concerns are effectively addressed.

''(c) ENTERING INTO CONTRACTS.—After a determination that a producer is eligible for the program under subsection (a), and a determination that the contract offer ranks sufficiently high under the evaluation criteria under subsection (b), the Secretary shall enter into a conservation stewardship contract with the producer to enroll the eligible land to be covered by the contract.

''(d) CONTRACT PROVISIONS.—

''(1) TERM.—A conservation stewardship contract shall be for a term of 5 years.

''(2) REQUIRED PROVISIONS.—The conservation stewardship contract of a producer shall—

''(A) state the amount of the payment the Secretary agrees to make to the producer for each year of the conservation stewardship contract under section 1238G(d);

''(B) require the producer—

''(i) to implement a conservation stewardship plan that describes the program purposes to be achieved through 1 or more conservation activities;

''(ii) to maintain and supply information as required by the Secretary to determine compliance with the conservation stewardship plan and any other requirements of the program; and

''(iii) not to conduct any activities on the agricultural operation that would tend to defeat the purposes of the program;

''(C) permit all economic uses of the eligible land that—

''(i) maintain the agricultural nature of the land; and

''(ii) are consistent with the conservation purposes of the conservation stewardship contract;

''(D) include a provision to ensure that a producer shall not be considered in violation of the contract for failure to comply with the contract due to circumstances beyond the control of the producer, including a disaster or related condition, as determined by the Secretary;

''(E) include provisions requiring that upon the violation of a term or condition of the contract at any time the producer has control of the land—

''(i) if the Secretary determines that the violation warrants termination of the contract—

''(I) the producer shall forfeit all rights to receive payments under the contract; and

''(II) the producer shall refund all or a portion of the payments received by the producer under the contract, including any interest on the payments, as determined by the Secretary; or

''(ii) if the Secretary determines that the violation does not warrant termination of the contract, the producer shall refund or accept adjustments to the payments provided to the producer, as the Secretary determines to be appropriate;

''(F) include provisions in accordance with paragraphs (3) and (4) of this section; and

''(G) include any additional provisions the Secretary determines are necessary to carry out the program.

''(3) CHANGE OF INTEREST IN LAND SUBJECT TO A CONTRACT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—At the time of application, a producer shall have control of the eligible land to be enrolled in the program. Except as provided in subparagraph (B), a change in the interest of a producer in eligible land covered by a contract under the program shall result in the termination of the contract with regard to that land.

''(B) TRANSFER OF DUTIES AND RIGHTS.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply if—

''(i) within a reasonable period of time (as determined by the Secretary) after the date of the change in the interest in eligible land covered by a contract under the program, the transferee of the land provides written notice to the Secretary that all duties and rights under the contract have been transferred to, and assumed by, the transferee for the portion of the land transferred;

''(ii) the transferee meets the eligibility requirements of the program; and

''(iii) the Secretary approves the transfer of all duties and rights under the contract.

''(4) MODIFICATION AND TERMINATION OF CONTRACTS.—

''(A) VOLUNTARY MODIFICATION OR TERMINATION.—The Secretary may modify or terminate a contract with a producer if—

''(i) the producer agrees to the modification or termination; and

''(ii) the Secretary determines that the modification or termination is in the public interest.

''(B) INVOLUNTARY TERMINATION.—The Secretary may terminate a contract if the Secretary determines that the producer violated the contract.

''(5) REPAYMENT.—If a contract is terminated, the Secretary may, consistent with the purposes of the program—

''(A) allow the producer to retain payments already received under the contract; or

''(B) require repayment, in whole or in part, of payments received and assess liquidated damages.

''(e) CONTRACT RENEWAL.—At the end of the initial 5-year contract period, the Secretary may allow the producer to renew the contract for 1 additional 5-year period if the producer—

''(1) demonstrates compliance with the terms of the initial contract;

''(2) agrees to adopt and continue to integrate conservation activities across the entire agricultural operation, as determined by the Secretary; and

''(3) agrees, by the end of the contract period—

''(A) to meet the stewardship threshold of at least two additional priority resource concerns on the agricultural operation; or

''(B) to exceed the stewardship threshold of two existing priority resource concerns that are specified by the Secretary in the initial contract.

''SEC. 1238G. DUTIES OF THE SECRETARY.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—To achieve the conservation goals of a contract under the conservation stewardship program, the Secretary shall—

''(1) make the program available to eligible producers on a continuous enrollment basis with 1 or more ranking periods, one of which shall occur in the first quarter of each fiscal year;

''(2) identify not less than 5 priority resource concerns in a particular watershed or other appropriate region or area within a State; and

''(3) establish a science-based stewardship threshold for each priority resource concern identified under paragraph (2).

''(b) ALLOCATION TO STATES.—The Secretary shall allocate acres to States for enrollment, based—

''(1) primarily on each State's proportion of eligible land to the total acreage of eligible land in all States; and

''(2) also on consideration of—

''(A) the extent and magnitude of the conservation needs associated with agricultural production in each State;

''(B) the degree to which implementation of the program in the State is, or will be, effective in helping producers address those needs; and

''(C) other considerations to achieve equitable geographic distribution of funds, as determined by the Secretary.

''(c) ACREAGE ENROLLMENT LIMITATION.—During the period beginning on October 1, 2013, and ending on September 30, 2021, the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable—

''(1) enroll in the program an additional 8,695,000 acres for each fiscal year; and

''(2) manage the program to achieve a national average rate of $18 per acre, which shall include the costs of all financial assistance, technical assistance, and any other expenses associated with enrollment or participation in the program.

''(d) CONSERVATION STEWARDSHIP PAYMENTS.—

''(1) AVAILABILITY OF PAYMENTS.—The Secretary shall provide annual payments under the program to compensate the producer for—

''(A) installing and adopting additional conservation activities; and

''(B) improving, maintaining, and managing conservation activities in place at the agricultural operation of the producer at the time the contract offer is accepted by the Secretary.

''(2) PAYMENT AMOUNT.—The amount of the conservation stewardship annual payment shall be determined by the Secretary and based, to the maximum extent practicable, on the following factors:

''(A) Costs incurred by the producer associated with planning, design, materials, installation, labor, management, maintenance, or training.

''(B) Income forgone by the producer.

''(C) Expected conservation benefits.

''(D) The extent to which priority resource concerns will be addressed through the installation and adoption of conservation activities on the agricultural operation.

''(E) The level of stewardship in place at the time of application and maintained over the term of the contract.

''(F) The degree to which the conservation activities will be integrated across the entire agricultural operation for all applicable priority resource concerns over the term of the contract.

''(G) Such other factors as determined appropriate by the Secretary.

''(3) EXCLUSIONS.—A payment to a producer under this subsection shall not be provided for—

''(A) the design, construction, or maintenance of animal waste storage or treatment facilities or associated waste transport or transfer devices for animal feeding operations; or

''(B) conservation activities for which there is no cost incurred or income forgone to the producer.

''(4) DELIVERY OF PAYMENTS.—In making payments under this subsection, the Secretary shall, to the extent practicable—

''(A) prorate conservation performance over the term of the contract so as to accommodate, to the extent practicable, producers earning equal annual payments in each fiscal year; and

''(B) make payments as soon as practicable after October 1 of each fiscal year for activities carried out in the previous fiscal year.

''(e) SUPPLEMENTAL PAYMENTS FOR RESOURCE-CONSERVING CROP ROTATIONS.—

''(1) AVAILABILITY OF PAYMENTS.—The Secretary shall provide additional payments to producers that, in participating in the program, agree to adopt or improve resource-conserving crop rotations to achieve beneficial crop rotations as appropriate for the eligible land of the producers.

''(2) BENEFICIAL CROP ROTATIONS.—The Secretary shall determine whether a resource-conserving crop rotation is a beneficial crop rotation eligible for additional payments under paragraph (1) based on whether the resource-conserving crop rotation is designed to provide natural resource conservation and production benefits.

''(3) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible to receive a payment described in paragraph (1), a producer shall agree to adopt and maintain beneficial resource-conserving crop rotations for the term of the contract.

''(4) RESOURCE-CONSERVING CROP ROTATION.—In this subsection, the term 'resource-conserving crop rotation' means a crop rotation that—

''(A) includes at least 1 resource-conserving crop (as defined by the Secretary);

''(B) reduces erosion;

''(C) improves soil fertility and tilth;

''(D) interrupts pest cycles; and

''(E) in applicable areas, reduces depletion of soil moisture or otherwise reduces the need for irrigation.

''(f) PAYMENT LIMITATIONS.—A person or legal entity may not receive, directly or indirectly, payments under the program that, in the aggregate, exceed $200,000 under all contracts entered into during fiscal years 2014 through 2018, excluding funding arrangements with Indian tribes, regardless of the number of contracts entered into under the program by the person or legal entity.

''(g) SPECIALTY CROP AND ORGANIC PRODUCERS.—The Secretary shall ensure that outreach and technical assistance are available, and program specifications are appropriate to enable specialty crop and organic producers to participate in the program.

''(h) COORDINATION WITH ORGANIC CERTIFICATION.—The Secretary shall establish a transparent means by which producers may initiate organic certification under the Organic Foods Production Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 6501 et seq.) while participating in a contract under the program.

''(i) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall promulgate regulations that—

''(1) prescribe such other rules as the Secretary determines to be necessary to ensure a fair and reasonable application of the limitations established under subsection (f); and

''(2) otherwise enable the Secretary to carry out the program.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2013.

(c) EFFECT ON EXISTING CONTRACTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendment made by this section shall not affect the validity or terms of any contract entered into by the Secretary of Agriculture under subchapter B of chapter 2 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3838d et seq.) before October 1, 2013, or any payments required to be made in connection with the contract.

(2) CONSERVATION STEWARDSHIP PROGRAM.—Funds made available under section 1241(a)(4) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3841(a)(4)) (as amended by section 2601(a) of this title) may be used to administer and make payments to program participants that enrolled into contracts during any of fiscal years 2009 through 2013.

Subtitle C—Environmental Quality Incentives Program

SEC. 2201. PURPOSES.

Section 1240 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C) and, in such subparagraph, by inserting ''and'' after the semicolon; and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraph:

''(B) developing and improving wildlife habitat; and'';

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a period; and

(3) by striking paragraph (5).

SEC. 2202. ESTABLISHMENT AND ADMINISTRATION.

Section 1240B of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa–2) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''2014'' and inserting ''2018'';

(2) in subsection (b), by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(2) TERM.—A contract under the program shall have a term that does not exceed 10 years.'';

(3) in subsection (d)(4)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting '', veteran farmer or rancher (as defined in section 2501(e) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 2279(e))),'' before ''or a beginning farmer or rancher''; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following new subparagraph:

''(B) ADVANCE PAYMENTS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Not more than 50 percent of the amount determined under subparagraph (A) may be provided in advance for the purpose of purchasing materials or contracting.

''(ii) RETURN OF FUNDS.—If funds provided in advance are not expended during the 90-day period beginning on the date of receipt of the funds, the funds shall be returned within a reasonable time frame, as determined by the Secretary.'';

(4) by striking subsection (f) and inserting the following new subsection:

''(f) ALLOCATION OF FUNDING.—

''(1) LIVESTOCK.—For each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018, at least 60 percent of the funds made available for payments under the program shall be targeted at practices relating to livestock production.

''(2) WILDLIFE HABITAT.—For each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018, 7.5 percent of the funds made available for payments under the program shall be targeted at practices benefitting wildlife habitat.'';

(5) in subsection (g)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking ''FEDERALLY RECOGNIZED NATIVE AMERICAN INDIAN TRIBES AND ALASKA NATIVE CORPORATIONS'' and inserting ''INDIAN TRIBES'';

(B) by striking ''federally recognized Native American Indian Tribes and Alaska Native Corporations (including their affiliated membership organizations)'' and inserting ''Indian tribes''; and

(C) by striking ''or Native Corporation''; and

(6) by adding at the end the following:

''(j) WILDLIFE HABITAT INCENTIVE PRACTICE.—The Secretary shall provide payments to producers under the program for practices, including recurring practices for the term of the contract, that support the restoration, development, protection, and improvement of wildlife habitat on eligible land, including—

''(1) upland wildlife habitat;

''(2) wetland wildlife habitat;

''(3) habitat for threatened and endangered species;

''(4) fish habitat;

''(5) habitat on pivot corners and other irregular areas of a field; and

''(6) other types of wildlife habitat, as determined appropriate by the Secretary.

''(k) FUNDING FOR COMMUNITY IRRIGATION ASSOCIATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may enter into an alternative funding arrangement with an eligible irrigation association if the Secretary determines that—

''(A) the purposes of the program will be met by such an arrangement; and

''(B) statutory limitations regarding contracts with individual producers will not be exceeded by any member of the irrigation association.

''(2) ELIGIBLE IRRIGATION ASSOCIATIONS.—In this subsection, the term 'eligible irrigation association' means an irrigation association that is—

''(A) comprised of producers; and

''(B) a local government entity, but does not have the authority to impose taxes or levies.''.

SEC. 2203. EVALUATION OF APPLICATIONS.

Section 1240C(b) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa–3(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''environmental'' and inserting ''conservation''; and

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking ''purpose of the environmental quality incentives program specified in section 1240(1)'' and inserting ''purposes of the program''.

SEC. 2204. DUTIES OF PRODUCERS.

Section 1240D(2) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa–4(2)) is amended by striking ''farm, ranch, or forest'' and inserting ''enrolled''.

SEC. 2205. LIMITATION ON PAYMENTS.

Section 1240G of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa–7) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 1240G. LIMITATION ON PAYMENTS.

''A person or legal entity may not receive, directly or indirectly, cost-share or incentive payments under this chapter that, in aggregate, exceed $450,000 for all contracts entered into under this chapter by the person or legal entity during the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2018, regardless of the number of contracts entered into under this chapter by the person or legal entity.''.

SEC. 2206. CONSERVATION INNOVATION GRANTS AND PAYMENTS.

Section 1240H of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa–8) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

''(E) facilitate on-farm conservation research and demonstration activities; and

''(F) facilitate pilot testing of new technologies or innovative conservation practices.''; and

(2) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following new subsection:

''(b) REPORTING.—Not later than December 31, 2014, and every two years thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives a report on the status of projects funded under this section, including—

''(1) funding awarded;

''(2) project results; and

''(3) incorporation of project findings, such as new technology and innovative approaches, into the conservation efforts implemented by the Secretary.''.

SEC. 2207. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this subtitle shall take effect on October 1, 2013.

(b) EFFECT ON EXISTING CONTRACTS.—The amendments made by this subtitle shall not affect the validity or terms of any contract entered into by the Secretary of Agriculture under chapter 4 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa et seq.) before October 1, 2013, or any payments required to be made in connection with the contract.

Subtitle D—Agricultural Conservation Easement Program

SEC. 2301. AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION EASEMENT PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 is amended by adding at the end the following new subtitle:

''Subtitle H—Agricultural Conservation Easement Program

''SEC. 1265. ESTABLISHMENT AND PURPOSES.

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish an agricultural conservation easement program for the conservation of eligible land and natural resources through easements or other interests in land.

''(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of the program are to—

''(1) combine the purposes and coordinate the functions of the wetlands reserve program established under section 1237, the grassland reserve program established under section 1238N, and the farmland protection program established under section 1238I, as such sections were in effect on September 30, 2013;

''(2) restore, protect, and enhance wetlands on eligible land;

''(3) protect the agricultural use and related conservation values of eligible land by limiting nonagricultural uses of that land; and

''(4) protect grazing uses and related conservation values by restoring and conserving eligible land.

''SEC. 1265A. DEFINITIONS.

''In this subtitle:

''(1) AGRICULTURAL LAND EASEMENT.—The term 'agricultural land easement' means an easement or other interest in eligible land that—

''(A) is conveyed for the purpose of protecting natural resources and the agricultural nature of the land; and

''(B) permits the landowner the right to continue agricultural production and related uses subject to an agricultural land easement plan, as approved by the Secretary.

''(2) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term 'eligible entity' means—

''(A) an agency of State or local government or an Indian tribe (including a farmland protection board or land resource council established under State law); or

''(B) an organization that is—

''(i) organized for, and at all times since the formation of the organization has been operated principally for, 1 or more of the conservation purposes specified in clause (i), (ii), (iii), or (iv) of section 170(h)(4)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;

''(ii) an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of that Code that is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of that Code; or

''(iii) described in—

''(I) paragraph (1) or (2) of section 509(a) of that Code; or

''(II) section 509(a)(3) of that Code and is controlled by an organization described in section 509(a)(2) of that Code.

''(3) ELIGIBLE LAND.—The term 'eligible land' means private or tribal land that is—

''(A) in the case of an agricultural land easement, agricultural land, including land on a farm or ranch—

''(i) that is subject to a pending offer for purchase of an agricultural land easement from an eligible entity;

''(ii) that—

''(I) has prime, unique, or other productive soil;

''(II) contains historical or archaeological resources; or

''(III) the protection of which will further a State or local policy consistent with the purposes of the program; and

''(iii) that is—

''(I) cropland;

''(II) rangeland;

''(III) grassland or land that contains forbs, or shrubland for which grazing is the predominate use;

''(IV) pastureland; or

''(V) nonindustrial private forest land that contributes to the economic viability of an offered parcel or serves as a buffer to protect such land from development;

''(B) in the case of a wetland easement, a wetland or related area, including—

''(i) farmed or converted wetlands, together with adjacent land that is functionally dependent on that land, if the Secretary determines it—

''(I) is likely to be successfully restored in a cost-effective manner; and

''(II) will maximize the wildlife benefits and wetland functions and values, as determined by the Secretary in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior at the local level;

''(ii) cropland or grassland that was used for agricultural production prior to flooding from the natural overflow of—

''(I) a closed basin lake and adjacent land that is functionally dependent upon it, if the State or other entity is willing to provide 50 percent share of the cost of an easement; and

''(II) a pothole and adjacent land that is functionally dependent on it;

''(iii) farmed wetlands and adjoining lands that—

''(I) are enrolled in the conservation reserve program;

''(II) have the highest wetland functions and values, as determined by the Secretary; and

''(III) are likely to return to production after they leave the conservation reserve program;

''(iv) riparian areas that link wetlands that are protected by easements or some other device that achieves the same purpose as an easement; or

''(v) other wetlands of an owner that would not otherwise be eligible, if the Secretary determines that the inclusion of such wetlands in a wetland easement would significantly add to the functional value of the easement; or

''(C) in the case of either an agricultural land easement or wetland easement, other land that is incidental to land described in subparagraph (A) or (B), if the Secretary determines that it is necessary for the efficient administration of the easements under this program.

''(4) PROGRAM.—The term 'program' means the agricultural conservation easement program established by this subtitle.

''(5) WETLAND EASEMENT.—The term 'wetland easement' means a reserved interest in eligible land that—

''(A) is defined and delineated in a deed; and

''(B) stipulates—

''(i) the rights, title, and interests in land conveyed to the Secretary; and

''(ii) the rights, title, and interests in land that are reserved to the landowner.

''SEC. 1265B. AGRICULTURAL LAND EASEMENTS.

''(a) AVAILABILITY OF ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall facilitate and provide funding for—

''(1) the purchase by eligible entities of agricultural land easements and other interests in eligible land; and

''(2) technical assistance to provide for the conservation of natural resources pursuant to an agricultural land easement plan.

''(b) COST-SHARE ASSISTANCE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall protect the agricultural use, including grazing, and related conservation values of eligible land through cost-share assistance to eligible entities for purchasing agricultural land easements.

''(2) SCOPE OF ASSISTANCE AVAILABLE.—

''(A) FEDERAL SHARE.—An agreement described in paragraph (4) shall provide for a Federal share determined by the Secretary of an amount not to exceed 50 percent of the fair market value of the agricultural land easement or other interest in land, as determined by the Secretary using—

''(i) the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice;

''(ii) an area-wide market analysis or survey; or

''(iii) another industry-approved method.

''(B) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Under the agreement, the eligible entity shall provide a share that is at least equivalent to that provided by the Secretary.

''(ii) SOURCE OF CONTRIBUTION.—An eligible entity may include as part of its share a charitable donation or qualified conservation contribution (as defined by section 170(h) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) from the private landowner if the eligible entity contributes its own cash resources in an amount that is at least 50 percent of the amount contributed by the Secretary.

''(C) EXCEPTION.—In the case of grassland of special environmental significance, as determined by the Secretary, the Secretary may provide an amount not to exceed 75 percent of the fair market value of the agricultural land easement.

''(3) EVALUATION AND RANKING OF APPLICATIONS.—

''(A) CRITERIA.—The Secretary shall establish evaluation and ranking criteria to maximize the benefit of Federal investment under the program.

''(B) CONSIDERATIONS.—In establishing the criteria, the Secretary shall emphasize support for—

''(i) protecting agricultural uses and related conservation values of the land; and

''(ii) maximizing the protection of areas devoted to agricultural use.

''(C) BIDDING DOWN.—If the Secretary determines that 2 or more applications for cost-share assistance are comparable in achieving the purpose of the program, the Secretary shall not assign a higher priority to any of those applications solely on the basis of lesser cost to the program.

''(4) AGREEMENTS WITH ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall enter into agreements with eligible entities to stipulate the terms and conditions under which the eligible entity is permitted to use cost-share assistance provided under this section.

''(B) LENGTH OF AGREEMENTS.—An agreement shall be for a term that is—

''(i) in the case of an eligible entity certified under the process described in paragraph (5), a minimum of five years; and

''(ii) for all other eligible entities, at least three, but not more than five years.

''(C) MINIMUM TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—An eligible entity shall be authorized to use its own terms and conditions for agricultural land easements so long as the Secretary determines such terms and conditions—

''(i) are consistent with the purposes of the program;

''(ii) permit effective enforcement of the conservation purposes of such easements;

''(iii) include a right of enforcement for the Secretary, that may be used only if the terms of the easement are not enforced by the holder of the easement;

''(iv) subject the land in which an interest is purchased to an agricultural land easement plan that—

''(I) describes the activities which promote the long-term viability of the land to meet the purposes for which the easement was acquired;

''(II) requires the management of grasslands according to a grasslands management plan; and

''(III) includes a conservation plan, where appropriate, and requires, at the option of the Secretary, the conversion of highly erodible cropland to less intensive uses; and

''(v) include a limit on the impervious surfaces to be allowed that is consistent with the agricultural activities to be conducted.

''(D) SUBSTITUTION OF QUALIFIED PROJECTS.—An agreement shall allow, upon mutual agreement of the parties, substitution of qualified projects that are identified at the time of the proposed substitution.

''(E) EFFECT OF VIOLATION.—If a violation occurs of a term or condition of an agreement under this subsection—

''(i) the Secretary may terminate the agreement; and

''(ii) the Secretary may require the eligible entity to refund all or part of any payments received by the entity under the program, with interest on the payments as determined appropriate by the Secretary.

''(5) CERTIFICATION OF ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—

''(A) CERTIFICATION PROCESS.—The Secretary shall establish a process under which the Secretary may—

''(i) directly certify eligible entities that meet established criteria;

''(ii) enter into long-term agreements with certified eligible entities; and

''(iii) accept proposals for cost-share assistance for the purchase of agricultural land easements throughout the duration of such agreements.

''(B) CERTIFICATION CRITERIA.—In order to be certified, an eligible entity shall demonstrate to the Secretary that the entity will maintain, at a minimum, for the duration of the agreement—

''(i) a plan for administering easements that is consistent with the purpose of this subtitle;

''(ii) the capacity and resources to monitor and enforce agricultural land easements; and

''(iii) policies and procedures to ensure—

''(I) the long-term integrity of agricultural land easements on eligible land;

''(II) timely completion of acquisitions of such easements; and

''(III) timely and complete evaluation and reporting to the Secretary on the use of funds provided under the program.

''(C) REVIEW AND REVISION.—

''(i) REVIEW.—The Secretary shall conduct a review of eligible entities certified under subparagraph (A) every three years to ensure that such entities are meeting the criteria established under subparagraph (B).

''(ii) REVOCATION.—If the Secretary finds that the certified eligible entity no longer meets the criteria established under subparagraph (B), the Secretary may—

''(I) allow the certified eligible entity a specified period of time, at a minimum 180 days, in which to take such actions as may be necessary to meet the criteria; and

''(II) revoke the certification of the eligible entity, if, after the specified period of time, the certified eligible entity does not meet such criteria.

''(c) METHOD OF ENROLLMENT.—The Secretary shall enroll eligible land under this section through the use of—

''(1) permanent easements; or

''(2) easements for the maximum duration allowed under applicable State laws.

''(d) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary may provide technical assistance, if requested, to assist in—

''(1) compliance with the terms and conditions of easements; and

''(2) implementation of an agricultural land easement plan.

"SEC. 1265C. WETLAND EASEMENTS.

''(a) AVAILABILITY OF ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall provide assistance to owners of eligible land to restore, protect, and enhance wetlands through—

''(1) wetland easements and related wetland easement plans; and

''(2) technical assistance.

''(b) EASEMENTS.—

''(1) METHOD OF ENROLLMENT.—The Secretary shall enroll eligible land under this section through the use of—

''(A) 30-year easements;

''(B) permanent easements;

''(C) easements for the maximum duration allowed under applicable State laws; or

''(D) as an option for Indian tribes only, 30-year contracts (which shall be considered to be 30-year easements for the purposes of this subtitle).

''(2) LIMITATIONS.—

''(A) INELIGIBLE LAND.—The Secretary may not acquire easements on—

''(i) land established to trees under the conservation reserve program, except in cases where the Secretary determines it would further the purposes of the program; and

''(ii) farmed wetlands or converted wetlands where the conversion was not commenced prior to December 23, 1985.

''(B) CHANGES IN OWNERSHIP.—No wetland easement shall be created on land that has changed ownership during the preceding 24-month period unless—

''(i) the new ownership was acquired by will or succession as a result of the death of the previous owner;

''(ii)(I) the ownership change occurred because of foreclosure on the land; and

''(II) immediately before the foreclosure, the owner of the land exercises a right of redemption from the mortgage holder in accordance with State law; or

''(iii) the Secretary determines that the land was acquired under circumstances that give adequate assurances that such land was not acquired for the purposes of placing it in the program.

''(3) EVALUATION AND RANKING OF OFFERS.—

''(A) CRITERIA.—The Secretary shall establish evaluation and ranking criteria to maximize the benefit of Federal investment under the program.

''(B) CONSIDERATIONS.—When evaluating offers from landowners, the Secretary may consider—

''(i) the conservation benefits of obtaining a wetland easement, including the potential environmental benefits if the land was removed from agricultural production;

''(ii) the cost-effectiveness of each wetland easement, so as to maximize the environmental benefits per dollar expended;

''(iii) whether the landowner or another person is offering to contribute financially to the cost of the wetland easement to leverage Federal funds; and

''(iv) such other factors as the Secretary determines are necessary to carry out the purposes of the program.

''(C) PRIORITY.—The Secretary shall place priority on acquiring wetland easements based on the value of the wetland easement for protecting and enhancing habitat for migratory birds and other wildlife.

''(4) AGREEMENT.—To be eligible to place eligible land into the program through a wetland easement, the owner of such land shall enter into an agreement with the Secretary to—

''(A) grant an easement on such land to the Secretary;

''(B) authorize the implementation of a wetland easement plan developed for the eligible land under subsection (f);

''(C) create and record an appropriate deed restriction in accordance with applicable State law to reflect the easement agreed to;

''(D) provide a written statement of consent to such easement signed by those holding a security interest in the land;

''(E) comply with the terms and conditions of the easement and any related agreements; and

''(F) permanently retire any existing base history for the land on which the easement has been obtained.

''(5) TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF EASEMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A wetland easement shall include terms and conditions that—

''(i) permit—

''(I) repairs, improvements, and inspections on the land that are necessary to maintain existing public drainage systems; and

''(II) owners to control public access on the easement areas while identifying access routes to be used for restoration activities and management and easement monitoring;

''(ii) prohibit—

''(I) the alteration of wildlife habitat and other natural features of such land, unless specifically authorized by the Secretary;

''(II) the spraying of such land with chemicals or the mowing of such land, except where such spraying or mowing is authorized by the Secretary or is necessary—

''(aa) to comply with Federal or State noxious weed control laws;

''(bb) to comply with a Federal or State emergency pest treatment program; or

''(cc) to meet habitat needs of specific wildlife species;

''(III) any activities to be carried out on the owner's or successor's land that is immediately adjacent to, and functionally related to, the land that is subject to the easement if such activities will alter, degrade, or otherwise diminish the functional value of the eligible land; and

''(IV) the adoption of any other practice that would tend to defeat the purposes of the program, as determined by the Secretary;

''(iii) provide for the efficient and effective establishment of wildlife functions and values; and

''(iv) include such additional provisions as the Secretary determines are desirable to carry out the program or facilitate the practical administration thereof.

''(B) VIOLATION.—On the violation of the terms or conditions of a wetland easement, the wetland easement shall remain in force and the Secretary may require the owner to refund all or part of any payments received by the owner under the program, together with interest thereon as determined appropriate by the Secretary.

''(C) COMPATIBLE USES.—Land subject to a wetland easement may be used for compatible economic uses, including such activities as hunting and fishing, managed timber harvest, or periodic haying or grazing, if such use is specifically permitted by the wetland easement plan developed for the land under subsection (f) and is consistent with the long-term protection and enhancement of the wetland resources for which the easement was established.

''(D) RESERVATION OF GRAZING RIGHTS.—The Secretary may include in the terms and conditions of a wetland easement a provision under which the owner reserves grazing rights if—

''(i) the Secretary determines that the reservation and use of the grazing rights—

''(I) is compatible with the land subject to the easement;

''(II) is consistent with the historical natural uses of the land and the long-term protection and enhancement goals for which the easement was established; and

''(III) complies with the wetland easement plan developed for the land under subsection (f); and

''(ii) the agreement provides for a commensurate reduction in the easement payment to account for the grazing value, as determined by the Secretary.

''(6) COMPENSATION.—

''(A) DETERMINATION.—

''(i) PERMANENT EASEMENTS.—The Secretary shall pay as compensation for a permanent wetland easement acquired under the program an amount necessary to encourage enrollment in the program, based on the lowest of—

''(I) the fair market value of the land, as determined by the Secretary, using the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice or an area-wide market analysis or survey;

''(II) the amount corresponding to a geographical cap, as determined by the Secretary in regulations; or

''(III) the offer made by the landowner.

''(ii) 30-YEAR EASEMENTS.—Compensation for a 30-year wetland easement shall be not less than 50 percent, but not more than 75 percent, of the compensation that would be paid for a permanent wetland easement.

''(B) FORM OF PAYMENT.—Compensation for a wetland easement shall be provided by the Secretary in the form of a cash payment, in an amount determined under subparagraph (A).

''(C) PAYMENT SCHEDULE.—

''(i) EASEMENTS VALUED AT $500,000 OR LESS.—For wetland easements valued at $500,000 or less, the Secretary may provide easement payments in not more than 10 annual payments.

''(ii) EASEMENTS VALUED AT MORE THAN $500,000.—For wetland easements valued at more than $500,000, the Secretary may provide easement payments in at least 5, but not more than 10 annual payments, except that, if the Secretary determines it would further the purposes of the program, the Secretary may make a lump-sum payment for such an easement.

''(c) EASEMENT RESTORATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide financial assistance to owners of eligible land to carry out the establishment of conservation measures and practices and protect wetland functions and values, including necessary maintenance activities, as set forth in a wetland easement plan developed for the eligible land under subsection (f).

''(2) PAYMENTS.—The Secretary shall—

''(A) in the case of a permanent wetland easement, pay an amount that is not less than 75 percent, but not more than 100 percent, of the eligible costs, as determined by the Secretary; and

''(B) in the case of a 30-year wetland easement, pay an amount that is not less than 50 percent, but not more than 75 percent, of the eligible costs, as determined by the Secretary.

''(d) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall assist owners in complying with the terms and conditions of wetland easements.

''(2) CONTRACTS OR AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary may enter into 1 or more contracts with private entities or agreements with a State, non-governmental organization, or Indian tribe to carry out necessary restoration, enhancement, or maintenance of a wetland easement if the Secretary determines that the contract or agreement will advance the purposes of the program.

''(e) WETLAND ENHANCEMENT OPTION.—The Secretary may enter into 1 or more agreements with a State (including a political subdivision or agency of a State), nongovernmental organization, or Indian tribe to carry out a special wetland enhancement option that the Secretary determines would advance the purposes of program.

''(f) ADMINISTRATION.—

''(1) WETLAND EASEMENT PLAN.—The Secretary shall develop a wetland easement plan for eligible lands subject to a wetland easement, which shall include practices and activities necessary to restore, protect, enhance, and maintain the enrolled lands.

''(2) DELEGATION OF EASEMENT ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary may delegate—

''(A) any of the easement management, monitoring, and enforcement responsibilities of the Secretary to other Federal or State agencies that have the appropriate authority, expertise, and resources necessary to carry out such delegated responsibilities; and

''(B) any of the easement management responsibilities of the Secretary to other conservation organizations if the Secretary determines the organization has the appropriate expertise and resources.

''(3) PAYMENTS.—

''(A) TIMING OF PAYMENTS.—The Secretary shall provide payment for obligations incurred by the Secretary under this section—

''(i) with respect to any easement restoration obligation under subsection (c), as soon as possible after the obligation is incurred; and

''(ii) with respect to any annual easement payment obligation incurred by the Secretary, as soon as possible after October 1 of each calendar year.

''(B) PAYMENTS TO OTHERS.—If an owner who is entitled to a payment under this section dies, becomes incompetent, is otherwise unable to receive such payment, or is succeeded by another person or entity who renders or completes the required performance, the Secretary shall make such payment, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary and without regard to any other provision of law, in such manner as the Secretary determines is fair and reasonable in light of all of the circumstances.

''SEC. 1265D. ADMINISTRATION.

''(a) INELIGIBLE LAND.—The Secretary may not use program funds for the purposes of acquiring an easement on—

''(1) lands owned by an agency of the United States, other than land held in trust for Indian tribes;

''(2) lands owned in fee title by a State, including an agency or a subdivision of a State, or a unit of local government;

''(3) land subject to an easement or deed restriction which, as determined by the Secretary, provides similar protection as would be provided by enrollment in the program; or

''(4) lands where the purposes of the program would be undermined due to on-site or off-site conditions, such as risk of hazardous substances, proposed or existing rights of way, infrastructure development, or adjacent land uses.

''(b) PRIORITY.—In evaluating applications under the program, the Secretary may give priority to land that is currently enrolled in the conservation reserve program in a contract that is set to expire within 1 year and—

''(1) in the case of an agricultural land easement, is grassland that would benefit from protection under a long-term easement; and

''(2) in the case of a wetland easement, is a wetland or related area with the highest functions and value and is likely to return to production after the land leaves the conservation reserve program.

''(c) SUBORDINATION, EXCHANGE, MODIFICATION, AND TERMINATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may subordinate, exchange, modify, or terminate any interest in land, or portion of such interest, administered by the Secretary, either directly or on behalf of the Commodity Credit Corporation under the program if the Secretary determines that—

''(A) it is in the Federal Government's interest to subordinate, exchange, modify, or terminate the interest in land;

''(B) the subordination, exchange, modification, or termination action—

''(i) will address a compelling public need for which there is no practicable alternative; or

''(ii) such action will further the practical administration of the program; and

''(C) the subordination, exchange, modification, or termination action will result in comparable conservation value and equivalent or greater economic value to the United States.

''(2) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall work with the owner, and eligible entity if applicable, to address any subordination, exchange, modification, or termination of the interest, or portion of such interest, in land.

''(3) NOTICE.—At least 90 days before taking any termination action described in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall provide written notice of such action to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate.

''(d) LAND ENROLLED IN CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM.—The Secretary may terminate or modify a contract entered into under section 1231(a) if eligible land that is subject to such contract is transferred into the program.

''(e) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS FOR AGRICULTURAL LAND EASEMENTS.—Of the funds made available under section 1241 to carry out the program for a fiscal year, the Secretary shall, to the extent practicable, use for agricultural land easements—

''(1) no less than 40 percent in each of fiscal years 2014 through 2017; and

''(2) no less than 50 percent in fiscal year 2018.''.

(b) COMPLIANCE WITH CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS.—Before an eligible entity or owner of eligible land may receive assistance under subtitle H of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985, the eligible entity or person shall agree, during the crop year for which the assistance is provided and in exchange for the assistance—

(1) to comply with applicable conservation requirements under subtitle B of title XII of that Act (16 U.S.C. 3811 et seq.); and

(2) to comply with applicable wetland protection requirements under subtitle C of title XII of that Act (16 U.S.C. 3821 et seq.).

(c) CROSS REFERENCE; CALCULATION.—Section 1244 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3844) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by inserting ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (A);

(ii) by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (B); and

(iii) by striking subparagraph (C);

(B) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3); and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph:

''(2) the agricultural conservation easement program established under subtitle H; and''; and

(2) in subsection (f)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''programs administered under subchapters B and C of chapter 1 of subtitle D'' and inserting ''conservation reserve program established under subchapter B of chapter 1 of subtitle D and wetland easements under section 1265C''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''an easement acquired under subchapter C of chapter 1 of subtitle D'' and inserting ''a wetland easement under section 1265C''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5) CALCULATION.—In calculating the percentages described in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall include any acreage that was included in calculations of percentages made under such paragraph, as in effect on September 30, 2013, and that remains enrolled when the calculation is made after that date under paragraph (1).''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2013.

Subtitle E—Regional Conservation Partnership Program

SEC. 2401. REGIONAL CONSERVATION PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 is amended by inserting after subtitle H, as added by section 2301, the following new subtitle:

''Subtitle I—Regional Conservation Partnership Program

''SEC. 1271. ESTABLISHMENT AND PURPOSES.

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a regional conservation partnership program to implement eligible activities on eligible land through—

''(1) partnership agreements with eligible partners; and

''(2) contracts with producers.

''(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of the program are as follows:

''(1) To use covered programs to accomplish purposes and functions similar to those of the following programs, as in effect on September 30, 2013:

''(A) The agricultural water enhancement program established under section 1240I.

''(B) The Chesapeake Bay watershed program established under section 1240Q.

''(C) The cooperative conservation partnership initiative established under section 1243.

''(D) The Great Lakes basin program for soil erosion and sediment control established under section 1240P.

''(2) To further the conservation, restoration, and sustainable use of soil, water, wildlife, and related natural resources on eligible land on a regional or watershed scale.

''(3) To encourage eligible partners to cooperate with producers in—

''(A) meeting or avoiding the need for national, State, and local natural resource regulatory requirements related to production on eligible land; and

''(B) implementing projects that will result in the carrying out of eligible activities that affect multiple agricultural or nonindustrial private forest operations on a local, regional, State, or multistate basis.

''SEC. 1271A. DEFINITIONS.

''In this subtitle:

''(1) COVERED PROGRAM.—The term 'covered program' means the following:

''(A) The agricultural conservation easement program.

''(B) The environmental quality incentives program.

''(C) The conservation stewardship program.

''(D) The healthy forests reserve program established under section 501 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6571).

''(2) ELIGIBLE ACTIVITY.—The term 'eligible activity' means any of the following conservation activities:

''(A) Water quality or quantity conservation, restoration, or enhancement projects relating to surface water and groundwater resources, including—

''(i) the conversion of irrigated cropland to the production of less water-intensive agricultural commodities or dryland farming; or

''(ii) irrigation system improvement and irrigation efficiency enhancement.

''(B) Drought mitigation.

''(C) Flood prevention.

''(D) Water retention.

''(E) Air quality improvement.

''(F) Habitat conservation, restoration, and enhancement.

''(G) Erosion control and sediment reduction.

''(H) Other related activities that the Secretary determines will help achieve conservation benefits.

''(3) ELIGIBLE LAND.—The term 'eligible land' means land on which agricultural commodities, livestock, or forest-related products are produced, including—

''(A) cropland;

''(B) grassland;

''(C) rangeland;

''(D) pastureland;

''(E) nonindustrial private forest land; and

''(F) other land incidental to agricultural production (including wetlands and riparian buffers) on which significant natural resource issues could be addressed under the program.

''(4) ELIGIBLE PARTNER.—The term 'eligible partner' means any of the following:

''(A) An agricultural or silvicultural producer association or other group of producers.

''(B) A State or unit of local government.

''(C) An Indian tribe.

''(D) A farmer cooperative.

''(E) A water district, irrigation district, rural water district or association, or other organization with specific water delivery authority to producers on agricultural land.

''(F) An institution of higher education.

''(G) An organization or entity with an established history of working cooperatively with producers on agricultural land, as determined by the Secretary, to address—

''(i) local conservation priorities related to agricultural production, wildlife habitat development, or nonindustrial private forest land management; or

''(ii) critical watershed-scale soil erosion, water quality, sediment reduction, or other natural resource issues.

''(5) PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT.—The term 'partnership agreement' means an agreement entered into under section 1271B between the Secretary and an eligible partner.

''(6) PROGRAM.—The term 'program' means the regional conservation partnership program established by this subtitle.

''SEC. 1271B. REGIONAL CONSERVATION PARTNERSHIPS.

''(a) PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENTS AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary may enter into a partnership agreement with an eligible partner to implement a project that will assist producers with installing and maintaining an eligible activity on eligible land.

''(b) LENGTH.—A partnership agreement shall be for a period not to exceed 5 years, except that the Secretary may extend the agreement one time for up to 12 months when an extension is necessary to meet the objectives of the program.

''(c) DUTIES OF PARTNERS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Under a partnership agreement, the eligible partner shall—

''(A) define the scope of a project, including—

''(i) the eligible activities to be implemented;

''(ii) the potential agricultural or nonindustrial private forest land operations affected;

''(iii) the local, State, multistate, or other geographic area covered; and

''(iv) the planning, outreach, implementation, and assessment to be conducted;

''(B) conduct outreach to producers for potential participation in the project;

''(C) at the request of a producer, act on behalf of a producer participating in the project in applying for assistance under section 1271C;

''(D) leverage financial or technical assistance provided by the Secretary with additional funds to help achieve the project objectives;

''(E) conduct an assessment of the project's effects; and

''(F) at the conclusion of the project, report to the Secretary on its results and funds leveraged.

''(2) CONTRIBUTION.—An eligible partner shall provide a significant portion of the overall costs of the scope of the project that is the subject of the agreement entered into under subsection (a), as determined by the Secretary.

''(d) APPLICATIONS.—

''(1) COMPETITIVE PROCESS.—The Secretary shall conduct a competitive process to select applications for partnership agreements and may assess and rank applications with similar conservation purposes as a group.

''(2) CRITERIA USED.—In carrying out the process described in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall make public the criteria used in evaluating applications.

''(3) CONTENT.—An application to the Secretary shall include a description of—

''(A) the scope of the project, as described in subsection (c)(1)(A);

''(B) the plan for monitoring, evaluating, and reporting on progress made toward achieving the project's objectives;

''(C) the program resources requested for the project, including the covered programs to be used and estimated funding needed from the Secretary;

''(D) eligible partners collaborating to achieve project objectives, including their roles, responsibilities, capabilities, and financial contribution; and

''(E) any other elements the Secretary considers necessary to adequately evaluate and competitively select applications for funding under the program.

''(4) PRIORITY TO CERTAIN APPLICATIONS.—The Secretary may give a higher priority to applications that—

''(A) assist producers in meeting or avoiding the need for a natural resource regulatory requirement;

''(B) have a high percentage of eligible producers in the area to be covered by the agreement;

''(C) significantly leverage non-Federal financial and technical resources and coordinate with other local, State, or national efforts;

''(D) deliver high percentages of applied conservation to address conservation priorities or regional, State, or national conservation initiatives;

''(E) provide innovation in conservation methods and delivery, including outcome-based performance measures and methods; or

''(F) meet other factors that are important for achieving the purposes of the program, as determined by the Secretary.

''SEC. 1271C. ASSISTANCE TO PRODUCERS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall enter into contracts with producers to provide financial and technical assistance to—

''(1) producers participating in a project with an eligible partner, as described in section 1271B; or

''(2) producers that fit within the scope of a project described in section 1271B or a critical conservation area designated under section 1271F, but who are seeking to implement an eligible activity on eligible land independent of a partner.

''(b) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—

''(1) CONSISTENCY WITH PROGRAM RULES.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Secretary shall ensure that the terms and conditions of a contract under this section are consistent with the applicable rules of the covered programs to be used as part of the project, as described in the application under section 1271B(d)(3)(C).

''(2) ADJUSTMENTS.—Except with respect to statutory program requirements governing appeals, payment limitations, and conservation compliance, the Secretary may adjust the discretionary program rules of a covered program—

''(A) to provide a simplified application and evaluation process; and

''(B) to better reflect unique local circumstances and purposes if the Secretary determines such adjustments are necessary to achieve the purposes of the program.

''(c) PAYMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with statutory requirements of the covered programs involved, the Secretary may make payments to a producer in an amount determined by the Secretary to be necessary to achieve the purposes of the program.

''(2) PAYMENTS TO PRODUCERS IN STATES WITH WATER QUANTITY CONCERNS.—The Secretary may provide payments to producers participating in a project that addresses water quantity concerns for a period of five years in an amount sufficient to encourage conversion from irrigated farming to dryland farming.

''(3) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—To assist in the implementation of the program, the Secretary may waive the applicability of the limitation in section 1001D(b)(2) of this Act for participating producers if the Secretary determines that the waiver is necessary to fulfill the objectives of the program.

''SEC. 1271D. FUNDING.

''(a) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—The Secretary shall use $100,000,000 of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018 to carry out the program.

''(b) DURATION OF AVAILABILITY.—Funds made available under subsection (a) shall remain available until expended.

''(c) ADDITIONAL FUNDING AND ACRES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the funds made available under subsection (a), the Secretary shall reserve 6 percent of the funds and acres made available for a covered program for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018 in order to ensure additional resources are available to carry out this program.

''(2) UNUSED FUNDS AND ACRES.—Any funds or acres reserved under paragraph (1) for a fiscal year from a covered program that are not obligated under this program by April 1 of that fiscal year shall be returned for use under the covered program.

''(d) ALLOCATION OF FUNDING.—Of the funds and acres made available for the program under subsections (a) and (c), the Secretary shall allocate—

''(1) 25 percent of the funds and acres to projects based on a State competitive process administered by the State Conservationist, with the advice of the State technical committee established under subtitle G;

''(2) 50 percent of the funds and acres to projects based on a national competitive process to be established by the Secretary; and

''(3) 25 percent of the funds and acres to projects for the critical conservation areas designated under section 1271F.

''(e) LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—None of the funds made available under the program may be used to pay for the administrative expenses of eligible partners.

''SEC. 1271E. ADMINISTRATION.

''(a) DISCLOSURE.—In addition to the criteria used in evaluating applications as described in section 1271B(d)(2), the Secretary shall make publicly available information on projects selected through the competitive process described in section 1271B(d)(1).

''(b) REPORTING.—Not later than December 31, 2014, and every two years thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report on the status of projects funded under the program, including—

''(1) the number and types of eligible partners and producers participating in the partnership agreements selected;

''(2) the number of producers receiving assistance; and

''(3) total funding committed to projects, including from Federal and non-Federal resources.

''SEC. 1271F. CRITICAL CONSERVATION AREAS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—In administering funds under section 1271D(d)(3), the Secretary shall select applications for partnership agreements and producer contracts within critical conservation areas designated under this section.

''(b) CRITICAL CONSERVATION AREA DESIGNATIONS.—

''(1) PRIORITY.—In designating critical conservation areas under this section, the Secretary shall give priority to geographical areas based on the degree to which the geographical area—

''(A) includes multiple States with significant agricultural production;

''(B) is covered by an existing regional, State, binational, or multistate agreement or plan that has established objectives, goals, and work plans and is adopted by a Federal, State, or regional authority;

''(C) would benefit from water quality improvement, including through reducing erosion, promoting sediment control, and addressing nutrient management activities affecting large bodies of water of regional, national, or international significance;

''(D) would benefit from water quantity improvement, including improvement relating to—

''(i) groundwater, surface water, aquifer, or other water sources; or

''(ii) a need to promote water retention and flood prevention; or

''(E) contains producers that need assistance in meeting or avoiding the need for a natural resource regulatory requirement that could have a negative economic impact on agricultural operations within the area.

''(2) LIMITATION.—The Secretary may not designate more than 8 geographical areas as critical conservation areas under this section.

''(c) ADMINISTRATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Secretary shall administer any partnership agreement or producer contract under this section in a manner that is consistent with the terms of the program.

''(2) RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING ACTIVITY.—The Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, ensure that eligible activities carried out in critical conservation areas designated under this section complement and are consistent with other Federal and State programs and water quality and quantity strategies.

''(3) ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY.—For a critical conservation area described in subsection (b)(1)(D), the Secretary may use authorities under the Watershed Protection and Flood

Prevention Act (16 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.), other than section 14 of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1012), to carry out projects for the purposes of this section.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2013.

Subtitle F—Other Conservation Programs

SEC. 2501. CONSERVATION OF PRIVATE GRAZING LAND.

Section 1240M(e) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839bb(e)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 2502. GRASSROOTS SOURCE WATER PROTECTION PROGRAM.

Section 1240O(b) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839bb–2) is amended to read as follows:

''(b) FUNDING.—

''(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

''(2) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—In addition to funds made available under paragraph (1), of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Secretary shall use $5,000,000, to remain available until expended.''.

SEC. 2503. VOLUNTARY PUBLIC ACCESS AND HABITAT INCENTIVE PROGRAM.

(a) FUNDING.—Section 1240R(f)(1) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839bb–5(f)(1)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: ''and $30,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2018''.

(b) REPORT ON PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS.—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report evaluating the effectiveness of the voluntary public access program established by section 1240R of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839bb–5), including—

(1) identifying cooperating agencies;

(2) identifying the number of land holdings and total acres enrolled by each State and tribal government;

(3) evaluating the extent of improved access on eligible lands, improved wildlife habitat, and related economic benefits; and

(4) any other relevant information and data relating to the program that would be helpful to such committees.

SEC. 2504. AGRICULTURE CONSERVATION EXPERIENCED SERVICES PROGRAM.

(a) FUNDING.—Subsection (c) of section 1252 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3851) is amended to read as follows:

''(c) FUNDING.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may carry out the ACES program using funds made available to carry out each program under this title.

''(2) EXCLUSION.—Funds made available to carry out the conservation reserve program may not be used to carry out the ACES program.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2013.

SEC. 2505. SMALL WATERSHED REHABILITATION PROGRAM.

(a) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Section 14(h)(1) of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (16 U.S.C. 1012(h)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (E), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (F), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon;

(3) in subparagraph (G), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(H) $250,000,000 for fiscal year 2014, to remain available until expended.''.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 14(h)(2)(E) of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (16 U.S.C. 1012(h)(2)(E)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 2506. AGRICULTURAL MANAGEMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) USES.—Section 524(b)(2) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1524(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking subparagraph (B) and redesignating subparagraphs (C) through (F) as subparagraphs (B) through (E), respectively; and

(2) in subparagraph (B) (as so redesignated)—

(A) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''or resource conservation practices''; and

(B) by striking clause (i) and redesignating clauses (ii) through (iv) as clauses (i) through (iii), respectively.

(b) COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION.—

(1) FUNDING.—Section 524(b)(4)(B) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1524(b)(4)(B)) is amended to read as follows:

''(B) FUNDING.—The Commodity Credit Corporation shall make available to carry out this subsection not less than $10,000,000 for each fiscal year.''.

(2) CERTAIN USES.—Section 524(b)(4)(C) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1524(b)(4)(C)) is amended—

(A) in clause (i)—

(i) by striking ''50'' and inserting ''30''; and

(ii) by striking ''(A), (B), and (C)'' and inserting ''(A) and (B)''; and

(B) in clause (iii), by striking ''40'' and inserting ''60''.

SEC. 2507. EMERGENCY WATERSHED PROTECTION PROGRAM.

Section 403 of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2203) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''In evaluating requests for assistance under this section, the Secretary shall give priority consideration to projects that address runoff retardation and soil-erosion preventive measures needed to mitigate the risks and remediate the effects of catastrophic wildfire on land that is the source of drinking water for landowners and land users.''.

Subtitle G—Funding and Administration

SEC. 2601. FUNDING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 1241 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3841) is amended to read as follows:

''(a) ANNUAL FUNDING.—For each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018, the Secretary shall use the funds, facilities, and authorities of the Commodity Credit Corporation to carry out the following programs under this title (including the provision of technical assistance):

''(1) The conservation reserve program under subchapter B of chapter 1 of subtitle D, including, to the maximum extent practicable, $25,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2018 to carry out section 1235(f) to facilitate the transfer of land subject to contracts from retired or retiring owners and operators to beginning farmers or ranchers and socially disadvantaged farmers or ranchers.

''(2) The agriculture conservation easement program under subtitle H, using, to the maximum extent practicable—

''(A) $425,000,000 in fiscal year 2014;

''(B) $450,000,000 in fiscal year 2015;

''(C) $475,000,000 in fiscal year 2016;

''(D) $500,000,000 in fiscal year 2017; and

''(E) $200,000,000 in fiscal year 2018.

''(3) The conservation security program under subchapter A of chapter 2 of subtitle D, using such sums as are necessary to administer contracts entered into before September 30, 2008.

''(4) The conservation stewardship program under subchapter B of chapter 2 of subtitle D.

''(5) The environmental quality incentives program under chapter 4 of subtitle D, using, to the maximum extent practicable, $1,750,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

(b) REGIONAL EQUITY; GUARANTEED AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Section 1241 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3841) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (d);

(2) by redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

''(b) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Amounts made available by subsection (a) shall be used by the Secretary to carry out the programs specified in such subsection for fiscal years 2014 through 2018 and shall remain available until expended. Amounts made available for the programs specified in such subsection during a fiscal year through modifications, cancellations, terminations, and other related administrative actions and not obligated in that fiscal year shall remain available for obligation during subsequent fiscal years, but shall reduce the amount of additional funds made available in the subsequent fiscal year by an amount equal to the amount remaining unobligated.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2013.

SEC. 2602. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (c) of section 1241 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3841), as redesignated by section 2601(b)(2) of this Act, is amended to read as follows:

''(c) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—

''(1) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Commodity Credit Corporation funds made available for a fiscal year for each of the programs specified in subsection (a)—

''(A) shall be available for the provision of technical assistance for the programs for which funds are made available as necessary to implement the programs effectively; and

''(B) shall not be available for the provision of technical assistance for conservation programs specified in subsection (a) other than the program for which the funds were made available.

''(2) REPORT.—Not later than December 31, 2013, the Secretary shall submit (and update as necessary in subsequent years) to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report—

''(A) detailing the amount of technical assistance funds requested and apportioned in each program specified in subsection (a) during the preceding fiscal year; and

''(B) any other data relating to this subsection that would be helpful to such committees.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2013.

SEC. 2603. RESERVATION OF FUNDS TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN FARMERS OR RANCHERS FOR CONSERVATION ACCESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (g) of section 1241 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3841) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) PREFERENCE.—In providing assistance under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall give

preference to a veteran farmer or rancher (as defined in section 2501(e) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 2279(e))) that qualifies under subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (1).''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2013.

SEC. 2604. ANNUAL REPORT ON PROGRAM ENROLLMENTS AND ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (h) of section 1241 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3841) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''wetlands reserve program'' and inserting ''agricultural conservation easement program'';

(2) by striking paragraphs (2) and (3) and redesignating paragraphs (4), (5), and (6) as paragraphs (2), (3), and (4), respectively; and

(3) in paragraph (3) (as so redesignated)—

(A) by striking ''agricultural water enhancement program'' and inserting ''regional conservation partnership program''; and

(B) by striking ''1240I(g)'' and inserting ''1271C(c)(3)''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2013.

SEC. 2605. REVIEW OF CONSERVATION PRACTICE STANDARDS.

Section 1242(h)(1)(A) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3842(h)(1)(A)) is amended by striking ''the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008'' and inserting ''the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2606. ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS APPLICABLE TO ALL CONSERVATION PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1244 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3844) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2), by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(E) Veteran farmers or ranchers (as defined in section 2501(e) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 2279(e))).'';

(2) in subsection (d), by inserting '', H, and I'' before the period at the end;

(3) in subsection (f)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking ''country'' and inserting ''county''; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking ''subsection (c)(2)(B) or (f)(4)'' and inserting ''subsection (c)(2)(A)(ii) or (f)(2)'';

(4) in subsection (h)(2), by inserting '', including, to the extent practicable, practices that maximize benefits for honey bees'' after ''pollinators''; and

(5) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

''(j) IMPROVED ADMINISTRATIVE EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS.—In administrating a conservation program under this title, the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable—

''(1) seek to reduce administrative burdens and costs to producers by streamlining conservation planning and program resources; and

''(2) take advantage of new technologies to enhance efficiency and effectiveness.

''(k) RELATION TO OTHER PAYMENTS.—Any payment received by an owner or operator under this title, including an easement payment or rental payment, shall be in addition to, and not affect, the total amount of payments that the owner or operator is otherwise eligible to receive under any of the following:

''(1) This Act.

''(2) The Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1421 et seq.).

''(3) The Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013.

''(4) Any law that succeeds a law specified in paragraph (1), (2), or (3).''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2013.

SEC. 2607. STANDARDS FOR STATE TECHNICAL COMMITTEES.

Section 1261(b) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3861(b)) is amended by striking ''Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008, the Secretary shall develop'' and inserting ''The Secretary shall review and update as necessary''.

SEC. 2608. RULEMAKING AUTHORITY.

Subtitle E of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3841 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 1246. REGULATIONS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall promulgate such regulations as are necessary to implement programs under this title, including such regulations as the Secretary determines to be necessary to ensure a fair and reasonable application of the limitations established under section 1244(f).

''(b) RULEMAKING PROCEDURE.—The promulgation of regulations and administration of programs under this title—

''(1) shall be carried out without regard to—

''(A) the Statement of Policy of the Secretary effective July 24, 1971 (36 Fed. Reg. 13804), relating to notices of proposed rulemaking and public participation in rulemaking; and

''(B) chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code (commonly known as the Paperwork Reduction Act); and

''(2) shall be made pursuant to section 553 of title 5, United States Code, including by interim rules effective on publication under the authority provided in subparagraph (B) of subsection (b) of such section if the Secretary determines such interim rules to be needed and final rules, with an opportunity for notice and comment, no later than 21 months after the date of the enactment of the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013.''.

SEC. 2609. WETLANDS MITIGATION.

Section 1222 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3822) is amended—

(1) in subsection (f)—

(A) in paragraph (2)(D), by striking ''unless more acreage is needed to provide equivalent functions and values that will be lost as a result of the wetland conversion to be mitigated''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(E)—

(i) by inserting ''not'' before ''greater than''; and

(ii) by striking ''if more acreage is needed to provide equivalent functions and values that will be lost as a result of the wetland conversion that is mitigated''; and

(2) by striking subsection (g).

SEC. 2610. LESSER PRAIRIE-CHICKEN CONSERVATION REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report containing the results of a review and analysis of each of the programs administered by the Secretary that pertain to the conservation of the lesser prairie-chicken, including the conservation reserve program, the environmental quality incentives program, the wildlife habitat incentive program, and the Lesser Prairie-Chicken Initiative.

(b) CONTENTS.—The Secretary shall include in the report required by this section, at a minimum—

(1) with respect to each program described in subsection (a) as it relates to the conservation of the lesser prairie-chicken, findings regarding—

(A) the cost of the program to the Federal Government, impacted State governments, and the private sector;

(B) the conservation effectiveness of the program; and

(C) the cost-effectiveness of the program; and

(2) a ranking of the programs described in subsection (a) based on their relative cost-effectiveness.

Subtitle H—Repeal of Superseded Program Authorities and Transitional Provisions; Technical Amendments

SEC. 2701. COMPREHENSIVE CONSERVATION ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 1230 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3830) is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The heading of chapter 1 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3830 et seq.) is amended to read as follows: ''**CONSERVATION RESERVE**''.

SEC. 2702. EMERGENCY FORESTRY CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 1231A of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831a) is repealed.

(b) TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS.—

(1) EFFECT ON EXISTING CONTRACTS.—The amendment made by this section shall not affect the validity or terms of any contract entered into by the Secretary of Agriculture under section 1231A of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831a) before October 1, 2013, or any payments required to be made in connection with the contract.

(2) FUNDING.—The Secretary may use funds made available to carry out the conservation reserve program under subchapter B of chapter 1 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831 et seq.) to continue to carry out contracts referred to in paragraph (1) using the provisions of law and regulation applicable to such contracts as they existed on September 30, 2013.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2013.

SEC. 2703. WETLANDS RESERVE PROGRAM.

(a) REPEAL.—Subchapter C of chapter 1 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3837 et seq.) is repealed.

(b) TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS.—

(1) EFFECT ON EXISTING CONTRACTS.—The amendment made by this section shall not affect the validity or terms of any contract entered into by the Secretary of Agriculture under subchapter C of chapter 1 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3837 et seq.) before October 1, 2013, or any payments required to be made in connection with the contract.

(2) FUNDING.—The Secretary may use funds made available to carry out the agricultural conservation easement program under subtitle H of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985, as added by section 2301 of this Act, to continue to carry out contracts referred to in paragraph (1) using the provisions of law and regulation applicable to such contracts as they existed on September 30, 2013.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2013.

SEC. 2704. FARMLAND PROTECTION PROGRAM AND FARM VIABILITY PROGRAM.

(a) REPEAL.—Subchapter C of chapter 2 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3838h et seq.) is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The heading of chapter 2 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3838 et seq.) is amended by striking ''**AND FARMLAND PROTECTION**''.

(c) TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS.—

(1) EFFECT ON EXISTING CONTRACTS.—The amendments made by this section shall not affect the validity or terms of any contract entered into by the Secretary of Agriculture under subchapter C of chapter 2 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3838h et seq.) before October 1, 2013, or any payments required to be made in connection with the contract.

(2) FUNDING.—The Secretary may use funds made available to carry out the agricultural conservation easement program under subtitle H of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985, as added by section 2301 of this Act, to continue to carry out contracts referred to in paragraph (1) using the provisions of law and regulation applicable to such contracts as they existed on September 30, 2013.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2013.

SEC. 2705. GRASSLAND RESERVE PROGRAM.

(a) REPEAL.—Subchapter D of chapter 2 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3838n et seq.) is repealed.

(b) TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS.—

(1) EFFECT ON EXISTING CONTRACTS.—The amendment made by this section shall not affect the validity or terms of any contract entered into by the Secretary of Agriculture under subchapter D of chapter 2 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3838n et seq.) before October 1, 2013, or any payments required to be made in connection with the contract.

(2) FUNDING.—The Secretary may use funds made available to carry out the agricultural conservation easement program under subtitle H of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985, as added by section 2301 of this Act, to continue to carry out contracts referred to in paragraph (1) using the provisions of law and regulation applicable to such contracts as they existed on September 30, 2013.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2013.

SEC. 2706. AGRICULTURAL WATER ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 1240I of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa–9) is repealed.

(b) TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS.—

(1) EFFECT ON EXISTING CONTRACTS.—The amendment made by this section shall not affect the validity or terms of any contract entered into by the Secretary of Agriculture under section 1240I of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa–9) before October 1, 2013, or any payments required to be made in connection with the contract.

(2) FUNDING.—The Secretary may use funds made available to carry out the regional conservation partnership program under subtitle I of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985, as added by section 2401 of this Act, to continue to carry out contracts referred to in paragraph (1) using the provisions of law and regulation applicable to such contracts as they existed on September 30, 2013.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2013.

SEC. 2707. WILDLIFE HABITAT INCENTIVE PROGRAM.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 1240N of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839bb–1) is repealed.

(b) TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS.—

(1) EFFECT ON EXISTING CONTRACTS.—The amendment made by this section shall not affect the validity or terms of any contract entered into by the Secretary of Agriculture under section 1240N of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839bb–1) before October 1, 2013, or any payments required to be made in connection with the contract.

(2) FUNDING.—The Secretary may use funds made available to carry out the environmental quality incentives program under chapter 4 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa et seq.) to continue to carry out contracts referred to in paragraph (1) using the provisions of law and regulation applicable to such contracts as they existed on September 30, 2013.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2013.

SEC. 2708. GREAT LAKES BASIN PROGRAM.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 1240P of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839bb–3) is repealed.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2013.

SEC. 2709. CHESAPEAKE BAY WATERSHED PROGRAM.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 1240Q of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839bb–4) is repealed.

(b) TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS.—

(1) EFFECT ON EXISTING CONTRACTS.—The amendment made by this section shall not affect the validity or terms of any contract entered into by the Secretary of Agriculture under section 1240Q of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839bb–4) before October 1, 2013, or any payments required to be made in connection with the contract.

(2) FUNDING.—The Secretary may use funds made available to carry out the regional conservation partnership program under subtitle I of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985, as added by section 2401 of this Act, to continue to carry out contracts referred to in paragraph (1) using the provisions of law and regulation applicable to such contracts as they existed on September 30, 2013.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2013.

SEC. 2710. COOPERATIVE CONSERVATION PARTNERSHIP INITIATIVE.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 1243 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3843) is repealed.

(b) TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS.—

(1) EFFECT ON EXISTING CONTRACTS.—The amendment made by this section shall not affect the validity or terms of any contract entered into by the Secretary of Agriculture under section 1243 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3843) before October 1, 2013, or any payments required to be made in connection with the contract.

(2) FUNDING.—The Secretary may use funds made available to carry out the regional conservation partnership program under subtitle I of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985, as added by section 2401 of this Act, to continue to carry out contracts referred to in paragraph (1) using the provisions of law and regulation applicable to such contracts as they existed on September 30, 2013.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2013.

SEC. 2711. ENVIRONMENTAL EASEMENT PROGRAM.

Chapter 3 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839 et seq.) is repealed.

SEC. 2712. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 1201(a) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3801(a)) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking ''E'' and inserting ''I''.

(b) PROGRAM INELIGIBILITY.—Section 1211(a) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3811(a)) is amended by striking ''predominate'' each place it appears and inserting ''predominant''.

(c) SPECIALTY CROP PRODUCERS.—Section 1242(i) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3842(i)) is amended in the header by striking ''SPECIALITY'' and inserting ''SPECIALTY''.

TITLE III—TRADE

Subtitle A—Food for Peace Act

SEC. 3001. GENERAL AUTHORITY.

Section 201 of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1721) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting ''(to be implemented by the Administrator)'' after ''under this title''; and

(2) by striking paragraph (7) and the second sentence and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(7) build resilience to mitigate and prevent food crises and reduce the future need for emergency aid.''.

SEC. 3002. SUPPORT FOR ORGANIZATIONS THROUGH WHICH ASSISTANCE IS PROVIDED.

Section 202(e)(1) of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1722(e)(1)) is amended by striking ''13 percent'' and inserting ''11 percent''.

SEC. 3003. FOOD AID QUALITY.

Section 202(h) of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1722(h)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking ''The Administrator shall use funds made available for fiscal year 2009'' and inserting ''In consultation with the Secretary, the Administrator shall use funds made available for fiscal year 2013''; and

(ii) by inserting ''to establish a mechanism'' after ''this title'';

(B) by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (B); and

(C) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following new subparagraphs:

''(C) to evaluate, as necessary, the use of current and new agricultural commodities and products thereof in different program settings and for particular recipient groups, including the testing of prototypes;

''(D) to establish and implement appropriate protocols for quality assurance of food products procured by the Secretary for food aid programs; and

''(E) to periodically update program guidelines on the recommended use of agricultural commodities and food products in food aid programs to reflect findings from the implementation of this subsection and other relevant information.'';

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''The Administrator'' and inserting ''In consultation with the Secretary, the Administrator''; and

(3) in paragraph (3), by striking ''section 207(f)'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following: ''section 207(f)—

''(A) for fiscal years 2009 through 2013, not more than $4,500,000 may be used to carry out this subsection; and

''(B) for fiscal years 2014 through 2018, not more than $1,000,000 may be used to carry out this subsection.''.

SEC. 3004. MINIMUM LEVELS OF ASSISTANCE.

Section 204(a) of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1724(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 3005. FOOD AID CONSULTATIVE GROUP.

(a) MEMBERSHIP.—Section 205(b) of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1725(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (6);

(2) by redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (8); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following new paragraph:

''(7) representatives from the United States agricultural processing sector involved in providing agricultural commodities for programs under this Act; and''.

(b) CONSULTATION.—Section 205(d) of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1725(d)) is amended—

(1) by striking the first sentence and inserting the following:

''(1) CONSULTATION IN ADVANCE OF ISSUANCE OF IMPLEMENTATION REGULATIONS, HANDBOOKS, AND GUIDELINES.—Not later than 45 days before a proposed regulation, handbook, or guideline implementing this title, or a proposed significant revision to a regulation, handbook, or guideline implementing this title, becomes final, the Administrator shall provide the proposal to the Group for review and comment.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) CONSULTATION REGARDING FOOD AID QUALITY EFFORTS.—The Administrator shall seek input from and consult with the Group on the implementation of section 202(h).''.

(c) REAUTHORIZATION.—Section 205(f) of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1725(f)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 3006. OVERSIGHT, MONITORING, AND EVALUATION.

(a) REGULATIONS AND GUIDANCE.—Section 207(c) of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1726a(c)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by inserting ''AND GUIDANCE'' after ''REGULATIONS'';

(2) in paragraph (1), by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013, the Administrator shall issue all regulations and revisions to agency guidance necessary to implement the amendments made to this title by such Act.''; and

(3) in paragraph (2), by inserting ''and guidance'' after ''develop regulations''.

(b) FUNDING.—Section 207(f) of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1726a(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by inserting ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (D);

(B) by striking ''; and'' at the end of subparagraph (E) and inserting the period; and

(C) by striking subparagraph (F);

(2) by striking paragraphs (3) and (4); and

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (5) and (6) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively; and

(4) in paragraph (4) (as so redesignated)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''2012'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''2013, and up to $10,000,000 of such funds for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)(i), by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION REPORTS.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Agency for International Development shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate and the Committees on Agriculture and Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a report describing—

(1) the implementation of section 207(c) of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1726a(c));

(2) the surveys, studies, monitoring, reporting, and audit requirements for programs conducted under title II of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1721 et seq.) by an eligible organization that is a nongovernmental organization (as such term is defined in section 402 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1732)); and

(3) the surveys, studies, monitoring, reporting, and audit requirements for such programs by an eligible organization that is an intergovernmental organization, such as the World Food Program or other multilateral organization.

SEC. 3007. ASSISTANCE FOR STOCKPILING AND RAPID TRANSPORTATION, DELIVERY, AND DISTRIBUTION OF SHELF-STABLE PREPACKAGED FOODS.

Section 208(f) of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1726b(f)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 3008. GENERAL PROVISIONS.

(a) IMPACT ON LOCAL FARMERS AND ECONOMY.—Section 403(b) of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1733(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''The Secretary or the Administrator, as appropriate, shall seek information, as part of the regular proposal and submission process, from implementing agencies on the potential benefits to the local economy of sales of agricultural commodities within the recipient country.''.

(b) PREVENTION OF PRICE DISRUPTIONS.—Section 403(e) of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1733(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking ''reasonable market price'' and inserting ''fair market value''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) COORDINATION ON ASSESSMENTS.—The Secretary and the Administrator shall coordinate in assessments to carry out paragraph (1) and in the development of approaches to be used by implementing agencies for determining the fair market value described in paragraph (2).''.

(c) REPORT ON USE OF FUNDS.—Section 403 of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1733) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(m) REPORT ON USE OF FUNDS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013, and annually thereafter, the Administrator shall submit to Congress a report—

''(1) specifying the amount of funds (including funds for administrative costs, indirect cost recovery, and internal transportation, storage and handling, and associated distribution costs) provided to each eligible organization that received assistance under this Act in the previous fiscal year; and

''(2) describing how those funds were used by the eligible organization.''.

SEC. 3009. PREPOSITIONING OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES.

Section 407(c)(4) of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1736a(c)(4)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''; and

(B) by striking ''for each such fiscal year not more than $10,000,000 of such funds'' and inserting ''for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2013 not more than $10,000,000 of such funds and for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018 not more than $15,000,000 of such funds''; and

(2) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following new subparagraph:

''(B) ADDITIONAL PREPOSITIONING SITES.—The Administrator may establish additional sites for prepositioning in foreign countries or change the location of current sites for prepositioning in foreign countries after conducting, and based on the results of, assessments of need, the availability of appropriate technology for long-term storage, feasibility, and cost.''.

SEC. 3010. ANNUAL REPORT REGARDING FOOD AID PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES.

Section 407(f)(1) of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1736a(f)(1)) is amended—

(1) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''AGRICULTURAL TRADE'' and inserting ''FOOD AID'';

(2) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: ''and the total number of beneficiaries of the project and the activities carried out through such project''; and

(3) in subparagraph (B)(iii)—

(A) in the matter preceding subclause (I), by inserting '', and the total number of beneficiaries in,'' after ''commodities made available to'';

(B) by striking ''and'' at the end of subclause (I);

(C) by inserting ''and'' at the end of subclause (II); and

(D) by inserting after subclause (II) the following new subclause:

''(III) the McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program established by section 3107 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 1736o–1);''.

SEC. 3011. DEADLINE FOR AGREEMENTS TO FINANCE SALES OR TO PROVIDE OTHER ASSISTANCE.

Section 408 of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1736b) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 3012. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 412(a)(1) of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1736f(a)(1)) is amended by striking ''for fiscal year 2008 and each fiscal year thereafter, $2,500,000,000'' and inserting ''$2,500,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 and $2,000,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018''.

(b) MINIMUM LEVEL OF NONEMERGENCY FOOD ASSISTANCE.—Paragraph (1) of section 412(e) of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1736f(e)) is amended to read as follows:

''(1) FUNDS AND COMMODITIES.—For each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018, of the amounts made available to carry out emergency and nonemergency food assistance programs under title II, not less than $400,000,000 shall be expended for nonemergency food assistance programs under such title.''.

SEC. 3013. MICRONUTRIENT FORTIFICATION PROGRAMS.

(a) ELIMINATION OF OBSOLETE REFERENCE TO STUDY.—Section 415(a)(2)(B) of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1736g–2(a)(2)(B)) is amended by striking '', using recommendations'' and all that follows through ''quality enhancements''.

(b) EXTENSION.—Section 415(c) of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1736g–2(c)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 3014. JOHN OGONOWSKI AND DOUG BEREUTER FARMER-TO-FARMER PROGRAM.

Section 501 of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1737) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2013, and not less than the greater of $15,000,000 or 0.5 percent of the amounts made available for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018,''; and

(2) in subsection (e)(1), by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

Subtitle B—Agricultural Trade Act of 1978

SEC. 3101. FUNDING FOR EXPORT CREDIT GUARANTEE PROGRAM.

Section 211(b) of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5641(b)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 3102. FUNDING FOR MARKET ACCESS PROGRAM.

Section 211(c)(1)(A) of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5641(c)(1)(A)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 3103. FOREIGN MARKET DEVELOPMENT COOPERATOR PROGRAM.

Section 703(a) of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5723(a)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

Subtitle C—Other Agricultural Trade Laws

SEC. 3201. FOOD FOR PROGRESS ACT OF 1985.

(a) EXTENSION.—The Food for Progress Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1736o) is amended—

(1) in subsection (f)(3), by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018'';

(2) in subsection (g), by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018'';

(3) in subsection (k), by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''; and

(4) in subsection (l)(1), by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

(b) REPEAL OF COMPLETED PROJECT.—Subsection (f) of the Food for Progress Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1736o) is amended by striking paragraph (6).

SEC. 3202. BILL EMERSON HUMANITARIAN TRUST ACT.

Section 302 of the Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust Act (7 U.S.C. 1736f–1) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(2)(B)(i), by striking ''2012'' both places it appears and inserting ''2018''; and

(2) in subsection (h), by striking ''2012'' both places it appears and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 3203. PROMOTION OF AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS TO EMERGING MARKETS.

(a) DIRECT CREDITS OR EXPORT CREDIT GUARANTEES.—Section 1542(a) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (Public Law 101–624; 7 U.S.C. 5622 note) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

(b) DEVELOPMENT OF AGRICULTURAL SYSTEMS.—Section 1542(d)(1)(A)(i) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (Public Law 101–624; 7 U.S.C. 5622 note) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 3204. MCGOVERN-DOLE INTERNATIONAL FOOD FOR EDUCATION AND CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAM.

(a) REAUTHORIZATION.—Section 3107(l)(2) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 1736o–1(l)(2)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

(b) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Section 3107(d) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 1736o–1(d)) is amended by striking ''to'' in the matter preceding paragraph (1).

SEC. 3205. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR SPECIALTY CROPS.

(a) PURPOSE.—Section 3205(b) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 5680(b)) is amended by striking ''related barriers to trade'' and inserting ''technical barriers to trade''.

(b) FUNDING.—Section 3205(e)(2) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 5680(e)(2)) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (C); and

(2) by striking subparagraphs (D) and (E) and inserting the following new subparagraph:

''(D) $9,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2011 through 2018.''.

(c) U.S. ATLANTIC SPINY DOGFISH STUDY.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall conduct an economic study on the existing market in the United States for U.S. Atlantic Spiny Dogfish.

SEC. 3206. GLOBAL CROP DIVERSITY TRUST.

Section 3202(c) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–246; 22 U.S.C. 2220a note) is amended by striking ''section'' and all that follows through the period and inserting the following: ''section—

''(1) $60,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2013; and

''(2) $50,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 3207. UNDER SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE FOR FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle B of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 is amended by inserting after section 225 (7 U.S.C. 6931) the following new section:

''SEC. 225A. UNDER SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE FOR FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICES.

''(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary is authorized to establish in the Department the position of Under Secretary of Agriculture for Foreign Agricultural Services.

''(b) CONFIRMATION REQUIRED.—If the Secretary establishes the position of Under Secretary of Agriculture for Foreign Agricultural Services under subsection (a), the Under Secretary shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

''(c) FUNCTIONS OF UNDER SECRETARY.—

''(1) PRINCIPAL FUNCTIONS.—Upon establishment, the Secretary shall delegate to the Under Secretary of Agriculture for Foreign Agricultural Services those functions under the jurisdiction of the Department that are related to foreign agricultural services.

''(2) ADDITIONAL FUNCTIONS.—The Under Secretary of Agriculture for Foreign Agricultural Services shall perform such other functions as may be required by law or prescribed by the Secretary.

''(d) SUCCESSION.—Any official who is serving as Under Secretary of Agriculture for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services on the date of the enactment of this section and who was appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall not be required to be reappointed under subsection (b) or section 225(b) to the successor position authorized under subsection (a) or section 225(a) if the Secretary establishes the position, and the official occupies the new position, with 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section (or such later date set by the Secretary if litigation delays rapid succession).''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 225 of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6931) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Under Secretary of Agriculture for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services'' each place it appears and inserting ''Under Secretary of Agriculture for Farm Services''; and

(2) in subsection (c)(1), by striking ''and foreign agricultural''.

(c) PERMANENT AUTHORITY.—Section 296(b) of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 7014(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (6)(C), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (7), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(8) the authority of the Secretary to establish in the Department the position of Under Secretary of Agriculture for Foreign Agricultural Services in accordance with section 225A;''.

SEC. 3208. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE CERTIFICATES OF ORIGIN.

The Secretary of Agriculture shall seek to ensure that Department of Agriculture certificates of origin are accepted by any country with respect to which the United States has entered into a free trade agreement providing for preferential duty treatment.

TITLE IV—CREDIT

Subtitle A—Farm Ownership Loans

SEC. 4001. ELIGIBILITY FOR FARM OWNERSHIP LOANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 302(a) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1922(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(a) IN GENERAL.—The'' and inserting the following:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—

''(1) ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—The'';

(2) in the 1st sentence, by inserting after ''limited liability companies'' the following: '', and such other legal entities as the Secretary deems appropriate,'';

(3) in the 2nd sentence, by redesignating clauses (1) through (4) as clauses (A) through (D), respectively;

(4) in each of the 2nd and 3rd sentences, by striking ''and limited liability companies'' each place it appears and inserting ''limited liability companies, and such other legal entities'';

(5) in the 3rd sentence, by striking ''(3)'' and ''(4)'' and inserting ''(C)'' and ''(D)'', respectively; and

(6) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) SPECIAL DEEMING RULES.—

''(A) ELIGIBILITY OF CERTAIN OPERATING-ONLY ENTITIES.—An entity that is or will become only the operator of a family farm is deemed to meet the owner-operator requirements of paragraph (1) if the individuals that are the owners of the family farm own more than 50 percent (or such other percentage as the Secretary determines is appropriate) of the entity.

''(B) ELIGIBILITY OF CERTAIN EMBEDDED ENTITIES.—An entity that is an owner-operator described in paragraph (1), or an operator described in subparagraph (A) of this paragraph that is owned, in whole or in part, by other entities, is deemed to meet the direct ownership requirement imposed under paragraph (1) if at least 75 percent of the ownership interests of each embedded entity of such entity is owned directly or indirectly by the individuals that own the family farm.''.

(b) DIRECT FARM OWNERSHIP EXPERIENCE REQUIREMENT.—Section 302(b)(1) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1922(b)(1)) is amended by inserting ''or has other acceptable experience for a period of time, as determined by the Secretary,'' after ''3 years''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 304(c)(2) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1924(c)(2)) by striking ''paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 302(a)'' and inserting ''clauses (A) and (B) of section 302(a)(1)''.

(2) Section 310D of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1934) is amended—

(A) by inserting after ''partnership'' the following: '', or such other legal entities as the Secretary deems appropriate,''; and

(B) by striking ''or partners'' each place it appears and inserting ''partners, or owners''.

SEC. 4002. CONSERVATION LOAN AND LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM.

(a) ELIGIBILITY.—Section 304(c) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1924(c)) is amended by inserting after ''limited liability companies'' the following: '', or such other legal entities as the Secretary deems appropriate,''.

(b) LIMITATION ON LOAN GUARANTEE AMOUNT.—Section 304(e) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1924(e)) is amended by striking ''75 percent'' and inserting ''90 percent''.

(c) EXTENSION OF PROGRAM.—Section 304(h) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1924(h)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 4003. DOWN PAYMENT LOAN PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 310E(b)(1)(C) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1935(b)(1)(C)) is amended by striking ''$500,000'' and inserting ''$667,000''.

(b) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Section 310E(b) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1935(b)) is amended by striking the 2nd paragraph (2).

SEC. 4004. ELIMINATION OF MINERAL RIGHTS APPRAISAL REQUIREMENT.

Section 307 of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1927) is

amended by striking subsection (d) and redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (d).

Subtitle B—Operating Loans

SEC. 4101. ELIGIBILITY FOR FARM OPERATING LOANS.

Section 311(a) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1941(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(a) IN GENERAL.—The'' and inserting the following:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—

''(1) ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—The'';

(2) in the 1st sentence, by inserting after ''limited liability companies'' the following: '', and such other legal entities as the Secretary deems appropriate,'';

(3) in the 2nd sentence, by redesignating clauses (1) through (4) as clauses (A) through (D), respectively;

(4) in each of the 2nd and 3rd sentences, by striking ''and limited liability companies'' each place it appears and inserting ''limited liability companies, and such other legal entities'';

(5) in the 3rd sentence, by striking ''(3)'' and ''(4)'' and inserting ''(C)'' and ''(D)'', respectively; and

(6) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) SPECIAL DEEMING RULE.—An entity that is an operator described in paragraph (1) that is owned, in whole or in part, by other entities, is deemed to meet the direct ownership requirement imposed under paragraph (1) if at least 75 percent of the ownership interests of each embedded entity of such entity is owned directly or indirectly by the individuals that own the family farm.''.

SEC. 4102. ELIMINATION OF RURAL RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT FOR OPERATING LOANS TO YOUTH.

Section 311(b)(1) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1941(b)(1)) is amended by striking ''who are rural residents''.

SEC. 4103. AUTHORITY TO WAIVE PERSONAL LIABILITY FOR YOUTH LOANS DUE TO CIRCUMSTANCES BEYOND BORROWER CONTROL.

Section 311(b) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1941(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5) The Secretary may, on a case-by-case basis, waive the personal liability of a borrower for a loan made under this subsection if any default on the loan was due to circumstances beyond the control of the borrower.''.

SEC. 4104. MICROLOANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 313 of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1943) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) MICROLOANS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary may establish a program to make or guarantee microloans.

''(2) LIMITATION.—The Secretary shall not make or guarantee a microloan under this subsection that exceeds $35,000 or that would cause the total principal indebtedness outstanding at any 1 time for microloans made under this chapter to any 1 borrower to exceed $70,000.

''(3) APPLICATIONS.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall limit the administrative burdens and streamline the application and approval process for microloans under this subsection.

''(4) COOPERATIVE LENDING PROJECTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the Secretary may contract with community-based and nongovernmental organizations, State entities, or other intermediaries, as the Secretary determines appropriate—

''(i) to make or guarantee a microloan under this subsection; and

''(ii) to provide business, financial, marketing, and credit management services to borrowers.

''(B) REQUIREMENTS.—Before contracting with an entity described in subparagraph (A), the Secretary—

''(i) shall review and approve—

''(I) the loan loss reserve fund for microloans established by the entity; and

''(II) the underwriting standards for microloans of the entity; and

''(ii) establish such other requirements for contracting with the entity as the Secretary determines necessary.''.

(b) EXCEPTIONS FOR DIRECT LOANS.—Section 311(c)(2) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1941(c)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

''(2) EXCEPTIONS.—In this subsection, the term 'direct operating loan' shall not include—

''(A) a loan made to a youth under subsection (b); or

''(B) a microloan made to a beginning farmer or rancher or a veteran farmer or rancher (as defined in section 2501(e) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 2279(e)).''.

(c) Section 312(a) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1942(a)) is amended by inserting ''(including a microloan, as defined by the Secretary)'' after ''A direct loan''.

(d) Section 316(a)(2) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1946(a)(2)) is amended by inserting ''a microloan to a beginning farmer or rancher or veteran farmer or rancher (as defined in section 2501(e) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 2279(e)), or'' after ''The interest rate on''.

Subtitle C—Emergency Loans

SEC. 4201. ELIGIBILITY FOR EMERGENCY LOANS.

Section 321(a) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1961(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''owner-operators (in the case of loans for a purpose under subtitle A) or operators (in the case of loans for a purpose under subtitle B)'' each place it appears and inserting ''(in the case of farm ownership loans in accordance with subtitle A) owner-operators or operators, or (in the case of loans for a purpose under subtitle B) operators'';

(2) by inserting after ''limited liability companies'' the 1st place it appears the following: '', or such other legal entities as the Secretary deems appropriate'';

(3) by inserting after ''limited liability companies'' the 2nd place it appears the following: '', or other legal entities'';

(4) by striking ''and limited liability companies,'' and inserting ''limited liability companies, and such other legal entities'';

(5) by striking ''ownership and operator'' and inserting ''ownership or operator''; and

(6) by adding at the end the following: ''An entity that is an owner-operator or operator described in this subsection is deemed to meet the direct ownership requirement imposed under this subsection if at least 75 percent of the ownership interests of each embedded entity of such entity is owned directly or indirectly by the individuals that own the family farm.''.

Subtitle D—Administrative Provisions

SEC. 4301. BEGINNING FARMER AND RANCHER INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT ACCOUNTS PILOT PROGRAM.

Section 333B(h) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1983b(h)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 4302. ELIGIBLE BEGINNING FARMERS AND RANCHERS.

(a) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS RELATING TO CHANGES IN ELIGIBILITY RULES.—Section 343(a)(11) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1991(a)(11)) is amended—

(1) by inserting after ''joint operation,'' the 1st place it appears the following: ''or such other legal entity as the Secretary deems appropriate,'';

(2) by striking ''or joint operators'' each place it appears and inserting ''joint operators, or owners''; and

(3) by inserting after ''joint operation,'' the 2nd and 3rd place it appears the following: ''or such other legal entity,''.

(b) MODIFICATION OF ACREAGE OWNERSHIP LIMITATION.—Section 343(a)(11)(F) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1991(a)(11)(F)) is amended by striking ''median acreage'' and inserting ''average acreage''.

SEC. 4303. LOAN AUTHORIZATION LEVELS.

Section 346(b)(1) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1994(b)(1)) is amended in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 4304. PRIORITY FOR PARTICIPATION LOANS.

Section 346(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1994(b)(2)(A)(i)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(III) PRIORITY.—In order to maximize the number of borrowers served under this clause, the Secretary—

''(aa) shall give priority to applicants who apply under the down payment loan program under section 310E or joint financing arrangements under section 307(a)(3)(D); and

''(bb) may offer other financing options under this subtitle to applicants only if the Secretary determines that down payment or other participation loan options are not a viable approach for the applicants.''.

SEC. 4305. LOAN FUND SET-ASIDES.

Section 346(b)(2)(A)(ii)(III) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1994(b)(2)(A)(ii)(III)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''; and

(2) by striking ''of the total amount''.

SEC. 4306. CONFORMING AMENDMENT TO BORROWER TRAINING PROVISION, RELATING TO ELIGIBILITY CHANGES.

Section 359(c)(2) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 2006a(c)(2)) is amended by striking ''section 302(a)(2) or 311(a)(2)'' and inserting ''section 302(a)(1)(B) or 311(a)(1)(B)''.

Subtitle E—State Agricultural Mediation Programs

SEC. 4401. STATE AGRICULTURAL MEDIATION PROGRAMS.

Section 506 of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1987 (7 U.S.C. 5106) is amended by striking ''2015'' and inserting ''2018''.

Subtitle F—Loans to Purchasers of Highly Fractionated Land

SEC. 4501. LOANS TO PURCHASERS OF HIGHLY FRACTIONATED LAND.

The first section of Public Law 91–229 (25 U.S.C. 488) is amended in subsection (b)(1) by striking ''pursuant to section 205(c) of the Indian Land Consolidation Act (25 U.S.C. 2204(c))'' and inserting ''or to intermediaries in order to establish revolving loan funds for the purchase of highly fractionated land''.

TITLE V—RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Subtitle A—Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act

SEC. 5001. WATER, WASTE DISPOSAL, AND WASTEWATER FACILITY GRANTS.

Section 306(a)(2)(B)(vii) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1926(a)(2)(B)(vii)) is amended by striking ''2008 through 2012'' and inserting ''2014 through 2018''.

SEC. 5002. RURAL BUSINESS OPPORTUNITY GRANTS.

Section 306(a)(11)(D) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C.

1926(a)(11)(D)) is amended by striking ''$15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2012'' and inserting ''$15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018''.

SEC. 5003. ELIMINATION OF RESERVATION OF COMMUNITY FACILITIES GRANT PROGRAM FUNDS.

Section 306(a)(19) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1926(a)(19)) is amended by striking subparagraph (C).

SEC. 5004. UTILIZATION OF LOAN GUARANTEES FOR COMMUNITY FACILITIES.

Section 306(a)(24) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1926(a)(24)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(C) UTILIZATION OF LOAN GUARANTEES FOR COMMUNITY FACILITIES.—The Secretary shall consider the benefits to communities that result from using loan guarantees in the Community Facilities Program and to the maximum extent possible utilize guarantees to enhance community involvement.''.

SEC. 5005. RURAL WATER AND WASTEWATER CIRCUIT RIDER PROGRAM.

Section 306(a)(22) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1926(a)(22)) is amended to read as follows:

''(22) RURAL WATER AND WASTEWATER CIRCUIT RIDER PROGRAM.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall continue a national rural water and wastewater circuit rider program that—

''(i) is consistent with the activities and results of the program conducted before the date of enactment of this paragraph, as determined by the Secretary; and

''(ii) receives funding from the Secretary, acting through the Rural Utilities Service.

''(B) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this paragraph $20,000,000 for fiscal year 2014 and each fiscal year thereafter.''.

SEC. 5006. TRIBAL COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY ESSENTIAL COMMUNITY FACILITIES.

Section 306(a)(25)(C) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1926(a)(25)(C)) is amended by striking ''$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2012'' and inserting ''$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018''.

SEC. 5007. ESSENTIAL COMMUNITY FACILITIES TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING.

Section 306(a) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1926(a)(19)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(26) ESSENTIAL COMMUNITY FACILITIES TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may make grants to public bodies and private nonprofit corporations, such as States, counties, cities, townships, and incorporated towns and villages, boroughs, authorities, districts and Indian tribes on Federal and State reservations which will serve rural areas for the purpose of enabling them to provide to associations described in this subsection technical assistance and training, with respect to essential community facilities programs authorized under this subsection, to—

''(i) assist communities in identifying and planning for community facility needs;

''(ii) identify public and private resources to finance community facilities needs;

''(iii) prepare reports and surveys necessary to request financial assistance to develop community facilities;

''(iv) prepare applications for financial assistance;

''(v) improve the management, including financial management, related to the operation of community facilities; or

''(vi) assist with other areas of need identified by the Secretary.

''(B) SELECTION PRIORITY.—In selecting recipients of grants under this paragraph, the Secretary shall give priority to private, nonprofit, or public organizations that have experience in providing technical assistance and training to rural entities.

''(C) FUNDING.—Not less than 3 nor more than 5 percent of any funds appropriated to carry out each of the essential community facilities grant, loan and loan guarantee programs as authorized under this subsection for any fiscal year shall be reserved for grants under this paragraph.''.

SEC. 5008. EMERGENCY AND IMMINENT COMMUNITY WATER ASSISTANCE GRANT PROGRAM.

Section 306A(i)(2) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1926a(i)(2)) is amended by striking ''$35,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2012'' and inserting ''$27,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018''.

SEC. 5009. HOUSEHOLD WATER WELL SYSTEMS.

Section 306E(d) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1926e(d)) is amended by striking ''$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2012'' and inserting ''$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018''.

SEC. 5010. RURAL BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY LOAN PROGRAM.

(a) FLEXIBILITY FOR THE BUSINESS AND LOAN PROGRAM.—Section 310B(a)(2)(A) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1932(a)(2)(A)) is amended by inserting ''including working capital'' after ''employment''.

(b) GREATER FLEXIBILITY FOR ADEQUATE COLLATERAL THROUGH ACCOUNTS RECEIVABLE.—Section 310B(g)(7) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1932(g)(7)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''In the discretion of the Secretary, if the Secretary determines that the action would not create or otherwise contribute to an unreasonable risk of default or loss to the Federal Government, the Secretary may take account receivables as security for the obligations entered into in connection with loans and a borrower may use account receivables as collateral to secure a loan made or guaranteed under this subsection.''.

(c) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall promulgate such regulations as are necessary to implement the amendments made by this section.

SEC. 5011. RURAL COOPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT GRANTS.

Section 310B(e)(12) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1932(e)(12)) is amended by striking ''$50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2012'' and inserting ''$40,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018''.

SEC. 5012. LOCALLY OR REGIONALLY PRODUCED AGRICULTURAL FOOD PRODUCTS.

Section 310B(g)(9)(B)(v)(I) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1932(g)(9)(B)(v)(I)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''; and

(2) by inserting ''and not more than 7 percent'' after ''5 percent''.

SEC. 5013. INTERMEDIARY RELENDING PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle A of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1922–1936a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 310H. INTERMEDIARY RELENDING PROGRAM.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall make loans to the entities, for the purposes, and subject to the terms and conditions specified in the 1st, 2nd, and last sentences of section 623(a) of the Community Economic Development Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 9812(a)).

''(b) LIMITATIONS ON AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For loans under subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary not more than $10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 1323(b)(2) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (Public Law 99–198; 7 U.S.C. 1932 note) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by adding ''and'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a period; and

(3) by striking subparagraph (C).

SEC. 5014. RURAL COLLEGE COORDINATED STRATEGY.

Section 331 of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1981) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) RURAL COLLEGE COORDINATED STRATEGY.—The Secretary shall develop a coordinated strategy across the relevant programs within the Rural Development mission areas to serve the specific, local needs of rural communities when making investments in rural community colleges and technical colleges through other current authorities. During the development of a coordinated strategy, the Secretary shall consult with groups representing rural-serving community colleges and technical colleges to coordinate critical investments in rural community colleges and technical colleges involved in workforce training. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to provide a priority for funding within current authorities. The Secretary shall use the coordinated strategy and information developed for the strategy to more effectively serve rural communities with respect to investments in community colleges and technical colleges.''.

SEC. 5015. RURAL WATER AND WASTE DISPOSAL INFRASTRUCTURE.

Section 333 of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1983) is amended—

(1) by striking ''require'';

(2) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''require'' after ''(1)'';

(3) in paragraph (2), by inserting '', require'' after ''314'';

(4) in paragraph (3), by inserting ''require'' after ''loans,'';

(5) in paragraph (4)—

(A) by inserting ''require'' after ''(4)''; and

(B) by striking ''and'' after the semicolon;

(6) in paragraph (5)—

(A) by inserting ''require'' after ''(5)''; and

(B) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(7) by adding at the end the following:

''(6) with respect to water and waste disposal direct and guaranteed loans provided under section 306, encourage, to the maximum extent practicable, private or cooperative lenders to finance rural water and waste disposal facilities by—

''(A) maximizing the use of loan guarantees to finance eligible projects in rural communities where the population exceeds 5,500;

''(B) maximizing the use of direct loans to finance eligible projects in rural communities where the impact on rate payers will be material when compared to financing with a loan guarantee;

''(C) establishing and applying a materiality standard when determining the difference in impact on rate payers between a direct loan and a loan guarantee;

''(D) in the case of projects that require interim financing in excess of $500,000, requiring that such projects initially seek such financing from private or cooperative lenders; and

''(E) determining if an existing direct loan borrower can refinance with a private or cooperative lender, including with a loan guarantee, prior to providing a new direct loan.''.

SEC. 5016. SIMPLIFIED APPLICATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 333A of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1983a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(h) SIMPLIFIED APPLICATION FORMS.—Except as provided in subsection (g)(2) of this section, the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, develop a simplified application process, including a single page application where possible, for grants and relending authorized under sections 306, 306C, 306D, 306E, 310B(b), 310B(c), 310B(e), 310B(f), 310H, 379B, and 379E.''.

(b) REPORT TO THE CONGRESS.—Within 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a written report that contains an evaluation of the implementation of the amendment made by subsection (a).

SEC. 5017. GRANTS FOR NOAA WEATHER RADIO TRANSMITTERS.

Section 379B(d) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 2008p(d)) is amended to read as follows:

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $1,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 5018. RURAL MICROENTREPRENEUR ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Section 379E(d)(2) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 2008s(d)(2)) is amended by striking ''$40,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2012'' and inserting ''$20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018''.

SEC. 5019. DELTA REGIONAL AUTHORITY.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 382M(a) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 2009aa–12(a)) is amended by striking ''$30,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2012'' and inserting ''$12,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018''.

(b) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—Section 382N of such Act (7 U.S.C. 2009aa–13) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 5020. NORTHERN GREAT PLAINS REGIONAL AUTHORITY.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 383N(a) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 2009bb–12(a)) is amended by striking ''$30,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2012'' and inserting ''$2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018''.

(b) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—Section 383O of such Act (7 U.S.C. 2009bb–13) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 5021. RURAL BUSINESS INVESTMENT PROGRAM.

Section 384S of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 2009cc–18) is amended by striking ''$50,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2012'' and inserting ''$20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018''.

Subtitle B—Rural Electrification Act of 1936

SEC. 5101. RELENDING FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 901 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 2(a), by inserting ''(including relending for this purpose as provided in section 4)'' after ''efficiency'';

(2) in section 4(a), by inserting ''(including relending to ultimate consumers for this purpose by borrowers enumerated in the proviso in this section)'' after ''efficiency''; and

(3) in section 313(b)(2)(B)—

(A) by inserting ''(acting through the Rural Utilities Service)'' after ''Secretary''; and

(B) by inserting ''energy efficiency (including relending to ultimate consumers for this purpose),'' after ''promoting''.

(b) CURRENT AUTHORITY.—The authority provided in this section is in addition to any other relending authority of the Secretary under the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 901 et. seq.) or any other law.

(c) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary (acting through the Rural Utilities Service) shall continue to carry out section 313 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 940c) in the same manner as on the day before enactment of this Act until such time as any regulations necessary to carry out the amendments made by this section are fully implemented.

SEC. 5102. FEES FOR CERTAIN LOAN GUARANTEES.

The Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 901 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 4 the following:

''SEC. 5. FEES FOR CERTAIN LOAN GUARANTEES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—For electrification baseload generation loan guarantees, the Secretary shall, at the request of the borrower, charge an upfront fee to cover the costs of the loan guarantee.

''(b) FEE.—The fee described in subsection (a) for a loan guarantee shall be equal to the costs of the loan guarantee (within the meaning of section 502(5)(C) of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 661a(5)(C))).

''(c) LIMITATION.—Funds received from a borrower to pay the fee described in this section shall not be derived from a loan or other debt obligation that is made or guaranteed by the Federal Government.''.

SEC. 5103. RURAL UTILITIES SERVICE CONTRACTING AUTHORITY.

Section 18(c) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 918(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''Rural Electrification Administration'' each place it appears and inserting ''Rural Utilities Service''; and

(2) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by inserting ''COOPERATIVE'' before ''AGREEMENTS''; and

(B) by inserting after the 1st sentence the following: ''A contract funded by a borrower that is to be paid for out of the general funds of the borrower is not a public contract within the meaning of title 41, United States Code.''.

SEC. 5104. GUARANTEES FOR BONDS AND NOTES ISSUED FOR ELECTRIFICATION OR TELEPHONE PURPOSES.

Section 313A(f) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 940c–1(f)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 5105. EXPANSION OF 911 ACCESS.

Section 315(d) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 940e(d)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 5106. ACCESS TO BROADBAND TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES IN RURAL AREAS.

Section 601 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 950bb) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(2) PRIORITIES.—In making or guaranteeing loans under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall give—

''(A) the highest priority to applicants that offer to provide broadband service to the greatest proportion of households that, prior to the provision of the broadband service, had no incumbent service provider; and

''(B) priority to applicants that offer in their applications to provide broadband service not predominantly for business service, but where at least 25 percent of customers in the proposed service territory are commercial interests.'';

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (5)—

(i) by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (B);

(ii) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting a semicolon; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) the amount and type of support requested; and

''(E) a list of the census block groups or tracts proposed to be so served.''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(8) ADDITIONAL PROCESS.—The Secretary shall establish a process under which an incumbent service provider which, as of the date of the publication of notice under paragraph (5) with respect to an application submitted by the provider, is providing broadband service to a remote rural area, may (but shall not be required to) submit to the Secretary, not less than 15 and not more than 30 days after that date, information regarding the broadband services that the provider offers in the proposed service territory, so that the Secretary may assess whether the application meets the requirements of this section with respect to eligible projects.'';

(3) in subsection (e), by adding at the end the following:

''(3) REQUIREMENT.—In considering the technology needs of customers in a proposed service territory, the Secretary shall take into consideration the upgrade or replacement cost for the construction or acquisition of facilities and equipment in the territory.''; and

(4) in each of subsections (k)(1) and (l), by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

Subtitle C—Miscellaneous

SEC. 5201. DISTANCE LEARNING AND TELEMEDICINE.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 2335A of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 950aaa–5) is amended by striking ''$100,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1996 through 2012'' and inserting ''$65,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1(b) of Public Law 102–551 (7 U.S.C. 950aaa note) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 5202. VALUE-ADDED AGRICULTURAL MARKET DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM GRANTS.

Section 231(b)(7) of the Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000 (7 U.S.C. 1632a(b)(7)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking ''2008'' and inserting ''2013''; and

(B) by striking ''$15,000,000'' and inserting ''$50,000,000''; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 5203. AGRICULTURE INNOVATION CENTER DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.

Section 6402(i) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 1632b(i)) is amended by striking ''$6,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2012'' and inserting ''$1,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018''.

SEC. 5204. PROGRAM METRICS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall collect data regarding economic activities created through grants and loans, including any technical assistance provided as a component of the grant or loan program, and measure the short and long term viability of award recipients and any entities to whom those recipients provide assistance using award funds under section 231 of the Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000 (7 U.S.C. 1621 note; Public Law 106–224),

section 9007 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8107), section 313(b)(2) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 940c(b)(2)), or section 306(a)(11), 310B(c), 310B(e), 310B(g), 310H, or 379E, or subtitle E, of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1926(a)(11), 1932(c), 1932(e), 1932(g), 2008s, or 2009 through 2009m).

(b) DATA.—The data collected under subsection (a) shall include information collected from recipients both during the award period and after the period as determined by the Secretary, but not less than 2 years after the award period ends.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 2 years thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that contains the data described in subsection (a). The report shall include detailed information regarding—

(1) actions taken by the Secretary to utilize the data;

(2) the number of jobs, including self-employment and the value of salaries and wages;

(3) how the provision of funds from the grant or loan involved affected the local economy;

(4) any benefit, such as an increase in revenue or customer base; and

(5) such other information as the Secretary deems appropriate.

SEC. 5205. STUDY OF RURAL TRANSPORTATION ISSUES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Transportation shall publish an updated version of the study described in section 6206 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (as amended by subsection (b)).

(b) ADDITION TO STUDY.—Section 6206(b) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–246; 122 Stat. 1971) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5) the sufficiency of infrastructure along waterways in the United States and the impact of such infrastructure on the movement of agricultural goods in terms of safety, efficiency and speed, as well as the benefits derived through upgrades and repairs to locks and dams.''.

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Transportation shall submit to the Congress the updated version of the study required by subsection (a).

SEC. 5206. CERTAIN FEDERAL ACTIONS NOT TO BE CONSIDERED MAJOR.

In the case of a loan, loan guarantee, or grant program in the rural development mission area of the Department of Agriculture, an action of the Secretary before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act that does not involve the provision by the Department of Agriculture of Federal dollars or a Federal loan guarantee, including—

(1) the approval by the Department of Agriculture of the decision of a borrower to commence a privately funded activity;

(2) a lien accommodation or subordination;

(3) a debt settlement or restructuring; or

(4) the restructuring of a business entity by a borrower,

shall not be considered a major Federal action.

SEC. 5207. TELEMEDICINE AND DISTANCE LEARNING SERVICES IN RURAL AREAS.

Section 2333(d) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 950aaa-2(d)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (12); and

(2) by redesignating paragraph (13) as paragraph (14) and inserting after paragraph (12) the following:

''(13) whether the applicant for assistance is located in a designated health professional shortage area (within the meaning of section 332 of the Public Health Service Act)''.

SEC. 5208. REGIONAL ECONOMIC AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT.

Section 15751 of title 40, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking ''Not more than'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), not more than''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) LIMITED FUNDING.—In a case in which less than $10,000,000 is made available to a Commission for a fiscal year under this section, paragraph (1) shall not apply.''.

TITLE VI—RESEARCH, EXTENSION, AND RELATED MATTERS

Subtitle A—National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977

SEC. 6101. OPTION TO BE INCLUDED AS NON-LAND-GRANT COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE.

Section 1404 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3103) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (5) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(5) COOPERATING FORESTRY SCHOOL.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'cooperating forestry school' means an institution—

''(i) that is eligible to receive funds under the Act of October 10, 1962 (16 U.S.C. 582a et seq.), commonly known as the McIntire-Stennis Act of 1962; and

''(ii) with respect to which the Secretary has not received a declaration of the intent of that institution to not be considered a cooperating forestry school.

''(B) TERMINATION OF DECLARATION.—A declaration of the intent of an institution to not be considered a cooperating forestry school submitted to the Secretary shall be in effect until September 30, 2018.''; and

(2) in paragraph (10)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''that'';

(ii) in clause (i)—

(I) by inserting ''that'' before ''qualify''; and

(II) by striking ''and'' at the end;

(iii) in clause (ii)—

(I) by inserting ''that'' before ''offer''; and

(II) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following new clause:

''(iii) with respect to which the Secretary has not received a statement of the declaration of the intent of a college or university to not be considered a Hispanic-serving agricultural college or university.''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(C) TERMINATION OF DECLARATION OF INTENT.—A declaration of the intent of a college or university to not be considered a Hispanic-serving agricultural college or university submitted to the Secretary shall be in effect until September 30, 2018.''.

SEC. 6102. NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH, EXTENSION, EDUCATION, AND ECONOMICS ADVISORY BOARD.

(a) EXTENSION OF TERMINATION DATE.—Section 1408(h) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3123(h)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

(b) DUTIES OF NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH, EXTENSION, EDUCATION, AND ECONOMICS ADVISORY BOARD.—Section 1408(c) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3123(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (4)(C), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5) consult with industry groups on agricultural research, extension, education, and economics, and make recommendations to the Secretary based on that consultation.''.

SEC. 6103. SPECIALTY CROP COMMITTEE.

Section 1408A(c) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3123a(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''Measures'' and inserting ''Programs'';

(2) by striking paragraph (2);

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (3), (4), and (5) as paragraphs (2), (3), and (4), respectively; and

(4) in paragraph (2) (as so redesignated)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''Programs that would'' and inserting ''Research, extension, and teaching programs designed to improve competitiveness in the specialty crop industry, including programs that would'';

(B) in subparagraph (D), by inserting '', including improving the quality and taste of processed specialty crops'' before the semicolon; and

(C) in subparagraph (G), by inserting ''the remote sensing and the'' before ''mechanization''.

SEC. 6104. VETERINARY SERVICES GRANT PROGRAM.

The National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 is amended by inserting after section 1415A (7 U.S.C. 3151a) the following new section:

''SEC. 1415B. VETERINARY SERVICES GRANT PROGRAM.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) QUALIFIED ENTITY.—The term 'qualified entity' means—

''(A) a for-profit or nonprofit entity located in the United States that, or an individual who, operates a veterinary clinic providing veterinary services—

''(i) in a rural area, as defined in section 343(a) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1991(a)); and

''(ii) in a veterinarian shortage situation;

''(B) a State, national, allied, or regional veterinary organization or specialty board recognized by the American Veterinary Medical Association;

''(C) a college or school of veterinary medicine accredited by the American Veterinary Medical Association;

''(D) a university research foundation or veterinary medical foundation;

''(E) a department of veterinary science or department of comparative medicine accredited by the Department of Education;

''(F) a State agricultural experiment station; or

''(G) a State, local, or tribal government agency.

''(2) VETERINARIAN SHORTAGE SITUATION.—The term 'veterinarian shortage situation' means a veterinarian shortage situation as

determined by the Secretary under section 1415A.

''(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—

''(1) COMPETITIVE GRANTS.—The Secretary shall carry out a program to make competitive grants to qualified entities that carry out programs or activities described in paragraph (2) for the purpose of developing, implementing, and sustaining veterinary services.

''(2) ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—A qualified entity shall be eligible to receive a grant described in paragraph (1) if the entity carries out programs or activities that the Secretary determines will—

''(A) substantially relieve veterinarian shortage situations;

''(B) support or facilitate private veterinary practices engaged in public health activities; or

''(C) support or facilitate the practices of veterinarians who are providing or have completed providing services under an agreement entered into with the Secretary under section 1415A(a)(2).

''(c) AWARD PROCESSES AND PREFERENCES.—

''(1) APPLICATION, EVALUATION, AND INPUT PROCESSES.—In administering the grant program established under this section, the Secretary shall—

''(A) use an appropriate application and evaluation process, as determined by the Secretary; and

''(B) seek the input of interested persons.

''(2) COORDINATION PREFERENCE.—In selecting recipients of grants to be used for any of the purposes described in subsection (d)(1), the Secretary shall give a preference to qualified entities that provide documentation of coordination with other qualified entities, with respect to any such purpose.

''(3) CONSIDERATION OF AVAILABLE FUNDS.—In selecting recipients of grants to be used for any of the purposes described in subsection (d), the Secretary shall take into consideration the amount of funds available for grants and the purposes for which the grant funds will be used.

''(4) NATURE OF GRANTS.—A grant awarded under this section shall be considered to be a competitive research, extension, or education grant.

''(d) USE OF GRANTS TO RELIEVE VETERINARIAN SHORTAGE SITUATIONS AND SUPPORT VETERINARY SERVICES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a qualified entity may use funds provided by a grant awarded under this section to relieve veterinarian shortage situations and support veterinary services for any of the following purposes:

''(A) To promote recruitment (including for programs in secondary schools), placement, and retention of veterinarians, veterinary technicians, students of veterinary medicine, and students of veterinary technology.

''(B) To allow veterinary students, veterinary interns, externs, fellows, and residents, and veterinary technician students to cover expenses (other than the types of expenses described in section 1415A(c)(5)) to attend training programs in food safety or food animal medicine.

''(C) To establish or expand accredited veterinary education programs (including faculty recruitment and retention), veterinary residency and fellowship programs, or veterinary internship and externship programs carried out in coordination with accredited colleges of veterinary medicine.

''(D) To provide continuing education and extension, including veterinary telemedicine and other distance-based education, for veterinarians, veterinary technicians, and other health professionals needed to strengthen veterinary programs and enhance food safety.

''(E) To provide technical assistance for the preparation of applications submitted to the Secretary for designation as a veterinarian shortage situation under this section or section 1415A.

''(2) QUALIFIED ENTITIES OPERATING VETERINARY CLINICS.—A qualified entity described in subsection (a)(1)(A) may only use funds provided by a grant awarded under this section to establish or expand veterinary practices, including—

''(A) equipping veterinary offices;

''(B) sharing in the reasonable overhead costs of such veterinary practices, as determined by the Secretary; or

''(C) establishing mobile veterinary facilities in which a portion of the facilities will address education or extension needs.

''(e) SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN GRANTS.—

''(1) TERMS OF SERVICE REQUIREMENTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Funds provided through a grant made under this section to a qualified entity described in subsection (a)(1)(A) and used by such entity under subsection (d)(2) shall be subject to an agreement between the Secretary and such entity that includes a required term of service for such entity (including a qualified entity operating as an individual), as prospectively established by the Secretary.

''(B) CONSIDERATIONS.—In establishing a term of service under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall consider only—

''(i) the amount of the grant awarded; and

''(ii) the specific purpose of the grant.

''(2) BREACH REMEDIES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—An agreement under paragraph (1) shall provide remedies for any breach of the agreement by the qualified entity referred to in paragraph (1)(A), including repayment or partial repayment of the grant funds, with interest.

''(B) WAIVER.—The Secretary may grant a waiver of the repayment obligation for breach of contract if the Secretary determines that such qualified entity demonstrates extreme hardship or extreme need.

''(C) TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS RECOVERED.—Funds recovered under this paragraph shall—

''(i) be credited to the account available to carry out this section; and

''(ii) remain available until expended without further appropriation.

''(f) PROHIBITION ON USE OF GRANT FUNDS FOR CONSTRUCTION.—Except as provided in subsection (d)(2), funds made available for grants under this section may not be used—

''(1) to construct a new building or facility; or

''(2) to acquire, expand, remodel, or alter an existing building or facility, including site grading and improvement and architect fees.

''(g) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary shall promulgate regulations to carry out this section.

''(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this section $10,000,000 for fiscal year 2014 and each fiscal year thereafter, to remain available until expended.''.

SEC. 6105. GRANTS AND FELLOWSHIPS FOR FOOD AND AGRICULTURE SCIENCES EDUCATION.

Section 1417(m) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3152(m)) is amended by striking ''section $60,000,000'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''section—

''(1) $60,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1990 through 2013; and

''(2) $40,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 6106. POLICY RESEARCH CENTERS.

Section 1419A of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3155) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by inserting ''**AGRICULTURAL AND FOOD**'' before ''**POLICY**'';

(2) in subsection (a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking ''Secretary may'' and inserting ''Secretary shall, acting through the Office of the Chief Economist,'';

(B) by striking ''make grants, competitive grants, and special research grants to, and enter into cooperative agreements and other contracting instruments with,'' and inserting ''make competitive grants to, or enter into cooperative agreements with,''; and

(C) by inserting ''with a history of providing unbiased, nonpartisan economic analysis to Congress'' after ''subsection (b)'';

(3) in subsection (b), by striking ''other research institutions'' and all that follows through ''shall be eligible'' and inserting ''and other public research institutions and organizations shall be eligible'';

(4) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively;

(5) by inserting after subsection (b), the following new subsection:

''(c) PREFERENCE.—In awarding grants under this section, the Secretary shall give a preference to policy research centers that have extensive databases, models, and demonstrated experience in providing Congress with agricultural market projections, rural development analysis, agricultural policy analysis, and baseline projections at the farm, multiregional, national, and international levels.''; and

(6) by striking subsection (e) (as redesignated by paragraph (4)) and inserting the following new subsection:

''(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section—

''(1) such sums as are necessary for each of fiscal years 1996 through 2013; and

''(2) $5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 6107. REPEAL OF HUMAN NUTRITION INTERVENTION AND HEALTH PROMOTION RESEARCH PROGRAM.

Effective October 1, 2013, section 1424 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3174) is repealed.

SEC. 6108. REPEAL OF PILOT RESEARCH PROGRAM TO COMBINE MEDICAL AND AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH.

Effective October 1, 2013, section 1424A of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3174a) is repealed.

SEC. 6109. NUTRITION EDUCATION PROGRAM.

Section 1425(f) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3175(f)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 6110. CONTINUING ANIMAL HEALTH AND DISEASE RESEARCH PROGRAMS.

Section 1433 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3195) is amended by striking the section designation and heading and all that follows through subsection (a) and inserting the following:

''SEC. 1433. APPROPRIATIONS FOR CONTINUING ANIMAL HEALTH AND DISEASE RESEARCH PROGRAMS.

''(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to support continuing animal health and disease research programs at eligible institutions—

''(A) $25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1991 through 2013; and

''(B) $15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.

''(2) USE OF FUNDS.—Funds made available under this section shall be used—

''(A) to meet the expenses of conducting animal health and disease research, publishing and disseminating the results of such research, and contributing to the retirement of employees subject to the Act of March 4, 1940 (7 U.S.C. 331);

''(B) for administrative planning and direction; and

''(C) to purchase equipment and supplies necessary for conducting the research described in subparagraph (A).''.

SEC. 6111. REPEAL OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR RESEARCH ON NATIONAL OR REGIONAL PROBLEMS.

(a) REPEAL.—Effective October 1, 2013, section 1434 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3196) is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) MATCHING FUNDS.—Section 1438 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3200) is amended in the first sentence by striking '', exclusive of the funds provided for research on specific national or regional animal health and disease problems under the provisions of section 1434 of this title,''.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR EXISTING AND CERTAIN NEW AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH PROGRAMS.—Section 1463(c) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3311(c)) is amended by striking ''sections 1433 and 1434'' and inserting ''section 1433''.

SEC. 6112. GRANTS TO UPGRADE AGRICULTURAL AND FOOD SCIENCES FACILITIES AT 1890 LAND-GRANT COLLEGES, INCLUDING TUSKEGEE UNIVERSITY.

Section 1447(b) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3222b(b)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 6113. GRANTS TO UPGRADE AGRICULTURE AND FOOD SCIENCE FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT AT INSULAR AREA LAND-GRANT INSTITUTIONS.

(a) SUPPORTING TROPICAL AND SUBTROPICAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1447B(a) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3222b–2(a)) is amended to read as follows:

''(a) PURPOSE.—It is the intent of Congress to assist the land-grant colleges and universities in the insular areas in efforts to—

''(1) acquire, alter, or repair facilities or relevant equipment necessary for conducting agricultural research; and

''(2) support tropical and subtropical agricultural research, including pest and disease research.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1447B of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3222b–2) is amended in the heading—

(A) by inserting ''**AND SUPPORT TROPICAL AND SUBTROPICAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH**'' after ''**EQUIPMENT**''; and

(B) by striking ''**INSTITUTIONS**'' and inserting ''**COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES**''.

(b) EXTENSION.—Section 1447B(d) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3222b–2(d)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 6114. REPEAL OF NATIONAL RESEARCH AND TRAINING VIRTUAL CENTERS.

Effective October 1, 2013, section 1448 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3222c) is repealed.

SEC. 6115. HISPANIC-SERVING INSTITUTIONS.

Section 1455(c) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3241(c)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 6116. COMPETITIVE GRANTS PROGRAM FOR HISPANIC AGRICULTURAL WORKERS AND YOUTH.

Section 1456(e)(1) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3243(e)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a competitive grants program—

''(A) to fund fundamental and applied research and extension at Hispanic-serving agricultural colleges and universities in agriculture, human nutrition, food science, bioenergy, and environmental science; and

''(B) to award competitive grants to Hispanic-serving agricultural colleges and universities to provide for training in the food and agricultural sciences of Hispanic agricultural workers and Hispanic youth working in the food and agricultural sciences.''.

SEC. 6117. COMPETITIVE GRANTS FOR INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL SCIENCE AND EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

Section 1459A(c) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3292b(c)) is amended to read as follows:

''(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section—

''(1) such sums as are necessary for each of fiscal years 1999 through 2013; and

''(2) $5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 6118. REPEAL OF RESEARCH EQUIPMENT GRANTS.

Effective October 1, 2013, section 1462A of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3310a) is repealed.

SEC. 6119. UNIVERSITY RESEARCH.

Section 1463 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3311) is amended in both of subsections (a) and (b) by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 6120. EXTENSION SERVICE.

Section 1464 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3312) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 6121. AUDITING, REPORTING, BOOKKEEPING, AND ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS.

Section 1469 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3315) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by adding ''and'' at the end;

(B) by striking paragraph (3); and

(C) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (3);

(2) by redesignating subsections (b), (c), and (d) as subsections (d), (e), and (f), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsections:

''(b) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2) and notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may retain not more than 4 percent of amounts made available for agricultural research, extension, and teaching assistance programs for the administration of those programs authorized under this Act or any other Act.

''(2) EXCEPTIONS.—The limitation on administrative expenses under paragraph (1) shall not apply to peer panel expenses under subsection (d) or any other provision of law related to the administration of agricultural research, extension, and teaching assistance programs that contains a limitation on administrative expenses that is less than the limitation under paragraph (1).

''(c) AGREEMENTS WITH NON-FEDERAL ENTITIES.—

''(1) FORMER AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH FACILITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary, for purposes of supporting ongoing research and information dissemination activities, including supporting research and those activities through co-locating scientists and other technical personnel, sharing of laboratory and field equipment, and providing financial support, shall enter into grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, or other legal instruments with former Department of Agriculture agricultural research facilities.

''(2) AGREEMENTS WITH AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ORGANIZATIONS.—The Secretary, for purposes of receiving from a non-Federal agricultural research organization support for agricultural research, including staffing, laboratory and field equipment, or direct financial assistance, may enter into grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, or other legal instruments with a non-Federal agricultural research organization, the operation of which is consistent with the research mission and programs of an agricultural research facility of the Department of Agriculture.''.

SEC. 6122. SUPPLEMENTAL AND ALTERNATIVE CROPS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS AND TERMINATION.—Section 1473D of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3319d) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section—

''(1) such sums as are necessary for fiscal year 2013; and

''(2) $1,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

(b) COMPETITIVE GRANTS.—Section 1473D(c)(1) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3319d(c)(1)) is amended by striking ''use such research funding, special or competitive grants, or other means, as the Secretary determines,'' and inserting ''make competitive grants''.

SEC. 6123. CAPACITY BUILDING GRANTS FOR NLGCA INSTITUTIONS.

Section 1473F(b) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3319i(b)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 6124. AQUACULTURE ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.

(a) COMPETITIVE GRANTS.—Section 1475(b) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3322(b)) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting ''competitive'' before ''grants''.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 1477 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3324) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 1477. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subtitle—

''(1) $7,500,000 for each of fiscal years 1991 through 2013; and

''(2) $5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.

''(b) PROHIBITION ON USE.—Funds made available under this section may not be used to acquire or construct a building.''.

SEC. 6125. RANGELAND RESEARCH PROGRAMS.

Section 1483(a) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching

Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3336(a)) is amended by striking ''subtitle'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''subtitle—

''(1) $10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1991 through 2013; and

''(2) $2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 6126. SPECIAL AUTHORIZATION FOR BIOSECURITY PLANNING AND RESPONSE.

Section 1484(a) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3351(a)) is amended by striking ''response such sums as are necessary'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''response—

''(1) such sums as are necessary for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2013; and

''(2) $10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 6127. DISTANCE EDUCATION AND RESIDENT INSTRUCTION GRANTS PROGRAM FOR INSULAR AREA INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

(a) DISTANCE EDUCATION GRANTS FOR INSULAR AREAS.—

(1) COMPETITIVE GRANTS.—Section 1490(a) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3362(a)) is amended by striking ''or noncompetitive''.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 1490(f) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3362(f)) is amended by striking ''section'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''section—

''(1) such sums as are necessary for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2013; and

''(2) $2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

(b) RESIDENT INSTRUCTION GRANTS FOR INSULAR AREAS.—Section 1491(c) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3363(c)) is amended by striking ''such sums as are necessary'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''to carry out this section—

''(1) such sums as are necessary for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2013; and

''(2) $2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 6128. MATCHING FUNDS REQUIREMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3101 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new subtitle:

''Subtitle P—General Provisions

''SEC. 1492. MATCHING FUNDS REQUIREMENT.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The recipient of a competitive grant that is awarded by the Secretary under a covered law shall provide funds, in-kind contributions, or a combination of both, from sources other than funds provided through such grant in an amount at least equal to the amount of such grant.

''(b) EXCEPTION.—The matching funds requirement under subsection (a) shall not apply to grants awarded—

''(1) to a research agency of the Department of Agriculture; or

''(2) to an entity eligible to receive funds under a capacity and infrastructure program (as defined in section 251(f)(1)(C) of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6971(f)(1)(C))), including a partner of such entity.

''(c) COVERED LAW.—In this section, the term 'covered law' means each of the following provisions of law:

''(1) This title.

''(2) Title XVI of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5801 et seq.).

''(3) The Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7601 et seq.).

''(4) Part III of subtitle E of title VII of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 3202 et seq.).

''(5) The Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act (7 U.S.C. 450i).''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (9) of subsection (b) of the Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act (7 U.S.C. 450i(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking subparagraph (B);

(2) in the heading, by inserting ''FOR EQUIPMENT GRANTS'' after ''FUNDS'';

(3) by striking ''(A) EQUIPMENT GRANTS.—''; and

(4) by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and moving the margins of such subparagraphs two ems to the left.

(c) APPLICATION TO AMENDMENTS.—

(1) NEW GRANTS.—Section 1492 of the National Agricultural, Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977, as added by subsection (a), shall apply with respect to grants described in such section awarded after October 1, 2013, unless the provision of a covered law under which such grants are awarded specifically exempts such grants from the matching funds requirement under such section.

(2) EXISTING GRANTS.—A matching funds requirement in effect on or before October 1, 2013, under a covered law shall continue to apply to a grant awarded under such provision of law on or before that date.

SEC. 6129. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING EXPANSION OF THE LAND GRANT PROGRAM TO INCLUDE ENHANCED FUNDING AND ADDITIONAL INSTITUTIONS.

It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) institutions of higher education designated under the Act of August 30, 1890 (commonly known, and referred to in this section, as the ''Second Morrill Act''; 7 U.S.C. 321 et seq.) have played an integral role in the education and advancement of agriculture and mechanic arts for over a century;

(2) in addition to those institutions, a number of colleges and universities have fulfilled similar and parallel missions in successfully training and graduating generations of students who have gone on to be leaders in their field;

(3) the colleges and universities, both with and without designation under the Second Morrill Act, fulfill a vital role to the future of industry, opportunities for increased job creation, and the strength of agriculture in the United States;

(4) Congress must ensure that the United States' higher education framework and policies meet the needs of young individuals in the United States, and that students from across the country are able to choose from a variety of institutions and programs that will equip them with the skills and training necessary to achieve their individual goals; and

(5) as Congress and the agricultural community generally consider policies and approaches to improve research, extension, and education in the agricultural sciences, expansion of the land grant program under the Second Morrill Act to include enhanced funding and additional institutions should be considered.

Subtitle B—Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990

SEC. 6201. BEST UTILIZATION OF BIOLOGICAL APPLICATIONS.

Section 1624 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5814) is amended in the first sentence—

(1) by striking ''$40,000,000 for each fiscal year''; and

(2) by inserting ''$40,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2018'' after ''chapter''.

SEC. 6202. INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS.

Section 1627(d) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5821(d)) is amended to read as follows:

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section through the National Institute of Food and Agriculture $20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2018.''.

SEC. 6203. SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFER PROGRAM.

Section 1628(f) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5831(f)) is amended to read as follows:

''(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section—

''(1) such sums as are necessary for fiscal year 2013; and

''(2) $5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 6204. NATIONAL TRAINING PROGRAM.

Section 1629(i) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5832(i)) is amended to read as follows:

''(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the National Training Program $20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2018.''.

SEC. 6205. NATIONAL GENETICS RESOURCES PROGRAM.

Section 1635(b) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5844(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''such funds as may be necessary''; and

(2) by striking ''subtitle'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''subtitle—

''(1) such sums as are necessary for each of fiscal years 1991 through 2013; and

''(2) $1,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 6206. REPEAL OF NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL WEATHER INFORMATION SYSTEM.

Effective October 1, 2013, subtitle D of title XVI of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5851 et seq.) is repealed.

SEC. 6207. REPEAL OF RURAL ELECTRONIC COMMERCE EXTENSION PROGRAM.

Effective October 1, 2013, section 1670 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5923) is repealed.

SEC. 6208. REPEAL OF AGRICULTURAL GENOME INITIATIVE.

Effective October 1, 2013, section 1671 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5924) is repealed.

SEC. 6209. HIGH-PRIORITY RESEARCH AND EXTENSION INITIATIVES.

Section 1672 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5925) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence of subsection (a), by striking ''subsections (e) through (i)'' and inserting ''subsections (e), (f), and (g)'';

(2) in subsection (b)(2), in the first sentence, by striking ''subsections (e) through (i)'' and inserting '' 'subsections (e), (f), and (g)' '';

(3) by striking subsections (e), (f), and (i);

(4) by redesignating subsections (g), (h), and (j) as subsections (e), (f), and (h), respectively;

(5) in subsection (f) (as redesignated by paragraph (4))—

(A) by striking ''2012'' each place it appears in paragraphs (1)(B), (2)(B), and (3) and inserting ''2018''; and

(B) in paragraph (4)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by inserting ''and honey bee health disorders'' after ''collapse''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by inserting '', including best management practices'' after ''strategies'';

(6) by inserting after subsection (f) (as redesignated by paragraph (4)) the following new subsection:

''(g) COFFEE PLANT HEALTH INITIATIVE.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a coffee plant health initiative to address the critical needs of the coffee industry by—

''(A) developing and disseminating science-based tools and treatments to combat the coffee berry borer (*Hypothenemus hampei*); and

''(B) establishing an area-wide integrated pest management program in areas affected by, or areas at risk of, being affected by the coffee berry borer.

''(2) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—The Secretary may carry out the coffee plant health initiative through—

''(A) Federal agencies, including the Agricultural Research Service and the National Institute of Food and Agriculture;

''(B) National Laboratories;

''(C) institutions of higher education;

''(D) research institutions or organizations;

''(E) private organizations or corporations;

''(F) State agricultural experiment stations;

''(G) individuals; or

''(H) groups consisting of 2 or more entities or individuals described in subparagraphs (A) through (G).

''(3) PROJECT GRANTS AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary shall—

''(A) enter into cooperative agreements with eligible entities, as appropriate; and

''(B) award grants on a competitive basis.

''(4) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection $2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''; and

(7) in subsection (h) (as redesignated by paragraph (4)), by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 6210. REPEAL OF NUTRIENT MANAGEMENT RESEARCH AND EXTENSION INITIATIVE.

Effective October 1, 2013, section 1672A of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5925a) is repealed.

SEC. 6211. ORGANIC AGRICULTURE RESEARCH AND EXTENSION INITIATIVE.

Section 1672B of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5925b) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (e) and inserting the following new subsection:

''(e) FARM BUSINESS MANAGEMENT ENCOURAGED.—Following the completion of a peer review process for grant proposals received under this section, the Secretary shall give a priority to grant proposals found in the review process to be scientifically meritorious using the same criteria the Secretary uses to give priority to grants under section 1672D(b).''; and

(2) in subsection (f)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the heading of such paragraph, by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018'';

(ii) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(iii) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(C) $20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the heading of such paragraph, by striking ''2009 THROUGH 2012'' and inserting ''2014 THROUGH 2018''; and

(ii) by striking ''2009 through 2012'' and inserting ''2014 through 2018''.

SEC. 6212. REPEAL OF AGRICULTURAL BIO-ENERGY FEEDSTOCK AND ENERGY EFFICIENCY RESEARCH AND EXTENSION INITIATIVE.

(a) REPEAL.—Effective October 1, 2013, section 1672C of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5925e) is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 251(f)(1)(D) of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6971(f)(1)(D)) is amended—

(1) by striking clause (xi); and

(2) by redesignating clauses (xii) and (xiii) as clauses (xi) and (xii), respectively.

SEC. 6213. FARM BUSINESS MANAGEMENT.

Section 1672D(d) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5925f(d)) is amended by striking ''such sums as are necessary to carry out this section.'' and inserting the following: ''to carry out this section—

''(1) such sums as are necessary for fiscal year 2013; and

''(2) $5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 6214. CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE.

The Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 is amended by inserting after section 1672D (7 U.S.C. 5925f) the following new section:

''SEC. 1673. CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE.

''(a) FUNDING PRIORITIES.—The Secretary shall prioritize centers of excellence established for specific agricultural commodities for the receipt of funding for any competitive research or extension program administered by the Secretary.

''(b) COMPOSITION.—A center of excellence is composed of 1 or more of the eligible entities specified in subsection (b)(7) of the Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act (7 U.S.C. 450i(b)(7)) that provide financial or in-kind support to the center of excellence.

''(c) CRITERIA FOR CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE.—

''(1) REQUIRED EFFORTS.—The criteria for consideration to be recognized as a center of excellence shall include efforts—

''(A) to ensure coordination and cost effectiveness by reducing unnecessarily duplicative efforts regarding research, teaching, and extension;

''(B) to leverage available resources by using public/private partnerships among agricultural industry groups, institutions of higher education, and the Federal Government;

''(C) to implement teaching initiatives to increase awareness and effectively disseminate solutions to target audiences through extension activities; and

''(D) to increase the economic returns to rural communities by identifying, attracting, and directing funds to high-priority agricultural issues.

''(2) ADDITIONAL EFFORTS.—Where practicable, the criteria for consideration to be recognized as a center of excellence shall include efforts to improve teaching capacity and infrastructure at colleges and universities (including land-grant institutions, schools of forestry, schools of veterinary medicine, and NLGCA Institutions).''.

SEC. 6215. REPEAL OF RED MEAT SAFETY RESEARCH CENTER.

Effective October 1, 2013, section 1676 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5929) is repealed.

SEC. 6216. ASSISTIVE TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM FOR FARMERS WITH DISABILITIES.

Section 1680(c)(1) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5933(c)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''is'' and inserting ''are''; and

(2) by striking ''section'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''section—

''(A) $6,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1999 through 2013; and

''(B) $3,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 6217. NATIONAL RURAL INFORMATION CENTER CLEARINGHOUSE.

Section 2381(e) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 3125b(e)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

Subtitle C—Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998

SEC. 6301. RELEVANCE AND MERIT OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH, EXTENSION, AND EDUCATION FUNDED BY THE DEPARTMENT.

Section 103(a)(2) of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7613(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) in the heading by striking ''MERIT REVIEW OF EXTENSION'' and inserting ''RELEVANCE AND MERIT REVIEW OF RESEARCH, EXTENSION,'';

(2) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by inserting ''relevance and'' before ''merit''; and

(B) by striking ''extension or education'' and inserting ''research, extension, or education''; and

(3) in subparagraph (B), by inserting ''on a continuous basis'' after ''procedures''.

SEC. 6302. INTEGRATED RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND EXTENSION COMPETITIVE GRANTS PROGRAM.

Section 406(f) of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7626(f)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 6303. REPEAL OF COORDINATED PROGRAM OF RESEARCH, EXTENSION, AND EDUCATION TO IMPROVE VIABILITY OF SMALL AND MEDIUM SIZE DAIRY, LIVESTOCK, AND POULTRY OPERATIONS.

(a) REPEAL.—Effective October 1, 2013, section 407 of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7627) is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 251(f)(1)(D) of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6971(f)(1)(D)), as amended by section 6212(b), is further amended—

(1) by striking clause (xi) (as redesignated by section 6212(b)); and

(2) by redesignating clause (xii) (as redesignated by section 6212(b)) as clause (xi).

SEC. 6304. FUSARIUM GRAMINEARUM GRANTS.

Section 408(e) of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7628(e)) is amended to read as follows:

''(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section—

''(1) such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 1999 through 2013; and

''(2) $7,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 6305. REPEAL OF BOVINE JOHNE'S DISEASE CONTROL PROGRAM.

Effective October 1, 2013, section 409 of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7629) is repealed.

SEC. 6306. GRANTS FOR YOUTH ORGANIZATIONS.

Section 410(d) of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7630(d)) is amended by striking ''section such sums as are necessary'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''section—

''(1) such sums as are necessary for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2013; and

''(2) $3,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 6307. SPECIALTY CROP RESEARCH INITIATIVE.

Section 412 of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7632) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''and genomics'' and inserting ''genomics, and other methods''; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by inserting ''handling and processing,'' after ''production efficiency,'';

(2) by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following new subsection:

''(d) RESEARCH PROJECTS.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall award competitive grants on the basis of—

''(1) an initial scientific peer review conducted by a panel of subject matter experts from Federal agencies, non-Federal entities, and the specialty crop industry; and

''(2) a final funding determination made by the Secretary based on a review and ranking for merit, relevance, and impact conducted by a panel of specialty crop industry representatives for the specific specialty crop.''; and

(3) in subsection (h)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''(1) MANDATORY FUNDING FOR FISCAL YEARS 2008 THROUGH 2012.—Of the funds'' and inserting the following:

''(1) MANDATORY FUNDING.—

''(A) FISCAL YEARS 2008 THROUGH 2012.—Of the funds''; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(B) SUBSEQUENT FUNDING.—Of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Secretary shall make available to carry out this section—

''(i) $50,000,000 for fiscal years 2014 and 2015;

''(ii) $55,000,000 for fiscal years 2016 and 2017; and

''(iii) $65,000,000 for fiscal year 2018 and each fiscal year thereafter.''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the heading, by striking ''2008 Through 2012'' and inserting ''2014 Through 2018''; and

(ii) by striking ''2008 through 2012'' and inserting ''2014 through 2018''.

SEC. 6308. FOOD ANIMAL RESIDUE AVOIDANCE DATABASE PROGRAM.

Section 604(e) of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7642(e)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 6309. REPEAL OF NATIONAL SWINE RESEARCH CENTER.

Effective October 1, 2013, section 612 of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–185; 112 Stat. 605) is repealed.

SEC. 6310. OFFICE OF PEST MANAGEMENT POLICY.

Section 614(f) of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7653(f)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''such sums as are necessary''; and

(2) by striking ''section'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''section—

''(1) such sums as are necessary for each of fiscal years 1999 through 2013; and

''(2) $3,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 6311. REPEAL OF STUDIES OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH, EXTENSION, AND EDUCATION.

Effective October 1, 2013, subtitle C of title VI of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7671 et seq.) is repealed.

Subtitle D—Other Laws

SEC. 6401. CRITICAL AGRICULTURAL MATERIALS ACT.

Section 16(a) of the Critical Agricultural Materials Act (7 U.S.C. 178n(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''such sums as are necessary''; and

(2) by striking ''Act'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''Act—

''(1) such sums as are necessary for each of fiscal years 1991 through 2013; and

''(2) $2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 6402. EQUITY IN EDUCATIONAL LAND-GRANT STATUS ACT OF 1994.

(a) DEFINITION OF 1994 INSTITUTIONS.—Section 532 of the Equity in Educational Land-Grant Status Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 301 note; Public Law 103–382) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (8), by striking ''Memorial'';

(2) in paragraph (26), by striking ''Community'';

(3) by striking paragraphs (5), (10), and (27);

(4) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (6), (7), (8), (9), (14), (15), (16), (17), (18), (19), (20), (21), (22), (23), (24), (25), (26), (28), (29), (30), (31), (32), (33), and (34) as paragraphs (2), (3), (4), (7), (8), (9), (5), (10), (15), (17), (18), (19), (20), (22), (23), (24), (25), (32), (26), (27), (28), (29), (30), (31), (33), (34), (35), and (14), respectively, and transferring the paragraphs so as to appear in numerical order;

(5) by inserting before paragraph (2) (as so redesignated), the following new paragraph:

''(1) Aaniih Nakoda College.'';

(6) by inserting after paragraph (5) (as so redesignated), the following new paragraph:

''(6) College of the Muscogee Nation.'';

(7) by inserting after paragraph (15) (as so redesignated) the following new paragraph:

''(16) Keweenaw Bay Ojibwa Community College.''; and

(8) by inserting after paragraph (20) (as so redesignated) the following new paragraph:

''(21) Navajo Technical College.''.

(b) ENDOWMENT FOR 1994 INSTITUTIONS.—Section 533(b) of the Equity in Educational Land-Grant Status Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 301 note; Public Law 103–382) is amended in the first sentence by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

(c) INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY BUILDING GRANTS.—Section 535 of the Equity in Educational Land-Grant Status Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 301 note; Public Law 103–382) is amended by striking ''2012'' each place it appears in subsections (b)(1) and (c) and inserting ''2018''.

(d) RESEARCH GRANTS.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 536(c) of the Equity in Educational Land-Grant Status Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 301 note; Public Law 103–382) is amended in the first sentence by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

(2) RESEARCH GRANT REQUIREMENTS.—Section 536(b) of the Equity in Educational Land-Grant Status Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 301 note; Public Law 103–382) is amended by striking ''with at least 1 other land-grant college or university'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''with—

''(1) the Agricultural Research Service of the Department of Agriculture; or

''(2) at least 1—

''(A) other land-grant college or university (exclusive of another 1994 Institution);

''(B) non-land-grant college of agriculture (as defined in section 1404 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3103)); or

''(C) cooperating forestry school (as defined in that section).''.

SEC. 6403. RESEARCH FACILITIES ACT.

Section 6(a) of the Research Facilities Act (7 U.S.C. 390d(a)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 6404. REPEAL OF CARBON CYCLE RESEARCH.

Effective October 1, 2013, section 221 of the Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000 (7 U.S.C. 6711) is repealed.

SEC. 6405. COMPETITIVE, SPECIAL, AND FACILITIES RESEARCH GRANT ACT.

(a) EXTENSION.—Subsection (b)(11)(A) of the Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act (7 U.S.C. 450i(b)(11)(A)) is amended in the matter preceding clause (i) by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

(b) PRIORITY AREAS.—Subsection (b)(2) of the Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act (7 U.S.C. 450i(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) in clause (vi), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in clause (vii), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new clause:

''(viii) plant-based foods that are major sources of nutrients of concern (as determined by the Secretary).'';

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) in clause (vii), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in clause (viii), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new clauses:

''(ix) the research and development of surveillance methods, vaccines, vaccination delivery systems, or diagnostic tests for pests and diseases (especially zoonotic diseases) in wildlife reservoirs presenting a potential concern to public health or domestic livestock and pests and diseases in minor species (including deer, elk, and bison); and

''(x) the identification of animal drug needs and the generation and dissemination of data for safe and effective therapeutic applications of animal drugs for minor species and minor uses of such drugs in major species.'';

(3) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) in clause (ii), by inserting before the semicolon '', including the effects of plant-based foods that are major sources of nutrients of concern on diet and health'';

(B) in clause (iii), by inserting before the semicolon '', including plant-based foods that are major sources of nutrients of concern'';

(C) in clause (iv), by inserting before the semicolon '', including postharvest practices conducted with respect to plant-based foods that are major sources of nutrients of concern''; and

(D) in clause (v), by inserting before the period '', including improving the functionality of plant-based foods that are major sources of nutrients of concern'';

(4) in subparagraph (D)—

(A) by redesignating clauses (iv), (v), and (vi) as clauses (v), (vi), and (vii), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after clause (iii) the following new clause:

''(iv) the effectiveness of conservation practices and technologies designed to address nutrient losses and improve water quality;''; and

(5) in subparagraph (F)—

(A) in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting ''economics,'' after ''trade,'';

(B) by redesignating clauses (v) and (vi) as clauses (vi) and (vii), respectively; and

(C) by inserting after clause (iv) the following new clause:

''(v) the economic costs, benefits, and viability of producers adopting conservation

practices and technologies designed to improve water quality;''.

(c) GENERAL ADMINISTRATION.—Subsection (b)(4) of the Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act (7 U.S.C. 450i(b)(4)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (E), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(F) establish procedures under which a commodity board established under a commodity promotion law (as such term is defined under section 501(a) of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7401(a))) or a State commodity board (or other equivalent State entity) may directly submit to the Secretary proposals for requests for applications to specifically address particular issues related to the priority areas specified in paragraph (2).''.

(d) SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS.—Subsection (b)(6) of the Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act (7 U.S.C. 450i(b)(6)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(E) to eligible entities to carry out the specific research proposals submitted under procedures established under paragraph (4)(F).''.

(e) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—Subsection (b)(7)(G) of the Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act (7 U.S.C. 450i(b)(7)(G)) is amended by striking ''or corporations'' and inserting '', foundations, or corporations''.

(f) INTER-REGIONAL RESEARCH PROJECT NUMBER 4.—Subsection (e) of the Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act (7 U.S.C. 450i(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking ''minor use pesticides'' and inserting ''pesticides for minor agricultural use and for use on specialty crops (as defined in section 3 of the Specialty Crop Competitiveness Act of 2004 (7 U.S.C. 1621 note)),''; and

(2) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by inserting ''and for use on specialty crops'' after ''minor agricultural use'';

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(C) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (G); and

(D) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraphs:

''(C) prioritize potential pest management technology for minor agricultural use and for use on specialty crops;

''(D) conduct research to develop the data necessary to facilitate pesticide registrations, reregistrations, and associated tolerances;

''(E) assist in removing trade barriers caused by residues of pesticides registered for minor agricultural use and for use on domestically grown specialty crops;

''(F) assist in the registration and reregistration of pest management technologies for minor agricultural use and for use on specialty crops; and''.

(g) EMPHASIS ON SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE.—The Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act (7 U.S.C. 450i) is amended by striking subsection (k).

SEC. 6406. RENEWABLE RESOURCES EXTENSION ACT OF 1978.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 6 of the Renewable Resources Extension Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 1675) is amended in the first sentence by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

(b) TERMINATION DATE.—Section 8 of the Renewable Resources Extension Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 1671 note; Public Law 95–306) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 6407. NATIONAL AQUACULTURE ACT OF 1980.

Section 10 of the National Aquaculture Act of 1980 (16 U.S.C. 2809) is amended by striking ''2012'' each place it appears and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 6408. REPEAL OF USE OF REMOTE SENSING DATA.

Effective October 1, 2013, section 892 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 5935) is repealed.

SEC. 6409. REPEAL OF REPORTS UNDER FARM SECURITY AND RURAL INVESTMENT ACT OF 2002.

(a) REPEAL OF REPORT ON PRODUCERS AND HANDLERS FOR ORGANIC PRODUCTS.—Effective October 1, 2013, section 7409 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 5925b note; Public Law 107–171) is repealed.

(b) REPEAL OF REPORT ON GENETICALLY MODIFIED PEST-PROTECTED PLANTS.—Effective October 1, 2013, section 7410 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–171; 116 Stat. 462) is repealed.

(c) REPEAL OF STUDY ON NUTRIENT BANKING.—Effective October 1, 2013, section 7411 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 5925a note; Public Law 107–171) is repealed.

SEC. 6410. BEGINNING FARMER AND RANCHER DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.

Section 7405 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 3319f) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking subparagraphs (A) through (R) and inserting the following new subparagraphs:

''(A) basic livestock, forest management, and crop farming practices;

''(B) innovative farm, ranch, and private, nonindustrial forest land transfer strategies;

''(C) entrepreneurship and business training;

''(D) financial and risk management training (including the acquisition and management of agricultural credit);

''(E) natural resource management and planning;

''(F) diversification and marketing strategies;

''(G) curriculum development;

''(H) mentoring, apprenticeships, and internships;

''(I) resources and referral;

''(J) farm financial benchmarking;

''(K) assisting beginning farmers or ranchers in acquiring land from retiring farmers and ranchers;

''(L) agricultural rehabilitation and vocational training for veterans; and

''(M) other similar subject areas of use to beginning farmers or ranchers.'';

(B) in paragraph (7), by striking ''and community-based organizations'' and inserting '', community-based organizations, and school-based agricultural educational organizations'';

(C) by striking paragraph (8) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(8) MILITARY VETERAN BEGINNING FARMERS AND RANCHERS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not less than 5 percent of the funds used to carry out this subsection for a fiscal year shall be used to support programs and services that address the needs of military veteran beginning farmers and ranchers.

''(B) COORDINATION PERMITTED.—A recipient of a grant under this section using the grant as described in subparagraph (A) may coordinate with a recipient of a grant under section 1680 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5933) in addressing the needs of military veteran beginning farmers and ranchers with disabilities.''; and

(D) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(11) LIMITATION ON INDIRECT COSTS.—A recipient of a grant under this section may not use more than 10 percent of the funds provided by the grant for the indirect costs of carrying out the initiatives described in paragraph (1).'';

(2) in subsection (h)(1)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018'';

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(C) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(D) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(C) $20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018, to remain available until expended.''; and

(3) in subsection (h)(2)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''2008 THROUGH 2012'' and inserting ''2014 THROUGH 2018''; and

(B) by striking ''2008 through 2012'' and inserting ''2014 through 2018''.

SEC. 6411. INCLUSION OF AMERICAN SAMOA, FEDERATED STATES OF MICRONESIA, AND NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS AS A STATE UNDER MCINTIRE-STENNIS COOPERATIVE FORESTRY ACT.

Section 8 of Public Law 87–788 (commonly known as the McIntire-Stennis Cooperative Forestry Act; 16 U.S.C. 582a–7) is amended by striking ''and Guam'' and inserting ''Guam, American Samoa, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands''.

Subtitle E—Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008

PART 1—AGRICULTURAL SECURITY

SEC. 6501. AGRICULTURAL BIOSECURITY COMMUNICATION CENTER.

Section 14112(c) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8912(c)) is amended to read as follows:

''(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section—

''(1) such sums as are necessary for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2013; and

''(2) $2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 6502. ASSISTANCE TO BUILD LOCAL CAPACITY IN AGRICULTURAL BIOSECURITY PLANNING, PREPARATION, AND RESPONSE.

Section 14113 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8913) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2)—

(A) by striking ''such sums as may be necessary''; and

(B) by striking ''subsection'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''subsection—

''(A) such sums as are necessary for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2013; and

''(B) $15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''; and

(2) in subsection (b)(2), by striking ''is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection—

''(A) $25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2013; and

''(B) $15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 6503. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT OF AGRICULTURAL COUNTERMEASURES.

Section 14121(b) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8921(b)) is

amended by striking ''is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section—

''(1) $50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2013; and

''(2) $15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 6504. AGRICULTURAL BIOSECURITY GRANT PROGRAM.

Section 14122(e) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8922(e)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''sums as are necessary''; and

(2) by striking ''section'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''section—

''(1) such sums as are necessary for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2013, to remain available until expended; and

''(2) $5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018, to remain available until expended.''.

PART 2—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 6511. ENHANCED USE LEASE AUTHORITY PILOT PROGRAM.

Section 308 of the Federal Crop Insurance Reform and Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 3125a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(6)(A), by striking ''5 years'' and inserting ''10 years''; and

(2) in subsection (d)(2), by striking ''1, 3, and 5 years'' and inserting ''6, 8, and 10 years''.

SEC. 6512. GRAZINGLANDS RESEARCH LABORATORY.

Section 7502 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–246; 122 Stat. 2019) is amended by striking ''5-year period'' and inserting ''10-year period''.

SEC. 6513. BUDGET SUBMISSION AND FUNDING.

Section 7506 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 7614c) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following new subsection:

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) COVERED PROGRAM.—The term 'covered program' means—

''(A) each research program carried out by the Agricultural Research Service or the Economic Research Service for which annual appropriations are requested in the annual budget submission of the President; and

''(B) each competitive program carried out by the National Institute of Food and Agriculture for which annual appropriations are requested in the annual budget submission of the President.

''(2) REQUEST FOR AWARDS.—The term 'request for awards' means a funding announcement published by the National Institute of Food and Agriculture that provides detailed information on funding opportunities at the Institute, including the purpose, eligibility, restriction, focus areas, evaluation criteria, regulatory information, and instructions on how to apply for such opportunities.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

''(e) ADDITIONAL PRESIDENTIAL BUDGET SUBMISSION REQUIREMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Each year, the President shall submit to Congress, together with the annual budget submission of the President, the information described in paragraph (2) for each funding request for a covered program.

''(2) INFORMATION DESCRIBED.—The information described in this paragraph includes—

''(A) baseline information, including with respect to each covered program—

''(i) the funding level for the program for the fiscal year preceding the year the annual budget submission of the President is submitted;

''(ii) the funding level requested in the annual budget submission of the President, including any increase or decrease in the funding level; and

''(iii) an explanation justifying any change from the funding level specified in clause (i) to the level specified in clause (ii);

''(B) with respect to each covered program that is carried out by the Economic Research Service or the Agricultural Research Service, the location and staff years of the program;

''(C) the proposed funding levels to be allocated to, and the expected publication date, scope, and allocation level for, each request for awards to be published under or associated with—

''(i) each priority area specified in subsection (b)(2) of the Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act (7 U.S.C. 450i(b)(2));

''(ii) each research and extension project carried out under section 1621(a) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5811(a));

''(iii) each grant to be awarded under section 1672B(a) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5925b(a));

''(iv) each grant awarded under section 412(d) of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7632(d)); and

''(v) each grant awarded under 7405(c)(1) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 3319f(c)(1)); or

''(D) any other information the Secretary determines will increase congressional oversight with respect to covered programs.

''(3) PROHIBITION.—Unless the President submits the information described in paragraph (2)(C) for a fiscal year, the President may not carry out any program during the fiscal year that is authorized under—

''(A) subsection (b) of the Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act (7 U.S.C. 450i(b));

''(B) section 1621 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5811);

''(C) section 1672B of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5925b);

''(D) section 412 of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7632); or

''(E) section 7405 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 3319f).

''(f) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.—Each year on a date that is not later than the date on which the President submits the annual budget, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report containing a description of the agricultural research, extension, and education activities carried out by the Federal Government during the fiscal year that immediately precedes the year for which the report is submitted, including—

''(1) a review of the extent to which those activities—

''(A) are duplicative or overlap within the Department of Agriculture; or

''(B) are similar to activities carried out by—

''(i) other Federal agencies;

''(ii) the States (including the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and other territories or possessions of the United States);

''(iii) institutions of higher education (as defined in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001)); or

''(iv) the private sector; and

''(2) for each report submitted under this section on or after January 1, 2013, a 5-year projection of national priorities with respect to agricultural research, extension, and education, taking into account domestic needs.''.

SEC. 6514. RESEARCH AND EDUCATION GRANTS FOR THE STUDY OF ANTIBIOTIC-RESISTANT BACTERIA.

Section 7521(c) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 3202(c)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 6515. REPEAL OF FARM AND RANCH STRESS ASSISTANCE NETWORK.

Effective October 1, 2013, section 7522 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 5936) is repealed.

SEC. 6516. REPEAL OF SEED DISTRIBUTION.

Effective October 1, 2013, section 7523 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 415–1) is repealed.

SEC. 6517. NATURAL PRODUCTS RESEARCH PROGRAM.

Section 7525(e) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 5937(e)) is amended to read as follows:

''(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $7,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 6518. SUN GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7526 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8114) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(4)(B), by striking ''the Department of Energy'' and inserting ''other appropriate Federal agencies (as determined by the Secretary)'';

(2) in subsection (c)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''multistate'' and all that follows through the period and inserting ''integrated, multistate research, extension, and education programs on technology development and technology implementation.'';

(B) by striking subparagraph (C); and

(C) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (C);

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''in accordance with paragraph (2)'';

(ii) by striking ''gasification'' and inserting ''bioproducts''; and

(iii) by striking ''the Department of Energy'' and inserting ''other appropriate Federal agencies'';

(B) by striking paragraph (2); and

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively; and

(4) in subsection (g), by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 7526(f)(1) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8114(f)(1)) is amended by striking ''subsection (c)(1)(D)(i)'' and inserting ''subsection (c)(1)(C)(i)''.

SEC. 6519. REPEAL OF STUDY AND REPORT ON FOOD DESERTS.

Effective October 1, 2013, section 7527 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–246; 122 Stat. 2039) is repealed.

SEC. 6520. REPEAL OF AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH AND EDUCATION.

Effective October 1, 2013, section 7529 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 5938) is repealed.

Subtitle F—Miscellaneous Provisions

SEC. 6601. AGREEMENTS WITH NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS FOR NATIONAL ARBORETUM.

Section 6 of the Act of March 4, 1927 (20 U.S.C. 196), is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(1) negotiate agreements for the National Arboretum with nonprofit scientific or educational organizations, the interests of which are complementary to the mission of the National Arboretum, or nonprofit organizations that support the purpose of the National Arboretum, except that the net proceeds of the organizations from the agreements shall be used exclusively for research and educational work for the benefit of the National Arboretum and the operation and maintenance of the facilities of the National Arboretum, including enhancements, upgrades, restoration, and conservation;''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) RECOGNITION OF DONORS.—A non-profit organization that entered into an agreement under subsection (a)(1) may recognize donors if that recognition is approved in advance by the Secretary. In considering whether to approve such recognition, the Secretary shall broadly exercise the discretion of the Secretary to the fullest extent allowed under Federal law in effect on the date of the enactment of this subsection.''.

SEC. 6602. COTTON DISEASE RESEARCH REPORT.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the fungus fusarium oxysporum f. sp. vasinfectum race 4 (referred to in this section as ''FOV Race 4'') and the impact of such fungus on cotton, including—

(1) an overview of the threat FOV Race 4 poses to the cotton industry in the United States;

(2) the status and progress of Federal research initiatives to detect, contain, or eradicate FOV Race 4, including current FOV Race 4-specific research projects; and

(3) a comprehensive strategy to combat FOV Race 4 that establishes—

(A) detection and identification goals;

(B) containment goals;

(C) eradication goals; and

(D) a plan to partner with the cotton industry in the United States to maximize resources, information sharing, and research responsiveness and effectiveness.

SEC. 6603. ACCEPTANCE OF FACILITY FOR AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE.

(a) CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZED.—Subject to subsections (b) and (c), the Secretary of Agriculture may authorize a non-Federal entity to construct, at no cost and without obligation to the Federal Government, a facility for use by the Agricultural Research Service on land owned by the Agricultural Research Service and managed by the Secretary.

(b) ACCEPTANCE OF GIFT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), upon the completion of the construction of the facility by the non-Federal entity under subsection (a), the Secretary shall accept the facility as a gift in accordance with Public Law 95–442 (7 U.S.C. 2269).

(2) CERTIFICATION.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall certify in advance that the acceptance under paragraph (1) complies with the limitations specified in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (c).

(c) LIMITATIONS.—

(1) VALUE.—The Secretary may not accept a facility as a gift under this section if the fair market value of the facility is more than $5,000,000.

(2) NO FEDERAL COST.—The Secretary shall not enter into any acquisitions, demonstrations, exchanges, grants, contracts, incentives, leases, procurements, sales, or other transaction authorities or arrangements that would obligate future appropriations with respect to the facility constructed under subsection (a).

(d) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—No facility may be accepted by the Secretary for use by the Agricultural Research Service under this section after September 30, 2018.

SEC. 6604. MISCELLANEOUS TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

Sections 7408 and 7409 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–246; 122 Stat. 2013) are both amended by striking ''Title III of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994'' and inserting ''Title III of the Federal Crop Insurance Reform and Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994''.

SEC. 6605. LEGITIMACY OF INDUSTRIAL HEMP RESEARCH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.), the Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1988 (41 U.S.C. 8101 et seq.), the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act of 1986 (20 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), or any other Federal law, an institution of higher education (as defined in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001)) may grow or cultivate industrial hemp if—

(1) the industrial hemp is grown or cultivated for purposes of agricultural research or other academic research; and

(2) the growing or cultivating of industrial hemp is allowed under the laws of the State in which such institution of higher education is located and such research occurs.

(b) INDUSTRIAL HEMP DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''industrial hemp'' means the plant *Cannabis sativa L.* and any part of such plant, whether growing or not, with a delta-9 tetrahydrocannabinol concentration of not more than 0.3 percent on a dry weight basis.

TITLE VII—FORESTRY

Subtitle A—Repeal of Certain Forestry Programs

SEC. 7001. FOREST LAND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 4 of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2103) is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 8002 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–171; 16 U.S.C. 2103 note) is amended by striking subsection (a).

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2013.

SEC. 7002. WATERSHED FORESTRY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 6 of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2103b) is repealed.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2013.

SEC. 7003. EXPIRED COOPERATIVE NATIONAL FOREST PRODUCTS MARKETING PROGRAM.

Section 18 of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2112) is repealed.

SEC. 7004. HISPANIC-SERVING INSTITUTION AGRICULTURAL LAND NATIONAL RESOURCES LEADERSHIP PROGRAM.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 8402 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (16 U.S.C. 1649a) is repealed.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2013.

SEC. 7005. TRIBAL WATERSHED FORESTRY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 303 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6542) is repealed.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2013.

SEC. 7006. SEPARATE FOREST SERVICE DECISIONMAKING AND APPEALS PROCESS.

Section 322 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1993 (Public Law 102–381; 16 U.S.C. 1612 note) is repealed. Section 428 of division E of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2012 (Public Law 112–74; 125 Stat. 1046; 16 U.S.C. 6515 note) shall not apply to any project or activity implementing a land and resource management plan developed under section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1604) that is categorically excluded from documentation in an environmental assessment or an environmental impact statement under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

Subtitle B—Reauthorization of Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 Programs

SEC. 7101. STATE-WIDE ASSESSMENT AND STRATEGIES FOR FOREST RESOURCES.

Section 2A(c) of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2101a(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4), by striking ''and'';

(2) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (6); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

''(5) as feasible, appropriate military installations where the voluntary participation and management of private or State-owned or other public forestland is able to support, promote, and contribute to the missions of such installations; and''.

SEC. 7102. FOREST LEGACY PROGRAM.

Subsection (m) of section 7 of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2103c) is amended to read as follows:

''(m) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—To carry out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated—

''(1) such sums as are necessary for fiscal year 2013; and

''(2) $55,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 7103. COMMUNITY FOREST AND OPEN SPACE CONSERVATION PROGRAM.

Subsection (g) of section 7A of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2103d) is amended to read as follows:

''(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—To carry out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated—

''(1) such sums as are necessary for fiscal year 2013; and

''(2) $1,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

Subtitle C—Reauthorization of Other Forestry-Related Laws

SEC. 7201. RURAL REVITALIZATION TECHNOLOGIES.

Section 2371(d)(2) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 6601(d)(2)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 7202. OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL FORESTRY.

Subsection (d) of section 2405 of the Global Climate Change Prevention Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 6704) is amended to read as follows:

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—To carry out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated—

''(1) such sums as are necessary for each of fiscal years 1996 through 2013; and

''(2) $6,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 7203. CHANGE IN FUNDING SOURCE FOR HEALTHY FORESTS RESERVE PROGRAM.

Section 508 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6578) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''IN GENERAL'' and inserting ''FISCAL YEARS 2009 THROUGH 2013'';

(2) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (d); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsections:

''(b) FISCAL YEARS 2014 THROUGH 2018.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out this section $9,750,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.

''(c) ADDITIONAL SOURCE OF FUNDS.—In addition to funds appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in subsection (b) for a fiscal year, the Secretary may use such amount of the funds appropriated for that fiscal year to carry out the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590a et seq.) as the Secretary determines necessary to cover the cost of technical assistance, management, and enforcement responsibilities for land enrolled in the healthy forests reserve program pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) of section 504.''.

SEC. 7204. STEWARDSHIP END RESULT CONTRACTING PROJECT AUTHORITY.

Section 347 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in section 101(e) of division A of Public Law 105–277; 16 U.S.C. 2104 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''2013'' and inserting ''2018''; and

(2) in subsection (c), by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(6) CONTRACT FOR SALE OF PROPERTY.—At the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, a contract entered into by the Forest Service under this section may be considered a contract for the sale of property under such terms as the Secretary may prescribe without regard to any other provision of law.

''(7) FIRE LIABILITY PROVISIONS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Chief and the Director shall issue for use in all contracts and agreements under this section fire liability provisions that are in substantially the same form as the fire liability provisions contained in—

''(A) integrated resource timber contracts, as described in the Forest Service contract numbered 2400–13, part H, section H.4; and

''(B) timber sale contracts conducted pursuant to section 14 of the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 472a).''.

Subtitle D—National Forest Critical Area Response

SEC. 7301. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) CRITICAL AREA.—The term ''critical area'' means an area of the National Forest System designated by the Secretary under section 7302.

(2) NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM.—The term ''National Forest System'' has the meaning given that term in section 11(a) of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1609(a)).

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 7302. DESIGNATION OF CRITICAL AREAS.

(a) DESIGNATION REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall designate critical areas within the National Forest System for the purposes of addressing—

(1) deteriorating forest health conditions in existence as of the date of the enactment of this Act due to insect infestation, drought, disease, or storm damage; and

(2) the future risk of insect infestations or disease outbreaks through preventative treatments.

(b) DESIGNATION METHOD.—In considering National Forest System land for designation as a critical area, the Secretary shall use—

(1) for purposes of subsection (a)(1), the most recent annual forest health aerial surveys of mortality and defoliation; and

(2) for purposes of subsection (a)(2), the National Insect and Disease Risk Map.

(c) TIME FOR INITIAL DESIGNATIONS.—The first critical areas shall be designated by the Secretary not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) DURATION OF DESIGNATION.—The designation of a critical area shall expire not later than 10 years after the date of the designation.

SEC. 7303. APPLICATION OF EXPEDITED PROCEDURES AND ACTIVITIES OF THE HEALTHY FORESTS RESTORATION ACT OF 2003 TO CRITICAL AREAS.

(a) APPLICABILITY.—Subject to subsections (b) through (e), title I of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6511 et seq.) (including the environmental analysis requirements of section 104 of that Act (16 U.S.C. 6514), the special administrative review process under section 105 of that Act (16 U.S.C. 6515), and the judicial review process under section 106 of that Act (16 U.S.C. 6516)), shall apply to all Forest Service projects and activities carried out in a critical area.

(b) APPLICATION OF OTHER LAW.—Section 322 of Public Law 102–381 (16 U.S.C. 1612 note; 106 Stat. 1419) shall not apply to projects conducted in accordance with this section.

(c) REQUIRED MODIFICATIONS.—In applying title I of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6511 et seq.) to Forest Service projects and activities in a critical area, the Secretary shall make the following modifications:

(1) The authority shall apply to the entire critical area, including land that is outside of a wildland-urban interface area or that does not satisfy any of the other eligibility criteria specified in section 102(a) of that Act (16 U.S.C. 6512(a)).

(2) All projects and activities of the Forest Service, including necessary connected actions (as described in section 1508.25(a)(1) of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation)), shall be considered to be authorized hazardous fuel reduction projects for purposes of applying the title.

(d) SMALLER PROJECTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a project conducted in a critical area in accordance with this section that comprises less than 10,000 acres shall be—

(A) considered an action categorically excluded from the requirements for an environmental assessment or an environmental impact statement under section 1508.4 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation); and

(B) exempt from the special administrative review process under section 105 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6515).

(2) EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN AREAS.—Paragraph (1) does not apply to—

(A) a component of the National Wilderness Preservation System;

(B) any Federal land on which, by Act of Congress or Presidential proclamation, the removal of vegetation is restricted or prohibited;

(C) a congressionally designated wilderness study area; or

(D) an area in which activities under paragraph (1) would be inconsistent with the applicable land and resource management plan.

(e) FOREST MANAGEMENT PLANS.—All projects and activities carried out in a critical area pursuant to this subtitle shall be consistent with the land and resource management plan established under section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1604) for the unit of the National Forest System containing the critical area.

SEC. 7304. GOOD NEIGHBOR AUTHORITY.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ELIGIBLE STATE.—The term ''eligible State'' means a State that contains National Forest System land.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(3) STATE FORESTER.—The term ''State forester'' means the head of a State agency with jurisdiction over State forestry programs in an eligible State.

(b) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS AND CONTRACTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may enter into a cooperative agreement or contract (including a sole source contract) with a State forester to authorize the State forester to provide the forest, rangeland, and watershed restoration, management, and protection services described in paragraph (2) on National Forest System land in the eligible State.

(2) AUTHORIZED SERVICES.—The forest, rangeland, and watershed restoration, management, and protection services referred to in paragraph (1) include the conduct of—

(A) activities to treat insect infected forests;

(B) activities to reduce hazardous fuels;

(C) activities involving commercial harvesting or other mechanical vegetative treatments; or

(D) any other activities to restore or improve forest, rangeland, and watershed health, including fish and wildlife habitat.

(3) STATE AS AGENT.—Except as provided in paragraph (6), a cooperative agreement or contract entered into under paragraph (1) may authorize the State forester to serve as the agent for the Secretary in providing the restoration, management, and protection services authorized under that paragraph.

(4) SUBCONTRACTS.—In accordance with applicable contract procedures for the eligible State, a State forester may enter into subcontracts to provide the restoration, management, and protection services authorized under a cooperative agreement or contract entered into under paragraph (1).

(5) TIMBER SALES.—Subsections (d) and (g) of section 14 of the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 472a) shall not apply to services performed under a cooperative agreement or contract entered into under paragraph (1).

(6) RETENTION OF NEPA RESPONSIBILITIES.—Any decision required to be made under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) with respect to any restoration, management, and protection services to be provided under this section by a State forester on National Forest System land shall not be delegated to a State forester or any other officer or employee of the eligible State.

(7) APPLICABLE LAW.—The restoration, management, and protection services to be provided under this section shall be carried out on a project-to-project basis under existing authorities of the Forest Service.

Subtitle E—Miscellaneous Provisions

SEC. 7401. REVISION OF STRATEGIC PLAN FOR FOREST INVENTORY AND ANALYSIS.

(a) REVISION REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall revise the strategic plan for forest inventory and analysis initially prepared pursuant to section 3(e) of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Research Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 1642(e)) to address the requirements imposed by subsection (b).

(b) ELEMENTS OF REVISED STRATEGIC PLAN.—In revising the strategic plan, the Secretary of Agriculture shall describe in detail the organization, procedures, and funding needed to achieve each of the following:

(1) Complete the transition to a fully annualized forest inventory program and include inventory and analysis of interior Alaska.

(2) Implement an annualized inventory of trees in urban settings, including the status and trends of trees and forests, and assessments of their ecosystem services, values, health, and risk to pests and diseases.

(3) Report information on renewable biomass supplies and carbon stocks at the local, State, regional, and national level, including by ownership type.

(4) Engage State foresters and other users of information from the forest inventory and analysis in reevaluating the list of core data variables collected on forest inventory and analysis plots with an emphasis on demonstrated need.

(5) Improve the timeliness of the timber product output program and accessibility of the annualized information on that database.

(6) Foster greater cooperation among the forest inventory and analysis program, research station leaders, and State foresters and other users of information from the forest inventory and analysis.

(7) Promote availability of and access to non-Federal resources to improve information analysis and information management.

(8) Collaborate with the Natural Resources Conservation Service, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and United States Geological Survey to integrate remote sensing, spatial analysis techniques, and other new technologies in the forest inventory and analysis program.

(9) Understand and report on changes in land cover and use.

(10) Expand existing programs to promote sustainable forest stewardship through increased understanding, in partnership with other Federal agencies, of the over 10 million family forest owners, their demographics, and the barriers to forest stewardship.

(11) Implement procedures to improve the statistical precision of estimates at the sub-State level.

(c) SUBMISSION OF REVISED STRATEGIC PLAN.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall submit the revised strategic plan to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate.

SEC. 7402. FOREST SERVICE PARTICIPATION IN ACES PROGRAM.

The Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service, may use funds derived from conservation-related programs executed on National Forest System lands to utilize the Agriculture Conservation Experienced Services Program established pursuant to section 1252 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3851) to provide technical services for conservation-related programs and authorities carried out by the Secretary on National Forest System lands.

SEC. 7403. GREEN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER RESEARCH UNDER FOREST AND RANGELAND RENEWABLE RESOURCES RESEARCH ACT OF 1978.

(a) ADDITIONAL FORESTRY AND RANGELAND RESEARCH AND EDUCATION HIGH PRIORITY.—Section 3(d)(2) of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Research Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 1642(d)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(F) Science and technology transfer, through the Forest Products Laboratory, to demonstrate the beneficial characteristics of wood as a green building material, including investments in life cycle assessment for wood products.''.

(b) RESEARCH FACILITIES AND COOPERATION.—Section 4 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Research Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 1643) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) The Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate an annual report describing, for the period covered by the report—

''(1) the research conducted in furtherance of the research and education priority specified in section 3(d)(2)(F);

''(2) the number of buildings the Forest Service has built with wood as the primary structural material; and

''(3) the investments made by the Forest Service in green building wood promotion.''.

SEC. 7404. EXTENSION OF STEWARDSHIP CONTRACTS AUTHORITY REGARDING USE OF DESIGNATION BY PRESCRIPTION TO ALL THINNING SALES UNDER NATIONAL FOREST MANAGEMENT ACT OF 1976.

Subsection (g) of section 14 of the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 472a) is amended to read as follows:

''(g) Designation, including but not limited to, marking when necessary, designation by description, or designation by prescription, and supervision of harvesting of trees, portions of trees, or forest products shall be conducted by persons employed by the Secretary of Agriculture. Such persons shall have no personal interest in the purchase or harvest of such products and shall not be directly or indirectly in the employment of the purchaser thereof. Designation by prescription and designation by prescription shall be considered valid methods for designation, and may be supervised by use of post-harvest cruise, sample weight scaling, or other methods determined by the Secretary to be appropriate.''.

SEC. 7405. REIMBURSEMENT OF FIRE FUNDS EXPENDED BY A STATE FOR MANAGEMENT AND SUPPRESSION OF CERTAIN WILDFIRES.

(a) DEFINITION OF STATE.—In this section, the term ''State'' includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

(b) REIMBURSEMENT AUTHORITY.—If a State seeks reimbursement for amounts expended for resources and services provided to another State for the management and suppression of a wildfire, the Secretary of Agriculture, subject to subsections (c) and (d)—

(1) may accept the reimbursement amounts from the other State; and

(2) shall pay those amounts to the State seeking reimbursement.

(c) MUTUAL ASSISTANCE AGREEMENT.—As a condition of seeking and providing reimbursement under subsection (b), the State seeking reimbursement and the State providing reimbursement must each have a mutual assistance agreement with the Forest Service or an agency of the Department of the Interior for providing and receiving wildfire management and suppression resources and services.

(d) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe the terms and conditions determined to be necessary to carry out subsection (b).

(e) EFFECT ON PRIOR REIMBURSEMENTS.—Any acceptance of funds or reimbursements made by the Secretary of Agriculture before the date of enactment of this Act that otherwise would have been authorized under this section shall be considered to have been made in accordance with this section.

SEC. 7406. ABILITY OF NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM LANDS TO MEET NEEDS OF LOCAL WOOD PRODUCING FACILITIES FOR RAW MATERIALS.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to Congress a report containing—

(1) an assessment of the raw material needs of wood producing facilities located within the boundaries of each unit of the National Forest System or located outside of the unit, but within 100 miles of such boundaries;

(2) the volume of timber which would be available if the unit of the National Forest System annually sold its Allowable Sale Quantity in the current Forest Plan;

(3) the volume of timber actually sold and harvested from each unit of the National Forest System for the previous decade;

(4) a comparison of the volume actually sold and harvested from the previous decade to the Allowable Sale Quantity calculated in that decade by preceding or current forest plans; and

(5) an assessment of the ability of each unit of National Forest System to meet the needs of these facilities for raw materials.

SEC. 7407. REPORT ON THE NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM ROADS.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the following:

(1) The total mileage of National Forest System roads and trails not meeting forest plan standards and guidelines.

(2) The total amount, in dollars, of Capital Improvement & Maintenance deferred maintenance needs for National Forest System roads, including a five-year analysis in the trend in total deferred maintenance costs.

(3) The sources of funds used for capital improvement & maintenance roads, including appropriated funds, mandatory funds, and receipts from activities on National Forest System lands.

(4) The impact of road closures on recreational activities and timber harvesting.

(5) The impact on land acquisitions, whether through fee acquisition, donation, or easement, on the maintenance backlog.

SEC. 7408. FOREST SERVICE LARGE AIRTANKER AND AERIAL ASSET FIREFIGHTING RECAPITALIZATION PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the availability of appropriations, the Secretary, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service, may establish a large airtanker and aerial asset lease program in accordance with this section.

(b) AIRCRAFT REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out the program described in subsection (a), the Secretary may enter into a multiyear lease contract for up to five aircraft that meet the criteria—

(1) described in the Forest Service document entitled ''Large Airtanker Modernization Strategy'' and dated February 10, 2012, for large airtankers; and

(2) determined by the Secretary, for other aerial assets.

(c) LEASE TERMS.—The term of any individual lease agreement into which the Secretary enters under this section shall be—

(1) up to five years, inclusive of any options to renew or extend the initial lease term; and

(2) in accordance with section 3903 of title 41, United States Code.

(d) PROHIBITION.—No lease entered into under this section shall provide for the purchase of the aircraft by, or the transfer of ownership to, the Forest Service.

SEC. 7409. LAND CONVEYANCE, JEFFERSON NATIONAL FOREST IN WISE COUNTY, VIRGINIA.

(a) CONVEYANCE REQUIRED.—Upon payment by the Association of the consideration under subsection (b) and the costs under subsection (d), the Secretary shall, subject to valid existing rights, convey to the Association all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of National Forest System land in the Jefferson National Forest in Wise County, Virginia, consisting of approximately 0.70 acres and containing the Mullins and Sturgill Cemetery and an easement to provide access to the parcel, as generally depicted on the map.

(b) CONSIDERATION.—

(1) FAIR MARKET VALUE.—As consideration for the land conveyed under subsection (a), the Association shall pay to the Secretary cash in an amount equal to the market value

of the land, as determined by an appraisal approved by the Secretary and conducted in conformity with the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions and section 206 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1716).

(2) DEPOSIT.—The consideration received by the Secretary under paragraph (1) shall be deposited into the general fund of the Treasury of the United States for the purposes of deficit reduction.

(c) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the land to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary.

(d) COSTS.—The Association shall pay to the Secretary at closing the reasonable costs of the survey, the appraisal, and any administrative and environmental analyses required by law.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ASSOCIATION.—The term ''Association'' means the Mullins and Sturgill Cemetery Association of Pound, Virginia.

(2) MAP.—The term ''map'' means the map titled ''Mullins and Sturgill Cemetery'' dated March 1, 2013.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(f) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under subsection (a) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

SEC. 7410. CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION FOR FOREST PROJECTS IN RESPONSE TO EMERGENCIES.

In the case of National Forest System land damaged by a natural disaster regarding which the President declares a disaster or emergency pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), any forest project carried out to clean up or restore the damaged National Forest System land during the two-year period beginning on the date of the declaration shall be categorically excluded from the requirements relating to environmental assessments or environmental impact statements under section 1508.4 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations.

TITLE VIII—ENERGY

SEC. 8001. DEFINITION OF RENEWABLE ENERGY SYSTEM.

Section 9001 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8101) is amended by—

(1) striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(4) BIOBASED PRODUCT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'biobased product' means a product determined by the Secretary to be a commercial or industrial product (other than food or feed) that is—

''(i) composed, in whole or in significant part, of biological products, including renewable domestic agricultural materials and forestry materials; or

''(ii) an intermediate ingredient or feedstock.

''(B) INCLUSION.—The term 'biobased product', with respect to forestry materials, includes forest products that meet biobased content requirements, notwithstanding the market share the product holds, the age of the product, or whether the market for the product is new or emerging.'';

(2) redesignating paragraphs (9), (10), (11), (12), (13), and (14) as paragraphs (10), (11), (12), (13), (14), and (16);

(3) inserting after paragraph (8), the following new paragraph:

''(9) FOREST PRODUCT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'forest product' means a product made from materials derived from the practice of forestry or the management of growing timber.

''(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term 'forest product' includes—

''(i) pulp, paper, paperboard, pellets, lumber, and other wood products; and

''(ii) any recycled products derived from forest materials.''; and

(4) inserting after paragraph (14) (as so redesignated), the following new paragraph:

''(15) RENEWABLE ENERGY SYSTEM.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the term 'renewable energy system' means a system that—

''(i) produces usable energy from a renewable energy source; and

''(ii) may include distribution components necessary to move energy produced by such system to the initial point of sale.

''(B) LIMITATION.—A system described in subparagraph (A) may not include a mechanism for dispensing energy at retail.''.

SEC. 8002. BIOBASED MARKETS PROGRAM.

Section 9002(h) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8102(h)) is amended by—

(1) striking ''(h) FUNDING.—'' and all that follows through ''to carry out this section, there'' and inserting ''(h) FUNDING.—There''; and

(2) striking ''2013'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 8003. BIOREFINERY ASSISTANCE.

(a) PROGRAM ADJUSTMENTS.—Section 9003 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8103) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by striking ''to eligible entities'' and all that follows through ''guarantees for loans'' and inserting ''to eligible entities guarantees for loans'';

(2) by striking subsection (d);

(3) by redesignating subsections (e), (f), (g), and (h) as subsections (d), (e), (f), and (g), respectively; and

(4) in subsection (d) (as so redesignated)—

(A) by striking ''subsection (c)(2)'' each place it appears and inserting ''subsection (c)''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(C), by striking ''subsection (h)'' and inserting ''subsection (g)''.

(b) FUNDING.—Section 9003(g) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002, as redesignated by subsection (a)(3), is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (1);

(2) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (1);

(3) in paragraph (1) (as so redesignated)—

(A) in the heading, by striking ''DISCRETIONARY FUNDING'' and inserting ''FISCAL YEARS 2009 THROUGH 2013''; and

(B) by striking ''In addition to any other funds made available to carry out this section, there'' and inserting ''There''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) FISCAL YEARS 2014 THROUGH 2018.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $75,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 8004. REPOWERING ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Section 9004(d) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8104(d)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (1);

(2) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (1);

(3) in paragraph (1) (as so redesignated)—

(A) in the heading, by striking ''DISCRETIONARY FUNDING'' and inserting ''FISCAL YEARS 2009 THROUGH 2013''; and

(B) by striking ''In addition to any other funds made available to carry out this section, there'' and inserting ''There''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) FISCAL YEARS 2014 THROUGH 2018.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 8005. BIOENERGY PROGRAM FOR ADVANCED BIOFUELS.

Section 9005(g) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8105(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (1);

(2) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (1);

(3) in paragraph (1) (as so redesignated)—

(A) in the heading, by striking ''DISCRETIONARY FUNDING'' and inserting ''FISCAL YEARS 2009 THROUGH 2013''; and

(B) by striking ''In addition to any other funds made available to carry out this section, there'' and inserting ''There''; and

(4) by inserting after paragraph (1) (as so redesignated) the following new paragraph:

''(2) FISCAL YEARS 2014 THROUGH 2018.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 8006. BIODIESEL FUEL EDUCATION PROGRAM.

Section 9006(d) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8106(d)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (1);

(2) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (1);

(3) in the heading of paragraph (1) (as so redesignated), by striking ''AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS'' and inserting ''FISCAL YEAR 2013''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) FISCAL YEARS 2014 THROUGH 2018.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 8007. RURAL ENERGY FOR AMERICA PROGRAM.

(a) TIERED APPLICATION PROCESS.—Section 9007(c) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8107(c)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph:

''(2) TIERED APPLICATION PROCESS.—In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary shall establish a three-tiered application, evaluation, and oversight process that varies based on the cost of the proposed project with the process most simplified for projects referred to in subparagraph (A), more comprehensive for projects referred to in subparagraph (B), and most comprehensive for projects referred to in subparagraph (C). The three tiers for such process shall be as follows:

''(A) TIER 1.—Projects for which the cost of the project funded under this subsection is not more than $80,000.

''(B) TIER 2.—Projects for which the cost of the project funded under this subsection is more than $80,000 but less than $200,000.

''(C) TIER 3.—Projects for which the cost of the project funded under this subsection is $200,000 or more.''.

(b) FUNDING.—Section 9007(g) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8107(g)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraphs (1) and (2);

(2) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (1);

(3) in paragraph (1) (as so redesignated)—

(A) in the heading, by striking ''DISCRETIONARY FUNDING'' and inserting ''FISCAL YEARS 2009 THROUGH 2013''; and

(B) by striking ''In addition to any other funds made available to carry out this section, there'' and inserting ''There''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) FISCAL YEARS 2014 THROUGH 2018.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $45,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 8008. BIOMASS RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

Section 9008(h) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8108(h)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (1);

(2) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (1);

(3) in paragraph (1) (as so redesignated)—

(A) in the heading, by striking ''DISCRETIONARY FUNDING'' and inserting ''FISCAL YEARS 2009 THROUGH 2013''; and

(B) by striking ''In addition to any other funds made available to carry out this section, there'' and inserting ''There''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) FISCAL YEARS 2014 THROUGH 2018.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 8009. FEEDSTOCK FLEXIBILITY PROGRAM FOR BIOENERGY PRODUCERS.

Section 9010(b) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8110(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking ''2013'' and inserting ''2018''; and

(2) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking ''2013'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 8010. BIOMASS CROP ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Section 9011 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8111) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking paragraph (6); and

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (7) and (8) as paragraphs (6) and (7), respectively;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking ''Program to'' and all that follows through ''support the establishment'' and inserting ''Program to support the establishment'';

(B) by striking ''; and'' and inserting a period; and

(C) by striking paragraph (2);

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (2)(B)—

(i) in clause (viii), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(ii) by redesignating clause (ix) as clause (x); and

(iii) by inserting after clause (viii) the following new clause:

''(ix) existing project areas that have received funding under this section and the continuation of funding of such project areas to advance the maturity of such project areas; and''; and

(B) in paragraph (5)(C)(ii)—

(i) by striking subclause (III); and

(ii) by redesignating subclauses (IV) and (V) as subclauses (III) and (IV), respectively;

(4) by striking subsection (d);

(5) by redesignating subsections (e) and (f) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively; and

(6) in subsection (e) (as so redesignated)—

(A) by striking paragraph (1);

(B) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (1);

(C) in paragraph (1) (as so redesignated)—

(i) by striking ''FISCAL YEAR 2013'' and all that follows through ''There is authorized'' and inserting ''FISCAL YEAR 2013.—There is authorized''; and

(ii) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as paragraph (3) and moving the margin of such paragraph (as so redesignated) two ems to the left;

(D) by inserting after paragraph (1), the following new paragraph:

''(2) FISCAL YEARS 2014 THROUGH 2018.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $75,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''; and

(E) in paragraph (3) (as redesignated by subparagraph (C)(ii) of this paragraph), by striking ''this paragraph'' and inserting ''this subsection''.

SEC. 8011. COMMUNITY WOOD ENERGY PROGRAM.

Section 9013(e) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8113(e)) is amended by striking ''carry out this section'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''carry out this section—

''(1) $5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2013; and

''(2) $2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 8012. REPEAL OF BIOFUELS INFRASTRUCTURE STUDY.

Section 9002 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–246; 122 Stat. 2095) is repealed.

SEC. 8013. REPEAL OF RENEWABLE FERTILIZER STUDY.

Section 9003 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–246; 122 Stat. 2096) is repealed.

SEC. 8014. ENERGY EFFICIENCY REPORT FOR USDA FACILITIES.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report on energy use and energy efficiency projects at Department of Agriculture facilities.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An analysis of energy use by Department of Agriculture facilities.

(2) A list of energy audits that have been conducted at such facilities.

(3) A list of energy efficiency projects that have been conducted at such facilities.

(4) A list of energy savings projects that could be achieved with enacting a consistent, timely, and proper mechanical insulation maintenance program and upgrading mechanical insulation at such facilities.

TITLE IX—HORTICULTURE

SEC. 9001. SPECIALTY CROPS MARKET NEWS ALLOCATION.

Section 10107(b) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 1622b(b)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 9002. REPEAL OF GRANT PROGRAM TO IMPROVE MOVEMENT OF SPECIALTY CROPS.

Effective October 1, 2013, section 10403 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 1622c) is repealed.

SEC. 9003. FARMERS MARKET AND LOCAL FOOD PROMOTION PROGRAM.

Section 6 of the Farmer-to-Consumer Direct Marketing Act of 1976 (7 U.S.C. 3005) is amended—

(1) in the heading of such section, by inserting ''**AND LOCAL FOOD**'' after ''**FARMERS' MARKET**'';

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) by inserting ''and Local Food'' after ''Farmers' Market'';

(B) by striking ''farmers' markets and to promote''; and

(C) by striking the period and inserting ''and assist in the development of local food business enterprises.'';

(3) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following new subsection:

''(b) PROGRAM PURPOSES.—The purposes of the Program are to increase domestic consumption of, and consumer access to, locally and regionally produced agricultural products by assisting in the development, improvement, and expansion of—

''(1) domestic farmers' markets, roadside stands, community-supported agriculture programs, agritourism activities, and other direct producer-to-consumer market opportunities; and

''(2) local and regional food business enterprises that process, distribute, aggregate, and store locally or regionally produced food products.'';

(4) in subsection (c)(1)—

(A) by inserting ''or other agricultural business entity'' after ''cooperative''; and

(B) by inserting '', including a community supported agriculture network or association'' after ''association'';

(5) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f);

(6) by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

''(e) FUNDS REQUIREMENTS FOR ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—

''(1) MATCHING FUNDS.—An entity receiving a grant under this section for a project to carry out a purpose described in subsection (b)(2) shall provide matching funds in the form of cash or an in-kind contribution in an amount equal to 25 percent of the total cost of such project.

''(2) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—An eligible entity may not use a grant or other assistance provided under this section for the purchase, construction, or rehabilitation of a building or structure.''; and

(7) in subsection (f) (as redesignated by paragraph (5))—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(D) $30,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.'';

(B) by striking paragraphs (3) and (5);

(C) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (6); and

(D) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraphs:

''(3) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.

''(4) USE OF FUNDS.—Of the funds made available to carry out this section for a fiscal year, 50 percent of such funds shall be used for the purposes described in paragraph (1) of subsection (b) and 50 percent of such funds shall be used for the purposes described in paragraph (2) of such subsection.

''(5) LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Not more than 3 percent of the total amount made available to carry out this section for a fiscal year may be used for administrative expenses.''.

SEC. 9004. ORGANIC AGRICULTURE.

(a) ORGANIC PRODUCTION AND MARKET DATA INITIATIVES.—Section 7407(d)(2) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 5925c(d)(2)) is amended—

(1) in the heading of such paragraph, by striking ''2008 THROUGH 2012'' and inserting ''2014 THROUGH 2018''; and

(2) by striking ''2008 through 2012'' and inserting ''2014 through 2018''.

(b) MODERNIZATION AND TECHNOLOGY UPGRADE FOR NATIONAL ORGANIC PROGRAM.—Section 2122 of the Organic Foods Production Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 6521) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) MODERNIZATION AND TECHNOLOGY UPGRADE FOR NATIONAL ORGANIC PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall modernize database and technology systems of the national organic program.''.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR NATIONAL ORGANIC PROGRAM.—Effective October 1, 2013, section 2123(b)(6) of the Organic

Foods Production Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 6522(b)(6)) is amended to read as follows:

''(6) $11,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

(d) NATIONAL ORGANIC CERTIFICATION COST-SHARE PROGRAM.—Effective October 1, 2013, section 10606 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 6523) is repealed.

(e) EXEMPTION OF CERTIFIED ORGANIC PRODUCTS FROM PROMOTION ORDER ASSESSMENTS.—Subsection (e) of section 501 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7401) is amended to read as follows:

''(e) EXEMPTION OF CERTIFIED ORGANIC PRODUCTS FROM PROMOTION ORDER ASSESSMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any provision of a commodity promotion law, a person that produces, handles, markets, or imports organic products may be exempt from the payment of an assessment under a commodity promotion law with respect to any agricultural commodity that is certified as 'organic' or '100 percent organic' (as defined in part 205 of title 7, Code of Federal Regulations or a successor regulation).

''(2) SPLIT OPERATIONS.—The exemption described in paragraph (1) shall apply to the certified 'organic' or '100 percent organic' (as defined in part 205 of title 7 of the Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation)) products of a producer, handler, or marketer regardless of whether the agricultural commodity subject to the exemption is produced, handled, or marketed by a person that also produces, handles, or markets conventional or nonorganic agricultural products, including conventional or nonorganic agricultural products of the same agricultural commodity as that for which the exemption is claimed.

''(3) APPROVAL.—The Secretary shall approve the exemption of a person under this subsection if the person maintains a valid organic certificate issued under the Organic Foods Production Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 6501 et seq.).

''(4) TERMINATION OF EFFECTIVENESS.—This subsection shall be effective until the date on which the Secretary issues an organic commodity promotion order in accordance with subsection (f).

''(5) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall promulgate regulations concerning eligibility and compliance for an exemption under paragraph (1).''.

(f) ORGANIC COMMODITY PROMOTION ORDER.—Section 501 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7401) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) ORGANIC COMMODITY PROMOTION ORDER.—

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

''(A) CERTIFIED ORGANIC FARM.—The term 'certified organic farm' has the meaning given the term in section 2103 of the Organic Foods Production Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 6502).

''(B) COVERED PERSON.—The term 'covered person' means a producer, handler, marketer, or importer of an organic agricultural commodity.

''(C) DUAL-COVERED AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY.—The term 'dual-covered agricultural commodity' means an agricultural commodity that—

''(i) is produced on a certified organic farm; and

''(ii) is covered under both—

''(I) an organic commodity promotion order issued pursuant to paragraph (2); and

''(II) any other agricultural commodity promotion order issued under section 514.

''(2) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary may issue an organic commodity promotion order under section 514 that includes any agricultural commodity that—

''(A) is produced or handled (as defined in section 2103 of the Organic Foods Production Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 6502)) and that is certified to be sold or labeled as 'organic' or '100 percent organic' (as defined in part 205 of title 7, Code of Federal Regulations or a successor regulation)); or

''(B) is imported with a valid organic certificate (as defined in such part).

''(3) ELECTION.—If the Secretary issues an organic commodity promotion order described in paragraph (2), a covered person may elect, for applicable dual-covered agricultural commodities and in the sole discretion of the covered person, whether to be assessed under the organic commodity promotion order or another applicable agricultural commodity promotion order.

''(4) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall promulgate regulations concerning eligibility and compliance for an exemption under paragraph (1).''.

(g) DEFINITION OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY.—Section 513(1) of the Commodity Promotion, Research, and Information Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7412(1)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (E) and (F) as subparagraphs (F) and (G), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following new subparagraph:

''(E) products, as a class, that are produced on a certified organic farm (as defined in section 2103 of the Organic Foods Production Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 6502)) and that are certified to be sold or labeled as 'organic' or '100 percent organic' (as defined in part 205 of title 7, Code of Federal Regulations or a successor regulation);''.

SEC. 9005. INVESTIGATIONS AND ENFORCEMENT OF THE ORGANIC FOODS PRODUCTION ACT OF 1990.

The Organic Foods Production Act of 1990 is amended by inserting after section 2122 (7 U.S.C. 6521) the following new section:

''SEC. 2122A. INVESTIGATION AND ENFORCEMENT.

''(a) EXPEDITED ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING.—The Secretary shall establish an expedited administrative hearing procedure under which the Secretary may suspend or revoke the organic certification of a producer or handler or the accreditation of a certifying agent in accordance with subsection (d). Such a hearing may be conducted in addition to a hearing conducted pursuant to section 2120.

''(b) INVESTIGATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may take such investigative actions as the Secretary considers to be necessary to carry out this title—

''(A) to verify the accuracy of any information reported or made available under this title; and

''(B) to determine, with regard to actions, practices, or information required under this title, whether a person covered by this title has committed a violation of this title.

''(2) INVESTIGATIVE POWERS.—The Secretary may administer oaths and affirmations, subpoena witnesses, compel attendance of witnesses, take evidence, and require the production of any records required to be maintained under section 2112(d) or 2116(c) that are relevant to the investigation.

''(c) UNLAWFUL ACT.—It shall be unlawful and a violation of this title for any person covered by this title—

''(1) to refuse to provide information required by the Secretary under this title; or

''(2) to violate—

''(A) a suspension or revocation of the organic certification of a producer or handler; or

''(B) a suspension or revocation of the accreditation of a certifying agent.

''(d) ENFORCEMENT.—

''(1) SUSPENSION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may, after notice and opportunity for an expedited administrative hearing, suspend the organic certification of a producer, handler or the accreditation of a certifying agent if—

''(i) the Secretary, during such expedited administrative hearing, proved that—

''(I) in the case of a producer or handler, the producer or handler—

''(aa) has recklessly committed a violation of a term, condition, or requirement of the organic plan to which the producer or handler is subject; or

''(bb) has recklessly committed, or is recklessly committing, a violation of this title; or

''(II) in the case of a certifying agent, the agent has recklessly committed, or is recklessly committing, a violation of this title; or

''(ii) the producer, handler, or certifying agent has waived such expedited administrative hearing.

''(B) ISSUANCE OF SUSPENSION.—A suspension issued under this paragraph shall be issued not later than five days after the date on which—

''(i) the expedited administrative hearing referred to in clause (i) of subparagraph (A) concludes; or

''(ii) the Secretary receives notice of the waiver referred to in clause (ii) of such subparagraph.

''(C) DURATION OF SUSPENSION.—The period of a suspension issued under this paragraph shall be not more than 90 days, beginning on the date on which the Secretary issues the suspension.

''(D) CURING OF VIOLATIONS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may not issue a suspension of a certification or accreditation under this paragraph if the producer, handler, or certifying agent subject to such suspension—

''(I) before the date on which the suspension would otherwise have been issued, cures, or corrects the deficiency giving rise to, the violation for which the certification or accreditation would have been suspended; or

''(II) within a reasonable timeframe (as determined by the Secretary), enters into a settlement with the Secretary regarding a deficiency referred to in subclause (I).

''(ii) DURING SUSPENSION.—The Secretary shall terminate the suspension of an organic certification or accreditation issued under this paragraph if the producer, handler, or certifying agent subject to such suspension cures the violation for which the certification or accreditation was suspended under this paragraph before the date on which the period of the suspension ends.

''(2) REVOCATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may, after notice and opportunity for an expedited administrative hearing under this section and an expedited administrative appeal under section 2121, revoke the organic certification of a producer or handler, or the accreditation of a certifying agent if—

''(i) the Secretary, during such hearing, proved that—

''(I) in the case of a producer or handler, the producer or handler—

''(aa) has knowingly committed an egregious violation of a term, condition, or requirement of the organic plan to which the producer or handler is subject; or

''(bb) has knowingly committed, or is knowingly committing, an egregious violation of this title; or

''(II) in the case of a certifying agent, the agent has knowingly committed, or is knowingly committing, an egregious violation of this title; or

''(ii) the producer, handler, or certifying agent has waived such expedited administrative hearing and such an expedited administrative appeal.

''(B) INITIATION OF REVOCATION PROCEEDINGS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary finds, during an investigation or during the period of a suspension under paragraph (1), that a producer, handler, or certifying agent has knowingly committed an egregious violation of this title, the Secretary shall initiate revocation proceedings with respect to such violation not later than 30 days after the date on which the producer, handler, or certifying agent receives notice of such finding in accordance with clause (ii). The Secretary may not initiate revocation proceedings with respect to such violation after the date on which that 30-day period ends.

''(ii) NOTICE.—Not later than five days after the date on which the Secretary makes the finding described in clause (i), the Secretary shall provide to the producer, handler, or certifying agent notice of such finding.

''(e) APPEAL.—

''(1) SUSPENSIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The suspension of a certification or accreditation under subsection (d)(1) by the Secretary may be appealed to a United States district court in accordance with section 2121(b) not later than 30 business days after the date on which the person subject to such suspension receives notice of the suspension.

''(B) SUSPENSION FINAL AND CONCLUSIVE.—A suspension of a certification or accreditation under subsection (d)(1) by the Secretary shall be final and conclusive—

''(i) in the case of a suspension that is appealed under subparagraph (A) within the 30-day period specified in such subparagraph, on the date on which judicial review of such suspension is complete; or

''(ii) in the case of a suspension that is not so appealed, the date on which such 30-day period ends.

''(2) REVOCATIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The revocation of a certification or an accreditation under subsection (d)(2) by the Secretary may be appealed to a United States district court in accordance with section 2121(b) not later than 30 business days after the date on which the person subject to such revocation receives notice of the revocation.

''(B) REVOCATION FINAL AND CONCLUSIVE.—A revocation of a certification or an accreditation under subsection (d)(2) by the Secretary shall be final and conclusive—

''(i) in the case of a revocation that is appealed under subparagraph (A) within the 30-day period specified in such subparagraph, on the date on which judicial review of such revocation is complete; or

''(ii) in the case of a revocation that is not so appealed, the date on which such 30-day period ends.

''(3) STANDARDS FOR REVIEW OF SUSPENSIONS AND REVOCATIONS.—A suspension or revocation of a certification or an accreditation under subsection (d) shall be reviewed in accordance with the standards of review specified in section 706(2) of title 5, United States Code.

''(f) NONCOMPLIANCE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If a person covered by this title fails to obey a revocation of a certification or an accreditation under subsection (d)(2) after such revocation has become final and conclusive or after the appropriate United States district court has entered a final judgment in favor of the Secretary, the United States may apply to the appropriate United States district court for enforcement of such revocation.

''(2) ENFORCEMENT.—If the court determines that the revocation was lawfully made and duly served and that the person violated the revocation, the court shall enforce the revocation.

''(3) CIVIL PENALTY.—If the court finds that the person violated the revocation of a certification or an accreditation under subsection (d)(2), the person shall be subject to one or more of the penalties provided in subsections (a) and (b) of section 2120.

''(g) VIOLATION OF THIS TITLE DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'violation of this title' means a violation specified in section 2120.''.

SEC. 9006. FOOD SAFETY EDUCATION INITIATIVES.

Section 10105 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 7655) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting '', including farm workers'' after ''industry'';

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(C) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(D) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) practices that prevent bacterial contamination of food, how to identify sources of food contamination, and other means of decreasing food contamination.''; and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 9007. SPECIALTY CROP BLOCK GRANTS.

Section 101 of the Specialty Crops Competitiveness Act of 2004 (7 U.S.C. 1621 note; Public Law 108–465) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking ''subsection (j)'' and inserting ''subsection (l)''; and

(B) by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018'';

(2) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following new subsection:

''(b) GRANTS BASED ON VALUE AND ACREAGE.—Subject to subsection (c), for each State whose application for a grant for a fiscal year that is accepted by the Secretary under subsection (f), the amount of the grant for such fiscal year to the State under this section shall bear the same ratio to the total amount made available under subsection (l)(1) for such fiscal year as—

''(1) the average of the most recent available value of specialty crop production in the State and the acreage of specialty crop production in the State, as demonstrated in the most recent Census of Agriculture data; bears to

''(2) the average of the most recent available value of specialty crop production in all States and the acreage of specialty crop production in all States, as demonstrated in the most recent Census of Agriculture data.'';

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) an assurance that any grant funds received under this section that are used for equipment or capital-related research costs determined to enhance the competitiveness of specialty crops—

''(A) shall be supplemented by the expenditure of State funds in an amount that is not less than 50 percent of such costs during the fiscal year in which such costs were incurred; and

''(B) shall be completely replaced by State funds on the day after the date on which such fiscal year ends.'';

(4) by redesignating subsection (j) as subsection (l);

(5) by inserting after subsection (i) the following new subsections:

''(j) MULTISTATE PROJECTS.—Not later than 180 days after the effective date of the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013, the Secretary of Agriculture shall issue guidance for the purpose of making grants to multistate projects under this section for projects involving—

''(1) food safety;

''(2) plant pests and disease;

''(3) research;

''(4) crop-specific projects addressing common issues; and

''(5) any other area that furthers the purposes of this section, as determined by the Secretary.

''(k) ADMINISTRATION.—

''(1) DEPARTMENT.—The Secretary of Agriculture may not use more than 3 percent of the funds made available to carry out this section for a fiscal year for administrative expenses.

''(2) STATES.—A State receiving a grant under this section may not use more than 8 percent of the funds received under the grant for a fiscal year for administrative expenses.''; and

(6) in subsection (l) (as redesignated by paragraph (4))—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) as subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), respectively, and moving the margins of such subparagraphs two ems to the right;

(B) by striking ''Of the funds'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Of the funds'';

(C) in paragraph (1) (as so designated)—

(i) in subparagraph (B) (as redesignated by subparagraph (A)), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (C) (as redesignated by subparagraph (A)), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

''(D) $72,500,000 for fiscal years 2014 through 2017; and

''(E) $85,000,000 for fiscal year 2018.''; and

(D) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) MULTISTATE PROJECTS.—Of the funds made available under paragraph (1), the Secretary may use to carry out subsection (j), to remain available until expended—

''(A) $1,000,000 for fiscal year 2014;

''(B) $2,000,000 for fiscal year 2015;

''(C) $3,000,000 for fiscal year 2016;

''(D) $4,000,000 for fiscal year 2017; and

''(E) $5,000,000 for fiscal year 2018.''.

SEC. 9008. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE CONSULTATION REGARDING ENFORCEMENT OF CERTAIN LABOR LAW PROVISIONS.

Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall consult with the Secretary of Labor regarding the restraining of shipments of agricultural commodities, or the confiscation of such commodities, by the Department of Labor for actual or suspected labor law violations in order to consider—

(1) the perishable nature of such commodities;

(2) the impact of such restraining or confiscation on the economic viability of farming operations; and

(3) the competitiveness of specialty crops through grants awarded to States under section 101 of the Specialty Crops Competitiveness Act of 2004 (7 U.S.C. 1621 note).

SEC. 9009. REPORT ON HONEY.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture, in consultation with persons affected by the potential establishment of a Federal standard for the identity of honey, shall submit to the Commissioner of Food and Drugs a report describing how an appropriate Federal standard for the

identity of honey would be in the interest of consumers, the honey industry, and United States agriculture.

(b) CONSIDERATIONS.—In preparing the report required under subsection (a), the Secretary shall take into consideration the March 2006, Standard of Identity citizens petition filed with the Food and Drug Administration, including any current industry amendments or clarifications necessary to update such petition.

SEC. 9010. BULK SHIPMENTS OF APPLES TO CANADA.

(a) BULK SHIPMENT OF APPLES TO CANADA.—Section 4 of the Export Apple Act (7 U.S.C. 584) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Apples in'' and inserting ''(a) Apples in''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(b) Apples may be shipped to Canada in bulk bins without complying with the provisions of this Act.''.

(b) DEFINITION OF BULK BIN.—Section 9 of the Export Apple Act (7 U.S.C. 589) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5) The term 'bulk bin' means a bin that contains a quantity of apples weighing more than 100 pounds.''.

(c) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall issue regulations to carry out the amendments made by this section.

SEC. 9011. CONSOLIDATION OF PLANT PEST AND DISEASE MANAGEMENT AND DISASTER PREVENTION PROGRAMS.

(a) RELOCATION OF LEGISLATIVE LANGUAGE RELATING TO NATIONAL CLEAN PLANT NETWORK.—Section 420 of the Plant Protection Act (7 U.S.C. 7721) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

''(e) NATIONAL CLEAN PLANT NETWORK.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a program to be known as the 'National Clean Plant Network' (referred to in this subsection as the 'Program').

''(2) REQUIREMENTS.—Under the Program, the Secretary shall establish a network of clean plant centers for diagnostic and pathogen elimination services—

''(A) to produce clean propagative plant material; and

''(B) to maintain blocks of pathogen-tested plant material in sites located throughout the United States.

''(3) AVAILABILITY OF CLEAN PLANT SOURCE MATERIAL.—Clean plant source material may be made available to—

''(A) a State for a certified plant program of the State; and

''(B) private nurseries and producers.

''(4) CONSULTATION AND COLLABORATION.—In carrying out the Program, the Secretary shall—

''(A) consult with—

''(i) State departments of agriculture; and

''(ii) land-grant colleges and universities and NLGCA Institutions (as those terms are defined in section 1404 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3103)); and

''(B) to the extent practicable and with input from the appropriate State officials and industry representatives, use existing Federal or State facilities to serve as clean plant centers.

''(5) FUNDING FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out the Program $5,000,000 for fiscal year 2013.''.

(b) FUNDING.—Subsection (f) of section 420 of the Plant Protection Act (7 U.S.C. 7721) (as so redesignated) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking ''and each fiscal year thereafter.'' and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(5) $62,500,000 for fiscal years 2014 through 2017; and

''(6) $75,000,000 for fiscal year 2018.''.

(c) REPEAL OF EXISTING PROVISION.—Section 10202 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 7761) is repealed.

(d) CLARIFICATION OF USE OF FUNDS FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—Section 420 of the Plant Protection Act (7 U.S.C. 7721), as amended by subsection (a), is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAW.—The use of Commodity Credit Corporation funds under this section to provide technical assistance shall not be considered an allotment or fund transfer from the Commodity Credit Corporation for purposes of the limit on expenditures for technical assistance imposed by section 11 of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act (15 U.S.C. 714i).''.

(e) USE OF FUNDS FOR CLEAN PLANT NETWORK.—Section 420 of the Plant Protection Act (7 U.S.C. 7721), as amended by subsections (a) and (d), is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(h) USE OF FUNDS FOR CLEAN PLANT NETWORK.—Of the funds made available under subsection (f) to carry out this section for a fiscal year, not less than $5,000,000 shall be available to carry out the national clean plant network under subsection (e).''.

SEC. 9012. MODIFICATION, CANCELLATION, OR SUSPENSION ON BASIS OF A BIOLOGICAL OPINION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except in the case of a voluntary request from a pesticide registrant to amend a registration under section 3 of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a), a registration of a pesticide may be modified, canceled, or suspended on the basis of the implementation of a Biological Opinion issued by the National Marine Fisheries Service or the United States Fish and Wildlife Service prior to the date of completion of the study referred to in subsection (b), or January 1, 2015, whichever is earlier, only if—

(1) the modification, cancellation, or suspension is undertaken pursuant to section 6 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 136d); and

(2) the Biological Opinion complies with the recommendations contained in the study referred to in subsection (b).

(b) NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES STUDY.—The study commissioned by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency on March 10, 2011, shall include, at a minimum, each of the following:

(1) A formal, independent, and external peer review, consistent with Office of Management and Budget policies, of each Biological Opinion described in subsection (a).

(2) Assessment of economic impacts of measures or alternatives recommended in each such Biological Opinion.

(3) An examination of the specific scientific and procedural questions and issues pertaining to economic feasibility contained in the June 23, 2011, letter sent to the Administrator (and other Federal officials) by the Chairmen of the Committee on Agriculture, the Committee on Natural Resources, and the Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations, of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 9013. USE AND DISCHARGES OF AUTHORIZED PESTICIDES.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2013''.

(b) USE OF AUTHORIZED PESTICIDES.—Section 3(f) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a(f)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5) USE OF AUTHORIZED PESTICIDES.—Except as provided in section 402(s) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, the Administrator or a State may not require a permit under such Act for a discharge from a point source into navigable waters of a pesticide authorized for sale, distribution, or use under this Act, or the residue of such a pesticide, resulting from the application of such pesticide.''.

(c) DISCHARGES OF PESTICIDES.—Section 402 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(s) DISCHARGES OF PESTICIDES.—

''(1) NO PERMIT REQUIREMENT.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a permit shall not be required by the Administrator or a State under this Act for a discharge from a point source into navigable waters of a pesticide authorized for sale, distribution, or use under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, or the residue of such a pesticide, resulting from the application of such pesticide.

''(2) EXCEPTIONS.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to the following discharges of a pesticide or pesticide residue:

''(A) A discharge resulting from the application of a pesticide in violation of a provision of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act that is relevant to protecting water quality, if—

''(i) the discharge would not have occurred but for the violation; or

''(ii) the amount of pesticide or pesticide residue in the discharge is greater than would have occurred without the violation.

''(B) Stormwater discharges subject to regulation under subsection (p).

''(C) The following discharges subject to regulation under this section:

''(i) Manufacturing or industrial effluent.

''(ii) Treatment works effluent.

''(iii) Discharges incidental to the normal operation of a vessel, including a discharge resulting from ballasting operations or vessel biofouling prevention.''.

SEC. 9014. SEED NOT PESTICIDE OR DEVICE FOR PURPOSES OF IMPORTATION.

Section 17(c) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136o(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentences: ''Solely for purposes of notifications of arrival upon importation, for purposes of this subsection, seed, including treated seed, shall not be considered a pesticide or device. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed as precluding or limiting the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to the importation or movement of plants, plant products, or seeds, under the Plant Protection Act (7 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.) or the Federal Seed Act (7 U.S.C. 1551 et seq.).''.

SEC. 9015. STAY OF REGULATIONS RELATED TO CHRISTMAS TREE PROMOTION, RESEARCH, AND INFORMATION ORDER.

Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall lift the administrative stay that was imposed by the rule entitled ''Christmas Tree Promotion, Research, and Information Order; Stay of Regulations'' and published by the Department of Agriculture on November 17, 2011 (76 Fed. Reg. 71241), on the regulations in subpart A of part 214 of title 7, Code of Federal Regulations, establishing an industry-funded promotion, research, and information program for fresh cut Christmas trees.

SEC. 9016. STUDY ON PROPOSED ORDER PERTAINING TO SULFURYL FLUORIDE.

Not later than two years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of

the Environmental Protection Agency, in conjunction with the Secretary of Agriculture, shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives a report on the potential economic and public health effects that would result from finalization of the proposed order published in the January 19, 2011, Federal Register (76 Fed. Reg. 3422) pertaining to the pesticide sulfuryl fluoride, including the anticipated impacts of such finalization on the production of an adequate, wholesome, and economical food supply and on farmers and related agricultural sectors.

SEC. 9017. STUDY ON LOCAL AND REGIONAL FOOD PRODUCTION AND PROGRAM EVALUATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall—

(1) collect data on the production and marketing of locally or regionally produced agricultural food products;

(2) facilitate interagency collaboration and data sharing on programs related to local and regional food systems; and

(3) monitor the effectiveness of programs designed to expand or facilitate local food systems.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall—

(1) collect and distribute comprehensive reporting of prices of locally or regionally produced agricultural food products;

(2) conduct surveys and analysis and publish reports relating to the production, handling, distribution, and retail sales of, and trend studies (including consumer purchasing patterns) on, locally or regionally produced agricultural food products;

(3) evaluate the effectiveness of existing programs in growing local and regional food systems, including—

(A) the impact of local food systems on job creation and economic development;

(B) the level of participation in the Farmers' Market and Local Food Promotion Program established under section 6 of the Farmer-to-Consumer Direct Marketing Act of 1976 (7 U.S.C. 3005), including the percentage of projects funded in comparison to applicants and the types of eligible entities receiving funds;

(C) the ability for participants to leverage private capital and a synopsis of the places from which non-Federal funds are derived; and

(D) any additional resources required to aid in the development or expansion of local and regional food systems;

(4) expand the Agricultural Resource Management Survey to include questions on locally or regionally produced agricultural food products; and

(5) seek to establish or expand private-public partnerships to facilitate, to the maximum extent practicable, the collection of data on locally or regionally produced agricultural food products, including the development of a nationally coordinated and regionally balanced evaluation of the redevelopment of locally or regionally produced food systems.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter until September 30, 2018, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report describing the progress that has been made in implementing this section and identifying any additional needs related to developing local and regional food systems.

SEC. 9018. ANNUAL REPORT ON INVASIVE SPECIES.

(a) INITIAL REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on invasive species.

(2) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The report under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A list of each invasive species that is in the United States as of the date of the report.

(B) For each invasive species listed under subparagraph (A)—

(i) the country from which the species originated;

(ii) the means in which the species entered the United States;

(iii) the year in which the species entered the United States;

(iv) the rate by which the entry of the species is increasing or decreasing;

(v) cost estimates, covering both the date of the report and future periods, of the cost of such species to the public and private sectors;

(vi) if cost estimates cannot be conducted under clause (v), a detailed explanation of why;

(vii) environmental impact estimates, covering both the date of the report and future periods, of the environmental impact of the species;

(viii) if environmental impact estimates cannot be conducted under clause (vii), a detailed explanation of why;

(ix) recommendations as to what steps are needed to combat the species;

(x) a description of the ongoing research occurring to combat the species; and

(xi) a description of any legal recourse available to people affected by the species.

(C) Any other matter the Secretary determines appropriate.

(3) PERIOD COVERED.—The report under paragraph (1) shall cover the period beginning in 1980 and ending on the date on which the report is submitted.

(b) ANNUAL UPDATED REPORTS.—Not later than October 1 of each fiscal year beginning after the date on which the report under paragraph (1) of subsection (a) is submitted, the Secretary shall submit annually to Congress an updated report, including an update to each of the matters described in paragraph (2) of such subsection.

(c) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary shall make each report under this section available to the public.

TITLE X—CROP INSURANCE

SEC. 10001. INFORMATION SHARING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 502(c) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1502(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) INFORMATION.—

''(A) REQUEST.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the Farm Service Agency shall, in a timely manner, provide to an agent or an approved insurance provider authorized by the producer any information (including Farm Service Agency Form 578s (or any successor form) or maps (or any corrections to those forms or maps) that may assist the agent or approved insurance provider in insuring the producer under a policy or plan of insurance under this subtitle.

''(B) PRIVACY.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C), an agent or approved insurance provider that receives the information of a producer pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall treat the information in accordance with paragraph (1).

''(C) SHARING.—Nothing in this section prohibits the sharing of the information of a producer pursuant to subparagraph (A) between the agent and the approved insurance provider of the producer.''.

(b) DISCLOSURE OF CROP INSURANCE PREMIUM SUBSIDIES MADE ON BEHALF OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND CERTAIN OTHER INDIVIDUALS AND ENTITIES.—Section 502(c)(2) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1502(c)(2)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as subparagraphs (D) and (E) respectively; and

(2) by inserting before subparagraph (C) (as so redesignated) the following:

''(A) DISCLOSURE IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1) or any other provision of law, except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall on an annual basis make available to the public—

''(i)(I) the name of each individual or entity specified in subparagraph (C) who obtained a federally subsidized crop insurance, livestock, or forage policy or plan of insurance during the previous fiscal year;

''(II) the amount of premium subsidy received by that individual or entity from the Corporation; and

''(III) the amount of any Federal portion of indemnities paid in the event of a loss during that fiscal year for each policy associated with that individual or entity; and

''(ii) for each private insurance provider, by name—

''(I) the underwriting gains earned through participation in the federally subsidized crop insurance program; and

''(II) the amount paid under this subtitle for—

''(aa) administrative and operating expenses;

''(bb) any Federal portion of indemnities and reinsurance; and

''(cc) any other purpose.

''(B) LIMITATION.—The Secretary shall not disclose information pertaining to individuals and entities covered by a catastrophic risk protection plan offered under section 508(b).

''(C) COVERED INDIVIDUALS AND ENTITIES.—Subparagraph (A) applies with respect to the following:

''(i) Members of Congress and their immediate families.

''(ii) Cabinet Secretaries and their immediate families.

''(iii) Entities of which any individual described in clause (i) or (ii), or combination of such individuals, is a majority shareholder.''.

SEC. 10002. PUBLICATION OF INFORMATION ON VIOLATIONS OF PROHIBITION ON PREMIUM ADJUSTMENTS.

Section 508(a)(9) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(a)(9)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(C) PUBLICATION OF VIOLATIONS.—

''(i) PUBLICATION REQUIRED.—Subject to clause (ii), the Corporation shall publish in a timely manner on the website of the Risk Management Agency information regarding each violation of this paragraph, including any sanctions imposed in response to the violation, in sufficient detail so that the information may serve as effective guidance to approved insurance providers, agents, and producers.

''(ii) PROTECTION OF PRIVACY.—In providing information under clause (i) regarding violations of this paragraph, the Corporation shall redact the identity of the persons and entities committing the violations in order to protect their privacy.''.

SEC. 10003. SUPPLEMENTAL COVERAGE OPTION.

(a) AVAILABILITY OF SUPPLEMENTAL COVERAGE OPTION.—Paragraph (3) of section 508(c) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(c)) is amended to read as follows:

''(3) YIELD AND LOSS BASIS OPTIONS.—A producer shall have the option of purchasing additional coverage based on—

''(A)(i) an individual yield and loss basis; or

''(ii) an area yield and loss basis;

''(B) an individual yield and loss basis, supplemented with coverage based on an area

yield and loss basis to cover a part of the deductible under the individual yield and loss policy, as described in paragraph (4)(C); or

''(C) a margin basis alone or in combination with the coverages available in subparagraph (A) or (B).''.

(b) LEVEL OF COVERAGE.—Paragraph (4) of section 508(c) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(c)) is amended to read as follows:

''(4) LEVEL OF COVERAGE.—

''(A) DOLLAR DENOMINATION AND PERCENTAGE OF YIELD.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C), the level of coverage—

''(i) shall be dollar denominated; and

''(ii) may be purchased at any level not to exceed 85 percent of the individual yield or 95 percent of the area yield (as determined by the Corporation).

''(B) INFORMATION.—The Corporation shall provide producers with information on catastrophic risk and additional coverage in terms of dollar coverage (within the allowable limits of coverage provided in this paragraph).

''(C) SUPPLEMENTAL COVERAGE OPTION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), in the case of the supplemental coverage option described in paragraph (3)(B), the Corporation shall offer producers the opportunity to purchase coverage in combination with a policy or plan of insurance offered under this subtitle that would allow indemnities to be paid to a producer equal to a part of the deductible under the policy or plan of insurance—

''(I) at a county-wide level to the fullest extent practicable; or

''(II) in counties that lack sufficient data, on the basis of such larger geographical area as the Corporation determines to provide sufficient data for purposes of providing the coverage.

''(ii) TRIGGER.—Coverage offered under paragraph (3)(B) and clause (i) shall be triggered only if the losses in the area exceed 10 percent of normal levels (as determined by the Corporation).

''(iii) COVERAGE.—Subject to the trigger described in clause (ii), coverage offered under paragraph (3)(B) and clause (i) shall not exceed the difference between—

''(I) 90 percent; and

''(II) the coverage level selected by the producer for the underlying policy or plan of insurance.

''(iv) INELIGIBLE CROPS AND ACRES.—Crops for which the producer has elected under section 1107(c)(1) of the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013 to receive revenue loss coverage and acres that are enrolled in the stacked income protection plan under section 508B shall not be eligible for supplemental coverage under this subparagraph.

''(v) CALCULATION OF PREMIUM.—Notwithstanding subsection (d), the premium for coverage offered under paragraph (3)(B) and clause (i) shall—

''(I) be sufficient to cover anticipated losses and a reasonable reserve; and

''(II) include an amount for operating and administrative expenses established in accordance with subsection (k)(4)(F).''.

(c) PAYMENT OF PORTION OF PREMIUM BY CORPORATION.—Section 508(e)(2) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(e)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(H) In the case of the supplemental coverage option authorized in subsection (c)(4)(C), the amount shall be equal to the sum of—

''(i) 65 percent of the additional premium associated with the coverage; and

''(ii) the amount determined under subsection (c)(4)(C)(vi)(II), subject to subsection (k)(4)(F), for the coverage to cover operating and administrative expenses.''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The Federal Crop Insurance Corporation shall begin to provide additional coverage based on an individual yield and loss basis, supplemented with coverage based on an area yield and loss basis, not later than for the 2014 crop year.

SEC. 10004. PREMIUM AMOUNTS FOR CATASTROPHIC RISK PROTECTION.

Subparagraph (A) of section 508(d)(2) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(d)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

''(A) In the case of catastrophic risk protection, the amount of the premium established by the Corporation for each crop for which catastrophic risk protection is available shall be reduced by the percentage equal to the difference between the average loss ratio for the crop and 100 percent, plus a reasonable reserve.''.

SEC. 10005. REPEAL OF PERFORMANCE-BASED DISCOUNT.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 508(d) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(d)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (3); and

(2) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (3).

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 508(a)(9)(B) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(a)(9)(B)) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''or'' at the end of clause (i);

(2) by striking clause (ii); and

(3) by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (ii).

SEC. 10006. PERMANENT ENTERPRISE UNIT SUBSIDY.

Subparagraph (A) of section 508(e)(5) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(e)(5)) is amended to read as follows:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation may pay a portion of the premiums for plans or policies of insurance for which the insurable unit is defined on a whole farm or enterprise unit basis that is higher than would otherwise be paid in accordance with paragraph (2).''.

SEC. 10007. ENTERPRISE UNITS FOR IRRIGATED AND NONIRRIGATED CROPS.

Section 508(e)(5) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(e)(5)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(D) NONIRRIGATED CROPS.—Beginning with the 2014 crop year, the Corporation shall make available separate enterprise units for irrigated and nonirrigated acreage of crops in counties.''.

SEC. 10008. DATA COLLECTION.

Section 508(g)(2) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(g)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(E) SOURCES OF YIELD DATA.—To determine yields under this paragraph, the Corporation—

''(i) shall use county data collected by the Risk Management Agency or the National Agricultural Statistics Service, or both; or

''(ii) if sufficient county data is not available, may use other data considered appropriate by the Secretary.''.

SEC. 10009. ADJUSTMENT IN ACTUAL PRODUCTION HISTORY TO ESTABLISH INSURABLE YIELDS.

Section 508(g)(4)(B) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(g)(4)(B)) is amended by striking ''60'' each place it appears and inserting ''70''.

SEC. 10010. SUBMISSION AND REVIEW OF POLICIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 508(h) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(h)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(B) by striking ''(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition'' and inserting the following:

''(1) AUTHORITY TO SUBMIT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In addition''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(B) REVIEW AND SUBMISSION BY CORPORATION.—The Corporation shall review any policy developed under section 522(c) or any pilot program developed under section 523 and submit the policy or program to the Board under this subsection if the Corporation, at the sole discretion of the Corporation, finds that the policy or program—

''(i) will likely result in a viable and marketable policy consistent with this subsection;

''(ii) would provide crop insurance coverage in a significantly improved form; and

''(iii) adequately protects the interests of producers.''; and

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking ''A policy'' and inserting the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A policy''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(B) SPECIFIED REVIEW AND APPROVAL PRIORITIES.—In reviewing policies and other materials submitted to the Board under this subsection for approval, the Board—

''(i) shall make the development and approval of a revenue policy for peanut producers a priority so that a revenue policy is available to peanut producers in time for the 2014 crop year;

''(ii) shall make the development and approval of a margin coverage policy for rice producers a priority so that a margin coverage policy is available to rice producers in time for the 2014 crop year; and

''(iii) may approve a submission that is made pursuant to this subsection that would, beginning with the 2014 crop year, allow producers that purchase policies in accordance with subsection (e)(5)(A) to separate enterprise units by risk rating for acreage of crops in counties.''.

(b) ADVANCE PAYMENTS.—Section 522(b)(2)(E) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1522(b)(2)(E)) is amended by striking ''50 percent'' and inserting ''75 percent''.

SEC. 10011. EQUITABLE RELIEF FOR SPECIALTY CROP POLICIES.

Section 508(k)(8)(E) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1508(k)(8)(E)) is amended by adding at the end the following new clause:

''(iii) EQUITABLE RELIEF FOR SPECIALTY CROP POLICIES.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—For each of the 2011 through 2015 reinsurance years, in addition to the total amount of funding for reimbursement of administrative and operating costs that is otherwise required to be made available in each such reinsurance year pursuant to an agreement entered into by the Corporation, the Corporation shall use $41,000,000 to provide additional reimbursement with respect to eligible insurance contracts for any agricultural commodity that is not eligible for a benefit under subtitles A, B or C of title I of the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013.

''(II) TREATMENT.—Additional reimbursements made under this clause shall be included as part of the base level of administrative and operating expense reimbursement to which any limit on compensation to persons involved in the direct sale and service of any eligible crop insurance contract required under an agreement entered into by the Corporation is applied.

''(III) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this clause shall be construed as statutory assent to the limit described in subclause (II).''.

SEC. 10012. BUDGET LIMITATIONS ON RENEGOTIATION OF THE STANDARD REINSURANCE AGREEMENT.

Section 508(k)(8) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1508(k)(8)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(F) BUDGET.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall ensure that any Standard Reinsurance Agreement negotiated under subparagraph (A)(ii), as compared to the previous Standard Reinsurance Agreement—

''(I) to the maximum extent practicable, shall be budget neutral; and

''(II) in no event, may significantly depart from budget neutrality.

''(ii) USE OF SAVINGS.—To the extent that any budget savings is realized in the renegotiation of a Standard Reinsurance Agreement under subparagraph (A)(ii), and the savings are determined not to be a significant departure from budget neutrality under clause (i), the savings shall be used to increase the obligations of the Corporation under subsections (e)(2) or (k)(4) or section 523.''.

SEC. 10013. CROP PRODUCTION ON NATIVE SOD.

(a) FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE.—Section 508(o) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(o)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(B), by inserting '', or the producer cannot substantiate that the ground has ever been tilled,'' after ''tilled'';

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''INELIGIBILITY FOR'' and inserting ''REDUCTION IN''; and

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''for benefits under—'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''for—

''(i) a portion of crop insurance premium subsidies under this subtitle in accordance with paragraph (3);

''(ii) benefits under section 196 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7333); and

''(iii) payments described in subsection (b) or (c) of section 1001 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308).''; and

(3) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following new paragraphs:

''(3) ADMINISTRATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—During the first 4 crop years of planting on native sod acreage by a producer described in paragraph (2)—

''(i) paragraph (2) shall apply to 65 percent of the transitional yield of the producer; and

''(ii) the crop insurance premium subsidy provided for the producer under this subtitle shall be 50 percentage points less than the premium subsidy that would otherwise apply.

''(B) YIELD SUBSTITUTION.—During the period native sod acreage is covered by this subsection, a producer may not substitute yields for the native sod acreage.

''(4) APPLICATION.—This subsection shall only apply to native sod in the Prairie Pothole National Priority Area.''.

(b) NONINSURED CROP DISASTER ASSISTANCE.—Section 196(a)(4) of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7333(a)(4)) is amended—

(1) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''INELIGIBILITY'' and inserting ''BENEFIT REDUCTION'';

(2) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by inserting '', or the producer cannot substantiate that the ground has ever been tilled,'' after ''tilled'';

(3) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) in the subparagraph heading, by striking ''INELIGIBILITY'' and inserting ''REDUCTION IN''; and

(B) in clause (i), by striking ''for benefits under—'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''for—

''(I) benefits under this section;

''(II) a portion of crop insurance premium subsidies under the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.) in accordance with subparagraph (C); and

''(III) payments described in subsection (b) or (c) of section 1001 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308).''; and

(4) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following new subparagraphs:

''(C) ADMINISTRATION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—During the first 4 crop years of planting on native sod acreage by a producer described in subparagraph (B)—

''(I) subparagraph (B) shall apply to 65 percent of the transitional yield of the producer; and

''(II) the crop insurance premium subsidy provided for the producer under the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.) shall be 50 percentage points less than the premium subsidy that would otherwise apply.

''(ii) YIELD SUBSTITUTION.—During the period native sod acreage is covered by this paragraph, a producer may not substitute yields for the native sod acreage.

''(D) APPLICATION.—This paragraph shall only apply to native sod in the Prairie Pothole National Priority Area.''.

(c) CROPLAND REPORT.—

(1) BASELINE.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that describes the cropland acreage in each applicable county and State, and the change in cropland acreage from the preceding year in each applicable county and State, beginning with calendar year 2000 and including that information for the most recent year for which that information is available.

(2) ANNUAL UPDATES.—Not later than January 1, 2015, and each January 1 thereafter through January 1, 2018, the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that describes—

(A) the cropland acreage in each applicable county and State as of the date of submission of the report; and

(B) the change in cropland acreage from the preceding year in each applicable county and State.

SEC. 10014. COVERAGE LEVELS BY PRACTICE.

Section 508 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1508) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(p) COVERAGE LEVELS BY PRACTICE.—Beginning with the 2015 crop year, a producer that produces an agricultural commodity on both dry land and irrigated land may elect a different coverage level for each production practice.''.

SEC. 10015. BEGINNING FARMER AND RANCHER PROVISIONS.

(a) DEFINITION.—Section 502(b) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1502(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (9) as paragraphs (4) through (10), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

''(3) BEGINNING FARMER OR RANCHER.—The term 'beginning farmer or rancher' means a farmer or rancher who has not actively operated and managed a farm or ranch with a bona fide insurable interest in a crop or livestock as an owner-operator, landlord, tenant, or sharecropper for more than 5 crop years, as determined by the Secretary.''.

(b) PREMIUM ADJUSTMENTS.—Section 508 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(5)(E), by inserting ''and beginning farmers or ranchers'' after ''limited resource farmers'';

(2) in subsection (e), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(8) PREMIUM FOR BEGINNING FARMERS OR RANCHERS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection regarding payment of a portion of premiums, a beginning farmer or rancher shall receive premium assistance that is 10 percentage points greater than premium assistance that would otherwise be available under paragraphs (2) (except for subparagraph (A) of that paragraph), (5), (6), and (7) for the applicable policy, plan of insurance, and coverage level selected by the beginning farmer or rancher.''; and

(3) in subsection (g)—

(A) in paragraph (2)(B)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(ii) in clause (ii)(III), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(iii) if the producer is a beginning farmer or rancher who was previously involved in a farming or ranching operation, including involvement in the decisionmaking or physical involvement in the production of the crop or livestock on the farm, for any acreage obtained by the beginning farmer or rancher, a yield that is the higher of—

''(I) the actual production history of the previous producer of the crop or livestock on the acreage determined under subparagraph (A); or

''(II) a yield of the producer, as determined in clause (i).''; and

(B) in paragraph (4)(B)(ii) (as amended by section 10009)—

(i) by inserting ''(I)'' after ''(ii)'';

(ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(II) in the case of beginning farmers or ranchers, replace each excluded yield with a yield equal to 80 percent of the applicable transitional yield.''.

SEC. 10016. STACKED INCOME PROTECTION PLAN FOR PRODUCERS OF UPLAND COTTON.

(a) AVAILABILITY OF STACKED INCOME PROTECTION PLAN FOR PRODUCERS OF UPLAND COTTON.—The Federal Crop Insurance Act is amended by inserting after section 508A (7 U.S.C. 1508a) the following new section:

''SEC. 508B. STACKED INCOME PROTECTION PLAN FOR PRODUCERS OF UPLAND COTTON.

''(a) AVAILABILITY.—Beginning not later than the 2014 crop of upland cotton, the Corporation shall make available to producers of upland cotton an additional policy (to be known as the 'Stacked Income Protection Plan'), which shall provide coverage consistent with the Group Risk Income Protection Plan (and the associated Harvest Revenue Option Endorsement) offered by the Corporation for the 2011 crop year.

''(b) REQUIRED TERMS.—The Corporation may modify the Stacked Income Protection Plan on a program-wide basis, except that the Stacked Income Protection Plan shall comply with the following requirements:

''(1) Provide coverage for revenue loss of not less than 10 percent and not more than 30 percent of expected county revenue, specified in increments of 5 percent. The deductible is the minimum percent of revenue loss at

which indemnities are triggered under the plan, not to be less than 10 percent of the expected county revenue.

''(2) Be offered to producers of upland cotton in all counties with upland cotton production—

''(A) at a county-wide level to the fullest extent practicable; or

''(B) in counties that lack sufficient data, on the basis of such larger geographical area as the Corporation determines to provide sufficient data for purposes of providing the coverage.

''(3) Be purchased in addition to any other individual or area coverage in effect on the producer's acreage or as a stand-alone policy, except that if a producer has an individual or area coverage for the same acreage, the maximum coverage available under the Stacked Income Protection Plan shall not exceed the deductible for the individual or area coverage.

''(4) Establish coverage based on—

''(A) the expected price established under existing Group Risk Income Protection or area wide policy offered by the Corporation for the applicable county (or area) and crop year; and

''(B) an expected county yield that is the higher of—

''(i) the expected county yield established for the existing area-wide plans offered by the Corporation for the applicable county (or area) and crop year (or, in geographic areas where area-wide plans are not offered, an expected yield determined in a manner consistent with those of area-wide plans); or

''(ii) the average of the applicable yield data for the county (or area) for the most recent 5 years, excluding the highest and lowest observations, from the Risk Management Agency or the National Agricultural Statistics Service (or both) or, if sufficient county data is not available, such other data considered appropriate by the Secretary.

''(5) Use a multiplier factor to establish maximum protection per acre (referred to as a 'protection factor') of not less than the higher of the level established on a program wide basis or 120 percent.

''(6) Pay an indemnity based on the amount that the expected county revenue exceeds the actual county revenue, as applied to the individual coverage of the producer. Indemnities under the Stacked Income Protection Plan shall not include or overlap the amount of the deductible selected under paragraph (1).

''(7) In all counties for which data are available, establish separate coverage levels for irrigated and non-irrigated practices.

''(c) PREMIUM.—Notwithstanding section 508(d), the premium for the Stacked Income Protection Plan shall—

''(1) be sufficient to cover anticipated losses and a reasonable reserve; and

''(2) include an amount for operating and administrative expenses established in accordance with section 508(k)(4)(F).

''(d) PAYMENT OF PORTION OF PREMIUM BY CORPORATION.—Subject to section 508(e)(4), the amount of premium paid by the Corporation for all qualifying coverage levels of the Stacked Income Protection Plan shall be—

''(1) 80 percent of the amount of the premium established under subsection (c) for the coverage level selected; and

''(2) the amount determined under subsection (c)(2), subject to section 508(k)(4)(F), for the coverage to cover administrative and operating expenses.

''(e) RELATION TO OTHER COVERAGES.—The Stacked Income Protection Plan is in addition to all other coverages available to producers of upland cotton.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 508(k)(4)(F) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(k)(4)(F)) is amended by inserting ''or authorized under subsection (c)(4)(C) or section 508B'' after ''of this subparagraph''.

SEC. 10017. PEANUT REVENUE CROP INSURANCE.

The Federal Crop Insurance Act is amended by inserting after section 508B, as added by the previous section, the following new section:

''SEC. 508C. PEANUT REVENUE CROP INSURANCE.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Effective beginning with the 2014 crop year, the Risk Management Agency and the Corporation shall make available to producers of peanuts a revenue crop insurance program for peanuts.

''(b) EFFECTIVE PRICE.—Subject to subsection (c), for purposes of the revenue crop insurance program and the multiperil crop insurance program under this Act, the effective price for peanuts shall be equal to the Rotterdam price index for peanuts, as adjusted to reflect the farmer stock price of peanuts in the United States.

''(c) ADJUSTMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The effective price for peanuts established under subsection (b) may be adjusted by the Risk Management Agency and the Corporation to correct distortions.

''(2) ADMINISTRATION.—If an adjustment is made under paragraph (1), the Risk Management Agency and the Corporation shall—

''(A) make the adjustment in an open and transparent manner; and

''(B) submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that describes the reasons for the adjustment.''.

SEC. 10018. AUTHORITY TO CORRECT ERRORS.

Section 515(c) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1515(c)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking ''The Secretary'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary'';

(2) in the second sentence, by striking ''Beginning with'' and inserting the following:

''(2) FREQUENCY.—Beginning with''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) CORRECTIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the corrections permitted by the Corporation as of the date of enactment of the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013, the Corporation shall allow an agent or an approved insurance provider, subject to subparagraph (B)—

''(i) within a reasonable amount of time following the applicable sales closing date, to correct unintentional errors in information that is provided by a producer for the purpose of obtaining coverage under any policy or plan of insurance made available under this subtitle to ensure that the eligibility information is correct;

''(ii) within a reasonable amount of time following—

''(I) the acreage reporting date, to correct unintentional errors in factual information that is provided by a producer after the sales closing date to reconcile the information with the information reported by the producer to the Farm Service Agency; or

''(II) the date of any subsequent correction of data by the Farm Service Agency made as a result of the verification of information; and

''(iii) at any time, to correct unintentional errors that were made by the Farm Service Agency or an agent or approved insurance provider in transmitting the information provided by the producer to the approved insurance provider or the Corporation.

''(B) LIMITATION.—In accordance with the procedures of the Corporation, correction to the information described in clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (A) may only be made if the corrections do not allow the producer—

''(i) to avoid ineligibility requirements for insurance;

''(ii) to obtain, enhance, or increase an insurance guarantee or indemnity, or avoid premium owed, if a cause of loss exists or has occurred before any correction has been made; or

''(iii) to avoid an obligation or requirement under any Federal or State law.

''(C) EXCEPTION TO LATE FILING SANCTIONS.—Any corrections made pursuant to this paragraph shall not be subject to any late filing sanctions authorized in the reinsurance agreement with the Corporation.''.

SEC. 10019. IMPLEMENTATION.

Section 515 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1515) is amended—

(1) in subsection (j), by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(1) SYSTEMS MAINTENANCE AND UPGRADES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall maintain and upgrade the information management systems of the Corporation used in the administration and enforcement of this subtitle.

''(B) REQUIREMENT.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—In maintaining and upgrading the systems, the Secretary shall ensure that new hardware and software are compatible with the hardware and software used by other agencies of the Department to maximize data sharing and promote the purposes of this section.

''(ii) ACREAGE REPORT STREAMLINING INITIATIVE PROJECT.—As soon as practicable, the Secretary shall develop and implement an acreage report streamlining initiative project to allow producers to report acreage and other information directly to the Department.''; and

(2) in subsection (k), by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(1) INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subsection (j)(1), the Corporation may use, from amounts made available from the insurance fund established under section 516(c), not more than—

''(i)(I) for fiscal year 2014, $25,000,000; and

''(II) for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2018, $10,000,000; or

''(ii) if the Acreage Crop Reporting Streamlining Initiative (ACRSI) project is substantially completed by September 30, 2015, not more than $15,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2015 through 2018.

''(B) NOTIFICATION.—The Secretary shall notify the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate of the substantial completion of the Acreage Crop Reporting Streamlining Initiative (ACRSI) project not later than July 1, 2015.''.

SEC. 10020. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PRIORITIES.

(a) AUTHORITY TO CONDUCT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, PRIORITIES.—Section 522(c) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1522(c)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading by striking ''CONTRACTING'';

(2) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''may enter into contracts to carry out research and development to'' and inserting ''may conduct activities or enter into contracts to carry out research and development to maintain or improve existing policies or develop new policies to'';

(3) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by inserting ''conduct research and development or'' after ''The Corporation may''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by inserting ''conducting research and development or'' after ''Before'';

(4) in paragraph (5), by inserting ''after expert review in accordance with section 505(e)'' after ''approved by the Board''; and

(5) in paragraph (6), by striking ''a pasture, range, and forage program'' and inserting ''policies that increase participation by producers of underserved agricultural commodities, including sweet sorghum, biomass sorghum, rice, peanuts, sugarcane, alfalfa, pennycress, and specialty crops''.

(b) FUNDING.—Section 522(e) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1522(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking ''(A) AUTHORITY.—'' and inserting ''(A) CONDUCTING AND CONTRACTING FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—'';

(B) in subparagraph (A), by inserting ''conduct research and development and'' after ''the Corporation may use to''; and

(C) in subparagraph (B), by inserting ''conduct research and development and'' after ''for the fiscal year to'';

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking ''to provide either reimbursement payments or contract payments''; and

(3) by striking paragraph (4).

SEC. 10021. ADDITIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CONTRACTING REQUIREMENTS.

Section 522(c) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1522(c)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (17) as paragraph (24); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (16), the following new paragraphs:

''(17) MARGIN COVERAGE FOR CATFISH.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation shall offer to enter into a contract with a qualified entity to conduct research and development regarding a policy to insure producers against reduction in the margin between the market value of catfish and selected costs incurred in the production of catfish.

''(B) ELIGIBILITY.—Eligibility for the policy described in subparagraph (A) shall be limited to freshwater species of catfish that are propagated and reared in controlled or selected environments.

''(C) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Board shall review the policy described in subparagraph (B) under subsection 508(h) and approve the policy if the Board finds that the policy—

''(i) will likely result in a viable and marketable policy consistent with this subsection;

''(ii) would provide crop insurance coverage in a significantly improved form;

''(iii) adequately protects the interests of producers; and

''(iv) the proposed policy meets other requirements of this subtitle determined appropriate by the Board.

''(18) BIOMASS AND SWEET SORGHUM ENERGY CROP INSURANCE POLICIES.—

''(A) AUTHORITY.—The Corporation shall offer to enter into 1 or more contracts with qualified entities to carry out research and development regarding—

''(i) a policy to insure biomass sorghum that is grown expressly for the purpose of producing a feedstock for renewable biofuel, renewable electricity, or biobased products; and

''(ii) a policy to insure sweet sorghum that is grown for a purpose described in clause (i).

''(B) RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—Research and development with respect to each of the policies required in subparagraph (A) shall evaluate the effectiveness of risk management tools for the production of biomass sorghum or sweet sorghum, including policies and plans of insurance that—

''(i) are based on market prices and yields;

''(ii) to the extent that insufficient data exist to develop a policy based on market prices and yields, evaluate the policies and plans of insurance based on the use of weather indices, including excessive or inadequate rainfall, to protect the interest of crop producers; and

''(iii) provide protection for production or revenue losses, or both.

''(19) STUDY ON SWINE CATASTROPHIC DISEASE PROGRAM.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation shall contract with a qualified person to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of insuring swine producers for a catastrophic event.

''(B) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, the Corporation shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that describes the results of the study conducted under subparagraph (A).

''(20) WHOLE FARM DIVERSIFIED RISK MANAGEMENT INSURANCE PLAN.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation shall conduct activities or enter into contracts to carry out research and development to develop a whole farm risk management insurance plan, with a liability limitation of $1,250,000, that allows a diversified crop or livestock producer the option to qualify for an indemnity if actual gross farm revenue is below 85 percent of the average gross farm revenue or the expected gross farm revenue that can reasonably be expected of the producer, as determined by the Corporation.

''(B) ELIGIBLE PRODUCERS.—The Corporation shall permit producers (including direct-to-consumer marketers and producers servicing local and regional and farm identity-preserved markets) who produce multiple agricultural commodities, including specialty crops, industrial crops, livestock, and aquaculture products, to participate in the plan in lieu of any other plan under this subtitle.

''(C) DIVERSIFICATION.—The Corporation may provide diversification-based additional coverage payment rates, premium discounts, or other enhanced benefits in recognition of the risk management benefits of crop and livestock diversification strategies for producers that grow multiple crops or that may have income from the production of livestock that uses a crop grown on the farm.

''(D) MARKET READINESS.—The Corporation may include coverage for the value of any packing, packaging, or any other similar on-farm activity the Corporation determines to be the minimum required in order to remove the commodity from the field.

''(E) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Corporation shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that describes the results and feasibility of the research and development conducted under this paragraph, including an analysis of potential adverse market distortions.

''(21) STUDY ON POULTRY CATASTROPHIC DISEASE PROGRAM.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation shall contract with a qualified person to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of insuring poultry producers for a catastrophic event.

''(B) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, the Corporation shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that describes the results of the study conducted under subparagraph (A).

''(22) POULTRY BUSINESS INTERRUPTION INSURANCE POLICY.—

''(A) AUTHORITY.—The Corporation shall offer to enter into a contract or cooperative agreement with a university or other legal entity to carry out research and development regarding a policy to insure the commercial production of poultry against business interruptions caused by integrator bankruptcy.

''(B) RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—As part of the research and development conducted pursuant to a contract or cooperative agreement entered into under subparagraph (A), the entity shall—

''(i) evaluate the market place for business interruption insurance that is available to poultry growers;

''(ii) determine what statutory authority would be necessary to implement a business interruption insurance through the Corporation;

''(iii) assess the feasibility of a policy or plan of insurance offered under this subtitle to insure against losses due to the bankruptcy of an business integrator; and

''(iv) analyze the costs to the Federal Government of a Federal business interruption insurance program for poultry growers.

''(C) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph, the terms 'poultry' and 'poultry grower' have the meanings given those terms in section 2(a) of the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921 (7 U.S.C. 182(a)).

''(D) DEADLINE FOR CONTRACT OR COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT.—Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, the Corporation shall enter into the contract or cooperative agreement required by subparagraph (A).

''(E) DEADLINE FOR COMPLETION OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, the Corporation shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that describes the results of the research and development conducted pursuant to the contract or cooperative agreement entered into under subparagraph (A).

''(23) STUDY OF FOOD SAFETY INSURANCE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation shall offer to enter into a contract with 1 or more qualified entities to conduct a study to determine whether offering policies that provide coverage for specialty crops from food safety and contamination issues would benefit agricultural producers.

''(B) SUBJECT.—The study described in subparagraph (A) shall evaluate policies and plans of insurance coverage that provide protection for production or revenue impacted by food safety concerns including, at a minimum, government, retail, or national consumer group announcements of a health advisory, removal, or recall related to a contamination concern.

''(C) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Corporation shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that describes the results of the study conducted under subparagraph (A).''.

SEC. 10022. PROGRAM COMPLIANCE PARTNERSHIPS.

Paragraph (1) of section 522(d) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1522(d)) is amended to read as follows:

''(1) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this subsection is to authorize the Corporation to enter into partnerships with public and private entities for the purpose of either—

''(A) increasing the availability of loss mitigation, financial, and other risk management tools for producers, with a priority

given to risk management tools for producers of agricultural commodities covered by section 196 of the Agricultural Market Transition Act (7 U.S.C. 7333), specialty crops, and underserved agricultural commodities; or

''(B) improving analysis tools and technology regarding compliance or identifying and using innovative compliance strategies.''.

SEC. 10023. PILOT PROGRAMS.

Section 523(a) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1523(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting '', at the sole discretion of the Corporation,'' after ''may''; and

(2) by striking paragraph (5).

SEC. 10024. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) ELIGIBILITY FOR DEPARTMENT PROGRAMS.—Section 508(b) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (7); and

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (8) through (11) as paragraphs (7) through (10), respectively.

(b) EXCLUSIONS TO ASSISTANCE FOR LOSSES DUE TO DROUGHT CONDITIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 531(d)(3)(A) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1531(d)(3)(A)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''(A) ELIGIBLE LOSSES.—'' and all that follows through ''An eligible'' in clause (i) and inserting the following:

''(A) ELIGIBLE LOSSES.—An eligible'';

(B) by striking clause (ii); and

(C) by redesignating subclauses (I) and (II) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and indenting appropriately.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 901(d)(3)(A) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2497(d)(3)(A)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''(A) ELIGIBLE LOSSES.—'' and all that follows through ''An eligible'' in clause (i) and inserting the following:

''(A) ELIGIBLE LOSSES.—An eligible'';

(B) by striking clause (ii); and

(C) by redesignating subclauses (I) and (II) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and indenting appropriately.

SEC. 10025. ADVANCE PUBLIC NOTICE OF CROP INSURANCE POLICY AND PLAN CHANGES.

Section 505(e) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1505(e)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (5) and (6) as paragraphs (6) and (7); respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph (5):

''(5) ADVANCE NOTICE OF MODIFICATION BEFORE IMPLEMENTATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Any modification to be made in the terms or conditions of any policy or plan of insurance offered under this subtitle shall not take effect for a crop year unless the Secretary publishes the modification in the Federal Register and on the website of the Corporation and provides for a subsequent period of public comment—

''(i) with respect to fall-planted crops, not later than 60 days before June 30 during the preceding crop year; and

''(ii) with respect to spring-planted crops, not later than 60 days before November 30 during the preceding crop year.

''(B) WAIVER.—The Secretary may waive the application of subparagraph (A) in an emergency situation declared by the Secretary upon notice to Congress of the nature of the emergency and the need for immediate implementation of the policy or plan modification referred to in such subparagraph.''.

TITLE XI—MISCELLANEOUS

Subtitle A—Livestock

SEC. 11101. REPEAL OF THE NATIONAL SHEEP INDUSTRY IMPROVEMENT CENTER.

Effective October 1, 2013, section 375 of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 2008j) is repealed.

SEC. 11102. REPEAL OF CERTAIN REGULATIONS UNDER THE PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT, 1921.

(a) REPEAL OF CERTAIN REGULATION REQUIREMENT.—Section 11006 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–246; 122 Stat. 2120) is repealed.

(b) REPEAL OF CERTAIN EXISTING REGULATION.—Subsection (n) of section 201.2 of title 9, Code of Federal Regulations, is repealed.

(c) PROHIBITION ON ENFORCEMENT OF CERTAIN REGULATIONS OR ISSUANCE OF SIMILAR REGULATIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Agriculture shall not—

(1) enforce subsection (n) of section 201.2 of title 9, Code of Federal Regulations;

(2) finalize or implement sections 201.2(l), 201.2(t), 201.2(u), 201.3(c), 201.210, 201.211, 201.213, and 201.214 of title 9, Code of Federal Regulations, as proposed to be added by the proposed rule entitled ''Implementation of Regulations Required Under Title XI of the Food, Conservation and Energy Act of 2008; Conduct in Violation of the Act'' published by the Department of Agriculture on June 22, 2010 (75 Fed. Reg. 35338); or

(3) issue regulations or adopt a policy similar to the provisions—

(A) referred to in paragraph (1) or (2); or

(B) rescinded by the Secretary pursuant to section 742 of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113–6).

SEC. 11103. TRICHINAE CERTIFICATION PROGRAM.

(a) ALTERNATIVE CERTIFICATION PROCESS.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall amend the rule made under paragraph (2) of section 11010(a) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8304(a)) to implement the voluntary trichinae certification program established under paragraph (1) of such section, to include a requirement to establish an alternative trichinae certification process based on surveillance or other methods consistent with international standards for categorizing compartments as having negligible risk for trichinae.

(b) FINAL REGULATIONS.—Not later than one year after the date on which the international standards referred to in subsection (a) are adopted, the Secretary shall finalize the rule amended under such subsection.

(c) REAUTHORIZATION.—Section 10405(d)(1) of the Animal Health Protection Act (7 U.S.C. 8304(d)(1)) is amended in subparagraphs (A) and (B) by striking ''2012'' each place it appears and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 11104. NATIONAL AQUATIC ANIMAL HEALTH PLAN.

Section 11013(d) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8322(d)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 11105. COUNTRY OF ORIGIN LABELING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Office of the Chief Economist, shall conduct an economic analysis of the proposed rule entitled ''Mandatory Country of Origin Labeling of Beef, Pork, Lamb, Chicken, Goat Meat, Wild and Farm-raised Fish and Shellfish, Perishable Agricultural Commodities, Peanuts, Pecans, Ginseng and Macadamia Nuts'' published by the Department of Agriculture on March 12, 2013 (76 Fed. Reg. 15645).

(b) CONTENTS.—The economic analysis described in subsection (a) shall include, with respect to the labeling of beef, pork, and chicken, an analysis of the impact on consumers, producers, and packers in the United States of—

(1) the implementation of subtitle D of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1638 et seq.); and

(2) the proposed rule referred to in subsection (a).

SEC. 11106. NATIONAL ANIMAL HEALTH LABORATORY NETWORK.

Subtitle E of title X of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 is amended by inserting after section 10409 (7 U.S.C. 8308) the following new section:

''SEC. 10409A. NATIONAL ANIMAL HEALTH LABORATORY NETWORK.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall enter into contracts, grants, cooperative agreements, or other legal instruments with eligible laboratories for any of the following purposes:

''(1) To enhance the capability of the Secretary to detect, and respond in a timely manner to, emerging or existing threats to animal health and to support the protection of public health, the environment, and the agricultural economy of the United States.

''(2) To provide the capacity and capability for standardized—

''(A) test procedures, reference materials, and equipment;

''(B) laboratory biosafety and biosecurity levels;

''(C) quality management system requirements;

''(D) interconnected electronic reporting and transmission of data; and

''(E) evaluation for emergency preparedness.

''(3) To coordinate the development, implementation, and enhancement of national veterinary diagnostic laboratory capabilities, with special emphasis on surveillance planning and vulnerability analysis, technology development and validation, training, and outreach.

''(b) ELIGIBILITY.—An eligible laboratory under this section is a diagnostic laboratory meeting specific criteria developed by the Secretary, in consultation with State animal health officials and State and university veterinary diagnostic laboratories.

''(c) PRIORITY.—To the extent practicable and to the extent capacity and specialized expertise may be necessary, the Secretary shall give priority to existing Federal, State, and university facilities.

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 11107. REPEAL OF DUPLICATIVE CATFISH INSPECTION PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Effective on the date of the enactment of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8701 et seq.), section 11016 of such Act (Public Law 110–246; 122 Stat. 2130) and the amendments made by such section are repealed.

(b) APPLICATION.—The Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621 et seq.) and the Federal Meat Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) shall be applied and administered as if section 11016 (Public Law 110–246; 122 Stat. 2130) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8701 et seq.) and the amendments made by such section had not been enacted.

SEC. 11108. NATIONAL POULTRY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

The Secretary of Agriculture shall ensure that the Department of Agriculture continues to administer the diagnostic surveillance program for H5/H7 low pathogenic avian influenza with respect to commercial poultry under section 146.14 of title 9, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation) without amending the regulations in section 147.43 of title 9, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation) with respect to the governance of the General Conference Committee established under such section. The Secretary of Agriculture shall maintain—

(1) the operations of the General Conference Committee—

(A) in the physical location at which the Committee was located on the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(B) with the organizational structure within the Department of Agriculture in effect as of such date; and

(2) the funding levels for the National Poultry Improvement Plan for Commercial Poultry (established under part 146 of title 9, Code of Federal Regulations or a successor regulation) at the fiscal year 2013 funding levels for the Plan.

SEC. 11109. REPORT ON BOVINE TUBERCULOSIS IN TEXAS.

Not later than December 31, 2014, the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report on the incidence of bovine tuberculosis in cattle in Texas. The report shall cover the period beginning on January 1, 1997, and ending on December 31, 2013.

SEC. 11110. ECONOMIC FRAUD IN WILD AND FARM-RAISED SEAFOOD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Office of the Chief Economist, shall submit to Congress a report on the economic implications for consumers, fishermen, and aquaculturists of fraud and mislabeling in wild and farm-raised seafood.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include, with respect to fraud and mislabeling in wild and farm-raised seafood, an analysis of the impact on consumers and producers in the United States of—

(1) sales of imported seafood that is misrepresented as domestic product;

(2) country of origin labeling that allows seafood harvested outside the United States to be labeled as a product of the United States;

(3) the lack of seafood product traceability through the supply chain; and

(4) the inadequate use of DNA testing and other technology to address seafood safety and fraud, including traceability.

Subtitle B—Socially Disadvantaged Producers and Limited Resource Producers

SEC. 11201. OUTREACH AND ASSISTANCE FOR SOCIALLY DISADVANTAGED FARMERS AND RANCHERS AND VETERAN FARMERS AND RANCHERS.

(a) OUTREACH AND ASSISTANCE FOR SOCIALLY DISADVANTAGED FARMERS AND RANCHERS AND VETERAN FARMERS AND RANCHERS.—Section 2501 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 2279) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by inserting ''**AND VETERAN FARMERS AND RANCHERS**'' after ''**RANCHERS**'';

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''and veteran farmers or ranchers'' after ''ranchers'';

(B) in paragraph (2)(B)(i), by inserting ''and veteran farmers or ranchers'' after ''ranchers''; and

(C) in paragraph (4)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) in the heading of such subparagraph, by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018'';

(II) in clause (i), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(III) in clause (ii), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(IV) by adding at the end the following new clause:

''(iii) $10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(E) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.'';

(3) in subsection (b)(2), by inserting ''or veteran farmers and ranchers'' after ''socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers'';

(4) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A), by inserting ''veteran farmers or ranchers and'' before ''members''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(A), by inserting ''veteran farmers or ranchers and'' before ''members''; and

(5) in subsection (e)(5)(A)—

(A) in clause (i), by inserting ''and veteran farmers or ranchers'' after ''ranchers''; and

(B) in clause (ii), by inserting ''and veteran farmers or ranchers'' after ''ranchers''.

(b) DEFINITION OF VETERAN FARMER OR RANCHER.—Section 2501(e) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 2279(e)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(7) VETERAN FARMER OR RANCHER.—The term 'veteran farmer or rancher' means a farmer or rancher who served in the active military, naval, or air service, and who was discharged or released from the service under conditions other than dishonorable.''.

SEC. 11202. OFFICE OF ADVOCACY AND OUTREACH.

Paragraph (3) of section 226B(f) of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6934(f)) is amended to read as follows:

''(3) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection—

''(A) such sums as are necessary for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2013; and

''(B) $2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 11203. SOCIALLY DISADVANTAGED FARMERS AND RANCHERS POLICY RESEARCH CENTER.

Section 2501 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 2279), as amended by section 11201, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(i) SOCIALLY DISADVANTAGED FARMERS AND RANCHERS POLICY RESEARCH CENTER.—The Secretary shall award a grant to a college or university eligible to receive funds under the Act of August 30, 1890 (7 U.S.C. 321 et seq.), including Tuskegee University, to establish a policy research center to be known as the 'Socially Disadvantaged Farmers and Ranchers Policy Research Center' for the purpose of developing policy recommendations for the protection and promotion of the interests of socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers.''.

SEC. 11204. RECEIPT FOR SERVICE OR DENIAL OF SERVICE FROM CERTAIN DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AGENCIES.

Section 2501A(e) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 2279–1(e)) is amended by striking ''and, at the time of the request, also requests a receipt''.

Subtitle C—Other Miscellaneous Provisions

SEC. 11301. GRANTS TO IMPROVE SUPPLY, STABILITY, SAFETY, AND TRAINING OF AGRICULTURAL LABOR FORCE.

Subsection (d) of section 14204 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2008q–1) is amended to read as follows:

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section—

''(1) such sums as are necessary for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2013; and

''(2) $10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 11302. PROGRAM BENEFIT ELIGIBILITY STATUS FOR PARTICIPANTS IN HIGH PLAINS WATER STUDY.

Section 2901 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–246; 122 Stat. 1818) is amended by striking ''this Act or an amendment made by this Act'' and inserting ''this Act, an amendment made by this Act, the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013, or an amendment made by the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013''.

SEC. 11303. OFFICE OF TRIBAL RELATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Federal Crop Insurance Reform and Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 is amended by adding after section 308 (7 U.S.C. 3125a note; Public Law 103–354) the following new section:

''SEC. 309. OFFICE OF TRIBAL RELATIONS.

''The Secretary shall establish in the Office of the Secretary an Office of Tribal Relations to advise the Secretary on policies related to Indian tribes.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 296(b) of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 7014(b)) is amended by inserting after paragraph (8), as added by section 3207, the following new paragraph:

''(9) the authority of the Secretary to establish in the Office of the Secretary the Office of Tribal Relations in accordance with section 309; and''.

SEC. 11304. MILITARY VETERANS AGRICULTURAL LIAISON.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle A of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 is amended by inserting after section 218 (7 U.S.C. 6918) the following new section:

''SEC. 219. MILITARY VETERANS AGRICULTURAL LIAISON.

''(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary shall establish in the Department the position of Military Veterans Agricultural Liaison.

''(b) DUTIES.—The Military Veterans Agricultural Liaison shall—

''(1) provide information to returning veterans about, and connect returning veterans with, beginning farmer training and agricultural vocational and rehabilitation programs appropriate to the needs and interests of returning veterans, including assisting veterans in using Federal veterans educational benefits for purposes relating to beginning a farming or ranching career;

''(2) provide information to veterans concerning the availability of and eligibility requirements for participation in agricultural programs, with particular emphasis on beginning farmer and rancher programs;

''(3) serve as a resource for assisting veteran farmers and ranchers, and potential farmers and ranchers, in applying for participation in agricultural programs; and

''(4) advocate on behalf of veterans in interactions with employees of the Department.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 296(b) of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 7014(b)) is amended by inserting after paragraph (9), as added by section 11303, the following new paragraph:

''(10) the authority of the Secretary to establish in the Department the position of Military Veterans Agricultural Liaison in accordance with section 219.''.

SEC. 11305. PROHIBITION ON KEEPING GSA LEASED CARS OVERNIGHT.

Effective immediately, a Federal employee of a State office of the Farm Service Agency in the field and non-Federal employees of county and area committees established under section 8(b)(5) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590h(b)(5)) shall keep leased interagency

motor pool vehicles at a location listed on the General Services Administration inventory of owned and leased properties or a location owned or leased by the Department of Agriculture overnight unless the employee assigned the vehicle is on overnight, approved travel status involving per diem.

SEC. 11306. NONINSURED CROP ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Section 196 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7333), as amended by section 10013(b), is further amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—

''(A) COVERAGES.—In the case of an eligible crop described in paragraph (2), the Secretary of Agriculture shall operate a noninsured crop disaster assistance program to provide coverages based on individual yields (other than for value-loss crops) equivalent to—

''(i) catastrophic risk protection available under section 508(b) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(b)); or

''(ii) additional coverage available under subsections (c) and (h) of section 508 of that Act (7 U.S.C. 1508) that does not exceed 65 percent.

''(B) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary shall carry out this section through the Farm Service Agency (referred to in this section as the 'Agency').''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) in clause (i), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon at the end;

(II) by redesignating clause (ii) as clause (iii); and

(III) by inserting after clause (i) the following new clause:

''(ii) for which additional coverage under subsections (c) and (h) of section 508 of that Act (7 U.S.C. 1508) is not available; and''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by inserting ''sweet sorghum, biomass sorghum,'' before ''and industrial crops'';

(2) in subsection (d), by striking ''The Secretary'' and inserting ''Subject to subsection (l), the Secretary''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(l) PAYMENT EQUIVALENT TO ADDITIONAL COVERAGE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall make available to a producer eligible for noninsured assistance under this section a payment equivalent to an indemnity for additional coverage under subsections (c) and (h) of section 508 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508) that does not exceed 65 percent of the established yield for the eligible crop on the farm, computed by multiplying—

''(A) the quantity that is not greater than 65 percent of the established yield for the crop, as determined by the Secretary, specified in increments of 5 percent;

''(B) 100 percent of the average market price for the crop, as determined by the Secretary; and

''(C) a payment rate for the type of crop, as determined by the Secretary, that reflects—

''(i) in the case of a crop that is produced with a significant and variable harvesting expense, the decreasing cost incurred in the production cycle for the crop that is, as applicable—

''(I) harvested;

''(II) planted but not harvested; or

''(III) prevented from being planted because of drought, flood, or other natural disaster, as determined by the Secretary; or

''(ii) in the case of a crop that is produced without a significant and variable harvesting expense, such rate as shall be determined by the Secretary.

''(2) PREMIUM.—To be eligible to receive a payment under this subsection, a producer shall pay—

''(A) the service fee required by subsection (k); and

''(B) a premium for the applicable crop year that is equal to the product obtained by multiplying—

''(i) the number of acres devoted to the eligible crop;

''(ii) the established yield for the eligible crop, as determined by the Secretary under subsection (e);

''(iii) the coverage level elected by the producer;

''(iv) the average market price, as determined by the Secretary; and

''(v) .0525.

''(3) LIMITED RESOURCE, BEGINNING, AND SOCIALLY DISADVANTAGED FARMERS.—The additional coverage made available under this subsection shall be available to limited resource, beginning, and socially disadvantaged producers, as determined by the Secretary, in exchange for a premium that is 50 percent of the premium determined for a producer under paragraph (2).

''(4) PREMIUM PAYMENT AND APPLICATION DEADLINE.—

''(A) PREMIUM PAYMENT.—A producer electing additional coverage under this subsection shall pay the premium amount owed for the additional coverage by September 30 of the crop year for which the additional coverage is purchased.

''(B) APPLICATION DEADLINE.—The latest date on which additional coverage under this subsection may be elected shall be the application closing date described in subsection (b)(1).

''(5) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Additional coverage under this subsection shall be available beginning with the 2015 crop.''.

SEC. 11307. ENSURING HIGH STANDARDS FOR AGENCY USE OF SCIENTIFIC INFORMATION.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR FINAL GUIDELINES.—Not later than January 1, 2014, each Federal agency shall have in effect guidelines for ensuring and maximizing the quality, objectivity, utility, and integrity of scientific information relied upon by such agency.

(b) CONTENT OF GUIDELINES.—The guidelines described in subsection (a), with respect to a Federal agency, shall ensure that—

(1) when scientific information is considered by the agency in policy decisions—

(A) the information is subject to well-established scientific processes, including peer review where appropriate;

(B) the agency appropriately applies the scientific information to the policy decision;

(C) except for information that is protected from disclosure by law or administrative practice, the agency makes available to the public the scientific information considered by the agency;

(D) the agency gives greatest weight to information that is based on experimental, empirical, quantifiable, and reproducible data that is developed in accordance with well-established scientific processes; and

(E) with respect to any proposed rule issued by the agency, such agency follows procedures that include, to the extent feasible and permitted by law, an opportunity for public comment on all relevant scientific findings;

(2) the agency has procedures in place to make policy decisions only on the basis of the best reasonably obtainable scientific, technical, economic, and other evidence and information concerning the need for, consequences of, and alternatives to the decision; and

(3) the agency has in place procedures to identify and address instances in which the integrity of scientific information considered by the agency may have been compromised, including instances in which such information may have been the product of a scientific process that was compromised.

(c) APPROVAL NEEDED FOR POLICY DECISIONS TO TAKE EFFECT.—No policy decision issued after January 1, 2014, by an agency subject to this section may take effect prior to such date that the agency has in effect guidelines under subsection (a) that have been approved by the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy.

(d) POLICY DECISIONS NOT IN COMPLIANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), a policy decision of an agency that does not comply with guidelines approved under subsection (c) shall be deemed to be arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, and otherwise not in accordance with law.

(2) EXCEPTION.—This subsection shall not apply to policy decisions that are deemed to be necessary because of an imminent threat to health or safety or because of another emergency.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) AGENCY.—The term ''agency'' has the meaning given such term in section 551(1) of title 5, United States Code.

(2) POLICY DECISION.—The term ''policy decision'' means, with respect to an agency, an agency action as defined in section 551(13) of title 5, United States Code, (other than an adjudication, as defined in section 551(7) of such title), and includes—

(A) the listing, labeling, or other identification of a substance, product, or activity as hazardous or creating risk to human health, safety, or the environment; and

(B) agency guidance.

(3) AGENCY GUIDANCE.—The term ''agency guidance'' means an agency statement of general applicability and future effect, other than a regulatory action, that sets forth a policy on a statutory, regulatory, or technical issue or on an interpretation of a statutory or regulatory issue.

SEC. 11308. EVALUATION REQUIRED FOR PURPOSES OF PROHIBITION ON CLOSURE OR RELOCATION OF COUNTY OFFICES FOR THE FARM SERVICE AGENCY.

(a) PROHIBITION ON CLOSURE OR RELOCATION OF OFFICES WITH HIGH WORKLOAD VOLUME.—Section 14212 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 6932a) is amended by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following new subsection:

''(a) PROHIBITION ON CLOSURE OR RELOCATION OF OFFICES WITH HIGH WORKLOAD VOLUME.—The Secretary of Agriculture may not close or relocate a county or field office of the Farm Service Agency in a State if the Secretary determines, after conducting the evaluation required under subsection (b)(1)(B), that the office has a high workload volume compared with other county offices in the State.''.

(b) WORKLOAD EVALUATION.—Section 14212(b)(1) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 6932a(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and moving the margins of such clauses two ems to the right;

(2) by striking ''the Farm Service Agency, to the maximum extent practicable'' and inserting ''the Farm Service Agency—

''(A) to the maximum extent practicable'';

(3) in clause (ii) (as redesignated by paragraph (1))—

(A) by inserting ''as of the date of the enactment of this Act'' after ''employees''; and

(B) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(B) conduct and complete an evaluation of all workload assessments for Farm Service Agency county offices that were open and operational as of January 1, 2012, during the period that begins on a date that is not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013 and ends on the date that is 18 months after such date of enactment.''.

(c) NOTICE REQUIRED.—Section 14212(b)(2) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 6932a(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''After the period referred to in subsection (a)(1), the Secretary of Agriculture may not close a county or field office of the Farm Service Agency unless—'' and inserting ''After carrying out each of the activities required under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Agriculture shall, before closing a county or field office of the Farm Service Agency—'';

(2) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''the Secretary holds'' and inserting ''hold''; and

(3) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''the Secretary notifies'' and inserting ''notify''.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 14212(b)(1) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 6932a(b)(1)) is amended by striking ''After the period referred to in subsection (a)(1), the Secretary'' and inserting ''The Secretary''.

SEC. 11309. ACER ACCESS AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.

(a) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of Agriculture may make competitive grants to States, tribal governments, and research institutions to support the efforts of such States, tribal governments, and research institutions to promote the domestic maple syrup industry through the following activities:

(1) Promotion of research and education related to maple syrup production.

(2) Promotion of natural resource sustainability in the maple syrup industry.

(3) Market promotion for maple syrup and maple-sap products.

(4) Encouragement of owners and operators of privately held land containing species of trees in the genus Acer—

(A) to initiate or expand maple-sugaring activities on the land; or

(B) to voluntarily make the land available, including by lease or other means, for access by the public for maple-sugaring activities.

(b) APPLICATION.—In submitting an application for a competitive grant under this section, a State, tribal government, or research institution shall include—

(1) a description of the activities to be supported using the grant funds;

(2) a description of the benefits that the State, tribal government, or research institution intends to achieve as a result of engaging in such activities; and

(3) an estimate of the increase in maple-sugaring activities or maple syrup production that the State, tribal government, or research institution anticipates will occur as a result of engaging in such activities.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed so as to preempt a State or tribal government law, including a State or tribal government liability law.

(d) DEFINITION OF MAPLE-SUGARING.—In this section, the term ''maple-sugaring'' means the collection of sap from any species of tree in the genus Acer for the purpose of boiling to produce food.

(e) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall promulgate such regulations as are necessary to carry out this section.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.

SEC. 11310. REGULATORY REVIEW BY THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.

(a) REVIEW OF REGULATORY AGENDA.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall review publications that may give notice that the Environmental Protection Agency is preparing or plans to prepare any guidance, policy, memorandum, regulation, or statement of general applicability and future effect that may have a significant impact on a substantial number of agricultural entities, including—

(1) any regulatory agenda of the Environmental Protection Agency published pursuant to section 602 of title 5, United States Code;

(2) any regulatory plan or agenda published by the Environmental Protection Agency or the Office of Management and Budget pursuant to an Executive order, including Executive Order 12866; and

(3) any other publication issued by the Environmental Protection Agency or the Office of Management and Budget that may reasonably be foreseen to contain notice of plans by the Environmental Protection Agency to prepare any guidance, policy, memorandum, regulation, or statement of general applicability and future effect that may have a significant impact on a substantial number of agricultural entities.

(b) INFORMATION GATHERING.—For a publication item reviewed under subsection (a) that the Secretary determines may have a significant impact on a substantial number of agricultural entities, the Secretary shall—

(1) solicit from the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency any information the Administrator may provide to facilitate a review of the publication item;

(2) utilize the Chief Economist of the Department of Agriculture to produce an economic impact statement for the publication item that contains a detailed estimate of potential costs to agricultural entities;

(3) identify individuals representative of potentially affected agricultural entities for the purpose of obtaining advice and recommendations from such individuals about the potential impacts of the publication item; and

(4) convene a review panel for analysis of the publication item that includes the Secretary, any full-time Federal employee of the Department of Agriculture appointed to the panel by the Secretary, and any employee of the Environmental Protection Agency or the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs within the Office of Management and Budget that accepts an invitation from the Secretary to participate in the panel.

(c) DUTIES OF THE REVIEW PANEL.—A review panel convened for a publication item under subsection (b)(4) shall—

(1) review any information or material obtained by the Secretary and prepared in connection with the publication item, including any draft proposed guidance, policy, memorandum, regulation, or statement of general applicability and future effect;

(2) collect advice and recommendations from agricultural entity representatives identified by the Administrator after consultation with the Secretary;

(3) compile and analyze such advice and recommendations; and

(4) make recommendations to the Secretary based on the information gathered by the review panel or provided by agricultural entity representatives.

(d) COMMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date the Secretary convenes a review panel pursuant to subsection (b)(4), the Secretary shall submit to the Administrator comments on the planned or proposed guidance, policy, memorandum, regulation, or statement of general applicability and future effect for consideration and inclusion in any related administrative record, including—

(A) a report by the Secretary on the concerns of agricultural entities;

(B) the findings of the review panel;

(C) the findings of the Secretary, including any adopted findings of the review panel; and

(D) recommendations of the Secretary.

(2) PUBLICATION.—The Secretary shall publish the comments in the Federal Register and make the comments available to the public on the public Internet website of the Department of Agriculture.

(e) WAIVERS.—The Secretary may waive initiation of the review panel under subsection (b)(4) as the Secretary determines appropriate.

(f) DEFINITION OF AGRICULTURAL ENTITY.—In this section, the term ''agricultural entity'' means any entity involved in or related to agricultural enterprise, including enterprises that are engaged in the business of production of food and fiber, ranching and raising of livestock, aquaculture, and all other farming and agricultural related industries.

SEC. 11311. PROHIBITION ON ATTENDING AN ANIMAL FIGHTING VENTURE OR CAUSING A MINOR TO ATTEND AN ANIMAL FIGHTING VENTURE.

Section 26(a)(1) of the Animal Welfare Act (7 U.S.C. 2156(a)(1)) is amended by striking the period and inserting ''or to knowingly attend or knowingly cause a minor to attend an animal fighting venture.''.

SEC. 11312. PROHIBITION AGAINST INTERFERENCE BY STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS WITH PRODUCTION OR MANUFACTURE OF ITEMS IN OTHER STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Consistent with Article I, section 8, clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States, the government of a State or locality therein shall not impose a standard or condition on the production or manufacture of any agricultural product sold or offered for sale in interstate commerce if—

(1) such production or manufacture occurs in another State; and

(2) the standard or condition is in addition to the standards and conditions applicable to such production or manufacture pursuant to—

(A) Federal law; and

(B) the laws of the State and locality in which such production or manufacture occurs.

(b) AGRICULTURAL PRODUCT DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''agricultural product'' has the meaning given such term in section 207 of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1626).

SEC. 11313. INCREASED PROTECTION FOR AGRICULTURAL INTERESTS IN THE MISSOURI RIVER BASIN.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Record runoff occurred in the Missouri River basin during 2011 as a result of historic rainfall over portions of the upper basin coupled with heavy plains and mountain snowpack.

(2) Runoff above Sioux City, Iowa, during the 5-month period of March through July totaled an estimated 48.4 million acre-feet (referred to in this section as ''MAF''). This runoff volume was more than 20 percent greater than the design storm for the Missouri River Mainstem Reservoir System (referred to in this section as the ''System''), which was based on the 1881 runoff of 40.0 MAF during the same 5-month period.

(3) During the 2011 runoff season, nearly 61 million acre-feet of water entered the Missouri River system, far surpassing the previous record of 49 MAF in runoff that was set during the flood of 1997.

(4) Given the incredible amount of water entering the System, the summer months were spent working to evacuate as much water from the System as possible, ultimately leading to record high water releases from Gavins Point Dam of 160,000 cubic feet per second, a rate that more than doubled the previous release record of 70,000 cubic feet per second set in 1997.

(5) For nearly four months, those extremely high releases from Gavins Point were maintained, resulting in severe and sustained flooding, with much of western Iowa and eastern Nebraska as well as portions of South Dakota, Kansas, and Missouri inundated by a flooding river three to five feet deep, up to 11 miles wide, and flowing at a rate of 4 to 11 miles per hour.

(6) Thousands of homes and businesses were damaged or destroyed and hundreds of millions of dollars in damage was done to roads and other public infrastructure.

(7) In addition to the homes, businesses, and infrastructure impacted by the flooding, hundreds of thousands of acres of cropland were affected.

(8) The Department of Agriculture has estimated that 400,000 to 500,000 acres of some of the most productive crop land in the world was flooded in 2011.

(9) Local Farm Services Agency representatives have estimated that $82,100,000 was lost in 2011 alone due to damaged or lost crops and unplanted acres.

(10) Not only did the flooding eliminate the 2011 crop, but it is highly unlikely that many farmers will be able to put that land back into production at any point in the near future.

(11) Producers will have to contend with large piles of sand, silt, and other debris that have been deposited in their fields, meaning the impact of the 2011 flood will be felt in the agricultural communities up and down the Missouri River for many years to come.

(12) Currently, the amount of storage capacity in the System that is set aside for flood control is based upon the vacated space required to control the 1881 flood, because prior to the 2011 flood, the 1881 flood was seen as the ''high water mark''.

(13) Given the historic flooding that took place in 2011, it is clear that year's flooding now represents a new ''high water mark'', surpassing the flooding of even the 1881 flood.

(14) It is important that the flood control related functions of the System management be adjusted to reflect the reality of the 2011 flood as the new ''worst case scenario'' for flooding along the Missouri River.

(15) System management may begin to be adjusted to account for the 2011 flood through a recalculation of the amount of storage space within the System that is allocated to flood control, using the model not of the 1881 flood, but of the greatest flood experienced—the flood of 2011.

(16) As a result of the flooding in 2011, many States received disaster declarations from the Department of Agriculture to help farmers and producers recover from the damage done by the high water.

(17) Though helpful, even the assistance provided by the Department of Agriculture will not provide many in the agriculture community with the resources to put their land back into production any time soon.

(18) Without the protection that will come from a fundamental change in the System's flood control storage allocations, farmers, producers, and other agricultural interests who may be in a position to restart their operations will find it difficult to justify doing so, given the fact that they will not be protected from similar flooding in the future.

(b) UPDATED MANAGEMENT OF THE MISSOURI RIVER TO PROTECT AGRICULTURAL INTERESTS.—In order to strengthen the agricultural economy, revitalize the rural communities, and conserve the natural resources of the Missouri River basin, the Congress directs that the Secretary of Agriculture take action to promote immediate increased flood protection to farmers, producers, and other agricultural interests in the Missouri River basin by working within its jurisdiction to support efforts—

(1) to recalculate the amount of space within the System that is allocated to flood control storage using the 2011 flood as the model; and

(2) to increase the Missouri River's channel capacity between the reservoirs and below Gavins Point.

SEC. 11314. INCREASED PROTECTION FOR AGRICULTURAL INTERESTS IN THE BLACK DIRT REGION.

In order to strengthen the agricultural economy, revitalize the rural communities, and conserve the natural resources of the Black Dirt region, the Congress directs that the Secretary of Agriculture take action to promote immediate increased flood protection to farmers, producers, and other agricultural interests around the Wallkill River and in the Black Dirt region.

SEC. 11315. PROTECTION OF HONEY BEES AND OTHER POLLINATORS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, shall carry out such activities as the Secretary determines to be appropriate to protect and ensure the long-term viability of populations of honey bees, wild bees, and other beneficial insects of agricultural crops, horticultural plants, wild plants, and other plants, including—

(1) providing technical expertise relating to proposed agency actions that may threaten pollinator health or jeopardize the long-term viability of populations of pollinators;

(2) providing formal guidance on national policies relating to—

(A) permitting managed honey bees to forage on National Forest Service lands where compatible with other natural resource management priorities; and

(B) planting and maintaining managed honey bee and native pollinator forage on National Forest Service lands where compatible with other natural resource management priorities;

(3) making use of the best available peer-reviewed science regarding environmental and chemical stressors on pollinator health; and

(4) regularly monitoring and reporting on the health and population status of managed and native pollinators including bees, birds, bats, and other species.

(b) TASK FORCE ON BEE HEALTH AND COMMERCIAL BEEKEEPING.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a task force—

(A) to coordinate Federal efforts carried out on or after the date of enactment of this Act to address the serious worldwide decline in bee health, especially honey bees and declining native bees; and

(B) to assess Federal efforts to mitigate pollinator losses and threats to the United States commercial beekeeping industry.

(2) AGENCY CONSULTATION.—The task force established under this subsection shall seek ongoing consultation from any Federal agency carrying out activities important to bee health and commercial beekeeping, including officials from—

(A) the Department of Agriculture;

(B) the Department of the Interior;

(C) the Environmental Protection Agency;

(D) the Food and Drug Administration;

(E) the Department of Commerce; and

(F) U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

(3) STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION.—The task force established under this subsection shall consult with beekeeper, conservation, scientist, and agricultural stakeholders.

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the task force established under subsection (b) shall submit to Congress a report that—

(1) summarizes Federal activities carried out pursuant to subsection (f) of section of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5925) (as redesignated by section 7209) or any other provision of law (including regulations) to address bee decline;

(2) summarizes international efforts to address the decline of managed honey bees and native pollinators; and

(3) provides recommendations to Congress regarding how to better coordinate Federal agency efforts to address the decline of managed honey bees and native pollinators.

(d) POLLINATOR RESEARCH LAB FEASIBILITY STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Administrator of the Agricultural Research Service, may conduct feasibility studies regarding—

(A) re-locating existing honey bee and native pollinator research from Federal laboratories to a cooperator-run facility in a location most geographically appropriate for pollinator research; and

(B) modernizing existing honey bee research laboratories identified by the Agricultural Research Service in the capital investment strategy document dated 2012.

(2) CONSULTATION.—In conducting the feasibility studies under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall consult with—

(A) beekeeper, native bee, agricultural, research institution, and bee conservation stakeholders regarding new research laboratory needs under paragraph (1)(A); and

(B) commercial beekeepers regarding the modernizing of existing honey bee laboratories under paragraph (1)(B).

SEC. 11316. PRODUCE REPRESENTED AS GROWN IN THE UNITED STATES WHEN IT IS NOT IN FACT GROWN IN THE UNITED STATES.

(a) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO CBP.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall make available to U.S. Customs and Border Protection technical assistance related to the identification of produce represented as grown in the United States when it is not in fact grown in the United States.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report on produce represented as grown in the United States when it is not in fact grown in the United States.

SEC. 11317. URBAN AGRICULTURE COORDINATION.

The Secretary of Agriculture shall coordinate opportunities for urban agriculture, by—

(1) compiling a list of all programs administered by the Secretary or by the head of any other department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States to which urban farmers can apply for assistance or participation;

(2) examining and implementing opportunities to adjust the regulations governing the programs to enable urban farmers to participate in more of the programs;

(3) developing a process for streamlining the process by which urban farmers may apply for assistance from, or for participation in, the programs, including through the use of a single, harmonized application for multiple programs; and

(4) such other methods as the Secretary deems appropriate.

SEC. 11318. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON INCREASED BUSINESS OPPORTUNITIES FOR BLACK FARMERS, WOMEN, MINORITIES, AND SMALL BUSINESSES.

It is the sense of Congress that the Federal Government should increase the number of contracts the Federal Government awards to black farmers, businesses owned and controlled by women, businesses owned and controlled by minorities, and small business concerns.

SEC. 11319. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING AGRICULTURE SECURITY PROGRAMS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) agricultural nutrients and other agricultural chemicals are essential to ensuring the most efficient production of food, fuel, and fiber;

(2) these products must be properly stored, handled, transported, and used to ensure that they are not misused or cause harm either accidentally or intentionally;

(3) the Department of Agriculture is the Federal agency with the staffing and technical expertise to understand the important role these products play in agriculture;

(4) other Federal departments and agencies have been given lead responsibility to develop and implement security programs affecting the availability, storage, transportation, and use of a variety of chemicals and products used in agriculture;

(5) it is critical that the Department of Agriculture participates fully in the development of any such security programs to ensure that they do not unnecessarily restrict the availability of the most efficient and beneficial products needed to sustain agriculture in the United States;

(6) the Secretary of Agriculture should review staffing at the Department to ensure that the agency has senior employees within the Department at the Senior Executive Service level or higher, who have responsibility for coordinating with other Federal, State, and international agencies in the development of regulations, guidance, and procedures for the secure handling of agricultural chemicals; and

(7) such employees shall—

(A) work with manufacturers, retailers, and the general farm community to review existing and proposed Federal, State, and international agricultural chemical security regulations;

(B) coordinate with manufacturers, retailers, transporters, and farmers to evaluate how existing and proposed security regulations, including systems to track the sale, transportation, delivery, and use of agricultural products, can be designed to minimize any adverse impact on agricultural productivity;

(C) evaluate how existing and proposed security regulations will affect the ability of agricultural producers to have timely access to nutrients, chemicals, and other products that are affordable and best suited to the producers' operations;

(D) develop recommendations on best practices, policies, and regulatory mechanisms relating to existing and proposed security programs to ensure that there is minimal adverse impact on agricultural productivity; and

(E) engage with Federal agencies with responsibility for establishing security programs to ensure that they have the information needed to develop procedures for effective security administration and enforcement that minimize any adverse impact on domestic or international agricultural productivity.

SEC. 11320. REPORT ON WATER SHARING.

Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter, the Secretary of State shall submit to Congress a report on—

(1) efforts by Mexico to meet its treaty deliveries of water to the Rio Grande in accordance with the Treaty between the United States and Mexico Respecting Utilization of waters of the Colorado and Tijuana Rivers and of the Rio Grande (done at Washington, February 3, 1944); and

(2) the benefits to the United States of the Interim International Cooperative Measures in the Colorado River Basin through 2017 and Extension of Minute 318 Cooperative Measures to Address the Continued Effects of the April 2010 Earthquake in the Mexicali Valley, Baja, California (done at Coronado, California, November 20, 2012; commonly referred to as ''Minute No. 319'').

SEC. 11321. SCIENTIFIC AND ECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF THE FDA FOOD SAFETY MODERNIZATION ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services (referred to in this section as the ''Secretary'') may not enforce any regulations promulgated under the FDA Food Safety Modernization Act (Public Law 111–353) until the Secretary publishes in the Federal Register the following:

(1) An analysis of the scientific information used in the final rule to implement the FDA Food Safety Modernization Act with a particular focus on—

(A) agricultural businesses of a variety of sizes;

(B) regional differences of agriculture production, processing, marketing, and value added production;

(C) agricultural businesses that are diverse livestock and produce producers; and

(D) what, if any, negative impact on the agricultural businesses would be created, or exacerbated, by implementation of the FDA Food Safety Modernization Act.

(2) An analysis of the economic impact of the proposed final rule to implement the FDA Food Safety Modernization Act with a particular focus on—

(A) agricultural businesses of a variety of sizes; and

(B) small and mid-sized value added food processors.

(3) A plan to systematically evaluate the regulations by surveying farmers and processors and developing an ongoing process to evaluate and address business concerns.

(b) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives a report on the impact of implementation of the regulations promulgated under the FDA Food Safety Modernization Act.

SEC. 11322. IMPROVED DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE CONSIDERATION OF ECONOMIC IMPACT OF REGULATIONS ON SMALL BUSINESS.

The Secretary of Agriculture shall complete procedures consistent with the requirements of subsection (b) of section 609 of title 5, United States Code, whenever the Department of Agriculture promulgates any rule which will have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

SEC. 11323. SILVICULTURAL ACTIVITIES.

Section 402(l) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342(l)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) SILVICULTURAL ACTIVITIES.—

''(A) NPDES PERMIT REQUIREMENTS FOR SILVICULTURAL ACTIVITIES.—The Administrator shall not require a permit or otherwise promulgate regulations under this section or directly or indirectly require any State to require a permit under this section for a discharge of stormwater runoff resulting from the conduct of the following silviculture activities: nursery operations, site preparation, reforestation and subsequent cultural treatment, thinning, prescribed burning, pest and fire control, harvesting operations, surface drainage, and road use, construction, and maintenance.

''(B) PERMITS FOR DREDGED OR FILL MATERIAL.—Nothing in this paragraph exempts a silvicultural activity resulting in the discharge of dredged or fill material from any permitting requirement under section 404.''.

SEC. 11324. APPLICABILITY OF SPILL PREVENTION, CONTROL, AND COUNTERMEASURE RULE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator, in implementing the Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure rule with respect to any farm, shall—

(1) require certification of compliance with such rule by—

(A) a professional engineer for a farm with—

(i) an individual tank with an aboveground storage capacity greater than 10,000 gallons;

(ii) an aggregate aboveground storage capacity greater than or equal to 42,000 gallons; or

(iii) a history that includes a spill, as determined by the Administrator; or

(B) the owner or operator of the farm (via self-certification) for a farm with—

(i) an aggregate aboveground storage capacity greater than 10,000 gallons but less than 42,000 gallons; and

(ii) no history of spills, as determined by the Administrator; and

(2) exempt from all requirements of such rule any farm—

(A) with an aggregate aboveground storage capacity of less than or equal to 10,000 gallons; and

(B) no history of spills, as determined by the Administrator.

(b) CALCULATION OF AGGREGATE ABOVEGROUND STORAGE CAPACITY.—For the purposes of subsection (a), the aggregate aboveground storage capacity of a farm excludes—

(1) all containers on separate parcels that have a capacity that is less than 1,320 gallons; and

(2) all storage containers holding animal feed ingredients approved for use in livestock feed by the Food and Drug Administration.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ''Administrator'' means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(2) FARM.—The term ''farm'' has the meaning given such term in section 112.2 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations.

(3) GALLON.—The term ''gallon'' refers to a United States liquid gallon.

(4) HISTORY OF SPILLS.—The term ''history of spills'' has the meaning used to describe the term ''reportable discharge history'' in section 112.7(k)(1) of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations).

(5) SPILL PREVENTION, CONTROL, AND COUNTERMEASURE RULE.—The term ''Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure rule'' means the regulation promulgated by the Environmental Protection Agency under part 112 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 11325. AGRICULTURAL PRODUCER INFORMATION DISCLOSURE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ''Administrator'' means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(2) AGENCY.—The term ''Agency'' means the Environmental Protection Agency.

(3) AGRICULTURAL OPERATION.—The term ''agricultural operation'' includes any operation where an agricultural commodity crop is raised, including livestock operations.

(4) LIVESTOCK OPERATION.—The term ''livestock operation'' includes any operation involved in the raising or finishing of livestock or poultry.

(b) DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION.—

(1) PROHIBITION.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Administrator, any officer or employee of the Agency, or any contractor of the Agency, shall not make public the information of any owner, operator, or employee of an agricultural operation provided to the Agency by a farmer, rancher, or livestock producer or a State agency that has been obtained in accordance with the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) or any other law, including—

(A) names;

(B) telephone numbers;

(C) email addresses;

(D) physical addresses;

(E) Global Positioning System coordinates; or

(F) other identifying location information.

(2) EFFECT.—Nothing in paragraph (1) affects—

(A) the disclosure of information described in paragraph (1) if—

(i) the information has been transformed into a statistical or aggregate form at the county level or higher without any information that identifies the agricultural operation or agricultural producer; or

(ii) the producer consents to the disclosure; or

(B) the authority of any State agency to collect information on livestock operations.

(3) CONDITION OF PERMIT OR OTHER PROGRAMS.—The approval of any permit, practice, or program administered by the Administrator shall not be conditioned on the consent of the agricultural producer or livestock producer under paragraph (2)(A)(ii).

SEC. 11326. REPORT ON NATIONAL OCEAN POLICY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Executive Order 13547, issued on July 19, 2010, established the national policy for the Stewardship of the Ocean, Our Coasts, and the Great Lakes and requires—

(A) Federal implementation of ''ecosystem-based management'' to achieve a ''fundamental shift'' in how the United States manages ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes resources; and

(B) the establishment of nine new governmental ''Regional Planning Bodies'' and ''Coastal and Marine Spatial Plans'' in every region of the United States.

(2) Executive Order 13547 created a 54-member National Ocean Council led by the White House Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Science and Technology Policy that includes 54 principal and deputy-level representatives from Federal entities, including the Department of Agriculture.

(3) Executive Order 13547 requires National Ocean Council members, including the Department of Agriculture, to take action to implement the Policy and participate in coastal and marine spatial planning to the maximum extent possible.

(4) The Final Recommendations of the Interagency Ocean Policy Task Force that were adopted by Executive Order 13547 state that ''effective'' implementation of the National Ocean Policy will ''require clear and easily understood requirements and regulations, where appropriate, that include enforcement as a critical component''.

(5) Despite repeated Congressional requests, the National Ocean Council, which is charged with overseeing implementation of the policy, has still not provided a complete accounting of Federal activities under the policy and resources expended and allocated in furtherance of implementation of the policy.

(6) The continued economic and budgetary challenges of the United States underscore the necessity for sound, transparent, and practical Federal policies.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Inspector General of the Department of Agriculture shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report detailing—

(1) all activities engaged in and resources expended in furtherance of Executive Order 13547 since July 19, 2010; and

(2) any budget requests for fiscal year 2014 for support of implementation of Executive Order 13547.

SEC. 11327. SUNSETTING OF PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), each fiscal year the Secretary of Agriculture may not carry out any program—

(1) for which an authorization of appropriations is established or extended under this Act; and

(2) that is funded by discretionary appropriations (as defined in section 250(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900(c))).

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (a) shall take effect with respect to a program referred to in such subsection on the date on which the authorization of appropriations under this Act for such program expires.

(c) EXISTING OBLIGATIONS.—Subsection (a) does not affect the ability of the Secretary to carry out responsibilities with regard to loans, grants, or other obligations made or in existence before an applicable effective date under subsection (b).

Subtitle D—Chesapeake Bay Accountability and Recovery

SEC. 11401. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''Chesapeake Bay Accountability and Recovery Act of 2013''.

SEC. 11402. CHESAPEAKE BAY CROSSCUT BUDGET.

(a) CROSSCUT BUDGET.—The Director, in consultation with the Chesapeake Executive Council, the chief executive of each Chesapeake Bay State, and the Chesapeake Bay Commission, shall submit to Congress a financial report containing—

(1) an interagency crosscut budget that displays—

(A) the proposed funding for any Federal restoration activity to be carried out in the succeeding fiscal year, including any planned interagency or intra-agency transfer, for each of the Federal agencies that carry out restoration activities;

(B) to the extent that information is available, the estimated funding for any State restoration activity to be carried out in the succeeding fiscal year;

(C) all expenditures for Federal restoration activities from the preceding 2 fiscal years, the current fiscal year, and the succeeding fiscal year; and

(D) all expenditures, to the extent that information is available, for State restoration activities during the equivalent time period described in subparagraph (C);

(2) a detailed accounting of all funds received and obligated by all Federal agencies for restoration activities during the current and preceding fiscal years, including the identification of funds which were transferred to a Chesapeake Bay State for restoration activities;

(3) to the extent that information is available, a detailed accounting from each State of all funds received and obligated from a Federal agency for restoration activities during the current and preceding fiscal years; and

(4) a description of each of the proposed Federal and State restoration activities to be carried out in the succeeding fiscal year (corresponding to those activities listed in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1)), including the—

(A) project description;

(B) current status of the project;

(C) Federal or State statutory or regulatory authority, programs, or responsible agencies;

(D) authorization level for appropriations;

(E) project timeline, including benchmarks;

(F) references to project documents;

(G) descriptions of risks and uncertainties of project implementation;

(H) adaptive management actions or framework;

(I) coordinating entities;

(J) funding history;

(K) cost sharing; and

(L) alignment with existing Chesapeake Bay Agreement and Chesapeake Executive Council goals and priorities.

(b) MINIMUM FUNDING LEVELS.—The Director shall only describe restoration activities in the report required under subsection (a) that—

(1) for Federal restoration activities, have funding amounts greater than or equal to $100,000; and

(2) for State restoration activities, have funding amounts greater than or equal to $50,000.

(c) DEADLINE.—The Director shall submit to Congress the report required by subsection (a) not later than 30 days after the submission by the President of the President's annual budget to Congress.

(d) REPORT.—Copies of the financial report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations, Natural Resources, Energy and Commerce, and Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Appropriations, Environment and Public Works, and Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall apply beginning with the first fiscal year after the date of enactment of this Act for which the President submits a budget to Congress.

SEC. 11403. RESTORATION THROUGH ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator, in consultation with other Federal and State agencies, and with the participation of stakeholders, shall develop a plan to provide technical and financial assistance to Chesapeake Bay States to employ adaptive management in carrying out restoration activities in the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

(b) PLAN DEVELOPMENT.—The plan referred to in subsection (a) shall include—

(1) specific and measurable objectives to improve water quality, habitat, and fisheries identified by Chesapeake Bay States;

(2) a process for stakeholder participation;

(3) monitoring, modeling, experimentation, and other research and evaluation technical assistance requested by Chesapeake Bay States;

(4) identification of State restoration activities planned by Chesapeake Bay States to attain the State's objectives under paragraph (1);

(5) identification of Federal restoration activities that could help a Chesapeake Bay State to attain the State's objectives under paragraph (1);

(6) recommendations for a process for modification of State and Federal restoration activities that have not attained or will not attain the specific and measurable objectives set forth under paragraph (1); and

(7) recommendations for a process for integrating and prioritizing State and Federal restoration activities and programs to which adaptive management can be applied.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION.—In addition to carrying out Federal restoration activities under existing authorities and funding, the Administrator shall implement the plan developed under subsection (a) by providing technical and financial assistance to Chesapeake Bay States using resources available for such purposes that are identified by the Director under section 11402.

(d) UPDATES.—The Administrator shall update the plan developed under subsection (a) every 2 years.

(e) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the end of a fiscal year, the Administrator shall transmit to Congress an annual report on the implementation of the plan required under this section for such fiscal year.

(2) CONTENTS.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall contain information about the application of adaptive management to restoration activities and programs, including level changes implemented through the process of adaptive management.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Paragraph (1) shall apply to the first fiscal year that begins after the date of enactment of this Act.

(f) INCLUSION OF PLAN IN ANNUAL ACTION PLAN AND ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT.—The Administrator shall ensure that the Annual Action Plan and Annual Progress Report required by section 205 of Executive Order 13508 includes the adaptive management plan outlined in subsection (a).

SEC. 11404. INDEPENDENT EVALUATOR FOR THE CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There shall be an Independent Evaluator for restoration activities in the Chesapeake Bay watershed, who shall review and report on restoration activities and the use of adaptive management in restoration activities, including on such related topics as are suggested by the Chesapeake Executive Council.

(b) APPOINTMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Independent Evaluator shall be appointed by the Administrator from among nominees submitted by the Chesapeake Executive Council.

(2) NOMINATIONS.—The Chesapeake Executive Council may submit to the Administrator 4 nominees for appointment to any vacancy in the office of the Independent Evaluator.

(c) REPORTS.—The Independent Evaluator shall submit a report to the Congress every 2 years in the findings and recommendations of reviews under this section.

(d) CHESAPEAKE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.—In this section, the term ''Chesapeake Executive Council'' has the meaning given that term by section 307 of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Authorization Act of 1992 (Public Law 102–567; 15 U.S.C. 1511d).

SEC. 11405. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle, the following definitions apply:

(1) ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT.—The term ''adaptive management'' means a type of natural resource management in which project and program decisions are made as part of an ongoing science-based process. Adaptive management involves testing, monitoring, and evaluating applied strategies and incorporating new knowledge into programs and restoration activities that are based on scientific findings and the needs of society. Results are used to modify management policy, strategies, practices, programs, and restoration activities.

(2) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ''Administrator'' means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(3) CHESAPEAKE BAY STATE.—The term ''Chesapeake Bay State'' or ''State'' means the States of Maryland, West Virginia, Delaware, and New York, the Commonwealths of Virginia and Pennsylvania, and the District of Columbia.

(4) CHESAPEAKE BAY WATERSHED.—The term ''Chesapeake Bay watershed'' means the Chesapeake Bay and the geographic area, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, consisting of 36 tributary basins, within the Chesapeake Bay States, through which precipitation drains into the Chesapeake Bay.

(5) CHIEF EXECUTIVE.—The term ''chief executive'' means, in the case of a State or Commonwealth, the Governor of each such State or Commonwealth and, in the case of the District of Columbia, the Mayor of the District of Columbia.

(6) DIRECTOR.—The term ''Director'' means the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(7) STATE RESTORATION ACTIVITIES.—The term ''State restoration activities'' means any State programs or projects carried out under State authority that directly or indirectly protect, conserve, or restore living resources, habitat, water resources, or water quality in the Chesapeake Bay watershed, including programs or projects that promote responsible land use, stewardship, and community engagement in the Chesapeake Bay watershed. Restoration activities may be categorized as follows:

(A) Physical restoration.

(B) Planning.

(C) Feasibility studies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2642, the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013.

The bill before us includes 11 of the 12 titles of H.R. 1947 as amended on the House floor last month. To recap, we adopted over 60 amendments in an open process. This bill gives taxpayers nearly $20 billion in savings from mandatory Federal spending. It's the most significant reduction to farm policy in history and further improves agricultural programs so that producers have a true safety net that is triggered only when they suffer significant losses.

The bill repeals or consolidates more than 100 programs administered by USDA, including direct payments to farmers. The bill also repeals outdated and unworkable permanent law and replaces it with the cost-effective and market-oriented provisions in title I going forward. This provides certainty to farmers and ranchers and eliminates the threat of government quotas and government price support levels based on 1938 and 1949 agricultural practices and economic conditions.

This bill includes multiple regulatory relief provisions, making it the largest regulatory relief bill to be voted on this year.

This process began 4 years ago when then-Chairman Peterson led us into the countryside to have eight field hearings across the Nation. We followed up with three more sets of hearings, including audits of every single policy under the jurisdiction of the House Agriculture Committee. The result is the legislation that reduces the Federal footprint and makes commonsense reforms to policy.

It's no secret, my friends, that my preference would have been to pass H.R. 1947—the full farm bill—last month, but that didn't happen. We are here today with another opportunity. Today is a step towards getting a 5-year farm bill on the books this year. We can't lose sight of our responsibility to do this work.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would say this: If you're serious about reducing billions of dollars in mandatory government spending, then vote for the bill. If you're serious about reducing the size and the cost of the Federal Government, vote for the bill. If you're serious about providing regulatory relief to farmers and small businesses all across rural America, then vote for the bill. If you're serious about making sure every American has a safe, affordable, reliable food supply, then vote for the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this farm bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill—and I'm sorry that I have to do that because I started, as the chairman said, having hearings on this bill April 21 of 2010—and I do it for two reasons. First and foremost, I believe the strategy of splitting the farm bill is a mistake. It jeopardizes the chances of it ever becoming law. And I think that repealing permanent law all but ensures that we will never write a farm bill again in this House.

I'm not alone in my belief that this is a flawed strategy. Last week, a broad coalition of 532 agriculture, conservation, rural development, finance, forestry, energy, and crop insurance groups expressed their opposition to splitting the farm bill and urged House leaders to pass a 5-year farm bill. When such a large group of organizations—most with different, if not conflicting, priorities—can come together and agree on something, we should listen to them. Doing the exact opposite of what everyone with a stake in this bill urges us to do in my opinion does not make sense and is not the way to achieve success.

I don't see a clear path forward from here. There is no assurance from the Republican leadership that passing this bill will allow us to begin a conference with the Senate in a timely manner. In fact, the Republican leadership has told agriculture groups to support this bill as a way to go to conference, while

also telling Republican Members, fearful of the wrath of conservative groups' opposition, that there will be no conference, or at least not without first getting concessions from the Senate—concessions that the Senate will never agree to.

There is a very real chance that we could end up in a situation like we have with the Federal budget, where the House majority claim that they want something, but instead disregard regular order and demand preconditions before appointing conferees, leaving the bill hanging with nothing getting done.

Maybe the chairman has received assurances from his leadership that, should this bill pass, that they're going to let this move forward to conference and appoint conferees. I have received no assurance to that end. And given the majority's past performance, frankly, I don't have a lot of confidence that they're going to move in that direction.

I have repeatedly said that if they only would leave us alone, the Agriculture Committee could put together a good bill with good policy, and we did in the committee. But last month, the Republican leaders interfered by pushing into the farm bill poison pill amendments, amendments that the chairman and I both said could bring the bill down. And even if the House passes this bill today, I fear the leadership's continued interference will doom any prospects of getting a bill that the President can sign.

The other fatal flaw with this bill is the repeal of permanent law from 1938 and 1949 and replacing it by making the commodity title in this bill permanent. If you want to ensure that Congress never considers another farm bill and the farm programs, as written, are going to remain forever, then vote for this bill.

In every farm bill there are some people that like things and some people that don't. The beauty of the '38 and '49 laws is that they force both groups to work together on a new farm bill. And because nobody really wants to go back to the old commodity programs, people will get to a point where they don't necessarily like it, but everybody can live with it.

So if you make the new farm safety net programs the new permanent law, then what you've got is you've got permanent authorization of food stamps, you've got permanent authorization of crop insurance, and then you have permanent authorization of the title I programs. So I'll guarantee you, what that means is, if you're concerned about conservation, fruits and vegetables, research, these other areas, there's never going to be a farm bill if we do this.

Another reason that I'm concerned about this is the Goodlatte amendment to the Dairy Security Act that was passed on the floor here. I lost that argument—big time. But if I'm proven right in what I said about that, and if this bill makes permanent law out of that dairy provision, I will guarantee you that this dairy provision that you're going to enact will cost more money than what you're going to save in this bill here that's being considered on the floor today.

We had a bipartisan bill out of the committee. We were able to work together. We had 13 of the 21 Democrats on the committee support that bill. We were doing fine until we got here to the floor and the leadership screwed this up.

We have the votes to do this bill on a bipartisan basis if we just take out those amendments that were a poison pill. I'll give you the names of the people that will vote for this bill if we do that. You can call them up yourself and ask them; you don't have to rely on me. We can do that. But no, you've got to make this a partisan bill. You know, some people on that side have been trying to make this a partisan bill for 4 months, and they finally succeeded.

I told my caucus something I never thought would happen. You have now managed to make me a partisan. And that's a darn hard thing to do, but you accomplished it.

This is a bad bill; it should be defeated. We should go back and do a bipartisan bill like we worked in the first place.

I reserve the balance of my time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for a parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. On the basis of such an eloquent statement by our ranking member, my inquiry is: At this point, could we not, in essence, table this bill and begin the process of reconstructing the bill, as the ranking member has so eloquently stated, in order to be able to feed America's children and not continue the starvation that this farm bill will create and promote for years to come?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Any requests for a disposition of this bill would have to come from the majority manager.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, if I could continue my parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is recognized for a further parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Is the bill not flawed, as the ranking member has said, for it has left out what has traditionally been a major component of the farm bill, which is the supplemental nutrition program, which deals with feeding hungry Americans and hungry children?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has not raised a proper parliamentary inquiry. That is a matter that's being discussed in debate.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I will go back and return again. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), the chairman of the General Farm Commodities Subcommittee.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this farm bill. The farm bill before us was fully debated by this body and subjected to more than 100 amendments just a couple of weeks ago. More than 60 of those amendments were adopted. This body has had ample opportunity to work its will, and now it's time to vote for passage.

Today, those of us who came to town to cut spending, reduce the deficit, reduce the size of government, and make reforms have a real opportunity to walk the walk. This farm bill does all of those things.

This bill is going to save taxpayers $19.3 billion, it's going to repeal or consolidate more than 100 programs at USDA, and it's going to repeal the direct payment program, something that many of my farmers and ranchers back home do not really want to give up.

□ 1315

The farm bill also does a couple of other things. It is being considered separately on its own merits, as many in this body have called for, and it replaces antiquated permanent law so that we don't face things, like the dairy cliff, at the end of the year anymore. The bill before us reforms not just the politics of the farm bill, but the process as well.

This farm bill has earned our support, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes.''

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished minority whip, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I thank the chairman and ranking member.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman does not want to do this, with all due respect. The chairman has said publicly he does not want to do this. The chairman has said publicly he wants to do what historically we have done: gone forth in a bipartisan way. That is the bill he constructed last year, and his colleagues did not bring it to the floor. That's the bill he constructed this year, and it was brought to the floor.

As Mr. PETERSON has so eloquently stated, it was turned from a bipartisan bill into a partisan bill.

Why, why, why, do we always have to do that?

The response to its failure, because 62 of Mr. LUCAS' party would not join him in the extraordinarily eloquent closing that he gave—not speaking to the motion to recommit—but said, look, I understand that some of you think this is too much and some of you think it is too little, but it's democracy. Yet the chairman's party rejected his bill. We reject it as well because you adopted three amendments that you knew beforehand were going to turn this into a more partisan bill.

So what did you do? You left this House and said, we are going to not

compromise, not try to create a broader coalition, but we are going to narrow the coalition, we are going to try to buy off those 62 folks who said they really don't like this bill at all anyway and get them to say, This is a Republican bill, let's pass it, knowing full well it will not pass the Senate, knowing full well that the President won't sign it.

Farmers need our agreement. I support it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. I don't think I have ever opposed a farm bill, not because I represent a vast farm district—I don't. But I understand that food and fiber is critical for my people, for our Nation, indeed, for much of the world.

So, ladies and gentlemen, let us reject this flawed process, this process which abrogates the pledge of 3 days of consideration for legislation, last night published, and we are asked to vote on it today.

Why? Because this is a very controversial provision, and they didn't want to have the light of day shine too long on this flawed process.

Let us reject this bill, let us reject a partisan bill, let us speak out for the farm community of America, and, yes, those who need nutritional help. Let us also speak for job growth in rural America, which the bill that the chairman reported out would have helped.

This bill ought to be rejected, and we ought to do our duty and our responsibility in a responsible and effective democratic, bipartisan, cooperative way.

I congratulate the chairman for what he would like to do.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a disgraceful abandonment of the most vulnerable people in our country.

The legislation Republicans have chosen to introduce—with just hours' notice and in blatant violation of their own stated 'three-day' policy to read the bill—is missing a major part of any responsible farm bill.

By leaving funding for the supplemental nutrition assistance program—or ''SNAP''—out of this bill, they are effectively killing that program.

SNAP is a critical tool in keeping 47.5 million people—including many children and seniors—from experiencing hunger and illness.

It is one of our front-line programs against poverty in America.

My republican friends know that, even if they pass this bill through this House, the United States Senate will not consider a Farm Bill without SNAP funding.

Even conservative Republican Senator CHARLES GRASSLEY of Iowa has said that splitting SNAP from the rest of the Farm Bill ''might fly in the House, but I don't think it's going to fly in the Senate.''

Our Republican friends claim to want fiscally responsible reforms to farm programs.

So it's ironic that their bill actually increases spending and the deficit by $1 billion in 2014—and it saves less over ten years than the Senate Farm Bill while creating permanent new farm programs.

The bill before us is just another exercise in house Republicans' political messaging game to make it appear that they are moving important legislation through Congress while, in reality, they refuse to play a constructive role in governing.

I urge its defeat.

Instead we ought to consider a farm bill that includes SNAP funding, after which we can go to conference with the Senate to achieve a real compromise.

If the Speaker really believes in regular order, which he has called for, Republicans should work with Democrats to pass a bipartisan farm bill and allow the conference process to move forward.

He has yet to do so with the budget, and I suspect that the reason we are not seeing regular order play out is because Republicans are not interested in compromise—only partisan politics.

Withdraw this bill; defeat this bill; restore regular order.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to one of my prime subcommittee chairmen, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding to me and for the work that he has done to pull together this bill over these last 2 years.

There is much that I'm hearing on this floor so far in this debate that I do not disagree with. There is much that I do agree with.

The numbers are this: 62 ''no'' votes on the Republican side and 24 ''yes'' votes on the Democrat side. I said for weeks we should go to both sides and pull together 218. I appreciate the effort to do that. I appreciate the honor that has been brought to this process by the chairman, Mr. LUCAS, and others that we work with.

We are down to this now: we are down to this is our choice for this bill which can provide 5 years of predictability for agriculture and an uncertain bill that might come before us on nutrition, which I think ends up without what I want, which is reform of SNAP.

I am going to support this bill, I urge my colleagues to do the same, and I would like to back this train up, if we could, and do it over. We can't, so I'm going to be for moving forward.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT).

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Thank you very much, Chairman Peterson.

Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, what we have here is not a farm bill. You tell me how in the world we can have a farm bill and separate food and nutrition out from it. The American people don't get that. When you think of farms and you think of agriculture, do you mean to tell me it isn't about food?

Here we have made this critical, terrible mistake of divorcing, of segregating, of separating the most basic essential of farm policy, which is to produce the food and the nutrition for the people of America. This isn't just about food stamps, although we are here because the Republican Party, my friends—and I have many over there—have been hijacked to turn a bipartisan effort to deal with the complexity, the vulgarity, where 38 States in this Nation their primary part of their economy is agriculture, is business.

My members on the Agriculture Committee, we have a broad mandate. We should be the most powerful committee up here. We not only deal with food, we not only deal with agriculture, we deal with fuel going our way up to energy independence. We are dealing with the heavy finance of $600 trillion in derivatives. But this makes us look small.

To bring a bill and call it a farm bill and it has nothing to do with food—and it's so hypocritical, my friends. You've seen the news reports. The American people have seen the news reports, where we have Members who are accepting millions of dollars in subsidies and will be voting against poor people who need the food to eat.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to yield 1 minute to the other Mr. SCOTT from Georgia, one of the chairmen of the primary subcommittee on the House Agriculture Committee, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this bill. While I know that many people who I have worked with, who I have a tremendous amount of respect for, oppose the way forward here, I rise because it is the only way forward.

Throughout this entire process, there were many things that we agreed on. The agriculture industry needs certainty. Our farmers who produce our food and fiber need the ability to plan so that they can produce a safe, reliable, and affordable food source for our country.

I know that many of us who are on the committee would have preferred that the last bill pass. I too would have preferred that it pass. As a small business owner, I can attest to the importance of having the ability to plan. If we are able to get these titles that we agree to, these 11 titles that we agree to, passed into law, then our farmers will have that ability.

I appreciate being part of the process. The farms and families in this country need the certainty of this agriculture policy.

I ask that you support this bill.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen, the farm bill usually is one of the most bipartisan things we do around here, but not today.

Even though many of my colleagues, unlike myself, were not farm kids, I assume that they could tell the horse's head from the horse's rear; but they are totally backwards on this one.

Last night, we received notice that previously an unreleased farm bill was going to be sprung on the floor today. What about regular order? This stunt makes a mockery of Chairman LUCAS and Ranking Member PETERSON and the committee's work over the last year and a half.

Farmers, ranchers, and anyone who believes in government transparency must be shaking their heads, saying, There they go again.

Once again, the majority has chosen to make everything we do around here partisan. This is one of the least likely partisan persons you are going to talk to. Unlike many of my colleagues on this side of the aisle, I supported the farm bill 2 weeks ago when it failed. I supported it because I thought we ought to move the process forward. This moves us backwards, and it removes permanent law, and I don't think we will ever see a farm bill again.

I cannot support this bill. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, once again I turn to one of the outstanding subcommittee chairmen who has jurisdiction over Conservation, Energy, and Forestry, and yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, passage of a new farm bill is long overdue.

The House Agriculture Committee has spent 4 years, held dozens of hearings and countless hours preparing for this farm bill. Plain and simple, the committee-passed bill, which was recently considered by this body, made substantial reforms to agriculture programs. It eliminated more than 100 programs and reformed outdated, costly, and ineffective programs. The committee-passed bill would have saved taxpayers over $40 billion, with half of the savings coming out of the farm programs.

The bill before us today repeals the outdated farm programs that we don't need and we can't afford. Direct payments, counter-cyclical payments, the Average Crop Revenue Election (ACRE) program, and the Supplemental Revenue Assistance Payments (SURE) are all repealed in this bill. We get rid of many costly subsidy programs and replace them with free market-modeled risk mismanagement.

For the sake of our Nation's farmers and ranchers, and also for all citizens who rely on the safest, most affordable and highest quality food, I rise in support of this legislation and strongly encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ).

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member.

I come from a proud agricultural family, I proudly represent a strong agricultural district in the heartland in southern Minnesota, I'm a proud ranking member on the subcommittee in the House Agriculture Committee, and I'm proud to call both the ranking member and the chairman my friends.

I am not proud of what you are seeing here today. The disrespect shown to this hallowed ground by hatching this abomination in the middle of the night and forcing it here because of extremist elements is the reason that the American people think higher of North Korea than they do of this body.

I can tell you, as people listening today, Mr. Speaker, they are going to say it is more of the same. They said, he said—Democrats or Republicans or whatever—don't listen to me. Listen to this book full of people who said this is wrong:

American Farm Bureau Federation; National Farmers Union; American Soybean Association; National Association of Wheat Growers, National Milk Producers, National Rural Electric Cooperative, Ducks Unlimited, Pheasants Forever, AgriBank, AgStar Financial Services, Izaak Walton League, National Catholic Rural Life Conference, Renewable Fuels Association, First Farm Credit Services, Advanced Biofuels, AgGeorgia, AgHeritage, AgriBank, Agriculture Council of Arkansas, Agriculture Energy Coalition, AgCarolina, AgCountry, AgFirst, AgStar Financial, AgTexas, Alabama Dairy Producers, Alabama Farmers Cooperative, American Agriculture Movement, American Association of Crop Insurers, American Association of Veterinary Laboratory Diagnosticians, American Bankers Association, American Coalition for Ethanol, American Crystal Sugar, American Farmland Trust.

I may need more time. I am on the A's.

American Fruit and Vegetable Processors, American Forest Foundation, American Honey Producers, American Public Works Association, American Sugarbeet Growers, American Agriculture Coalition, Arizona Farm Bureau Federation, Arkansas Farm Bureau, Arkansas Farmers Union, Association of American Veterinary Medical Colleges.

It goes on and on and on.

Listen to the public, listen to your constituents, reject the extremism. I am one of the 24 who put my money where my money is and voted for a bipartisan bill. This is wrong.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK).

□ 1330

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 2642, the farm bill.

Like many of my colleagues in this body, I am honored to represent a district with a deep agricultural heritage. Because I am a doctor by trade, not a farmer, it has been important for me to get to know the farmers in my district over the last 3 years. As I travel around the First District, nearly every producer I meet with stresses the importance of passing a long-term farm bill.

The programs in the farm bill are important to keeping our farmers in business with some certainty. I know some will say this bill isn't perfect. Some want more reform. Some would like more spending, and some would like less. Yet, I urge all of you to strongly consider moving H.R. 2642 forward. We have one thing in common: we all need to eat. Our country is the breadbasket of the world. Let's keep that in mind and remember our farmers who produce our food here today. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman.

This is not a farm bill. This is a leadership-designed train wreck. We had a farm bill. It was bipartisan. It saved money. It provided farmers with more security. It provided conservation and a way forward. Instead, what we have is the result of a failure of the leadership to work with their committee chair. They came on this floor, and they unraveled intentionally, deliberately and, regrettably, effectively a compromise that was reached by Republicans and Democrats who dealt with tough issues.

America needs a farm bill, not something that is designed for political consumption and for farm failure.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I and the ranking member have remaining in the debate?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 22 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Minnesota has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RIBBLE).

Mr. RIBBLE. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the legislation today.

I'll tell you that I've often told folks back in Wisconsin that working in the House of Representatives is sometimes like living in an alternate universe. For the last hour and a half here we've been debating what is not rather than debating what is. Maybe we should debate what is, and that is what is in this bill.

This bill, for the first time, eliminates direct payments to rich farmers. I think that sounds like a pretty good idea. It eliminates it by $14 billion. We remove subsidies to people who no longer farm, and I think that sounds like a pretty good idea. For Wisconsin, America's dairy land, we fix our Nation's dairy policy. That sounds like a pretty good idea as well. We fix forestry problems and improve timber harvest. We stop the brain drain that has been going on in our national forests. It improves the fruit and vegetable production in the Midwest. Finally, it minimizes reforms and improves important regulatory problems that have put burdens on producers.

These are all of the really great things that are in the bill, and I think

we ought to focus on what is there rather than on what is not. Let's worry about what is there today and worry about what is not tomorrow.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER).

Mr. SCHRADER. I thank the gentleman.

It is with a pretty heavy heart that I am on the floor here today. This should have been a high point. I listened to the good chairman and even to the Rules Committee chairman about this being the way to get the bill to conference. I've heard people say this is the only way to get this bill to conference. We had another way, and that got sabotaged.

I guess the point I'd make to this body and to the people at home is that some of us are listening to you. The most important thing is for us to work together. That's what I hear back home. They don't know about the details of all of this policy.

Colleagues, how a bill gets to conference is as important as getting it to conference. Doing it with one party ramrodding it through, without listening to half of America, is just wrong. This is anathema to what America wants to see happen. We are ceding our authority to the Senate and to the President. The Senate will never take this up, and the President has said he will veto this bill. Why not go back and work together? That was the message of 2 weeks ago. We got it wrong. That's the legislative process. It's not pretty. We should have gone back and worked together. As you've heard, Democrats are willing to work with our Republican colleagues for a good piece of legislation.

I am proud of the American Farm Bureau, of the National Farmers Union, and of others who still oppose this bill because we are not working together. This is a travesty, and they recognize it. American agriculture is under siege. The world economy, global competition—it's gotten scary out there. Now they are under siege from their own Congress.

Colleagues, that is unacceptable to all of us. We can do better. America deserves better. I ask my colleagues to research and check their hearts, to vote their consciences and to search their moral compasses. Let's work together and defeat this particular bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you to my colleague from Oklahoma for his leadership on this issue because, Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this farm bill.

One thing I've learned in my 6 months here in Washington is that the farm bill has not been easy. It has been a 3-year saga, but I was proud to help produce a strong, bipartisan farm bill out of committee.

Three weeks ago on this very floor, we had a farm bill that cut $40 billion, including direct payments. It kept crop insurance as a key risk management tool. It made commonsense reforms to a food stamp program that helps feed those who need a hand up, but unfortunately, a majority of my friends on the other side of the aisle and a minority of folks on my side said ''no.''

I came here to govern, and this bill includes an amendment I authored to help family farmers by giving agriculture a seat at the table when EPA considers regulations that affect our producers. Today is another opportunity to govern and to get to conference so we can iron out our differences as reasonable people. If we fail today, I'm not sure we will get another chance, and reverting back to 1940s law or getting into a perpetual cycle of uncertain 1-year extensions is not an option.

Some of us are blessed to represent districts with amber waves of grain, but even if you don't, everyone is impacted by the farm bill. All one needs to do is to go to the rotunda, which is a few steps away from here, and look up at the Apotheosis of Washington. It depicts a scene that makes this country great, and that is American agriculture. This vote is about helping our family farmers. It's about providing certainty to the ag economy so that the men and women employed in agriculture can survive and thrive and so that our family farmers can continue to feed the world.

Let's move this process forward today by cutting $20 billion and by preserving crop insurance as a vital safety net for the many producers in central Illinois and in southwestern Illinois who produce the food we eat so that our farmers can continue to feed the world. I ask my colleagues for their vote on this bill today.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE).

Ms. FUDGE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I've listened to this debate over the last, actually, month since I'm a member of the committee of jurisdiction, and I have listened to my Christian friends, my religious friends, talk about their hearts.

I want every one of them who goes to the prayer meetings and to all of the things that they do here every week to go and see how many times ''poor'' is mentioned in the Bible and how many times ''hungry'' is mentioned in the Bible because, if we are to say today that feeding hungry children and seniors and veterans and the disabled is relegated to being extraneous, we are not who we say we are.

It is a sad day for America and this country when we want to separate farmers from food and the people they feed. We are going down a path of no return, and I urge all who believe they are Christians to vote ''no'' on this bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to note to my colleague that I have no additional speakers and that I reserve the rest of my time to close.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA).

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, we are here today as a result of a lack of leadership of the Republican majority. Instead of passing a bipartisan farm bill like the Senate has done, House Republicans have tried to ram through a partisan bill that would have attacked our most vulnerable children. I'm talking about poor children, senior citizens, and many who have lost their jobs.

When that bill failed, instead of reaching out to Democrats to craft a bipartisan bill that could easily pass, like every farm bill has for the past 40 years, they resorted to this desperate tactic. By removing the reauthorization of the food stamp program from the bill, they are doing what they have wanted to do for years—completely gut the program—leaving millions of hungry children without anywhere to turn.

Their heartless action today on the House floor of the Nation's Capitol will increase poverty and hurt the weakest among us. Nearly one in five children suffers from food insecurity. This bill is an embarrassment and should be voted down.

Mr. LUCAS. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in opposition to this bill because it injures and makes it impossible for children in my congressional district to be fed, and it makes it impossible for poor veterans to be fed. It disconnects the farm policy from nutrition, which has been at play forever and a day in this country. I cannot support the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota's time will be charged.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. WATT. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. WATT. This is not a proper ruling. It did not constitute debate. It was simply a unanimous consent request, and I do not believe this is a proper ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair ruled earlier today, it is not in order to embellish a unanimous consent request with debate. When such a request extends into debate, the yielding Member is charged.

In the opinion of the Chair, the request of the gentleman from North Carolina contained debate. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the

Chair stand in the judgment of the House?

MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the appeal on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 189, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 350]

YEAS—226

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schrader
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—189

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—19

Bishop (UT)
Broun (GA)
Campbell
Carney
Garamendi
Gingrey (GA)
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Huffman
Hunter
Lynch
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Pelosi
Richmond
Rogers (MI)
Schweikert
Shimkus

□ 1407

Ms. ESHOO, Messrs. COHEN and RANGEL changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mrs. LUMMIS, Messrs. DUNCAN of South Carolina, WESTMORELAND, HALL and Mrs. BLACKBURN changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill H.R. 2642.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I'd note to my colleague, I have one additional 1-minute speaker, and then I'll reserve the rest of my time for myself.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD), one of my subcommittee chairmen.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman LUCAS for his extraordinary leadership throughout this trying process.

I'm pleased to say we're one step closer to providing our ag producers the certainty that they need to accomplish their goals through a 5-year farm bill.

This bill is a product of our extensive outreach to farmers, ranchers, and stakeholders across the country, and reflects the critical input we received from our rural constituents in the farm bill process that allowed producers to be heard. The Ag Committee held more than 40 farm bill hearings in Washington and across the countryside. Through this rigorous audit hearing process, we scrutinized every dollar authorized in the legislation we're offered today. What's more, the bill is the result of an open process that allowed for consideration of the ideas of anyone and everyone in the House.

Ag is the number one industry in my district and the State of Arkansas; and according to the University of Arkansas, it accounts for over 250,000 direct jobs in my State. But, Mr. Speaker, it is more important for everyone to know what's at stake. This legislation may be crafted to address the U.S. ag economy, but it's not just important to our rural constituents. It's important to everyone. I have always said that if you eat, you're involved in agriculture; and I would ask my colleagues to think about that. Even if you don't have ag interests or production in your district, every single one of our constituents depends on it.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Washington (Ms. DELBENE).

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, I rise with great disappointment today. It's a shame that the House has allowed the farm bill to get to this point. We should be voting on the bipartisan bill the Agriculture Committee passed and I supported, not this bill. This bill has been hijacked by divisive politics and is simply not good enough.

It's not good enough for our farmers because reforms that would have protected Washington State's dairy farmers and consumers have been stripped out. It is certainly not good enough for the millions of working families, seniors, and children who count on nutrition programs and have been excluded from this bill. And it's not good enough for this country.

Our constituents sent us here to work across the aisle to deliver results. This bill is certainly not what they had in mind. While I appreciate the funding for specialty crops, which I fought hard for, and is in this bill, this is the wrong way to conduct agricultural policy for the future.

Our country's farmers and families deserve a farm bill that works for everyone. Instead, they've been given this. I am incredibly disappointed today, and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting ''no.''

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the bill because it violates a decades-old principle that has brought rural people and urban people together to help protect them from the vagaries of life and weather and circumstances. It brought farm producers together to help meet the food and nutrition needs of hungry people here in this country and all over the world. It is one of the best things we've ever done. And this bill violates that fundamental, noble principle of bringing people together for a noble cause, feeding hungry people and encouraging the production of food and nutrition.

Mr. Speaker and members of the committee, please vote this bill down.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 18 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Minnesota has 8½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GALLEGO).

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, I spent 20-some years learning the process, working my way through the process of the Texas Legislature; and I can tell you that this process is worse. And it's worse in the sense that so much time and effort went forward by Mr. LUCAS and the ranking member, Mr. PETERSON, to craft a very carefully done bipartisan product. It came to the floor, and people who had no intention of voting for the bill in the first place were suddenly allowed to amend it. And what we have today is a product that has jettisoned the nutrition part of that bill.

And so when we do that, we jettison the women and the children and the elderly and the families who depend on that part of the bill. Ninety-eight percent of the households who take SNAP in the district that I represent are elderly or kids, and they're jettisoned entirely in this process.

□ 1415

This process isn't supposed to work this way. It's supposed to be bipartisan. It's supposed to be a product that is carefully crafted by the committee chair and the ranking member working together. It's unfortunate that it has come to this, and I simply cannot support a bill that jettisons our kids and jettisons our elderly.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I'm now pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MALONEY).

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise, not to speak about the food assistance program, others have done that eloquently, but as one of 90 new Members of Congress, one of 15 freshman on the Agriculture Committee, one of 36 Members, bipartisan Members, who voted this bill out of committee to bring it to the floor.

We did so, not because we agreed with everything in it; in fact, many of us disagreed very strongly with things in this bill. We did it because we respected our chairman and our ranking member, who worked across the aisle together for years to get a product that would help the country, that would help our farmers, that would help the people I represent in the Hudson Valley.

What we have watched on this floor is the sabotaging and the undoing of careful, bipartisan work. And the result, once again, is paralysis.

Five hundred farm groups are supporting the defeat of this bill. Don't tell me it's good for farmers. Everyone who cares about food assistance for kids is opposing this bill. Don't tell me it's good for food stamps.

And your own conservative groups, the most conservative groups, are opposing this bill as a big-spending bill. Don't tell me it saves the taxpayers money.

We came here to get results. This Congress can do better. Defeat this bill, bring it back, and let's work together to get a good result.

Mr. PETERSON. I'm now pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ENYART).

Mr. ENYART. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to bad public policy. As a member of the Agriculture Committee, I state my strong opposition to the leadership's drive to split a comprehensive farm bill. It destroys the bipartisan work of the committee. It destroys a coalition that has worked for our Nation for generations.

The Ag Committee did our work. We didn't agree on everything, but we achieved a compromise bill that was brought to the floor. I voted to keep this process moving and to get a bill signed into law.

I am stunned that so many in the majority party could not support the bill after the draconian nutrition cuts they insisted upon.

In representing southern Illinois, I represent the two groups that need comprehensive legislation the most: our agriculture community and the 100,000 citizens out of 700,000 citizens who live in poverty in southern Illinois.

This approach puts both groups in jeopardy. I cannot support that. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

I urge the House leadership to get serious, to stop playing foolish games with our farm economy and with our working poor.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I'm now pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. Thank you for yielding.

I'm the ranking member on the Ag Appropriations Committee, and I'm very proud that the USDA was founded by Abraham Lincoln.

This bill essentially destroys agriculture in the United States because we grow food to feed people, and the USDA is responsible for both sides of that equation. This bill now just turns it into growers.

My growers are there for the purpose of feeding people, and now we knock out all the people that need the food.

This is ridiculous. This is not agriculture. This is not farming. This is destruction. This is divide and conquer.

When you take away the people that need the food, you take away the purpose of agriculture. The best way to give the food back is to defeat this bill.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I'm now pleased to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I'm new here, but if there's one thing I've learned, this is not what we were sent here to do.

A Member from the other side, during the rules debate, asked me if our side understood that nutrition programs were not in this bill. Well, absolutely we understand it.

The great value of the bipartisan farm bill has been the balance of support for our Nation's family farms and the products that their labor produces in providing nutrition for those of us of greatest need.

I've heard this is the only way forward. Time and time again I've heard that. Says who?

I thought we were the Congress of the United States. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting ''no'' on this bill.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

(Ms. BROWN of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Bible says to whom much is given, much is required.

This is a sad day in the House of Representatives. Shame on the Republicans. Shame on the House.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentlewoman's words be taken down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will suspend. The gentlewoman will be seated. The Clerk will report the words.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Excuse me, Mr. Speaker. Did you rule in my favor?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will suspend.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will suspend. The gentlewoman will be seated while the Clerk reports the words.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Excuse me? What did I say that was incorrect?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will suspend while the Clerk reports the words. The gentlewoman is not recognized at this time.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I was recognized for a minute. Are you saying that I do not have a minute?

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Ms. EDWARDS. Parliamentary inquiry, please. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will state her parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. EDWARDS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Is it not in order, as we have heard many times on this floor, for a Member of the House to simply not mention by name individual Members of the House, but to mention categories of Members? That happens all the time.

Mr. Speaker, is it not in order, when there are Members on the other side of the aisle who have said ''Obama,'' ''Obamacare,'' ''That NANCY PELOSI is a train wreck'' on the floor of this House and their words have not been taken down and they have not been seated? Is it not in order for the gentlelady to have been recognized and to be able to speak on this issue merely saying ''Republicans''? That could be a lower case ''republicans.''

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will suspend. There is currently a demand for the words to be taken down pending before the body.

The Clerk will report the words. The gentlewoman from Florida will be seated.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, point of parliamentary inquiry. Mr. Speaker, is it in order to appeal your ruling?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will advise the gentleman there has been no ruling. There is a pending demand for words to be taken down. The Clerk will report the words.

□ 1428

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my demand.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Florida may resume. The gentlewoman has 42 seconds remaining.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, did you rule in my favor?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The demand has been withdrawn by the gentleman from Georgia. There is no longer a demand that the words be taken down. Therefore, the gentlewoman from Florida may proceed and has 42 seconds remaining.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This is a sad day in the House of Representatives. I want you to know that this is the people's House, and to separate the farm bill from the elderly, from the children is a shame.

Mitt Romney was right. You do not care about the 47 percent. Shame on you.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this bill. By stripping out the nutrition portion of this legislation, the Republican Majority is showing their disdain for those people who are struggling to make ends meet, and trying to put good nutritious food on the table for their children.

This Republican Leadership is the most partisan in the history of the House. By taking bipartisan legislation like the Farm Bill, which helps all Americans, they have made it a divisive issue.

Mitt Romney was right—you don't care about the 47 percent of Americans who depend on the government for the basic necessities of life—food and shelter.

The FARRM Bill needs to have all the sections included to genuinely affect all aspects of food production. From those who eat to those who produce. The family farmer produces the food for our table. The recipient of government funding spends all of that funding on food. Nothing is saved for later.

Farm bills represent a delicate balance between America's farm, nutrition, conservation, and other priorities, and accordingly require strong bipartisan support. It is vital for a broad coalition of lawmakers from both sides of the aisle to provide certainty for urban and rural America, the environment and our economy in general.

Splitting the nutrition title from the rest of the bill could result in neither farm nor nutrition programs passing.

I urge the leadership of the House of Representatives to move a unified farm bill forward.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not directly to other Members on the floor.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate my Republican colleagues. They really caught us off guard on this one. They have gone above and beyond the high jinks that they pulled to get this farm bill to the floor. And while they were at it, they willfully ignored the nearly 48 million Americans who rely on SNAP and over 500 agriculture groups who say that this is bad policy.

There is a reasonable center here, and I know we can reach a rational compromise if we will stay here and work at it. What's the rush to get out of town? Let's stay here and get the job done that the American people sent us here to do.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, can I inquire as to the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I hope my colleagues on the other side of the aisle understand the passion, but I think what we've come to today is the ripping apart of our literal hearts around a bill that is going to continue to pierce the existence of 46.2 million people living in poverty and almost 10 million families. And for my friends from my State, it will affect 3.4 percent of children living in poverty, 17 percent of the elderly, and 21 percent of all adults. Because this is about hunger, and hunger is silent.

We cannot pass this farm bill today because there is no proof, there is no documentation, there is no written commitment that we will ever get to the SNAP program. And food stamps will be no more. The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program will be no more. As I said, the only thing we will carry home today will be bragging rights of a sound bite: I cut the budget; I threw the children of America under the bus.

We should vote ''no'' on the farm bill and not throw the children under the bus.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2642—Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013.

Food is not an option—it is a right that all people living in this nation must have to exist and to prosper. The $20.5 billion cuts in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program also known as SNAP would remove 2 million Americans from this important food assistance program, and 210,000 children would lose access to free or reduced priced school meals.

The course of our nation's history led to changes in our economy first from agricultural, to industrial and now technological. These economic changes impacted the availability and affordability of food. Today our nation is still one of the wealthiest in the world, but we now have food deserts. A food desert is a place where access to food may not be available and certainly access to health sustaining food is not available.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture defines a food desert as a ''low-access community,'' where at least 500 people and/or at least 33 percent of the census tract's population live more than one mile from a supermarket or large grocery store. The USDA defines a food desert for rural communities as a census tract where the distance to a grocery store is more than 10 miles.

Food deserts exist in rural and urban areas and are spreading as a result of fewer farms as well as fewer places to access fresh fruits, vegetables, proteins, and other foods as well as a poor economy.

The result of food deserts are increases in malnutrition and other health disparities that impact minority and low-income communities in rural and urban areas. Health disparities occur because of a lack of access to critical food groups that provide nutrients that it does not it does not support normal metabolic functions.

Poor metabolic function leads to malnutrition that causes breakdown in tissue. For example, a lack of protein in a diet leads to disease and decay of teeth and bones. Another example of health disparities in food deserts are the presence of fast food establishments instead of grocery stores. If someone only consumes energy dense foods like fast foods this will lead to clogged arteries, which is a precursor for arterial disease, a leading cause of heart disease. A person eating a constant diet of fast foods are also vulnerable to higher risks of insulin resistance which results in diabetes.

In Harris County, Texas, 149 out of 920 households or 20 percent of residents do not

have automobiles and live more than one-half mile from a grocery store.

At the beginning of the third millennium of this nation's existence we should know better. Denying a higher quality of life that would result from better access to healthier food choices is shortsighted—it is also economically unsound and threatens our national security.

Social stability is threatened when people's basic needs are not met—food, clean drinking water and breathable air or the least of the requirements for life. Denying access to sufficient amounts of the right kinds of food means people will become less productive, more prone to disease and will not be able to function as contributing members of a society.

For one in six Americans hunger is real and far too many people assume that the problem of hunger is isolated. One in six men, women or children you see every day may not know where their next meal is coming from or may have missed one or two meals yesterday.

Hunger is silent—most victims of hunger are ashamed and will not ask for help, they work to hide their situation from everyone. Hunger is persistent and impacts millions of people who struggle to find enough to eat. Food insecurity causes parents to skip meals so that their children can eat.

In Harris County, Texas, 149 out of 920 households or 20 percent of residents do not have automobiles and live more than one-half mile from a grocery store.

For one in six Americans hunger is real and far too many people assume that the problem of hunger is isolated. One in six men, women or children you see every day may not know where their next meal is coming from or may have missed one or two meals yesterday.

In 2009–2010 the Houston, Sugar Land and Baytown area had 27.6 percent of households with children experiencing food hardship. In households without children food hardship was experienced by 16.5. Houston, Sugar Land and Baytown rank 22 among the areas surveyed.

In 2011, According to Feeding America: 46.2 million people were in poverty, 9.5 million families were in poverty, 26.5 million of people ages 18–64 were in poverty. 16.1 million children under the age of 18 were in poverty, 3.6 million (9.0 percent) seniors 65 and older were in poverty.

In the State of Texas: 34% of children live in poverty in Texas, 21% of adults (19–64) live in poverty in Texas, 17% of elderly live in poverty in Texas.

In my city of Houston Texas the U.S. census reports that over the last 12 months 442,881 incomes were below the poverty level.

In 2011: 50.1 million Americans lived in food insecure households, 33.5 million adults and 16.7 million children, households with children reported food insecurity at a significantly higher rate than those without children, 20.6 percent compared to 12.2 percent.

Eighteen percent of households in the state of Texas from 2009 through 2011 ranked second in the highest rate of food insecurity—only the state of Mississippi exceed the ratio of households struggling with hunger.

In the 18th Congressional District an estimated 151,741 families lived in poverty.

There are charitable organizations that many of us contribute to that provide food assistance to people in need, but their resources would not be able to fill the gap created by a $20.5 billion dollar cut to Federal food assistance programs.

Food banks and pantry's fill an important role by helping the working poor, disabled and the poor gain access to food assistance when government subsidized food assistance or budgets fall short of basic needs. Food pantries also help when an unforeseen circumstance occurs and more food is needed for a family to make it until payday or government assistance arrives. However, food pantries cannot carry the full burden of a communities' need for food on their own.

During these difficult economic times, people who once gave to food pantries may now seek donations from them. Millions of low income persons and families receive food assistance through SNAP. This program represents the nation's largest program that combats domestic hunger.

For more than 40 years, SNAP has offered nutrition assistance to millions of low income individuals and families. Today, the SNAP program serves over 46 million people each month.

SNAP Statistics: Households with children receive about 75 percent of all food stamp benefits, 23 percent of households include a disabled person and 18 percent of households include an elderly person, The FSP increases household food spending, and the increase is greater than what would occur with an equal benefit in cash, every $5 in new food stamp benefits generates almost twice as much ($9.20) in total community spending.

The economics of SNAP food it does not support programs benefit everyone by preventing new food deserts from developing. The impact of SNAP funds coming into local and neighborhood grocery stores is more profitable supermarkets. SNAP funds going into local food economies also make the cost of food for everyone less expensive and assure a variety and abundance of food selections found in grocery stores.

SNAP is the largest program in the American domestic hunger safety net. The Food and Nutrition Service programs it does not supported by SNAP work with State agencies, nutrition educators, and neighborhood as well as faith-based organizations to assist those eligible for nutrition assistance. Food and Nutrition Service programs also work with State partners and the retail community to improve program administration and work to ensure the program's integrity.

Yes, more can be done to assure that food distribution from the fields to the tables of Americans in most need can be improved. To begin the process of improving our nations ability to more efficiently and effective in meeting the food needs of citizens must began with understanding the problem and acting on facts. I strongly it does not support hearings on the subject and encourage all oversight committees to consider taking up the matter during this Congress.

However, we cannot ignore the safety process in place to prevent abuse or misuse of the program. The Federal SNAP law provides two basic pathways for financial eligibility to the program: (1) meeting federal eligibility requirements, or (2) being automatically or ''categorically'' eligible for SNAP based on being eligible for or receiving benefits from other specified low-income assistance programs. Categorical eligibility eliminated the requirement that households who already met financial eligibility rules in one specified low-income program go through another financial eligibility determination in SNAP.

However, since the 1996 welfare reform law, states have been able to expand categorical eligibility beyond its traditional bounds. That law created TANF to replace the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program, which was a traditional cash assistance program. TANF is a broad-purpose block grant that finances a wide range of social and human services.

TANF gives states flexibility in meeting its goals, resulting in a wide variation of benefits and services offered among the states. SNAP allows states to convey categorical eligibility based on receipt of a TANF ''benefit,'' not just TANF cash welfare. This provides states with the ability to convey categorical eligibility based on a wide range of benefits and services. TANF benefits other than cash assistance typically are available to a broader range of households and at higher levels of income than are TANF cash assistance benefits.

Congress cannot afford to forget that by the year 2050, the world population is expected to be 9 billion persons. We cannot build our nation's food security on an uncertain future. Domestic food production and access to healthy nutritious food is essential to our nation's long term national security.

Until we see the final farm bill, including the amendment adopted by the Full House, I cannot offer my it does not support for the legislation as it is written.

The bill is too shortsighted about the realities of hunger in our nation—the fact that it proposes to cut $20.5 billion from the SNAP program is of great concern. We should work to create certainty for farmers who run high risk businesses that are vulnerable to weather changes, insects or blight.

We should be equally concerned about providing long term food security for all of our nation's citizens, which include rural, suburban and urban dwellers.

I thank the Agriculture Committee for including the Jackson Lee amendment in the en bloc for the bill. I as my colleagues on both sides of the isle should have it does not supported the McGovern Amendment to prevent the $20.5 billion in cuts to the SNAP program. Food is not an option—and people who need help from their government should not be treated like they committed a crime.

I do not support this bill. It removes all authorization to feed our nations hungry.

Mr. PETERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to this bill. This bill makes millionaire farmers richer. It takes from the poor. It makes the poorest Americans suffer. This bill promotes hunger in the richest country in the world. We should not be about that. We are a better country. We should demonstrate that every day we're on this floor. What we're doing today will go down in history as one of the greatest misgivings and misguided laws in this country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota's time will be charged.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that my comments should not be taken from Mr. PETERSON's time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair ruled earlier today, it is not in order to embellish a unanimous consent request with debate. When such a request extends into debate, the yielding Member is charged. In the opinion of the Chair, the request of the gentleman from Mississippi contained debate. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand in the judgment of the House?

MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. LUCAS. I move to lay the appeal on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 221, noes 181, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 351]

AYES—221

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schrader
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—181

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—32

Bera (CA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Campbell
Diaz-Balart
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Graves (GA)
Grijalva
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Huffman
Hunter
Langevin
Lewis
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McKeon
Murphy (FL)
Negrete McLeod
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Rogers (MI)
Ruiz
Schock
Schweikert
Shimkus
Smith (WA)
Stewart
Van Hollen

□ 1452

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. PALAZZO changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 351, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise for an inquiry of my colleague, the ranking member.

Does the gentleman need sufficient time to close?

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, it would be helpful to me if you could yield me 2 minutes. You may not like what I have to say.

Mr. LUCAS. In the spirit of comity, I yield to my ranking member 2 minutes for his use.

Mr. PETERSON. I thank the chairman, and I thank him for his leadership through this process.

America's two largest farm organizations, the American Farm Bureau and the National Farmers Union, which don't often agree, both asked us to oppose this bill. I will submit their letters for the RECORD.

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, DC, July 11, 2013.

House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES: The American Farm Bureau Federation is our nation's largest general farm organization, representing more than 6 million member families in all 50 states and Puerto Rico. Our members represent the grassroots farmers and ranchers who produce the wide range of food and fiber crops for our customers here and around the world. To achieve this, farmers and ranchers depend on the variety of programs such as risk management, conservation, credit and rural development contained in H.R. 2642 that is scheduled to be voted on by the full House today.

Last night the House Rules Committee approved the rule for considering H.R. 2642, which also includes separating the nutrition title from the remaining provisions of H.R. 1947, a complete farm bill that was reported out of the House Agriculture Committee by a 36–10 bipartisan vote.

We are very disappointed in this action. The ''marriage'' between the nutrition and farm communities and our constituents in developing and adopting comprehensive farm legislation has been an effective, balanced arrangement for decades that has worked to ensure all Americans and the nation benefits. In spite of reports to the contrary, this broad food and farm coalition continues to hold strong against partisan politics. In fact, last week, more than 530 groups representing the farm, conservation, credit, rural development and forestry industries urged the House to not split the bill. Similar communications were relayed from the nutrition

community. Yet today, in spite of the broad-based bipartisan support for keeping the farm bill intact, you will vote on an approach that seeks to affect a divorce of this longstanding partnership. It is frustrating to our members that this broad coalition of support for passage of a complete farm bill appears to have been pushed aside in favor of interests that have no real stake in this farm bill, the economic vitality and jobs agriculture provides or the customers farmers and ranchers serve.

We are quite concerned that without a workable nutrition title, it will prove to be nearly impossible to adopt a bill that can be successfully conferenced with the Senate's version, approved by both the House and Senate and signed by the President.

We are also very much opposed to the repeal of permanent law contained in H.R. 2642. This provision received absolutely no discussion in any of the process leading up to the passage of the bill out of either the House or Senate Agriculture Committees. To replace permanent law governing agricultural programs without hearing from so much as a single witness on what that law should be replaced with is not how good policy is developed.

As recently as last December, the threat of reverting to permanent law was the critical element that forced Congress to pass an extension of the current farm bill when it proved impossible to complete action on the new five-year farm bill—an action that not only provided important safety net programs for this year, it ensured Congress would have time this year to consider comprehensive reforms that contribute billions to deficit reduction.

We urge you to oppose the rule as well to vote against final passage of this attempt to split the farm bill and end permanent law provisions for agriculture.

Sincerely,

BOB STALLMAN,
President.

JULY 11, 2013.

House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: National Farmers Union (NFU), strongly urges you to vote against the rule and final passage of H.R. 2642, a bill that divorces the nutrition title from the rest of the farm bill and repeals permanent law.

The two largest general farm organizations in the country have spoken out multiple times in opposition to separating nutrition programs from the farm bill. Splitting the bill is a shortsighted strategy that would effectively undermine the long-standing bipartisan coalition of rural and urban members that have traditionally supported passage of a unified bill. We are also very concerned that including a provision that would repeal permanent law did not receive any outside scrutiny or ability to weigh in through hearings. Repealing permanent law would remove the element in the bill which would force Congress to act on a piece of legislation that provides a safety net for farmers, ranchers, the food insecure and protects our nation's natural resources.

Last week, NFU led a coalition of 531 other organizations in writing a letter calling for the House of Representatives not to split the bill. This broad-based coalition, composed of agriculture, conservation, rural development, finance, forestry, energy and crop insurance companies and organizations is now being undermined by extreme partisan political organizations that do not represent constituents affected by the farm bill.

Thank you for your consideration of this letter. We urge you to vote against the rule and final passage of H.R. 2642 and encourage leadership to bring a unified bill to the floor as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

ROGER JOHNSON,
President.

Mr. PETERSON. The idea of splitting this bill is a brainchild of the conservative groups like Club for Growth, Americans for Prosperity and Heritage Action. Ironically, now that they have split the bill, they don't support it. I will submit their letters and statements in the RECORD.

KEY VOTE ALERT

THE HOUSE ''FARM-ONLY'' BILL (HR)

The Club for Growth strongly opposes the ''Farm-Only'' bill and urges all House members to oppose it. We believe floor consideration of the bill could happen as early as this week. The vote on final passage will be included in the Club's 2013 Congressional Scorecard.

Breaking up the unholy alliance between agricultural policy and the food stamp program within the traditional farm bill is an excellent decision on behalf of House leadership. However, the whole purpose of splitting up the bill is to enact true reform that reduces the size and scope of government. Sadly, this ''farm-only'' bill does not do that, especially under an anticipated closed rule. It is still loaded down with market-distorting giveaways to special interests with no path established to remove the government's involvement in the agriculture industry.

Worse, we highly suspect that this whole process is a ''rope-a-dope'' exercise. We think House leadership is splitting up the farm bill only as a means to get to conference with the Senate where a bicameral backroom deal will reassemble the commodity and food stamp titles, leaving us back where we started. Unless our suspicions are proven unwarranted, we will continue to oppose this bill.

Our Congressional Scorecard for the 113th Congress provides a comprehensive rating of how well or how poorly each member of Congress supports pro-growth, free-market policies and will be distributed to our members and to the public.

''NO'' ON PERMANENT FARM BILL

(July 11, 2013)

Today, the House will vote on the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013 (H.R. 2642). Although the bill does not contain the $750 billion in food stamp spending like the previous FARRM Act, it does nothing to make ''meaningful reforms'' to America's farm policy. Even worse, the bill would make permanent farm policies—like the sugar program—that harm consumers and taxpayers alike.

While many realize the bill would repeal the 1938 and 1949 permanent farm law, few realize it would also create new permanent law—the commodities title in H.R. 2642 would become permanent. As a result, lawmakers would not have a built in check, in the form of a reauthorization, in the years ahead.

Instead, market-distorting programs would continue indefinitely, like the government-imposed tariffs on sugar imports and quotas on domestic sugar production, which cause Americans to pay two to four times higher prices for sugar than consumers in other countries.

The new, untested and expensive crop insurance provisions would become permanent, undermining the effectiveness of the Foxx Amendment, which would have capped the costs of these new programs at 110 percent of the Congressional Budget Office's estimates until the year 2020.

And as Heritage Action explained during the initial debate:

The ''shallow loss'' program would protect farmers from virtually all risk. Taxpayers are on the hook to cover even small risks for farmers, eliminating competitive challenges that drive innovation. Finally, the bill includes a reference price program that would designate certain standard prices for commodities; if actual prices are different, taxpayers make up for the difference. The Congressional Budget Office estimate for the Senate's Agriculture Risk Coverage (ARC) program—the counterpart to the House's Revenue Loss Coverage (RLC)—is based on farmers' record high incomes. If prices decline toward historical levels, taxpayers will be on the hook.

Finally, farmers are currently carrying far less debt compared to their very strong assets. Net farm income is expected to reach ''a remarkable $128.2 billion this year—the highest level since 1973,'' making the aforementioned farm programs all but insanity. The ''farm'' bill means more expenses for taxpayers and higher costs for consumers. It means more unnecessary government dependence for wealthy farmers and food stamp recipients.

The reason Congress should end the unholy alliance that has dominated the food stamp and farm bill for decades is to allow an open and substantive debate on the issues. By doing so, the House could show its conservative values. As top-ranking House Republicans acknowledged last night in the Rules Committee, this is nothing more than a mechanism to get to a conference committee with the Senate.

Heritage Action opposes H.R. 2642 and will include it as a key vote on our legislative scorecard.

JULY 9, 2013.

OPEN LETTER TO SPEAKER BOEHNER: ENSURE OPEN PROCESS ON ''FARM-ONLY'' FARM BILL!

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER, On behalf of the millions of members and supporters of the undersigned organizations, we write to commend you for separating the agriculture and nutrition portions of the farm bill and for moving to repeal archaic language that reverts back to 1949 law in the absence of Congressional action. However, we are deeply concerned by reports that agriculture legislation will move in the coming days under a closed rule that will prevent any amendments from being heard.

The purpose of splitting the agriculture and nutrition pieces was to change the political dynamics that conspire to prevent true reform. If the House pushes through agriculture-only language taken directly from the combined bill that failed on the floor last month without amendment, it will not only fail to champ those dynamics, it will actively preserve them.

In doing so, the Republican-controlled House would be advancing an agriculture bill that is substantially worse on policy grounds than the legislation produced by the Democrat-controlled Senate. For example, the House language includes no means-testing whatsoever for crop insurance while the Senate reduced subsidies for those with incomes over $750,000. In addition, the so-called ''shallow loss'' programs in the House bill are poorly structured and likely to cost dramatically more than official estimates.

We urge you to live up to your commitments to robust debate by ensuring that any agriculture or nutrition bill is considered in an open process. A closed rule on farm legislation would run counter to those commitments and produce bad policy.

Sincerely,

Andrew Moylan, R Street Institute; Phil Kerpen, American Commitment; Al

Cardenas, American Conservative Union; James Valvo, Americans for Prosperity; Grover Norquist, Americans for Tax Reform; John Tate, Campaign for Liberty; Jeff Mazzella, Center for Individual Freedom; Chris Chocola, Club for Growth; Iain Murray, Competitive Enterprise Institute; Rob Sisson, ConservAmerica; Mattie Duppler, Cost of Government Center.

Tom Schatz, Council for Citizens Against Government Waste; Matt Kibbe, FreedomWorks; Michael A. Needham, Heritage Action for America; Baylen J. Linnekin, Keep Food Legal; Colin Hanna, Let Freedom Ring; Duane Parde, National Taxpayers Union; William L. Walton, Rappahannock Ventures; Ryan Alexander, Taxpayers for Common Sense; David Williams, Taxpayers Protection Alliance; Becky Norton Dunlop, Former Secretary of Natural Resources, Virginia.

R STREET,
Washington, DC, July 12, 2013.

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: FARM BILL IS BAD PROCESS, WORSE POLICY

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE, On behalf of the R Street Institute, I write today to urge your opposition to H.R. 2642, the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act (FARRM Act). Better known as the ''Farm Bill,'' this flawed and expensive legislation comes before the chamber after being separated from the nutrition assistance provisions. However, rather than utilizing this clean slate as an opportunity to secure long-overdue reforms to farm subsidies, this bill is being shielded from any amendment that could trim its cost or improve its operation.

As a free market think tank that seeks lower costs for taxpayers, more accountability, and fewer incentives to damage the environment, R Street is appalled by this legislation and the process by which it is being advanced. This legislation's purported agriculture savings amount to $1 billion less than those found in the Senate's farm programs. They amount to $18 billion less than proposed in the Ryan budget which passed with the nearly unanimous support of 221 Republicans. They even fall short of the agriculture subsidy reductions included in President Obama's budget request by $25 billion. Furthermore, $7 of every $10 in claimed savings occurs after a new farm bill will presumably have passed.

In addition, the bill contains enormous structural problems. Its expanded crop insurance program includes no limits or caps whatsoever, allowing wealthy agribusinesses to rake in billions in subsidies. The ''reference prices'' for commodity crops are set at near-record highs, thus ensuring that even modest drops from current peaks will trigger huge payments. Common sense provisions like conservation compliance are not attached to crop insurance to prevent taxpayers from subsidizing farming on risky or sensitive lands. Distortionary subsidies and restrictions for both sugar and dairy products remain. All of this in a package that effectively makes its expensive commodity title into permanent law.

The House should be allowed to debate and modify these provisions, but the rushed process has shut off any such possibility. The result of this bad process is that the chamber has before it a bloated bill that is unworthy of the conservative principles that we share with House leaders. We urge all Members to oppose H.R. 2642, the FARRM Act, and instead work to craft a credible reform package that heeds the bipartisan consensus to trim agriculture subsidies once and for all.

Sincerely,

ANDREW MOYLAN,
Senior Fellow and Outreach Director
R Street Institute.

TAXPAYERS FOR COMMONSENSE
Washington, DC, July 11, 2013.

OPPOSE AG-ONLY FARM BILL: CHANGES MAKE SUBSIDIES PERMANENT; SPENDS MORE THAN SENATE BILL

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Taxpayers for Common Sense urges you to oppose H.R. 2642, the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013 or FARRM, and H. Res. 295, the rule providing for its debate. Not only does this bill save less money than comparable sections in the Democrat-controlled Senate-passed bill but it also seeks to lock in record commodity prices and farm income as the new business as usual farm policy. While the bill repeals permanent law, the new version strips out the 2018 sunset provisions contained in the previous version making the subsidy ridden 2013 bill permanent law. While we support splitting the Farm Bill up, leadership aides and agriculture centric lawmakers have made it clear that passing this bill is a step to get to conference and re-combine the agriculture and nutrition titles.

We have found significant changes that were made to this legislation, however lawmakers were allowed less than 12 hours to review changes made to the Farm Bill that was voted down in the House less than a month ago. Any and all attempts to amend or debate reforms to this $196 billion legislation were shot down. To deny amendments and reforms would make bifurcation virtually meaningless. Both the agriculture and nutrition ''bills'' must be open to robust debate to allow reforms to be considered.

With a $16.8 trillion national debt, our country simply cannot afford to continue sending checks to agribusinesses regardless of the state of the farm economy, crop prices, or whether or not producers even need or want government subsidies. H.R. 2642 would spend $1 billion more than comparable sections in the Senate-passed bill, increase FY14 spending by $1.34 billion above the current baseline. and only save $3.9 billion over the life of the actual bill (FY14–18) with the rest ($9 billion) occurring after this farm bill expires in FY18. In addition, it would spend drastically more than either the comparable portions of the President's FY14 budget request or Rep. Paul Ryan's FY14 budget (which called for $38 billion and $31 billion in savings, respectively). A Congressional Budget Office score hasn't even been posted yet.

Compared to the bill being voted on today, a summary of changes made to the bill that failed 195–234 less than a month ago include the following:

No nutrition assistance. While we urged lawmakers to debate the farm bill on its own merits and break the Ag-Urban unholy alliance that logrolled over attempts to reform both programs, there is no indication that a nutrition-only bill will ever receive a vote on the House floor. Therefore, this cynical procedural move is simply a green light to get to conference with the Senate. As Rep. Roe (R-TN) recently said, ''We'll take the farm bill and the food stamp bill and separate those two. Vote both of those and send them to the Senate. And then it'll come back as one bill in a conference and we'll hopefully get something.''

Repeal permanent law but replace It with the 2013 farm bill law: Instead of reverting to outdated allotments and quotas, now farm policy will revert to 2013 farm bill law. This will ensure profitable agribusinesses receive unlimited crop insurance subsidies, higher government-set target prices, profit margin guarantees for dairy, market distorting sugar subsidies, and new income guarantee entitlements that lock in record farm income for perpetuity.

This agriculture-only farm bill is the opposite of reform. It would also:

Exclude all common sense steps toward right-sizing the federally subsidized crop insurance program—which cost taxpayers an estimated record $14 billion in FY12—and actually increase spending by $9 billion. No means testing to exclude millionaire businessmen, no limit on subsidies, zero cuts to insurance company delivery subsidies, no transparency on who is benefiting from taxpayer spending, and no future opportunity for taxpayers to save money by renegotiating crop insurance industry subsidies.

Continue direct payments for cotton for two additional years.

Create an array of new special interest carve-outs for pennycress, biomass sorghum, peanuts, catfish, among others

Again, we encourage you to oppose H.R. 2642 and H. Res. 295, the agriculture-only farm bill and the rule governing its debate. We urge you to go back to the drawing board and devise a more fiscally responsible solution that saves at least $100 billion and enacts a more cost-effective, accountable, transparent, and responsive farm safety net.

Sincerely,

RYAN ALEXANDER,
President.

Mr. PETERSON. You know, I spent 4 years working on dairy policy, and I lost a vote on the floor here on that dairy policy. That was not an easy thing for me to swallow. In spite of that, I was going to vote for the bill, and I did vote for the bill. What I don't get is that you guys over there have people that have put amendments on this bill, that were successful in amending this bill, and then they vote against it. I don't get how we're going to get a bill done in this place when you've got that kind of a situation going on.

I'll say this: We're willing, in spite of everything that's happened, to try to work this out somehow or another through this process. I'm not sure how it's going to work, I'm not sure if you've got the votes, where we're going to end up. But we have stood ready to work with you. I think you know that, Mr. Chairman. I believe we had the votes to get this done if we would have just taken that Southerland amendment out, but it didn't happen.

So let's finish this up and move ahead. You know, I had the first hearing on this when I was chairman on April 21, 2010, and I am sick and tired of working on this bill. So let's get this thing over with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is reminded to address the remarks to the Chair and not to other Members of the body.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, colleagues, I stand before you again to discuss a farm bill. It has not been that many days ago since we did this very thing. On that particular day, it was my hope that the bill put forth on the floor—after 100 amendments, approximately, in committee, after 100 amendments essentially being filed and mostly considered on the floor of the House—that we would have a product we could all support. But on that day, a sufficient number of my friends from both sides of the aisle, from different political perspectives, united together to say no.

Now, I chair the committee of primary jurisdiction on this. I'm a member of the majority. My good friend was my coauthor on the bill. But I take responsibility. That was my chin that got bopped, and maybe it needed it. But I take that responsibility.

But I am a practical guy. I sat down and I had conversations with as many of you as possible and reached out to everyone I could possibly reach out to, and I came to the realization that I had to think outside the box. Because, after all, what's the most important responsibility here? To get our work done in a dignified, orderly fashion, to consider the opinions of everyone—yes, protect the right of the political minority, whoever that may be, in whichever session of Congress that may be—but still, for the majority of the body to decide the actions of this House. And yes, on that day, the majority of you decided no action was the response.

So now I come back asking you again to consider a bill. Eleven of the 12 titles we debated and discussed and rumbled and argued and cheered about 2 weeks ago, 11 of those titles. Yes, some of you saw it in committee; yes, the rest of you saw it on the floor.

Now, there is one change, and that is going from 1938, 1949 permanent law over to making whatever the ultimate product of this farm bill process this year is the permanent law.

□ 1500

Let me say to you, think about what the '38 and '49 law is all about. Franklin Roosevelt was President in 1938; Harry Truman was President in 1949. That's been a long time ago. The principles of the bill entail supply and management, allotments, quotas, production history limitations, prices based on parity from 1910 to 1913. Wasn't Taft President back then? It is not workable language.

I know many of you said, that's the hammer with which we force things to happen. Well, the hammer hasn't worked very well in the last 2 years, has it? It is time to move past that old paradigm, to craft good, agricultural policy for rural America for the consumers out there and make it the permanent law. And, yes, we can pass the new farm bill in 5 years if we want or sooner, but everything will be up to debate, discussion, and voting.

Now, what about title IX that was in the previous bill that's not in the bill today dealing with nutrition? It became quite clear to me not many days ago that that was the most complicated part of the process. It was an area where while the committee had by majority vote agreed to make very fundamental changes saving to the tune of $20.5 billion in mandatory spending, it became quite clear to me that a number of my friends in all sincerity felt it was far too draconian, far too extreme; and I accept that.

By the same token, I had a substantial number of my colleagues who said, oh, my goodness, why couldn't you do more, we demand more; and I couldn't reconcile those two perspectives in this comprehensive bill in this traditional way.

So what's the alternative? I ask you today to vote for a farm bill farm bill. What an amazing concept. All of you who represent farmers and ranches, the men and women who raise the food and fiber, who get things done in this country, when you go talk to them, they say, why didn't we do that all along.

But the nutrition title, let me give you my personal pledge. The committee will work in as bipartisan a fashion as I hope we have traditionally always have to craft language.

My only problem is, having dealt with this issue already, I can't guarantee you what the product will look like coming out of committee or coming across the floor. I can't guarantee that.

But I can assure you that in the committee it will be a fair and open process. I can assure you that you will be able to state your will on this floor.

Hopefully, if 218 of us can agree on a nutrition title, then the two bills can hopefully be wedded, matched—a conference is the more appropriate phrase to say—with the work of our friends over in the Senate and we will ultimately have a product. I just can't give you the kind of guarantees you need because I have to have 218 of you agree on anything. But I can give you my commitment to work in that direction.

I know there are some very grave concerns. What if we don't succeed in passing a nutrition title? What if the Senate says that is your fault, United States House?

I would remind you that SNAP's programs are an appropriated entitlement. That means the issues can be addressed in the appropriations process. That has occurred before. No one ever went without a benefit that they qualified for.

But I would also say to all my friends who care so intensely from every perspective about this bill, that doesn't guarantee you that you will get what you want, any of you. It just means that if we are not able to address nutrition through the regular authorizing process, our friends on the Appropriations Committee, the Ag Subcommittee of Appropriations, in particular, now become the front-line discussion. But once again, the House will work its will through the committee process and across the floor.

If you see a common thread here, it is that I have amazing amounts of faith in you. In spite of the challenges that outside groups from all political perspectives present, in spite of the diversity of opinion within elected leadership on both sides of the aisle—I know you are fond of me because of the way you've been treating me, all of you, lately—but in spite of those actions, my friends, and because you have a responsibility to your constituents as Members and to our fellow citizens in the country as a whole, I respect what you think.

I would simply conclude by saying, in the situation we are in right now, this I believe very sincerely is the most appropriate way to pass a bill that entails 20 percent of traditional farm bill spending. I commit to you that we will work on that second piece as hard and as diligently as we can. But please, after all the good faith and discussions in the spirit of comity, civility, and the nature of making this place work, I ask you to pass the farm bill farm bill so I can begin to work on the nutrition part of the farm bill next.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. LUCAS. I love all of you. I yield back whatever time I have to show it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 295, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. ESTY. I am opposed to the bill in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Esty moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 2642, to the Committee on Agriculture with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of title XI, add the following new subtitle:

Subtitle E—Food Safety

SEC. 11501. PROTECTING SAFE FOOD FOR AMERICAN CONSUMERS.

(a) MEAT PRODUCTS.—Section 20 of the Federal Meat Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 620) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (i); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (g) the following new subsection:

''(h) The Secretary shall annually conduct an on-site audit of the food regulatory system of each country that is eligible to export carcasses, parts of carcasses, meat, or meat food products to the United States.''.

(b) POULTRY PRODUCTS.—Section 17 of the Poultry Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C.

466) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) The Secretary shall annually conduct an on-site audit of the food regulatory system of each country that is eligible to export poultry or parts or products of poultry to the United States.''.

(c) EGG PRODUCTS.—Section 17 of the Egg Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 1046) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) The Secretary shall annually conduct an on-site audit of the food regulatory system of each country that is eligible to export eggs or egg products to the United States.''.

(d) FUNDING TRANSFER AUTHORITY FOR FOOD SAFETY EMERGENCIES.—If the Secretary of Agriculture determines that there is a food safety emergency, the Secretary of Agriculture may transfer funds from any program, project, or activity of the Department of Agriculture to the Food Safety and Inspection Service to respond to such food safety emergency.

Ms. ESTY (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, it will simply and immediately be amended.

The farm bill traditionally has been a risk-management tool for our country. It has reduced risk from price and weather disruptions or disasters for producers like dairy farmers in my district.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, can I reserve a point of order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's reservation is not timely.

The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized.

Ms. ESTY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It has reduced risk for all consumers through ensuring the plentiful, wholesome, safe, and affordable food supply, with the backstop for SNAP benefits for the most needy—for those who cannot afford to hire lobbyists.

Like some of our colleagues have inquired earlier, I too thought that SNAP's exclusion was so incredibly glaring that it had to be a drafting error. After all, how can we ignore the 16 million American children—including 34,000 in my district—lacking basic food security?

Unfortunately, today, we are breaking that risk-management tool into pieces and, as a result, the risk for far too many will rise. The increased risk will fall most heavily on consumers.

For many children, disabled, and elderly—who comprise almost 60 percent of SNAP beneficiaries—and for working families receiving SNAP benefits, their risk of food insecurity will rise.

Additionally, as more people look for more sources and varieties of food, we are importing record amounts of food from around the world.

Unfortunately, we are seeing more and more food safety outbreaks that are linked to an enormous variety of foods from sources worldwide. One needs to look no further than the current and ongoing Hepatitis A outbreak that has been linked to imported pomegranate seeds. Over 140 people have been sickened by this outbreak in eight States, including Wisconsin, Nevada, and California. And we are seeing recently the largest U.S.-owned meat company being bought by a Chinese company.

With industry ownership moving into the hands of foreign companies, how can we ensure food safety in the United States? As a mom, I know how critically important food safety is for our children's long-term health. Mothers in every one of our districts are watching our actions and hoping that we will help keep their children safe, whether at school or at home.

Congress must do all it can to ensure that the food being imported is as safe as the food produced in our country by hardworking Americans. The Federal Government has a vital role in ensuring that our food supply is safe. The USDA Food Safety and Inspection Service recently announced that it has reduced the number of on-site audits that it conducts in foreign countries to ensure that their food safety systems meet our standards. These used to be conducted annually, and now they've been reduced to only once every 3 years.

At a time when food imports are increasing, FSIS is doing less to ensure that exporting countries are keeping food safe. We have a responsibility to correct this trend and this motion to recommit would do just that.

My final amendment addresses two food safety issues:

First, it directs the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct annual, on-site audits of the food safety systems of countries that export meat, poultry, and egg products to the United States.

Second, it authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to move funds from other programs within USDA to the Food Safety and Inspection Service in order to better respond to food safety emergencies.

I wish I could have circulated this final amendment to my colleagues to read and review ahead of time, but unfortunately we received the 600-page bill last night.

I urge my colleagues to support increased food safety and support this final amendment to the farm bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. What can I say, my friends. We've covered a lot of ground, we discussed a lot of things, we pumped a lot of adrenaline, we focused on a lot of issues. I would simply say to you, today is towards a conclusion and because I'm so very fond of all of you, I simply ask you to reject this motion to recommit, pass the bill, and go home to your families.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, due to a family funeral, I was unable to vote on today's ''FARRM Bill'' legislation. However, I want the record to show my strong opposition to the bill that was passed by the House.

Despite the fact the welfare portion of the bill, in the form of SNAP, was separated; the bill that made its way to the Floor was rife with a permanent entitlement system in the form of farm policy.

If this bill becomes law, there will be no incentive for our friends in the agriculture community to pass another farm bill for the next 30 years because Washington, in one fell swoop, pegged prices at all time highs.

Further, under this bill, shallow-loss programs and wholly uncapped crop insurance have become a permanent backstop.

We had an opportunity to shrink government and chose instead to continue down a path of unending subsides and market distortions.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the House Republican revised farm bill.

The bill before us should not be referred to as a farm bill. Farm bills have traditionally tried to address challenges facing all of American agriculture including nutrition and hunger issues.

This legislation removes the Nutrition title from the farm bill, which includes the programs that help improve nutrition and fight hunger. Consequently, the bill before us is nothing more than an attempt by House Republicans to undermine the safety net provided to low-income Americans struggling to put food on their table.

It is unconscionable that Republican leadership has removed the Nutrition title from the farm bill and are using food as a political tool.

Despite what economists have been reporting, our economy is still in a recession for a significant number of Americans and we still have a poverty crisis in this country.

In 2011, there were 46.2 million people in poverty. 16.1 million children are living in poverty. Children under the age of 18 have the highest poverty rate in the United States.

More than 3.6 million seniors are living in poverty. Women over the age of 85 have the second highest poverty rate in the country.

Families and individuals living in poverty often rely on the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) to help put food on the table.

By removing SNAP from the farm bill, millions of Americans including many children and seniors will go hungry. This should not happen in the richest country on the planet.

While SNAP is the largest portion of the Nutrition title, there are other programs in the Nutrition title that are vital in combating hunger that will essentially cease to exist as a result of House Republicans.

I want to mention one of those programs, the Seniors Farmers Market Nutrition Program. This important program helps low-income seniors purchase fresh, nutritious, locally grown fruits and vegetables at farmers' markets, roadside stands, and community supported agriculture programs.

There were nearly 5 million seniors in 2011 that were food insecure. That means 1 in 12

seniors had trouble putting food on their plates in the United States. I find that completely unacceptable and no senior citizen should have to worry where his or her next meal will come from.

Given the damage that sequestration is doing to Meals on Wheels and other senior assistance programs, House Republicans should be ashamed for trying to take food away from our senior citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing the House Republican half-hearted farm bill.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, this bill is another example of House Republicans' misplaced priorities. Instead of addressing food insecurity in our country, this bill completely omits nutrition assistance funding and instead provides millions of dollars in subsidies to the nation's largest corporate farms. SNAP is a life line for millions of families who suffer from chronic hunger. With one in four children in the United States at risk of going hungry, including 170,000 school children in Southern Nevada, it is not only irresponsible, it is morally unacceptable to exclude SNAP funding from the Farm Bill. That is why I voted against this legislation, and why I have introduced the Weekends Without Hunger Act. My bill fills a critical need in our community by providing a nutritious meal to students who would not otherwise have access to food on weekends and during school breaks. I will continue to advocate on behalf of our communities to ensure they have the resources they need to root out the causes of hunger and build strategies to eliminate food insecurity.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this latest version of the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013.

This deeply flawed and misguided legislation comes before the chamber after a last minute decision by the Republican leadership to separate the nutrition assistance programs, which are a cornerstone of our Nation's food safety net, from the rest of the complete Farm Bill.

Our nation's nutrition programs, which benefit millions of Americans, in every district, and every state, across this great nation, should not be left behind as the rest of the Farm Bill advances. Failure to find a reasonable compromise to ensure that hardworking Americans are not left hungry is not a reason to advance agricultural subsidies.

H.R. 2642 expands unlimited crop insurance subsidies, increases price guarantees for major crops, and locks in these unprecedented giveaways by making the new farm bill permanent law and taking the future of agricultural programs out of the hands of policymakers.

At the same time, the bill guts protections of wetlands, prairies and forests, eviscerates regulation of pesticides under the Clean Water Act, and limits the ability of states to set standards for farm and food production.

This bill is bad procedure and bad policy. I urge my colleagues to vote no on the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman LUCAS and Ranking Member PETERSON for their work on this bill. There are some good ideas in here, and we should act on them. Now, I still have serious concerns with this bill. But I'm hopeful that a conference agreement will address these concerns.

Here's what this bill gets right: In some areas, it cuts wasteful spending. It eliminates direct payments. And it consolidates duplicative programs. I want to commend the chairman and the members of the Agriculture Committee for proposing these reforms. These reforms don't go far enough, but I'm hopeful that a conference agreement will limit crop-insurance subsidies to small farmers. We should impose a limitation on the Adjusted Gross Income (AGI) for those receiving crop-insurance subsidies, and I have been given assurances that the House will be able to speak on this issue. I will consider supporting a conference agreement only if it includes an AGI limitation or equivalent reforms.

I will say there's been noticeable improvement in this bill: First, it encourages real reform to our commodity programs. In the past, agricultural interests used the threat of skyrocketing costs under ''permanent law'' to push status quo farm bills through Congress. By eliminating this arbitrary threat, we can continue to reform these programs under a more deliberative process. Second, this bill considers farm programs on their own merits. For far too long, Congress has considered agricultural programs and nutrition programs in conjunction. Both of these programs need to be reformed, and we should evaluate each of them separately—and on their own merits.

I continue to believe we should have a safety net for our farmers. We should help the little guy—the family farm that's in need. We need these AGI limitations to maintain a safety net for small farmers and to ensure that large agribusinesses do not continue to receive taxpayer support.

I want to commend Chairman LUCAS for bringing good ideas to the table. I continue to have concerns about this bill, but am hopeful that a conference agreement can improve it. And if a conference agreement does not improve it, I will vote no on that agreement. I will support the passage of this bill—and will look forward to seeing the changes made in a conference agreement.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this bill. By stripping out the nutrition portion of this legislation, the Republican Majority is showing their disdain for those people who are struggling to make ends meet, and trying to put good nutritious food on the table for their children.

This Republican Leadership is the most partisan in the history of the House. By taking bipartisan legislation like the Farm Bill, which helps all Americans, they have made it a divisive issue.

Mitt Romney was right—you don't care about the 47 percent of Americans who depend on the government for the basic necessities of life—food and shelter.

The FARRM Bill needs to have all the sections included to genuinely affect all aspects of food production. From those who eat to those who produce. The family farmer produces the food for our table. The recipient of government funding spends all of that funding on food. Nothing is saved for later.

Farm bills represent a delicate balance between America's farm, nutrition, conservation, and other priorities, and accordingly require strong bipartisan support. It is vital for a broad coalition of lawmakers from both sides of the aisle to provide certainty for urban and rural America, the environment and our economy in general.

The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP as it's called, protects over 46 million Americans who are at risk of going without sufficient food. Nearly half of those are children.

The nutrition title of the FARRM bill includes SNAP. It includes the Nutrition Education and Obesity Prevention Grant Program to help people learn to eat healthier. Community Food Projects is a grant program for eligible nonprofit organizations, in order to improve community access to food. The Emergency Food Assistance Program, Commodity Supplemental Food Program, Child Nutrition Programs, Farm-to-School Programs, Senior Farmers' Market Nutrition Program and the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program are all programs that both help low income consumers and the farmers that produce what we put on our table.

Splitting the nutrition title from the rest of the bill could result in neither farm nor nutrition programs passing.

I urge the leadership of the House of Representatives to move a unified farm bill forward.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act, H.R. 2642.

Mr. Speaker, I refuse to vote for a FARM Bill that omits SNAP.

SNAP is America's first line of defense against hunger.

Its benefits improve nutrition, health, and increases the food-purchasing power of low-income households.

To move forward with a FARM bill that does not include this funding is a shameful abandonment of the most vulnerable people who live in our country.

The program has wide-reaching effects for the individuals participating in the program, their communities, and the entire nation.

My constituents have been clear.

Mothers have told me that without SNAP they cannot feed their children.

Many seniors, disabled individuals and veterans have told me that without SNAP, they will not eat.

How can we allow our children and those in need to starve?

How can we allow our seniors to go hungry?

I cannot and will not vote to harm our nation's most vulnerable.

I will not turn my back on low-income families, children, seniors and the disabled.

I will not vote for a FARM bill that omits SNAP and threatens the lives of American families, children and seniors.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2642, the ''Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013.'' Separating this bill from the nutrition provision, including SNAP, is a foolish and immoral decision. The process that House Republicans chose to bring this bill to the floor was egregious and a blatant violation of this body's policy of giving Members and the public 72 hours to read a bill. This bill denies Members the opportunity for robust debate and to consider reform of farm policies. Many new provisions were inserted in this bill late last night. Furthermore, passage of this bill would undermine our efforts to assist vulnerable Americans, risk severe cuts to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program

(SNAP), and will allow outdated allotments and quotas under current farm policy to become permanent law.

We are living at a time when low-income working families, senior citizens and disabled veterans are struggling to put food on their tables and children are attending school hungry—often leaving them unable to concentrate. Having a bitter partisan fight on the House floor opens the door to cuts to nutrition programs like the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), the Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP), the Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP) and Women, Infant and Children program (WIC), which will only dramatically increase hunger in our country and drive even more people to food banks. Until every American has access to a decent paying job, American families should have the ability to feed their families.

Every major deficit reduction packaged signed into law over the last thirty years has always been negotiated according to the principle of not increasing poverty or inequality. That's why I will continue to fight against cuts to the SNAP program and misguided efforts aimed at breaking the urban-rural coalition that protected and strengthened this program throughout our history. This bill fails our children and the most vulnerable in our country. Investing in hunger relief is a fiscally sound decision. It is a cost-effective and an investment in our nation's future. I ask you to stand with me to protect the most vulnerable and our most vital safety net in fighting hunger in America. I encourage my colleagues to oppose the bill.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today with the Ranking Member in opposition to the split farm bill before us. Setting a closed rule on this midnight-hour, backroom deal is not the way the American people elected us to govern.

I am privileged to sit on the Agriculture Committee. During the markup of the farm bill earlier this year, my colleagues and I discussed and debated and deliberated for ten hours on every provision of this bill.

That bill included critical reform of the dairy program, reauthorization of the Rural Broadband program, as well as important provisions for organic producers, beginning farmers and ranchers, conservationists, and the forestry industry.

We reached a bipartisan consensus and 36 of us—myself included—cast a vote in support of the legislation.

Then, on the floor, the legislation was systematically dismantled, piece by piece, until it was barely recognizable as the same farm bill that came out of committee. It was no surprise that this bill failed.

Rather than going back to committee to work on a better compromise, we are here voting on a more-than–600 page bill that only became available late last night.

This bill is even worse than the one that failed, and now the process itself has been poisoned. The American people did not elect us to conduct their business behind closed doors at midnight.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago Democrats and Republicans alike unilaterally rejected a bill that would have cut $20.5 billion from our Nation's most important anti-hunger program which touches nearly 1 out of 7 American's. Today, the Republican Majority in the House of Representatives is considering H.R. 2642, a bill that is even more deeply flawed than before, which opts to leave out programs that will protect those who are most in need entirely.

In these tough budgetary times, the Republican majority should not signal to their constituents that helping those most in need is no longer a priority. In addition to leaving behind those who are most in need, the bill being rushed to the floor today is under a closed rule, with an amendment that eliminates the 1949 permanent farm law and replaces it with the language of H.R. 2642. Additionally, this bill makes permanent deep cuts to conservation programs, weakens protections for our forests, wetlands and wildlife and guts regulation of pesticides.

Congress first enacted the farm bill in response to the Great Depression in order to foster growth in our Nation's economy and to protect those who were most in need. Today, we are still recovering from what some economists call, ''the Great Recession.'' We find ourselves at a crossroads where we must decide how to manage our fiscal priorities while still protecting those who were hardest hit by the recent recession. President Eisenhower once said, ''Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired, signifies in the final sense a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed.''

Mr. Speaker, historically funding for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, constitutes about 80 percent of the funding in a Farm Bill. I have received letters from the two largest general farm organizations in the country which have voiced opposition to separating nutrition programs from the farm bill. Splitting this bill is a shortsighted strategy which undermines the long-standing bipartisan fashion in which urban and rural members unite to support this package.

Mr. Speaker, considering the serious flaws of this bill, I would encourage all of my colleagues, both Democratic and Republican to vote against this unconscionable package.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the House Republican revised ''half-a-loaf'' farm bill.

The bill before us should not be referred to as a farm bill. Farm bills have traditionally tried to address challenges facing all of American agriculture including nutrition and hunger issues.

This legislation removes the Nutrition title from the farm bill, which includes the programs that help improve nutrition and fight hunger. Consequently, the bill before us is nothing more than an attempt by House Republicans to undermine the safety net provided to nutrition-short Americans struggling to put food on their table.

It is unconscionable that Republican leadership has removed the Nutrition title from the farm bill and are using food as a political tool. Those political figures who extract food as a political weapon, are not only morally compromised but dangerously destructive.

Despite what economists have been reporting, our economy is still in a recession for a significant number of Americans. We have a poverty crisis in this country. We have 12 million Americans unemployed or underemployed.

In 2011, there were 46.2 million people in poverty. 16.1 million children are living in poverty. Children under the age of 18 have the highest poverty rate in the United States.

More than 3.6 million seniors are living in poverty. Women over the age of 85 have the second highest poverty rate in our country.

Families and individuals living in poverty often rely on the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) to help put food on the table.

By removing SNAP from the farm bill, millions of Americans including many children and seniors will go hungry. This should not happen in the richest country on the planet.

While SNAP is the largest portion of the Nutrition title, there are other programs in the Nutrition title that are vital in combating hunger that will essentially cease to exist as a result of House Republicans.

I want to mention one of those programs, the Seniors Farmers Market Nutrition Program. This important program helps low-income seniors purchase fresh, nutritious, locally grown fruits and vegetables at farmers' markets, roadside stands, and community supported agriculture programs.

There were nearly 5 million seniors in 2011 that were food insecure. That means 1 in 12 seniors had trouble putting food on their plates in the United States. I find that completely unacceptable. No senior citizen should have to worry where his or her next meal will come from!

Given the damage that sequestration is doing to Meals on Wheels and other senior assistance programs, House Republicans should be ashamed for trying to take food away from our senior citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing the House Republican halfhearted farm bill.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 2642, the Federal-Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013.

I oppose this bill because it ignores the needs of working families. H.R. 2642 completely strips the nutrition titles out of the Farm Bill. Therefore, this is not a true Farm Bill. This would be the first time in decades that nutrition is not considered alongside agriculture, conservation, and trade issues.

Chief among the nutrition programs that are eliminated from this bill in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP). SNAP is a critical program for Americans facing food insecurity. As of January 2013, 3,159,000, or 16 percent of New York residents, and 47,772,000, or 15 percent of Americans, received SNAP benefits. According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, approximately two-thirds of SNAP recipients are children, elderly, or disabled. Also, most SNAP families with children are working households. It is unconscionable that this body, which should be protecting vulnerable Americans, is instead attempting to ignore them.

SNAP is an efficient and effective program. There is much talk by those critical of SNAP, accusing the program of waste, fraud, and abuse. This is wildly exaggerated—only 3 percent of SNAP benefits represent overpayments. The Department of Agriculture (USDA) has made improvements to its disbursements so that the families who truly need benefits get them. To reduce SNAP trafficking, which violates federal law, SNAP benefits are disbursed via an electronic debit card that recipients can use to purchase food only. Retailers or recipients who defraud the program by trading SNAP for money or misrepresenting their circumstances face strict criminal penalties. Additionally, approximately 95 percent of federal

SNAP spending goes directly to families to buy food. Most of the rest goes toward administrative costs, including reviews to determine that applicants are eligible, monitoring of retailers that accept SNAP, and anti-fraud activities.

This bill represents a failure to protect the vulnerable people of our country. I cannot support this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, if ordered, and approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 198, noes 226, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 352]

AYES—198

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—226

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—10

Broun (GA)
Campbell
Horsford
Hunter
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Rogers (MI)
Schweikert
Shimkus
Smith (WA)

□ 1531

Mrs. BLACKBURN changed her vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 216, nays 208, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 353]

YEAS—216

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boehner
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schock
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—208

Amash	Garcia	Napolitano
Andrews	Gingrey (GA)	Neal
Barber	Grayson	Nolan
Barrow (GA)	Green, Al	O'Rourke
Bass	Grijalva	Owens
Beatty	Gutiérrez	Pallone
Becerra	Hahn	Pascrell
Bera (CA)	Hanabusa	Pastor (AZ)
Bishop (GA)	Hastings (FL)	Payne
Bishop (NY)	Heck (WA)	Pelosi
Blumenauer	Higgins	Perlmutter
Bonamici	Himes	Peters (CA)
Brady (PA)	Hinojosa	Peters (MI)
Braley (IA)	Holt	Peterson
Brown (FL)	Honda	Pingree (ME)
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer	Pocan
Bustos	Huelskamp	Polis
Butterfield	Huffman	Price (NC)
Capps	Israel	Quigley
Capuano	Jackson Lee	Rahall
Cárdenas	Jeffries	Rangel
Carney	Johnson (GA)	Richmond
Carson (IN)	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard
Cartwright	Jones	Ruiz
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Castro (TX)	Keating	Rush
Chu	Kelly (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Cicilline	Kennedy	Salmon
Clarke	Kildee	Sánchez, Linda T.
Clay	Kilmer	
Cleaver	Kind	Sanchez, Loretta
Clyburn	Kirkpatrick	Sanford
Cohen	Kuster	Sarbanes
Connolly	Langevin	Schakowsky
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Schiff
Cook	Larson (CT)	Schneider
Cooper	Lee (CA)	Schrader
Costa	Levin	Schwartz
Courtney	Lewis	Scott (VA)
Crowley	Lipinski	Scott, David
Cuellar	LoBiondo	Serrano
Cummings	Loebsack	Sewell (AL)
Davis (CA)	Lofgren	Shea-Porter
Davis, Danny	Lowenthal	Sherman
DeFazio	Lowey	Sinema
DeGette	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Sires
Delaney	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Slaughter
DeLauro	Lynch	Speier
DelBene	Maffei	Swalwell (CA)
DeSantis	Maloney, Carolyn	Takano
Deutch	Maloney, Sean	Thompson (CA)
Dingell	Markey	Thompson (MS)
Doggett	Matheson	Tierney
Doyle	Matsui	Titus
Duckworth	McClintock	Tonko
Duncan (TN)	McCollum	Tsongas
Edwards	McDermott	Van Hollen
Ellison	McGovern	Vargas
Engel	McIntyre	Veasey
Enyart	McNerney	Vela
Eshoo	Meeks	Velázquez
Esty	Meng	Visclosky
Farr	Michaud	Walz
Fattah	Miller, George	Wasserman Schultz
Foster	Moore	Waters
Frankel (FL)	Moran	Watt
Franks (AZ)	Murphy (FL)	Waxman
Fudge	Nadler	Welch
Gabbard	Napolitano	Wilson (FL)
Gallego	Neal	Yarmuth
Garamendi	Nolan	

NOT VOTING—11

Broun (GA)	Hunter	Schweikert
Campbell	McCarthy (NY)	Shimkus
Green, Gene	Negrete McLeod	Smith (WA)
Horsford	Rogers (MI)	

□ 1539

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 353, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, on consideration H.R. 2609, I am not recorded because I was absent due to medically mandated recovery. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on final passage of the bill rollcall No. 345, "aye" on the Titus Amendment of the bill (rollcall No. 337), and "aye" on the Heck Amendment to the bill (rollcall No. 337), and "aye" on the Heck Amendment to the bill (rollcall No. 325).

On rollcall No. 353 on final passage H.R. 2642, I am not recorded because I was absent due to medically mandated recovery. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on final passage of this bill.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2300

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor from H.R. 2300.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WILLIAMS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

□ 1545

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for the week to come, and I yield to my friend, the majority leader, Mr. CANTOR.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland, the Democratic whip, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday the House will meet in pro forma session at 10 a.m. No votes are expected.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour and noon for legislative business.

On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a few bills under suspension of the rules, a complete list of which will be announced by the close of business tomorrow.

The House will also vote to delay, for a year, both the employer mandate and the individual mandate under ObamaCare. As the Speaker and the gentleman know, the administration declared last week that they would delay the enforcement of the mandate on businesses for a year, but not the mandate on working families and individuals. We will respond next week to correct this injustice.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the House may consider H.R. 5, the Student Success Act authored by Chairman JOHN KLINE. The bill represents a solid, commonsense approach to education to provide our next generation with the education they need to keep America competitive in the world economy.

Finally, the House may consider the Department of Defense appropriations bill for fiscal year 2014 drafted by Representative BILL YOUNG for the resources necessary for our troops.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his information on the schedule. As the gentleman knows, we just passed a farm bill and I'm wondering how soon he might expect to move to go to conference on that bill.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. I would say to the gentleman, the chairman, the Speaker, and other members of leadership are in discussions about how to expedite an agreement on the farm bill. Certainly it is our intention to act with dispatch to bring to the floor a bill dealing with the SNAP program, that portion of what was traditionally the farm bill. We intend to be bringing that vehicle to the floor at some time in the near future. It is our intention to do so.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information, and I am glad to hear that we will go to conference as soon as possible so we can consider that important piece of legislation. As the gentleman knows, there are substantial differences between the House and the Senate, and the sooner we get that bill done and whole, I think the better we will be.

You mentioned the Defense appropriations bill is coming to the floor. Does the gentleman expect that to be coming to the floor with an open rule?

And I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I will respond to the gentleman, as he knows, this Congress, as was the last Congress, has been a Congress that is as committed to the open process as any in recent history. I would say to the gentleman that the Speaker continues to insist that we strive toward that open process to allow for as much debate and exchange of ideas as possible to benefit the American people as well as the outcome of legislation.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman. Was that a ''yes''?

Mr. CANTOR. I would tell the gentleman again that the Rules Committee, as the gentleman knows when he was in the position of majority leader, determines the structure of debate, and I would remind the gentleman that the discourse and debate on this floor has been a lot more open than in years past, and I would remind him of that.

Mr. HOYER. Well, the good news is I don't have time to discuss that today, but perhaps at some time we will.

Immigration. Obviously, the Senate, as the gentleman so well knows, has passed a major piece of legislation, passed it 68–32. That bill is, I believe,

now with us. Can the gentleman tell us when we might be expecting immigration legislation on the floor?

Mr. CANTOR. I'd say to the gentleman, it is not correct to say that we have that bill. There was a tax, I believe, that was added to the bill so we do not have that. I would say to the gentleman, though, as he knows, our conference members met yesterday to discuss the path forward so far as immigration reform is concerned. I would say to characterize the agreement on our side, we all believe we need to fix a broken system of immigration and we need to rebuild the trust of the American people and the operation of government in terms of securing our borders and enforcing the law, at the same time balancing that with the history and tradition of our country as one that is built on immigrants.

Mr. HOYER. I'm pleased to hear that. Of course, former President George Bush said, as the gentleman knows, just a few days ago, that we have a problem. The laws governing the immigration system aren't working, the system is broken, and he urged us to pass a bill. The chairman of the Budget Committee, PAUL RYAN, has said the same thing that I think the gentleman just said. We are very hopeful that we will bring a comprehensive, which we believe is absolutely essential, immigration bill to the floor and to realization so we can fix a broken system. And, yes, give a pathway to citizenship for those who meet the criteria that we would set forth.

But I thank the gentleman for his comments; and if he would like to respond further, I'd yield.

If not, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JULY 15, 2013

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. on Monday, July 15, 2013.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

DEPENDENCE ON THE GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Today, despite all of the diatribe, all of the allegations, so many of which shocked me, this bill passed. There were things in the farm bill I was not crazy about, but what an extraordinary day for this reason: over the last 40–50 years, Members of the other party have increasingly made the United States a welfare state where more and more American people are dependent upon this government for their livelihood. Having been at a Harvard orientation course, I was shocked to have a dean there with charts that showed that since welfare began, and assistance to single moms, a check actually for each child that any woman could have out of wedlock, they would get a check from the government. Now, it was well intentioned.

Back in the sixties, there were deadbeat dads that were not helping with their obligation to help their children, and so the government, people here in Congress thought, wow, why don't we help these poor single moms by giving them a check for every child they have out of wedlock. At that time we were around 6–7 percent of children being born to single-parent homes. And after 40 years—actually after 30 years, as economists will tell you, you will get more of what you pay for. And so we are to date now past 40 percent and moving toward 50 percent of children born in American to a single-mom home because we got what we paid for.

Now, it doesn't matter how well intentioned the program was. What I saw happening in the nineties as a judge was single moms coming before me for welfare fraud, and the stories were usually the same that they presented to me. So often they were bored with high school, and someone said, hey, you can just have a baby and the government will send you a check. And then you can live, and you don't have to work. You don't have to finish high school.

And those well-intentioned Members of Congress back in the sixties ended up in effect luring smart young women away from finishing high school into having a child out of wedlock and away from reaching their full potential.

Now, even for those of us who are Christians that believe God created heaven and Earth and that God created at one time a Garden of Eden from which man fell for disobedience, even in that scenario when the world was perfect, Adam was given a job. In a perfect world where everything was fantastic—before childbirth pains, before briars, before thistles, before all of the things that frustrate farmers, at that time he had a job: tend the garden.

□ 1600

In a perfect world, people will have a job to reach their God-given potential, and there is a good feeling from doing a good job in what we do.

That's one of the things I miss about working in the yard or working out on a farm or working with your hands. When you finish, you see you've done something good.

When we work here, we try to do the right thing, on both sides of the aisle, but we never know for some times decades whether we did more good than damage.

And I would humbly submit that the program that began to lure young women away from their potential, away from finishing high school, away from time in college, was well intentioned, but this government should never be in the business of luring people away from their potential, from luring people into results from which they cannot seem to extricate themselves.

And they'd come before me for welfare fraud, felony welfare fraud, as a district judge. And normally the scenario was that they realized, after a number of children, they couldn't live on that little bit of government subsistence; and they would think, well, maybe if I get a job, and I don't report it to the Federal authorities, maybe I'll finally have enough income that, combined with what the government's giving me, then I can get ahead and I can get out of this hole, this rut.

And so when the Republicans took the majority, in 1995, one of the things that they wanted to do was welfare reform. And I was at that Harvard orientation seminar and was surprised when they brought out the big poster graph of single mothers' income over the 30-or-so years since that program had first begun.

Single moms' income, when adjusted for inflation over that 30-year period, was flat-lined. All those years, the average single mom never got ahead. She was flat-lined because she was lured into that government program.

I'm not sure what the right thing was, but I think it's time to have the debate about it.

So I know that those people that passed the bills in the sixties, they had the best of intentions, but those poor single moms were flat-lined for about 30 years of what they were bringing home. That's tragic. I know both sides of the aisle would want them to do better and do well and every year to do a little better. I know that feeling is on both sides of the aisle, but we disagree with how you get there.

But what really shocked me today, and I've got to say, in some cases broke my heart, is to hear friends talk about how Republicans wanted to take food out of the mouths of children. I would never insinuate or say such a motive on the part of friends across the aisle, even though I believe that that welfare program, back from the sixties, did exactly that.

I would never ascribe that motivation to friends across the aisle because I know that's not their heart. They really do want to help. They just went about it in the wrong way in the sixties.

And so, in 1995, when Newt Gingrich led the Republican Revolution, had the Contract With America, they put in a requirement for work. If you could work, you had to work. And it pushed people who had been subsisting on welfare, barely getting by, it pushed them into the workforce.

And this graph, about 9 years later, showed that single moms' income, when adjusted for inflation, after welfare reform, had single moms making

more money. Every year that graph showed their income went up. And surely that is what both sides of the aisle would want.

And when we took up this farm bill today, I voted against it for the first vote, previously. But if we are ever going to get down to truly reforming what has become a welfare state that lures far too many people away from the job they could be doing, and from the good feeling of actually accomplishing something, and the good feeling of knowing you're reaching closer, ever closer to your potential. I was willing to vote for this today because we were going to take the food stamp program out of the agriculture bill.

And I don't know what the Senate's going to do, and I can't help what they're going to do. But I know this: today, we had a first step in the right direction. And I agreed with my leadership, if you will separate out the food stamp program so that we can have a separate debate on the food stamp program, and even though I don't agree with a number of things in the farm bill we voted on, that was such a big deal, a tremendous stride forward.

People said neither the House nor the Senate would ever, ever separate the food stamp program from the Ag bill because in either the House or the Senate, you had to have them tied together to get enough people from both sides, or either side to vote for the bill because you'd never get enough Republicans by themselves, you'd never get enough Democrats by themselves and you'd never get enough together unless you put the food stamp program with the farm program.

But by doing so, it prevented us from looking closely at the farm program because the food stamp program made 70 to 80 percent of the budget; and you couldn't look effectively enough at the food stamp program because it was linked with the farm program.

This was a big step, and I know there are a number of groups that I thank God for that are doing a great job. And I have friends in these groups and they've said this was a major mistake today. And I would submit, very humbly, hide and watch. This was a first major step.

And my goal, and I hope I live to see it, and I hope this country's around long enough that we can do it, is to take every form of public assistance, every form of public assistance, and put it into one bill, in one subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, and they deal with all welfare, all types of public assistance. And once that happens, we can have major reform.

But the reason we have trouble having reform of this ever-growing, ever-bloated welfare state is because the public assistance programs are found throughout all the committee's budgets, throughout all the appropriations. So if over here in the farm program you say, wait a minute; we need to reform the food stamp program. They go, oh, you hate children. You want to starve children, you want to starve mothers or veterans or military. You must hate all these people.

Why?

Because they're willing to say things that are not right to come in here and say. And that's what broke my heart today over and over, hearing people that surely know I would never want to take food out of the mouth of someone who could not provide for themselves. I don't know any Republican who has ever said that or would ever want that.

We want to help people who truly cannot help themselves.

And my friend across the aisle, Mr. MCDERMOTT, at Rules, when I made a proposed amendment to separate the food stamp program from the farm bill, he said, so do you want to completely eliminate the food stamp program?

And I pointed out, no, I did not. Of course, that didn't stop the mainstream press or the left wing blogs from spouting lies. They're accustomed to that. And God bless them, they have the freedom to do that, and they should be able to do that without this administration grabbing up all their phone records.

But it was not true, and I pointed out to Mr. MCDERMOTT what was true. No, I don't want to end it. I want to separate it out. And one day I want to have all of the public assistance in one committee, where we can see all of the ones that are redundant, those that duplicate services already provided, those where the most waste, fraud and abuse is taking place, because the thing we know, we're over $50,000 for every child of debt before they ever even have a chance to start making a living.

And we have done that, and it is immoral what we have done to future generations, loading them up with debt, just because we can't get to the bottom of waste, fraud and abuse, get to the bottom of what helps this country more than hurts it. And there will be a price today to pay someday for our negligence.

But it's not too late. We can still fix it. But a start happened today. This was a big deal, to separate the food stamp program out so we can look at it.

And a good example of what I'm talking about, how these different types of assistance are spread out through so many different budgets, was pointed out by my good friend, DAN WEBSTER from Florida, first Republican Speaker of the House, as I understand it, down in Florida, was reluctant to run, did run, is elected here.

He decided to get to the bottom, just one little tiny aspect of this Federal, bloated bureaucracy. How many Federal programs are there that are responsible for getting people to appointments?

So far he says he's found 87 programs responsible for getting people to appointments, and most of them are in the same cities, and most of them have the vans that are the same size, same kind of vans. And on average, when they do take somebody, they'll maybe average three people per trip.

Well, when you take up one committee's budget, or one appropriations, and you were to take one of those 87 programs and say, you know what, let's combine this with these other programs, then we will hear, as we've heard today, oh, you hate children, or you want to take food from people's mouths.

If it's all 87 programs in one bill, then we can come before this body and say, no, we love children. We want to help this country. In fact, we will do more good for children of the future than what you've proposed because you're loading them up with debt, while we lavish it on our generation, and going to make future generations pay for lavishing ourselves. That is just wrong.

But if you combine them all into one bill, then we can say, no, we care every bit as deeply and perhaps more than you do, but we don't need 87 programs. We don't need all the duplication. Let's eliminate the redundancy.

Let's get down to what we really need as a Federal Government, because this administration was certainly shocked. They talked about all the horrors of cutting the budget with the sequestration.

Well, the sequestration made too many cuts in defend. Some were appropriate, but it did some in the wrong places. As I told my leadership 2 years ago this month, you never put your security on the table.

□ 1615

You can make cuts but you can never gamble your national security or your home. By putting defense on the table, my leadership did, and I was promised that those sequestration cuts would never happen. I was sure if that bill passed that would happen, and it would be a disastrous mistake and we would be blamed even though it was the President's idea. It all happened. Sometimes it's just not fun being right.

But here, today, we did something good. We started a step toward that goal one day of having all the public assistance in one bill, one budget, one committee, where we can get in and analyze without all of the false statements that people want to make about others wanting to take food from the mouths of children, from my friends saying that we wanted to do that, that I wanted to do that. Come on. Mr. Speaker, that is just wrong.

On our side of the aisle, yes, we will complain ObamaCare is going to hurt health care. We're now seeing that. We're seeing it all play out just as we said would happen. And maybe it wasn't a death panel. Call it what you want, but it is a panel under ObamaCare that will say that you're a little too old; you've had a good life; your hip is killing you. Before ObamaCare, you would have gotten a

new hip. But now we, the government, say, No, you don't get a new hip. Yes, you can use a new knee, and you might have 20, 25 good years with it, but we're the government and we say you've had a good knee for long enough so you're not getting a new knee. Or, as the President pointed out in his town hall meeting when a woman asked about a pacemaker that her mother had gotten, Will you consider the quality of life in deciding who gets a pacemaker and who does not? Since my mother has lived 10 years after getting a pacemaker, I'm concerned she wouldn't get one under ObamaCare. He beat around the bush but then finally said that maybe we're better off telling your mother to just take a pain pill, and that means die without your pacemaker.

That's what ObamaCare is going to do. But I would never, ever ascribe to any one of my friends across the aisle the intention to want people to die. Well, they might tell me that sometimes, but not to the public that they are charged with protecting, because I don't think they mean to do that. I just think they're motivated to do the right thing, but it's being done in the wrong ways and people are being hurt. And that's the way we look at it.

So today, to hear dozens and dozens of friends across the aisle come up here and try to vilify Republicans, saying we want to take food out of the mouths of children, that this is going to destroy these poor people that can't provide for themselves and this is what we want to do, most of those things were said in ways that it would have done no good to ask that their words be taken down because they would ascribe it to Republicans in general or to a big group so that you couldn't say that violated the rule of saying a specific person had a specific evil motive; but it was, nonetheless, just as hurtful.

That's, apparently, the difference. One side is willing to accuse the other of wanting to push Grandma off a cliff and let her die bouncing down a cliff, and the other side, we think you're going to cause Grandma to die early, but we know you don't mean to do that. In fact, ObamaCare will do that very thing because of what we've seen.

And I heard Bette Midler and Michelle Malkin are good friends. I heard she tweeted something to the effect that if we had lost the Revolution, everyone would have universal health care. Well, I have three daughters and a wife that's been married to me, God bless her and help her, for 35 years. Four women in my life in my immediate family. Sometimes children do things that break your heart. Sometimes they bless you beyond anything you could imagine.

What I think Ms. Midler didn't understand is, if we had England's health care, they have a 19 to 20 percent lower survival rate from breast cancer than we have in the United States because our health care is that much better and you get treatment that much quicker here. You didn't have to wait until you felt a lump. You could get a mammogram. There were groups that could help if you didn't have the money. But in England, you had to get on a list for everything you did.

And so, when you think about one in five women with breast cancer, I can't imagine anyone would want England's health care if they realized it means we're going to lose 20 percent of the women with breast cancer in this country.

I mentioned before that one of my constituents came from England. She said her mother died of breast cancer because she lived in England and was on list after list to get the diagnostic care to find out if she had cancer, and then when she found it, she went on another list. It took too long to get surgery, get help, get treatment. Her mother died, she'd said, because she lived in England. She said, On the other hand, I'm in America. I'm a secretary here and I don't have much money, but I'm alive today because when I was found to have cancer, I didn't have to go on a list. I was able to get treatment when I needed it, whether I could afford it or not.

And those who yearn for the ObamaCare days, where we look like England's health care, where we have 20 percent less survival rate of women we love with all our hearts, like the four women in my life, if you've got five women, which one of them do you want to die so we can have health care like England?

The disagreement here on the floor was not about anybody wanting children to not have the food they need. But we have seen the results of welfare reform, and the results of welfare reform in the Republican revolution of 1995 resulted in single moms having more income after inflation than ever before under the giveaway programs of the Great Society.

So, in that scenario, who cares more: those that pushed through the Great Society, that lured women into a rut that so many of them couldn't get out of, or those who pushed through a bill that forced them to start meeting their potential?

I spoke at Texas College, the oldest college in Tyler, Texas, my home, within the past few months. It's a great college. It changed my opinion about colleges that began as all one race. Now they're all different races. But it's basically an African American college still today. The people in charge are Christians, and they care deeply.

And I spoke to a combined sociology class there at Texas College and I laid this issue out before them. As one single mom told me, You've got to clean it up. You've got to clean these programs up. I'm now, after so many years later, coming to college to try to better myself. And I wish it had been otherwise, but you need to make people work. You need to make people finish high school. And if they can, have them do some college. You need to incentivize that. You do not need to just give people a check. She said too many people even spend it on drugs instead of their kids. She also said, You need to reform the system so that I don't waste years trying to get to college. And others chimed in and they said similar things.

These were people who understand the system better than I do. But as a judge, as a citizen, I've seen it from different angles. And though we care equally on both sides of the aisle, one way leads to the end of a Nation. And it's the broad path and it's wide, because every Nation in the history of the world has gone down that path and come to an end. Unless the Lord comes before, we will, too.

So my goal by running for Congress, the goal of so many people I know here, was to come try to make a difference, to prolong what some called a little experiment in democracy, to prolong what Ben Franklin said. It's a republic, Madam, if you can keep it. That's our goal. That's what we hope to do.

I really believe today we made a step in that direction toward reforming the system and starting down the path of eliminating the duplication. I realize it may not all happen in this farm bill by the time we agree with the Senate, but then we can expose those in the Senate that did not do the right thing and we can expose those in the House that didn't. I think it will end up giving us a majority of those who will do the right thing. Not that everybody doesn't have the right motivation, but we need more who will do the right thing, even under pressure from friends or enemies to do something else.

I think we did a good thing today.

With that, I yield to my friend from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY).

THE SYRIAN CONFLICT

Mr. FORTENBERRY. I thank the gentleman from Texas, if you would allow me a few minutes of commentary.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to add to Mr. GOHMERT's conversation today. I wanted to add a few words on the Syrian conflict, which has been unfolding with just horrific consequences.

In my office this week, I read the accounts about Father Francois Murad, a Franciscan priest who was shot dead in northern Syria by rebels engaged in the Syrian conflict. He was killed in a Christian village where he sought to serve. He did not deserve the death that he was dealt.

Mr. Speaker, I just simply firmly believe that the United States Congress cannot allow American taxpayers to become complicit in this killing and the other brutality that is occurring there in Syria.

What began as a very hopeful exercise of the Syrian people petitioning their government for redress of grievances and their basic rights has spun into a dreadful civil war with terroristic elements and other rebel groups fighting this brutal Assad regime. But the bloodbath in Syria has spared no

one. The regime and many of its rebel opponents have killed wantonly, without discretion, murdering civilians and combatants alike. Men, women, and even innocent children have not been spared. No one there is safe.

We have no place imposing our notions of democracy in a place where we cannot distinguish who stands for what. We cannot become complicit in barbaric attacks on civilians. We have no business shipping weapons that could end up in the hands of those who would raid convents and murder innocent people. Neither America nor Syria can possibly be served by this.

Mr. Speaker, true to our principles, the United States remains the largest donor of humanitarian assistance to the people of Syria, with a total of more than $800 million given since this conflict began in the spring of 2011. That's where our efforts belong.

Mr. Speaker, I think for Father Murad, whom I referenced earlier, this would probably be the outcome that he would want to see: humanitarian help, giving people some hope, possibly even stopping the shipment of arms into that country. That would be a legacy worthy of his sacrifice.

A hundred thousand persons have died, Mr. Speaker. No U.S. military engagement in Syria.

I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank my friend from Nebraska. A wonderful point.

I know that there are people on both sides of the aisle who are motivated, again, by doing the right thing. But when you know that you have a tyrant on one side in charge of the country and you know that now perhaps it would have been different if we'd gotten in earlier, but at this point al Qaeda or the most radical Islamists, brutal killers, are driving the rebels, there is no good reason for this country to expend any blood nor any treasure to get in the middle of that conflict, and I appreciate so much my friend pointing that out.

□ 1630

It points to the problem in the Middle East with regard to the American position. This President had his administration help the rebels in Libya when we knew—hey, people were saying it right here—we know there are al Qaeda supporting the rebels. We're not sure how extensive it is, so let's get to the bottom of it before you just launch in and eliminate Qadhafi. Because Qadhafi was giving us more information on terrorist elements in the world than most anybody but our best friend, Israel. He was being helpful. And though he had blood on his hands for which he should have paid, you have to choose between the lesser of two evils.

As Secretary Gates said at the time, there is absolutely no United States national security interest at stake in this Libya crisis, in the rebellion, and yet this President went headlong. And when you know, as one Egyptian paper reported, bragging, they have six Muslim Brotherhood members that advise this administration—and there are a lot more people sympathetic to Muslim Brotherhood that advise this administration than that. When you know that that is going on, then it makes sense, they're going to make stupid decisions. They're going to always, like they did in Egypt, say, well, let's rush in and help, even though it allows the Muslim Brotherhood to take over Egypt.

I've heard so many people say they've talked to people from Egypt who have said we don't want the radical Islamists in charge, we don't want the Muslim Brotherhood. We don't want them in charge. We want a moderate Muslim government so that we can live in peace and not tyranny, like Afghanistan did under the Taliban. And now, to the disgrace of this Nation—this, the greatest Nation in the history of the world—this administration is about to leave Afghanistan—which we should have done probably in 2002, but now we're about to leave it in the hands of the Taliban.

If we had left in 2002, the Taliban had been totally destroyed. They were gone. The people that were members were in such disarray they did not have any real presence in Afghanistan. Why was that? It wasn't because tens of thousands of American troops went into Afghanistan and wiped out the Taliban. No. It was because of the heroic sacrifices of those within the tribal groups called the Northern Alliance at that time.

General Dostum led those troops, and the United States provided less than 500 special ops intelligence people in Afghanistan and provided them air cover, gave them some weapons. And they routed the Taliban within a matter of 3 or 4 months. In the last famous battle with General Dostum leading, these Northern Alliance tribesmen, on horseback, with weapons, riding uphill into the strong area where the Taliban was located, with bullets, RPGs flying all around them, killing many on horseback, but they never stopped. They went up there to the fortress and they defeated the Taliban.

Now this administration says, as a result of how forceful those Northern Alliance were in defeating the Taliban, well, those are war criminals. No, they know how to fight the Taliban. Clearly, we don't because the Taliban has come back.

I would submit that this administration releasing Taliban leaders to go back and be in charge is not a good thing. Because we had four Americans that were killed at the same time this administration was pleading, oh, please, please, come talk to us. You don't have to have any preconditions, just talk to us. We look weak because this administration gives every appearance of being weak because it's getting terrible advice.

In that part of the world, they don't understand turn the other cheek. As Christians individually—individuals of us here that are—you are to turn the other cheek. But as a government official, you provide for the common defense. And you make sure if others do evil to people in this country or threaten this country, that they are punished because the government is not given the sword in vain. People misunderstand that and think, oh, if we will apologize enough for all of the Americans who have laid down their lives—not for some great empire, but for other nations to continue to speak their language, to continue to have their own identity, and to continue to have freedom that was taken away. This country has sacrificed for freedom like no one in the history of the world.

In the past, there were some selfish, very selfish motivations. Our selfish motivation has normally been that we want these people to be freer so that we can be friends and freedom will be catching. But as we've seen, if you are not educated in how to sustain a democratic republic where you actually could govern yourself, if you don't understand how to do that, you will lose it. We've watched in Turkey, which, after Ataturk made those great changes to the government—yes, Islam is the most widespread religion in Turkey, but it was a secular government where other people could also worship. We see that being removed little by little in Turkey. And I hear from Turkish friends who are frightened of what's happening.

Now our government seems to be on the wrong side in each of these disputes. We're out there trying to work with the Taliban while they're killing Americans. Shouldn't that at least be one precondition? Would you stop killing our American soldiers that are training your farmers, training your government officials, could you stop killing them long enough for us to have our talk? Because what needs to be done is you kill an American, we're going to wipe out a whole bunch of your folks because we are about protecting ourselves.

I still feel guilty for 1979, being in the United States Army when we were attacked. It was an act of war against our embassy in Tehran and we looked weak to the world. And it's still used as a recruiting tool. Forget Abu Ghraib—the best recruiting tool is the way we left Vietnam, the way we did nothing to avenge or even to truly get our people out of Tehran after that act of war.

I love the leadership of Ronald Reagan, but in 1983 he had a Democratic Congress. People that worked with him, when I blamed him for withdrawing from Beirut after attack, that showed weakness, they said the Democrats made clear he didn't have a whole lot of choice. But that gave a sign of weakness.

USS *Cole*, we basically did nothing. Nobody paid as they should have. If we're going to protect this Nation, we have to take care of things at home. Stop all the waste, fraud and abuse so

that people who truly need help get it, and those who can work have the opportunity to work, not with some do-nothing government program but with a real job where you make real money and you accomplish real things. Because one other thing that ObamaCare is doing is a disaster to our American friends.

I've been told by people, look, I used to work full time at McDonald's, and now, because of ObamaCare, they cut me to part time. So now I don't have the benefits I had before, and I have to go back and forth between Burger King or Arby's and McDonald's because everybody's cutting to part time because of ObamaCare.

Regardless of the incentives for passing the bill, regardless of all the desire people express about giving people better health care, they're having worse lives. It's the slowest recovery, the worst recovery in American history—other than from the Great Depression. And like Morganthau, the Secretary of the Treasury, said in 1940 in his own handwriting, he said, we have spent more money than anyone in history trying to end the Depression, and we created nothing but debt. No better off, they were no better off.

It was not until World War II began and we got drawn into that by Pearl Harbor being bombed and seeing liberty under attack through our European friends, we got drawn into it. And then the government started doing their number one job—provide for the common defense—and lo and behold we came out of the Depression. The government did the most important thing for it to do: provide freedom, protect Americans so they can grow the economies, so they can be entrepreneurs.

When the government does the most important job—provide for the common defense—it ended the Great Depression. Now we have people in government that think, though they may not have ever been successful in business, that they can tell people who have been and who are how to run their business so much better, and it's hurting this economy. Oh, not with companies like General Electric, those who have gotten plenty of crony capitalist help.

I would also advise those who don't want to see reform of welfare—that I think can only occur when we get all public assistance in one appropriation, in one committee, then we can get real reform. And we will save so many billions and billions and billions—heck, maybe trillions of dollars over a 10-year period. We will save so much money that they will be able to throw it away on many more thousands of Solyndras. They can have all kinds of crony capitalism with the money we can save by providing incentives to get back to work, by providing incentives to finish high school and to go to college if you need to. But not everyone needs to go to college. You don't have to get a college degree to learn how to weld.

I was over in Marshall, at the TSTA facility, the institution there. They're teaching welders, and they're making great money when they leave. And it's true of other institutions that teach those kinds of vocational training. But instead, we now have more people on food stamps than ever in history.

What has happened to this country when those of us who want to get the country back running by reforming welfare are vilified and accused of wanting to take food out of the mouths of children? How wrong that is. We want more children with more food. The same way I've been vilified for saying children need to be taught English. Even if they're just newly arrived from Mexico, teach them in English. Maybe they need some beginner courses to get them there. But don't teach them in Spanish, help them move into English. Why? Not because I or people like me hate those Hispanic children, it's because we love them. And we know that if you teach them in English, as my friend, Commissioner Ramirez, former City Councilman Ramirez, said, his parents from Mexico said they couldn't speak Spanish at home. His father said you can be anything in America you want to be but you've got to speak good English. It was true. And I am thrilled to death that Gus' new restaurant in Tyler is working out so well. But he wasn't allowed to speak Spanish at home, and the sky is the limit.

For someone born in this country, they can be President of the country. Instead of being a manual laborer speaking Spanish, they can be president of the company. So who really cares more about people? Those who rail against us who want to reform the entitlements we're told they are, that were supposed to be a hand up, not bait to be lured into a rut they could not get out of. That is immoral.

□ 1645

I know for some people—Star Parker, and there are others—who talk about how they have pulled themselves up, they're an inspiration. But there are too many that did not have the ability to pull themselves up or the wherewithal, and shame on us for luring them into a rut they couldn't get out of. It is time to reform that.

But I can also say, as the attacks on the Christian religion have grown and grown exponentially, this country is in deeper and deeper trouble and will continue to be. The assault and the intolerance upon Christianity is incredible.

People came to this country in the early days, Founders, Columbus when he discovered—he didn't know he was in a new country or a new continent. He thought he found a new way to Asia. But he claimed the land for his king and queen and also his Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ. He wrote in his own journal it was the Lord that put it into his mind that he could sail west and get to the east, and it was the Holy Spirit that comforted him all the way.

And you look at George Washington's writing, the father of this country, without whom there would be no country today as we know it, a noble, honorable, honest man. Faults, yes.

This country didn't begin to start really reaching its potential until we dealt with the blight of slavery and the horror that was in America. There has not been any kind of blight on our soul like slavery in American history until we started killing babies. Slavery had to go.

After we did away with slavery and more people were encouraged to be entrepreneurs and we came into the 1900s, we still needed a civil rights movement to set things straight. And Christian leaders like Martin Luther King, Jr., who had studied the Bible and wrote touching things like those letters from the Birmingham jail, they knew Christ was their salvation and they knew they were supposed to ensure that brothers and sisters treated brothers and sisters as such.

There were vile Christians, but I would submit those weren't really Christians. They didn't understand Jesus' teachings. But it was the church that was behind the revolutionary movement. It was the church that was strongest behind the abolition movement. It was Christian leaders who were strongest behind the civil rights movement.

Now this Nation, our government at least, seems to be at war with Christianity. We can have a little group complain that, Oh, we didn't feel comfortable in the military because of the prayers that were said or crosses worn or things that were said about Christianity. We have examples of someone being told you can't give someone a Bible when they need one because you may be prosecuted or thrown out of the military. Under the rule some are trying to push through, if you have a dying friend that asks you, ''Is there a God?'' under the order some would have, you couldn't even tell them what you know with all your heart. It's gotten to be a problem.

I love Ronald Reagan's quote back in 1984. He said:

> The frustrating thing is that those who are attacking religion claim they are doing it in the name of tolerance. Question: Isn't the real truth that they are intolerant of religion? They refuse to tolerate its importance in our lives.

The teachings of Jesus would allow people to make whatever choices they wish—choose not to believe in God; choose to be an atheist; choose to be an agnostic and say, ''I just don't think there's enough evidence''; choose to be a Buddhist; choose to be a Muslim—because all children are acceptable in God's eyes.

I believe God's will is not for any to stumble, that they will all come to eternal life. But the war that has been declared, as it appears to be, the gloves are off against Catholicism as a form of Christianity, all these different religious beliefs against abortion, those who have beliefs religiously against birth control, those who have beliefs

about marriage being what it has been for most of the world's history and without which marriage between men and women we would not have had the future generations that even exist today. You say, ''I support that traditional marriage,'' and now you are to be drummed out of your job, drummed out of having friends, eliminated from the public sector.

Ronald Reagan was right: the real intolerance, the real hatred is from those who choose to impose their beliefs and force them onto others.

Mr. Speaker, today still, nonetheless, was a good day. We made a big move toward what will one day, if we are faithful, allow us to take some of the burden that we have been putting on future generations and the $50,000 or so we have already humped onto the backs, shoulders of children that don't have jobs yet. We made a first step toward the day when we can reform them; we can start encouraging people to their God-given potential instead of luring them into ruts.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SCHWEIKERT (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today after 10:30 a.m. on account of attending his birth mother's funeral in California.

Mr. HORSFORD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of medical mandated recovery.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 251. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal features of the electric distribution system to the South Utah Valley Electric Service District, and for other purposes.

H.R. 254. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to facilitate the development of hydroelectric power on the Diamond Fork System of the Central Utah Project.

H.R. 588. An act to provide for donor contribution acknowledgments to be displayed at the Vietnam Veteran's Memorial Visitor Center, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 15, 2013, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2215. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Streamlining Requirements Governing the Use of Funding for Supportive Housing for the Elderly and Persons With Disabilities Programs [Docket No.: FR-5167-F-02] (RIN: 2502-AI67) received July 8, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2216. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment to the International Traffic in Arms Regulations: Continued Implementation of Export Control Reform (RIN: 1400-AD40) received July 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2217. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1162; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-002-AD; Amendment 39-17459; AD 2013-10-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2218. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron, Inc. (Bell) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0470; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-008-AD; Amendment 39-17465; AD 2013-11-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2219. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0930; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-251-AD; Amendment 39-17472; AD 2013-11-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2220. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1322; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-155-AD; Amendment 39-17466; AD 2013-11-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2221. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Embraer S.A. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1227; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-016-AD; Amendment 39-17467; AD 2013-11-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2222. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Iniziative Industriali Italiane S.p.A. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0455; Directorate Identifier 2013-CE-013-AD; Amendment 39-17461; AD 2013-11-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2223. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Alcohol and Controlled Substances Testing [Docket No.: FTA-2013-0012] (RIN: 2132-AB09) received July 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2224. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; La Pryor, Chaparrosa Ranch Airport, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1099; Airspace Docket No. 12-ASW-9] received July 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2225. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Atwood, KS [Docket No.: FAA-2011-1431; Airspace Docket No. 11-ACE-24] received July 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2226. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Boca Grande, FL [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1337; Airspace Docket No. 12-ASO-21] received July 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2227. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Clifton/Morenci, AZ [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1237; Airspace Docket No. 12-AWP-9] received July 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2228. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Tobe, CO [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0194; Airspace Docket No. 13-ANM-10] received July 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2229. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Sanibel, FL [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1334; Airspace Docket No. 12-ASO-18] received July 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2230. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30902; Amdt. No. 3537] received July 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2231. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30903; Amdt. No. 3538] received July 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2232. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30904; Amdt. No. 507] received July 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2233. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0856; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-093-AD; Amendment 39-17464; AD 2013-11-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2234. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue

Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Application of Wash Sale Rules to Money Market Fund Shares [Notice 2013-48] received July 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KLINE: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 5. A bill to support State and local accountability for public education, protect State and local authority, inform parents of the performance of their children's schools, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–150, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Financial Services discharged from further consideration. H.R. 5 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. YARMUTH (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. POLIS, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. RICHMOND):

H.R. 2653. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to award grants to prepare individuals for the 21st century workplace and to increase America's global competitiveness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself, Mr. RENACCI, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 2654. A bill to prohibit discrimination on the basis of military service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. HOLDING):

H.R. 2655. A bill to amend Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to improve attorney accountability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COBLE, Mr. MARINO, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. JEFFRIES):

H.R. 2656. A bill to enhance public safety by improving the effectiveness and efficiency of the Federal prison system with offender risk and needs assessment, individual risk reduction incentives and rewards, and risk and recidivism reduction; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 2657. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain Federal lands in Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, and Wyoming, previously identified as suitable for disposal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HANNA, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. BARLETTA):

H.R. 2658. A bill to amend the weighted child count used to determine targeted grant amounts and education finance incentive grant amounts for local educational agencies under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 2659. A bill to establish a grant program to issue grants to institutions of higher education to support student internships; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RUSH (for himself, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. ENYART, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 2660. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Health and Human Services for awarding grants to States to promote universal access to trauma care services provided by trauma centers and trauma-related physician specialties; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MCCARTHY of California (for himself, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. ISSA):

H.R. 2661. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a standardized scheduling policy for veterans enrolled in the health care system of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York):

H.R. 2662. A bill to strengthen families' engagement in the education of their children; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. WOMACK, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. LANCE):

H.R. 2663. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 respecting the scoring of preventive health savings; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. CARNEY (for himself and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 2664. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to establish a voluntary program under which manufacturers may have products certified as meeting the standards of labels that indicate to consumers the extent to which the products are manufactured in the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 2665. A bill to ensure secure gun storage and gun safety devices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTON:

H.R. 2666. A bill to establish a program for the licensing of Internet poker by States and federally recognized Indian tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. CAMP, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. NUNES, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. RENACCI, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. REED, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

H.R. 2667. A bill to delay the application of the employer health insurance mandate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG of Indiana (for himself, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. CAMP, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NUNES, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. REED, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. ROSKAM, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

H.R. 2668. A bill to delay the application of the individual health insurance mandate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. BASS, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. RUSH, Ms. HAHN, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 2669. A bill to provide definitions of terms and services related to community-based gang intervention to ensure that funding for such intervention is utilized in a cost-effective manner and that community-based agencies are held accountable for providing holistic, integrated intervention services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. SIRES, Mr. ENYART, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. TONKO, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California):

H.R. 2670. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to require corporations and labor organizations to disclose to their shareholders or members the amounts disbursed for certain political activity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NUNES (for himself, Mr. KIND, Mr. COLE, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 2671. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the deductibility of charitable contributions to agricultural research organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 2672. A bill to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to provide for an application process for interested parties to apply for a county to be designated as a rural area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 2673. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to provide that residential mortgage loans held on portfolio qualify as qualified mortgages for purposes of the presumption of the ability to repay requirements under such Act; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 2674. A bill to encourage job creation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Natural Resources, Education and the Workforce, Transportation and Infrastructure, Energy and Commerce, Small Business, and Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BUSTOS (for herself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, and Mr. DENT):

H.R. 2675. A bill to establish the Commission on Government Transformation to make recommendations to improve the economy, efficiency, and effectiveness, of Federal programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 2676. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to encourage the adoption and use of certified electronic health record technology by safety net providers and clinics under the Medicaid program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COFFMAN (for himself, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Ms. DELBENE):

H.R. 2677. A bill to reduce the annual rate of compensation of Members of Congress by a percentage equal to the effective reduction in the average annual rate of pay of Federal employees who were subject to sequestration-related furloughs during the two most recent fiscal years; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GARCIA (for himself, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. YOHO, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. MICA, Mr. POSEY, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. ROSS, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. RADEL, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 2678. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 10360 Southwest 186th Street in Miami, Florida, as the ''Larcenia J. Bullard Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. COLE, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas):

H.R. 2679. A bill to exclude the Internal Revenue Service from the provisions of title 5, United States Code, relating to labor-management relations; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H.R. 2680. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to tax bona fide residents of the District of Columbia in the same manner as bona fide residents of possessions of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H.R. 2681. A bill to provide for the retrocession of the District of Columbia to Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRAVES of Georgia (for himself, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. JONES, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. COTTON, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. BARTON, Mr. OLSON, Mr. HALL, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SCALISE, and Mr. YOHO):

H.R. 2682. A bill to prohibit the funding of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and the Workforce, Natural Resources, the Judiciary, and House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas (for himself, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, and Mr. REED):

H.R. 2683. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose recordkeeping requirements on the Internal Revenue Service to substantiate costs incurred in carrying out its responsibilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LYNCH (for himself, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 2684. A bill to require the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to report and obtain court approval for broad telephony metadata collection searches, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCNERNEY (for himself and Mr. CARTWRIGHT):

H.R. 2685. A bill to incorporate smart grid capability into the Energy Star Program, to reduce peak electric demand, to reauthorize a energy efficiency public information program to include Smart Grid information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCHRADER (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. BERA, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DENT, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. PETRI, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana):

H.R. 2686. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide that the President's annual budget submission to Congress list the current fiscal year spending level for each proposed program and a separate amount for any proposed spending increases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. GRIMM (for himself and Mr. MEEKS):

H. Res. 297. A resolution congratulating the State of Qatar on the ascension of their new amir, Sheik Tamim bin Hamad Al Thani on June 25, 2013, and recognizing the special relationship between the United States and the State of Qatar; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. QUIGLEY (for himself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. SCHNEIDER):

H. Res. 298. A resolution congratulating the 1963 men's basketball team of Loyola University Chicago on its induction into the National Collegiate Basketball Hall of Fame and the 50th anniversary of the team's Division I National Collegiate Athletic Association men's basketball championship; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. QUIGLEY (for himself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ENYART, Mr. RUSH, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. SCHOCK):

H. Res. 299. A resolution congratulating the Chicago Blackhawks on winning the 2013 Stanley Cup Championship; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. YARMUTH:

H.R. 2653.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 2654.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, sec 8, cl 3 (commerce clause), & c1. 18 (necessary and proper clause); section 1 of the 14th Amendment (due process and equal protection clauses), and section 5 of the 14th Amendment (enforcement). In addition, Article 1, sec 8, & cl. 16:

By Mr. SMITH of Texas:

H.R. 2655.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this legislation is based is found in Article I, Section 8, Clause 9; Article III, Section 1, Clause 1; and Article III, Section 2, Clause 2 of the Constitution, which grant Congress authority over federal courts.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 2656.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3, and 18.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 2657.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 2

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2658.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18; and including, but not solely limited to the 14th Amendment.

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 2659.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 2660.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause—Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, which gives Congress the power ''to regulate commerce with foreign nations, among the several states, and with Indian Tribes.''

By Mr. McCARTHY of California:

H.R. 2661.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 12,13,18.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2662.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18; and including, but not solely limited to the 14th Amendment.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 2663.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The attached bill is constitutional under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: ''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes'' as well as Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: ''The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.''

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 2664.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power * * * To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power * * * To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 2665.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BARTON:

H.R. 2666.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas:

H.R. 2667.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. YOUNG of Indiana:

H.R. 2668.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, Sec. 8.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS:

H.R. 2669.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1.

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 2670.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4: ''The times, places and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each state by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.''

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3: gives Congress the power ''to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.''

Amendment XVI: The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration.

By Mr. NUNES:

H.R. 2671.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 2672.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 2673.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 2674.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress as enumerated in Article I Section 7 and 8, Article III Section 1 and 2, and Article V of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. BUSTOS:

H.R. 2675.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 2676.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COFFMAN:

H.R. 2677.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I. Section 6

The Senators and Representatives shall receive a Compensation for their Services, to be ascertained by Law, and paid out of the Treasury of the United States.

By Mr. GARCIA:

H.R. 2678.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution, which reads:

''The Congress shall have Power . . . To establish Post Offices and post Roads''

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution, which reads:

''The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

By Mr. GARDNER:

H.R. 2679.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H.R. 2680.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 17 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the Acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H.R. 2681.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 17 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the Acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings

By Mr. GRAVES of Georgia:

H.R. 2682.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7—''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in

Consequence of Appropriations made by Law;''

By Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas:

H.R. 2683.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 2684.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 2685.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 2686.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under:

U.S. Const. art. 1, §1; and

U.S. Const. art. 1, §8, cl. 18.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 12: Mr. SCHNEIDER and Ms. DUCKWORTH.

H.R. 24: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 164: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 176: Mr. MULLIN and Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 278: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 282: Mr. GOWDY.

H.R. 303: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 310: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK and Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 351: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 506: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H.R. 508: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 515: Mr. BARBER.

H.R. 521: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 556: Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 578: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 594: Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 630: Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 647: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, and Mrs. ELLMERS.

H.R. 664: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 685: Mr. KIND and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 702: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 713: Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 721: Mr. CONAWAY and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 724: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 725: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 764: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 800: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 806: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 831: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H.R. 846: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 847: Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 942: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 955: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 956: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 958: Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 1014: Mr. CULBERSON and Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 1015: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. COHEN, and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 1030: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1101: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 1173: Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 1179: Mr. BARR and Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 1180: Mr. VEASEY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 1226: Mr. LABRADOR.

H.R. 1229: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 1252: Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1254: Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 1276: Mr. WALZ, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MORAN and Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 1288: Mr. MORAN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 1309: Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 1315: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1339: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1362: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1364: Mr. COURTNEY and Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 1416: Mr. CLAY, Ms. CLARKE, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 1428: Mr. BARTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 1466: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 1502: Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 1507: Ms. DUCKWORTH.

H.R. 1518: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 1565: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 1588: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1595: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 1609: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1661: Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 1666: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1692: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 1696: Mr. OWENS and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 1705: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1735: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 1748: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 1761: Mr. PETERS of Michigan and Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 1771: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 1779: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MULLIN, and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 1785: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 1807: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1825: Mr. JOYCE and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 1827: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1830: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1835: Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 1845: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1856: Mr. PETERS of California.

H.R. 1869: Mr. PETERS of California and Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 1891: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 1908: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1921: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 1985: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H.R. 1991: Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 2009: Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. KLINE, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 2019: Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. BARR.

H.R. 2022: Mr. MEEHAN and Mr. BRADY of Texas.

H.R. 2023: Mr. COHEN and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 2026: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 2053: Mr. GOWDY and Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 2061: Mr. FARENTHOLD and Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 2066: Mr. PERLMUTTER and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 2094: Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 2119: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 2123: Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 2131: Mr. ROONEY.

H.R. 2141: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 2177: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2222: Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 2229: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 2241: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 2248: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 2250: Mr. DELANEY and Mr. GARDNER.

H.R. 2273: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2278: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 2296: Ms. HANABUSA.

H.R. 2305: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 2347: Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 2350: Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2366: Mr. YOHO, Mr. ENYART, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.R. 2377: Mr. ROONEY, Ms. HANABUSA, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2426: Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 2429: Mr. RENACCI, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. REED, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. LONG, Mr. MATHESON, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 2445: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. MCCAUL, and Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 2449: Mr. COOK.

H.R. 2456: Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

H.R. 2458: Mr. PITTS, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mr. MASSIE.

H.R. 2472: Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 2473: Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 2480: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 2501: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 2506: Mr. NOLAN, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, and Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 2507: Mr. STOCKMAN.

H.R. 2518: Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 2536: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2540: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 2541: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 2549: Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 2553: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 2565: Ms. SINEMA, Mr. CALVERT, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. GOWDY.

H.R. 2574: Mr. COHEN, Ms. CHU, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. TITUS, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. DELAURO, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 2575: Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 2578: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 2586: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. POLIS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. COOPER, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 2590: Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 2607: Mr. COHEN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. BONNER.

H.R. 2632: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 2641: Mr. BONNER.

H.R. 2652: Ms. LEE of California and Mr. COHEN.

H.J. Res. 25: Ms. KUSTER and Mr. NADLER.

H.J. Res. 40: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.J. Res. 44: Mr. PAYNE.

H.J. Res. 51: Mr. NUNNELEE and Mr. HUDSON.

H. Con. Res. 16: Mr. LUCAS and Mr. COTTON.

H. Con. Res. 41: Mr. COOPER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H. Con. Res. 42: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H. Res. 97: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.

H. Res. 272: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H. Res. 285: Mr. KEATING, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. COHEN.

H. Res. 293: Mr. BARR and Mr. GARAMENDI.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 2300: Mr. CRAWFORD.

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JULY 11, 2013 *No. 99*

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable BRIAN SCHATZ, a Senator from the State of Hawaii.

PRAYER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Today's opening prayer will be offered by Rev. Kris Holzmeyer, campus pastor of Northwoods Baptist Church in Newburgh, IN.

The guest Chaplain offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Omnipotent Heavenly Father, we come to You this day in a spirit of worship. You are sovereign in all things and active in the affairs of men.

We are grateful for the blessings of freedom and prosperity You have bestowed upon our country and its citizens. We acknowledge that You and You alone are the provider of those blessings.

Lord, we ask for Your forgiveness for the many sins that plague our Nation. We ask for Your divine intervention as we move forward seeking to bring You glory and honor as a people. Today, men and women will gather in this room to make decisions on behalf of the American people. All of them have left family, friends, and occupations to serve a greater cause. Will You bless them, Lord? Will You shower them with Your favor? Help them to be unified, seeking Your will first and making Your motives their own. May the decisions they reach today serve our people well but, most importantly, may they be pleasing unto You.

In the name of Jesus Christ our Lord we pray. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, July 11, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable BRIAN SCHATZ, a Senator from the State of Hawaii, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. SCHATZ thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

KEEP STUDENT LOANS AFFORDABLE ACT OF 2013—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. I move to proceed to Calendar No. 124, S. 1238, Senator REED's student loan bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1238) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to extend the current reduced interest rate for undergraduate Federal Direct Stafford Loans for 1 year, to modify required distribution rules for pension plans, and for other purposes.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, the time until 12:30 today will be equally divided and controlled, with the Republicans controlling the first 30 minutes and the majority controlling the next 30 minutes.

The Senate will recess from 12:30 to 2:15 for caucus meetings.

SENATE RULES

Last month, the Republican leader spent a great deal of time talking about the importance of keeping one's word.

I agree without any question that Senators and everyone else should keep their word. I also believe a deal is a deal, a contract is a contract, an arrangement is an arrangement, a bargain is a bargain. As long as each party to such agreement holds up his end of the bargain, Senators should stick to their word.

But agreement is a two-way street. If one party fails to uphold their end, the agreement, of course, is null and void. The Republican leader wants everyone to believe—he has made many statements on the floor to which I have not responded—that I have broken my word. He neglects to recall his own commitments and his own words. Remember, an agreement is a two-way street.

Let's take a closer look at what the Republican leader committed to do. Let's look at the agreement we entered into together on the floor of this body, the Senate.

In a colloquy at the beginning of this Congress, January 24 of this year, I committed not to amend the Standing Rules of the Senate except through regular order. During that colloquy, Senator MCCONNELL also made a commitment. Senator MCCONNELL committed to end the constant Republican obstruction and return the Senate to a time when nominations were processed more efficiently.

This is what he said:

On the subject of nominations, Senate Republicans will continue to work with the majority to process nominations, consistent with the norms and traditions of the Senate.

I replied on the Senate floor:

The two leaders will continue to work together to schedule votes on nominees in a timely manner by unanimous consent, except in extraordinary circumstances.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Remember, an agreement is an agreement, a contract is a contract, and a bargain is a bargain.

The Republican leader also pledged: This Congress should be more bipartisan than the last Congress. He promised ''to work with the majority to process nominations.'' He committed that ''the two leaders will continue to work together to schedule votes on nominees in a timely manner by unanimous consent, except in extraordinary circumstances.''

Those were his words. Those were his commitments. Those were his promises. By any objective standard, they have been broken.

Let's take a look at the record—part of the record at least. Exactly 3 weeks after Senator MCCONNELL committed to process nominees consistent with norms and traditions of the Senate—I repeat, consistent with the norms and traditions of the Senate—he led the Republicans on an unprecedented filibuster of the Secretary of Defense, a highly qualified nominee, someone with whom we served in this body.

Nothing can be a starker violation of the commitment to a return to the norms and traditions of the Senate than launching a filibuster of the Secretary of Defense, the first ever in the history of our Republic. What is more, Republicans obstructed the nominee because of completely unrelated issues and despite the fact that nominee Chuck Hagel was a war hero of the Vietnam conflict and a former Republican Senator from Nebraska. Republicans were busy catering to the tea party by trying to inflate the Benghazi nonscandal, which was completely unrelated to Secretary Hagel. He wasn't there.

Secretary Hagel's nomination was pending in the Senate for 34 days, a record for the Secretary of Defense. The average time is about 10 days.

Confirmation of Cabinet Secretaries used to be free from obstruction. Once in a while there would be something, but not very often. But under President Obama, Cabinet nominees have faced unprecedented obstruction and significant delays in assuming their positions.

Not a single Cabinet nominee was filibustered in President Carter's administration. Not a single Cabinet Secretary nominee was filibustered in President George H. W. Bush's administration. One Cabinet Secretary was filibustered in the Reagan administration, and only one Cabinet Secretary was filibustered in President George W. Bush's administration. But already, in the Obama administration, four Cabinet Secretaries have been filibustered and more filibusters are likely. Remember, he still has 3½ years to go in his term of office. Yet the Republican leader says there is no problem; the status quo is fine.

Republicans were willing to risk national security for the sake of tea party politics when considering the Hagel nomination, and they were willing to risk it again when considering the nomination of John Brennan to lead the CIA, the Central Intelligence Agency. Now we have the Secretary of Defense, and we have the CIA Director. They filibustered the nomination of a man charged with leading one of the Nation's most vital national security agencies. Yet the Republican leader says there is no problem; the status quo is fine.

In fact, Republican obstructionism has affected nearly every single one of President Obama's nominees. These obstructions continued at every level and through creative new methods.

Even before President Obama's nominations reached the Senate floor, Senate Republicans bogged them down with unreasonable demands, which are terribly time consuming. They are designed to be, if not unattainable, hard and difficult.

Tom Perez is a man who worked as a garbage man, who put himself through school. He hauled garbage. He is the President's nominee for Secretary of Labor. He received, after the public hearing, more than 200 questions for the record. These are not easy questions. They are not single-line questions.

Jack Lew, the President's nominee for Secretary of Treasury, was asked more than 700 questions before he was confirmed. Previously, Secretaries of the Treasury were just whipped through here with only a handful of questions. Now Jack Lew is being held up again for another position he wants with the International Monetary Fund. He is the Secretary of Treasury of our Nation.

Gina McCarthy—after a full hearing which took quite a while to get arranged because the chairman of the committee wanted to make sure the ranking member was satisfied with the time, witnesses, and all of that—was asked to lead the Environmental Protection Agency.

I know quite a bit about that committee. I was chairman of that committee twice. Now this is a World Series deal. This holds the record. She had more than 1,100 questions. It used to be common for nominees to be asked a handful of questions in writing after the hearing took place.

My colleague in the minority wants to claim credit for letting some nominees proceed. The fact that he seeks credit for approving some nominees only highlights the extent of the problem. Confirming nominees should be the norm, not the exception.

Remember the agreement he and I talked about on the Senate floor. The President deserves to have his or her team in place. I don't really care who is elected, whether it is Jeb Bush, Hillary Clinton, or JOE BIDEN. That person shouldn't have to go through what we have gone through in the last 4½ years. One look at the Senate's Executive Calendar shows that fundamentally nothing has changed since Senator MCCONNELL and I entered into our supposed agreement.

There are currently 15 executive branch nominees ready to be confirmed by the Senate after long stalling in many different ways. They have been waiting more than 260 days. Add it up, and that is about 9 months per confirmation.

At this point in President Bush's second term, the Senate had confirmed three times as many executives as for President Obama. By the Fourth of July of President Clinton's second term, the Senate had confirmed 80 of his executive nominees. By the Fourth of July of President Bush's second term, the Senate had confirmed 118. By the Fourth of July of this year for President Obama, 34. Remember, he has 3½ years left.

Through June of this year I have been forced to file cloture on 25 Obama executive nominees—25. This is eating up so much time. By comparison, a cloture was rarely filed during the 8 years Bush was President.

These procedural blockades are as obvious as they are unprecedented. Yet the Republican leader says there is no problem here; the status quo is fine.

This leads me to wonder what exactly does my friend—and he is my friend—Senator MCCONNELL consider an extraordinary circumstance? Is it an extraordinary circumstance when Republicans merely dislike an otherwise qualified nominee? Is it an extraordinary circumstance when Republicans simply dislike the agency the nominee will lead, 1,100 questions? Is it an extraordinary circumstance when Republicans dislike the very laws a nominee will be bound to uphold?

It is a disturbing trend when Republicans are willing to block executive branch nominees even if they have no objection about the qualification of the nominee.

They don't like the law. They don't like the agency. Instead, they are blocking qualified nominees to circumvent the legislative process, forcing wholesale changes to laws or restructure of the entire executive branch departments. They are blocking qualified nominees because they refuse to accept the law of the land.

A perfect example is Richard Cordray, former attorney general of the State of Ohio, who has been asked by President Obama to lead the Consumer Finance Protection Bureau. To give a little background, remember, this was part of the bill that was passed called Dodd-Frank. This consumer finance protection bill was the brainchild of ELIZABETH WARREN, who is now a Senator representing Massachusetts.

The reason she is in the Senate is not by chance. Don't even put her there; the President for a long time wanted her to be there. No, he can't have her, so Cordray was a replacement. He was nominated in July of 2011. It is now July 2013.

There is no doubt about his ability to do the job. He has won high praise from both Democrats and Republicans. He

has a stellar track record. If Mr. Cordray received a fair up-or-down vote, he would be confirmed immediately. But the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau continues to operate without a leader because Republicans want to roll back a law that protects consumers from the greed of the big Wall Street banks that caused us to have the meltdown we had in the first place. Republicans refuse to confirm Richard Cordray's nomination because they refuse to accept the law of the land. They do not dislike him, they dislike the law that was passed. Yet the Republican leader says there is no problem here; the status quo is fine.

This same type of blatant obstruction was applied to the nomination of Gina McCarthy to lead the Environmental Protection Agency. This is a woman who has wide-ranging support with Republicans. She served in State Republican administrations. She was nominated 130 days ago, or thereabouts, and although she has a proven track record of public service that will help her bring environmental and business groups together to tackle the serious environmental challenges facing our Nation, her nomination drags on. It just lingers. Why? Because Republicans fundamentally oppose the mission of the agency—the EPA—she will lead to keep the air we breathe and the water we drink safe from dangerous pollution. Once again, they refuse to accept the law of the land. Yet the Republican leader says there is no problem here; the status quo is just fine; nothing is wrong with the Senate and how it works.

Republicans also made clear from the start they would never confirm Donald Berwick to lead the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, the agency tasked with implementing the landmark health care reform legislation. Talk about qualifications. This was a Harvard professor of medicine.

This health care law is already saving seniors money in checkups and prescriptions. Millions of seniors now have wellness checkups. Being a woman can no longer be considered a preexisting disability, as insurance companies did before. They can't do that now. Because of health care reform, insurance companies can no longer deny coverage to sick children, such as those kids I had in my office yesterday, who had juvenile diabetes. Because of health care reform, there can be no more lifetime caps. A man who was a race car driver in Nevada got in an accident—not racing, an accident in a car—and was paralyzed. He got to the $100,000 limit and was all through; no more help from the insurance company. He went on welfare. Because of the health care reform law insurance companies can no longer discriminate against those, as I have indicated, with preexisting conditions.

Since President Obama signed that law, insurance companies can no longer put profits ahead of people. It used to be there was no limit to what they could spend on the executives of the company, but now they are limited to 20 percent. That is why millions of people this year have gotten refunds, because the insurance company was gouging them. Republicans oppose this health care law. In the House they have scheduled another vote next week—to vote for I think the 41st time—to repeal it. Because Republicans oppose the health care law, they have done everything in their power to derail the law's implementation, including denying the CMS a leader.

Despite Dr. Berwick's stellar credentials, Republicans defamed him and destroyed his chance at confirmation because they refused to accept the law of the land. They refused to confirm Berwick, so in 2010 President Obama was forced to recess-appoint him. Berwick's term ended a year and a half later because that was done under a recess appointment, and at the end of that Congress the appointment expired. He was never confirmed to lead the CMS, although his nomination was pending for 593 days—more than a year and a half. Yet the Republican leader says there is no problem here; the status quo is just fine.

The same type of politically motivated obstruction has hobbled the National Labor Relations Board. This isn't some brand new law that Democrats came up with. This came into being during the Great Depression—not this one, but the one in the 1930s. That is when the National Labor Relations Board originated. From January 2008 to March 2010, the National Labor Relations Board has operated with just two members. Senate Republicans have refused to allow a vote on the President's nominees—refused.

In June 2010, the Supreme Court invalidated much of the NLRB's work during this period, finding three members were necessary. There was no quorum unless you had an extra one, and we didn't have one because they wouldn't let us do it. Then the President recess-appointed a bipartisan group of three members to the board so it would function. The appeals court ruled those appointments were also unconstitutional. The case will soon go to the Supreme Court about recess appointments.

As I mentioned, I had a meeting earlier with some of my Republican friends here this morning. We met in my office, and I reminded everybody when this issue came up in the past, we put people on that DC Circuit that we had to gag to vote for in an effort to avoid a problem here in the Senate, but we did. These are three we put on, the one who gave us this outrageous opinion that after 230 years as a country no longer could we have recess appointments. So it will go to the Supreme Court.

In the meantime, the term of one of the three remaining NLRB members expires next month. So at the end of August the NLRB will continue to be nonfunctioning. Republicans consider that a victory. I am not making this up. Listen: In 2011, the senior Senator from South Carolina—and I care a great deal about this man, LINDSEY GRAHAM. He would say he is my friend and I am saying he is my friend, but listen to what he said: ''The NLRB, as inoperable, could be considered progress.'' ''The NLRB, as inoperable, could be considered progress.''

Because Republicans refuse to accept the law of the land, they have denied the NLRB the ability to safeguard workers' rights and monitor unions. Workers have been illegally terminated. They have no way to appeal. The results of contested union elections? It doesn't matter; nobody is there to look it over. Labor abuse and unfair labor practices go unchallenged. Yet the Republican leader says there is no problem here; the status quo is just fine.

The Constitution gives the President, whomever that President might be, the right, the power to choose his team. It grants the Senate the right to advise and consent on those choices. But consistent and unprecedented obstruction by this Republican caucus has turned advise and consent into deny and obstruct. Republican obstruction has denied President Obama the ability to choose his team. Whether you are a Democrat, a Republican, or an Independent, we should all be able to agree that Presidents deserve the team members they want, and their nominations should be subject to simple up-or-down votes.

No President can safeguard America's national economic security to the best of his or her ability without their chosen team in place. Let's see if we can come up with an example. Davey Johnson is the manager of the Washington Nationals—his team—we are so happy to have here in Washington. He is here as manager of that team to field a winning team. He was a starring second baseman for the Baltimore Orioles when they won four American League pennants, two World Series championships, and he has managed five different baseball teams. He has been a two-time manager of the year, he led the Mets to their 1986 World Series as a manager, and last year he gave the Nats franchise their first division title since 1981.

Major League Baseball season begins about April 1. Imagine the front office of Major League Baseball calling up Davey Johnson around the 1st of April and saying: Davey, I know that first baseman you signed a week or so ago, Adam LaRoche, is a good first baseman. He is swell—a Gold Glove winner, a classic power hitter—but I am sorry to tell you that you can't play him until maybe the middle of June. Then Davey Johnson is called again by the same man who says: That third baseman, Ryan Zimmerman, I know you like him, he is a man who has won the Silver Slugger Award, he has been a Gold Glove recipient, an All Star, but tell you what, you can play him as soon as the All Star break is over.

If that were to happen, what would happen to that team? They would go on and perform, just as President Obama has done, but they would not play to their ability. And that is ridiculous. Yet that is where we are. That is exactly what Republicans are saying to President Obama: You can't have your team until we tell you everything is fine, and it is going to take a long time for us to tell you that. The gridlock the Republicans have created is not only bad for President Obama and bad for the Senate, it is bad for this country. We can have people come and give all the statistics in the world, but is there anybody out there in America who thinks this body is functioning well?

Upon examination of this record I have outlined of obstruction—of delay and filibuster—it can hardly be said Senator MCCONNELL has—to use his words—worked together to follow regular order and use his procedural options with discretion. It can hardly be said Senator MCCONNELL has worked with the majority to move nominations. It can hardly be said Senator MCCONNELL has worked with the majority to schedule votes on nominees in a timely manner except in extraordinary circumstances. But it could be said Senator MCCONNELL broke his word. That certainly could be said. The Republican leader has failed to live up to his commitments. He has failed to do what he said he would do—move nominations by regular order except in extraordinary circumstances. I refuse to unilaterally surrender my right to respond to this breach of faith. If Senator MCCONNELL wants to continue to defend the status quo of gridlock in Washington, he has that right. If Senator MCCONNELL wants to continue to believe there is no problem in the Senate, that is his choice. But the American people are fed up with gridlock, they are fed up with obstruction, and they are fed up with politics as usual. They want Washington to work again for American families.

I try every day of my life to be on the side of the American people. I wait and I wait, but I am not going to wait another month, another few weeks, another year for Congress to take action on the things we have been doing for almost 240 years.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I sat here patiently and listened to the majority leader's speech, and I hope he will do me the courtesy to listen to mine, since this is a very important day in the history of the Senate. I want to make a couple of observations, which I hope my friend the majority leader will listen to.

First, he is trying to justify in advance what would be a very clear failure to honor his very clear commitment not to break the rules of the Senate. What he is referring to are his own statements, not mine, regarding extraordinary circumstances. He said that, not me. In other words, to justify breaking his clear commitments not to break the rules of the Senate in order to change the rules of the Senate, he is attributing to me something somebody else said, and that somebody else, by the way, is him. He is attributing to me something he said.

We need to keep our commitments around here and not break them, and we need to be honest about quoting people around here. This is about trying to come up with excuses to break our commitments. What this is about is manufacturing a pretext for a power grab.

I listened very carefully to what the majority leader had to say. What he is saying, in effect, is he doesn't want to have any controversy at all attached to any of the nominees. In other words, don't ask any questions. Advise and consent means sit down and shut up.

He was complaining about the number of questions the nominee for EPA Administrator was required to answer.

What he conveniently left out was the chairwoman Senator BOXER requested 70,000 documents. Why is it OK for the chairwoman to request 70,000 documents and somehow if the ranking member makes a lot of requests it is some violation of some comity? When the Founders wrote ''advise and consent,'' I don't think they had in mind sit down and shut up.

It is noteworthy that all of the people he is complaining about got confirmed. So what he is saying is he doesn't want any debate at all in connection with Presidential appointments, just sit down, shut up, and rubberstamp everything, everyone the President sends up here.

On the calendar right now there are 21 nominations—21. There are 148 in committee. We don't control the committees, he does: 148 in committee, 21 on the calendar. It is pretty obvious Senate Democrats are gearing up today to make one of the most consequential changes to the Senate in the history of our Nation.

I want everybody to understand, this is no small matter we are talking about. I guarantee you it is a decision that if they actually go through with it, they will live to regret. It is an open secret at this point that big labor and others on the left are putting a lot of pressure on the majority leader to change the rules of the Senate and to do so, as he promised not to do, by breaking the rules of the Senate. That would violate every protection of the minority rights that has defined the Senate for as long as anyone can remember.

Let me assure you, this Pandora's box, once opened, will be utilized again and again by future majorities and it will make the meaningful consensus-building that has served our Nation so well a relic of the past.

The short-term issue that has triggered this dangerous and far-reaching proposal is simple enough. The hard left is so convinced that every one of the President's nominees should sail through the confirmation process that they are willing to do permanent irreversible damage to this institution in order to get their way, and it appears as if they have convinced the majority leader to do their bidding and hijack the Senate. They are not interested in checks and balances. They are not interested in advise and consent. They are not even interested in what this would mean down the road when Republicans are the ones making the nominations. They want the power and they want it now. They do not care about the consequences. The ends justify the means ethos has been resisted by basically every Senate leader in the past and it is a clear and unequivocal violation of the public assurances that the current majority leader made to the entire Senate, his constituents, and the American people just a few months ago.

What is worse is we got to this point on the basis of an absolute fairytale, a fairytale. Obviously, the left needed an excuse to justify such an unprecedented power grab, so they simply made up a story about Republicans blocking the President's nominees. The majority leader is entitled to his opinion, but he is not entitled to his facts. The facts are the facts. Here is the real story. Almost nothing about this tale so often repeated around here holds up to scrutiny.

The facts are that this President took office and the Senate has confirmed 1,560 people. The Senate has confirmed every single one of the Cabinet nominees who has been brought up for a vote—every single one. The President has gotten nearly three times as many judges confirmed at this point as President Bush in his Presidency.

Here is the point. What this whole so-called crisis boils down to are three nominees the President unlawfully appointed—as confirmed by the courts. A Federal court has held the three nominees were unlawfully appointed. Two of the three are direct parties to the litigation and the third one was appointed at exactly the same moment in the exact same way. One of these nominees has been held up by inaction over at the White House related to structural reforms that the administration and even the nominee himself, Mr. Cordray, now say they are willing to work with us on. The fact is, indisputably, we have been confirming lawfully nominated folks routinely and consistently: The Energy Secretary, 97 to 0; the Secretary of the Interior, 87 to 11; the Secretary of the Treasury, 71 to 26; the Secretary of State, 94 to 3, just a few days after the Senate got his nomination; the Secretary of Commerce, 97 to 1; the Secretary of Transportation, 100 to 0; the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, 96 to 0; the Administrator of the Centers for Medicare

and Medicaid Services, 91 to 7; the Chair of the Securities and Exchange Commission, on a voice vote—in other words, unanimously.

What about the nominees still awaiting confirmation who have not—not been unlawfully appointed? The Senate is ready to vote on them too. Regretfully, in my view, frankly, all of them appear ready to have the votes to be confirmed. I don't necessarily support them, but they have the votes to be confirmed. Why don't they call them up? The majority leader determines what the order of business is around here. He could have scheduled votes if that is what he wanted to happen. Why don't we have a vote on the Secretary of Labor? What about the Administrator of EPA? The NLRB nominees who were not unlawfully appointed—there are some other NLRB nominees who were not unlawfully appointed—why aren't we voting on them?

As I said, pending the expected negotiations on reforms to the CFPB, the Senate would likely confirm the chairman to that position as well.

We need to be honest about what is going on around here. The only crisis is the crisis the Democrats are creating with their threats to fundamentally change the Senate, something the majority leader said just a few years ago he would never even consider. Here is why he said that: Because going down this road is ''ultimately . . . about removing the last check in Washington against a complete abuse of power.''

Those are the words the majority leader himself used in describing the very thing he is now threatening to do—the very thing he is now threatening to do.

Let me sum up what is going on around here. Senate Democrats are getting ready to do permanent damage to this body to confirm three unconstitutionally appointed nominees by a simple majority vote. They are willing to break the rules of the Senate to change the rules of the Senate in order to confirm three nominees that the Federal courts have said were unlawfully appointed. Every other nomination we are talking about has either already been confirmed or is on the way to being confirmed, but they will not call them up. He gets to decide when we vote. Where are the callups for EPA and Labor and the three NLRB nominees lawfully appointed?

If this is not a power grab, I don't know what a power grab looks like. The President appoints three people unconstitutionally, the second highest court in the land confirms they were unlawfully appointed, and Senate Democrats want to break the rules of the Senate to confirm them. This is not the story we just heard from the majority leader, but this is a fact.

The entire phony crisis—absolutely phony, manufactured crisis—boils down to three unlawfully appointed nominees. The Democrats say we are holding up the others. It is not true. He gets to schedule the votes. Where are they? Bring them up. The truth is, if there is anyone to blame for holding up things in the Senate it is the Democratic majority. They are the ones blocking nearly 30 fast-track nominations, many of whom Republicans have already agreed to confirm unanimously. They are the ones, the Democrats, who have yet to schedule votes on McCarthy and Perez, despite the fact that both of these highly controversial nominees already have enough votes to clear the 60-vote hurdle.

I do not like the facts, frankly, and I am not going to be voting for either of these nominees. Tom Perez in particular is a far left ideologue whose record of bending the rules to achieve his ends is deeply concerning to me and just one of the reasons I plan to vote against him. But to pretend the power to confirm these folks lies in the hands of anyone but the majority leader is totally disingenuous.

The White House knows what I have just said. I have told them. The majority leader would know it too if he spent a little more time working with his colleagues in a collegial way and a little less time trying to undermine and marginalize people.

The real reason, as I said, is that the far left and big labor are leaning hard on Democrats to go nuclear. Go nuclear—they love the sound. The majority leader is about to sacrifice his reputation and this institution to go along with it because what they truly want is for the Senate to ratify the President's unconstitutional decision to illegally appoint nominees to the NLRB and the CFPB without the input of the Senate. They know they cannot get that done under current rules. They know time is not on their side. The second highest court in the land ruled unanimously that President Obama had no power to do what he did. Another court has since concurred. Now the Supreme Court is set to hear the case in just a few months. They obviously thought it was important enough to be dealt with at the highest Court in the land.

This is not a fight over nominees at all. It is a fight over these illegal, unconstitutionally appointed nominees. It is laughable to think Democrats would ever agree to such a thing if we were talking about a Republican President's unlawful nominees—laughable.

It is equally irrational to think we would go along with this. In fact, no Senator, regardless of party, should ever consider ceding our constitutional duties in such a way.

I advised the Romney team before the election that if he won and I was ever elected majority leader, I would defend the Senate first in these battles. I would defend this institution against a Republican President trying to abuse it. That is a precedent set by majority leaders, such as Robert Byrd, who revered this institution because they knew what it was to be in both the majority and the minority. It is what the best leaders of the Senate have always done. It is absolutely tragic to think these days may be over.

Here are the battle lines. On one side are people who think the President should have the power to unconstitutionally ignore Congress and their constituents. Those are people who believe in it so firmly that they are willing to irreparably damage the Senate to ensure they get their way. They are willing to do something the majority leader himself said would contribute to the ruination of the country. I am not making up his quotes; that is what he said.

On the other side are the folks in my conference, and even some Democrats, with the courage to speak up against this power grab. We are the folks who believe deeply that a President of any party should work within the bounds of the Constitution, and that Senators of both parties should fulfill their own constitutional obligations to thoroughly vet nominees. We also believe in giving those nominees a fair hearing. If you look at the facts, you will see we have already been doing that.

As Senator ALEXANDER noted, no majority leader wants written on his tombstone that he presided over the end of the Senate. Well, if this majority leader caves to the fringes and lets this happen, I am afraid that is exactly what they will write. In the majority leader's own words: Breaking the rules to change the rules is un-American. Those are his words, not mine.

I hope the majority leader thinks about his legacy, the future of his party and, most importantly, the future of our country before he acts.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I assume the words ''I agree'' are words that mean something. We had a colloquy on the floor, and at that time he said he wouldn't do anything extraordinarily—he said that, and I said I agree.

I would like to talk about a few other things. Here is a direct quote Senator MITCH MCCONNELL of Kentucky said a few years ago: The Senate has repeatedly adjusted its rules as circumstances dictate. The first Senate adopted its rules by a majority vote which specifically provided a means to end debate instantly by a simple majority vote.

This was the first Senate at the beginning of our country, and that was so we would have the ability to move the previous question and end debate. This is not the first time a minority of Senators has upset a Senate tradition or practice. The current Senate majority intends to do what the majority of the Senate has often done: Use its constitutional authority under Article I, Section 5 to reform Senate procedure by a simple majority vote. That is what Senator MCCONNELL said.

The interesting thing here is my friend talks as if: Gee, this has never been done before. But the fact is it has been done many times. Since 1977, it

has been done 18 times—about twice every year. I think that is pretty interesting. It has happened 18 times just since 1977: December 12, 1979; November 9, 1979; March 5, 1980; June 11, 1980; June 10, 1980; another time in 1980; 1986, 1985, 1987, 1995, 1996, 1996, 1999, 2000, 2011. Those are the times the rules have been changed, overruling precedence—as my friend Senator MCCONNELL said—with a majority vote.

It is also important to note that, without getting into a lot of legal jargon, the Constitution gives the nomination power to the President. The Constitution does not provide for a supermajority of the Senate to provide its advice and consent. The Drafters of the Constitution knew how to provide for supermajorities when they wanted to. The very same clause in the Constitution that gives the President the appointment power—the clause from which I just quoted—also provides for consortium of treaties, which is two-thirds. Same paragraph. Legislation and other things require a simple majority.

My friend the Republican leader has made my point. He talks about all the votes—97–0, 100–0, 98–0. That is the whole point. It takes months and months and sometimes years to get to where we can vote. They stall everything they can, and they have done that. That is the whole point. It was supposed to only be under extraordinary circumstances, and I went into some detail to explain that. Is this extraordinary circumstances? Of course not.

He talks about Richard Cordray and how they just want a little tweak in the law. Here is the tweak in the law they wanted: Dodd-Frank knew we would have trouble with the appropriations process because the Republicans don't let us do much appropriating at all. So in the wisdom of the people who drafted Dodd-Frank, they said: We are going to make sure the position that Cordray is talking about always has the resources to do what they want to do. So they did something unique and said the money will come from the Federal Reserve. The little tweak the Republicans want to do is to switch that and give it to the Appropriations Committees. They won't let us do appropriation bills. That is like giving us nothing.

My friend went into great detail about the NLRB. For the entire history of this country, the President has had the power to recess-appoint people. The Republicans have found a gimmick here that now they are saying—no one has raised any objection about the qualifications of the people the D.C. Circuit said shouldn't be sitting there. No one raised anything about their qualifications. If there were an effort to avoid what is going on around here, they should approve these people.

The other Alice-in-Wonderland statement made by my friend is: The majority leader can set votes whenever he wants. Oh, don't I wish. Stall and obstruct is what we have around here. It is very hard to schedule votes. As has been indicated by me a few minutes ago, we wait and we wait, and finally we get a vote after months and months—and I indicated sometimes years—and then it is a big and overwhelmingly positive vote. Yes, because there is nothing wrong with the person to begin with.

As I said early on: He makes my case. There isn't a single word that has been said here today about the qualifications of the three people who are seeking to go on the NLRB—or the two Republicans. He has not produced any facts to question their abilities. He just argues that the President's timing was not quite right.

I think everyone realizes that when you are trying to get somebody confirmed, such as Richard Cordray, and you are waiting 725 days, maybe that is a little too long.

Listen to this biggy here: The Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics—that may sound like a big fancy word, but that is an extremely important position in the Secretary of Defense's office—has been waiting 300 days. The Governor for the International Monetary Fund, Jack Lew, our present Secretary of Treasury, has been waiting 169 days. It is now probably 172, I guess, since this could be old; the EPA, 128 days; Secretary of Labor, 114 days; NLRB, 573 days; the Chairman of the Export-Import Bank, 111 days; Associate Attorney General, 294 days; Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation—shouldn't we have something going there? Well, they don't believe in the program so we have been waiting now for 295 days to even have a vote on that.

Remember, he said I can schedule a vote whenever I want. I wish that were true.

Member of the Board of Directors for the Tennessee Valley Authority, 292 days; Commissioner of the Rehabilitation Services Administration, 156 days. The average of those few people I mentioned comes to 260 days.

I presented my case. The case is: This is not working. For the Republicans to come here today and say: Well, that is fine, we will give you Cordray, all we want you to do is change things so the man never has any money to do his job doesn't sound like a very good deal to me. There has been no answer to these periods of times when we waited and waited, and finally we get somebody approved by an overwhelming margin. Why? Because all they are doing is stalling.

I used to do a little work in the courts and I would have a jury. I would appeal to the jury to make a decision. The jury I am appealing to right now is the American people. They know the Senate as it used to work. Our approval rating is in the swamps, and we need to do something to change that. Will this change everything? No. But remember: Since 1977, the rules of the Senate have been changed a couple of times a year in this body. My friend the Republican leader said previously that that is okay; that is what the majority could do.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on the issue of delay, there are 148 nominations in committees. The majority leader's party controls the committees. They can come out at any point. On the calendar of business on the floor 21 nominees are pending.

The majority leader, I am sure, will remind everybody he always gets the last word so I am sure he will speak again. But I would remind everybody of the core point here: He gave his word without equivocation back in January of this year that we had settled the issue of rules for the Senate for this Congress. That was in the wake of a bipartisan agreement to pass two rule changes and to pass two standing orders. So at the core of this is the majority leader's word to his colleagues and the Senate as to what the rules would be for this Congress. He gave his word, and now he appears to be on the verge of breaking his word.

Secondly, the only nominees—let's make sure we understand this—likely to have a problem getting cloture are the ones who were unconstitutionally appointed, according to the Federal Court in the District of Columbia.

So where we are is the majority leader wants to fundamentally change the Senate after breaking his word in order to jam through three nominees the Federal Courts have said were unconstitutionally appointed. That is where we are.

I think it is a sad day for the Senate. I hope the majority leader will reconsider what I consider to be a highly irresponsible action on his part.

Is the Senator from Tennessee going to pose a question to me or to the majority leader?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I will wait until the majority leader finishes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. My friend the Republican leader continues to ignore his words, that he would process nominations consistent with the norms and traditions of the Senate. Please. That is just ignored by him? If anyone thinks since the first of this year that the norms and traditions of the Senate have been followed by the Republican leader, they are living in gaga land.

The Republican leader agreed that we should not have filibusters except in the case of an extraordinary circumstance. He agreed with that, but he ignores that.

I think it is also worth talking a little bit here about how the Republican leader complains that people just don't like Congress. Well, there is a reason for that, and the Republican caucus deserves most of the blame. The Gallup organization polled Americans last

month and asked for some of the reasons why people disapprove of Congress. The two top reasons outdistance all others. They don't like Congress because of gridlock and not getting anything done. Is that our fault? No.

Surveying the years that President Obama has been in office, one can see time after time when Democrats reached out to Republicans to get things done, and no one can see where they have done that. One can see that time after time the Republican leader has pressured his colleagues not to work with us.

There is no reason Congress should be held in such low regard. We should clear the calendar. They are not going to do that. They are going to continue this process over the next 3½ years, badgering, saying: We are really good. We got this nomination done, and we approved it 98 to 0—after waiting months.

It is the first time ever in the history of this country that the Secretary of Defense has been filibustered.

So I appeal to my friends on the other side of the aisle, remember the words I read from Senator MCCONNELL where he said a simple majority has the right to do this. And we know that is true.

Mr. WICKER. Would the distinguished majority leader yield for 30 seconds?

Mr. REID. I would be happy to yield for a question.

Mr. WICKER. I would ask the majority leader, in an hour or so Democrats are going to have lunch with Democrats, and Republicans are going to go to another room and have lunch with Republicans and talk to each other about what the other side is doing. This is such a serious matter. It may be the wise thing to do. I totally disagree. But I think the majority leader will agree that this is a watershed moment.

Could it be that early next week, just once we could all meet together, perhaps in the Old Senate Chamber—every Democrat and every Republican—for a caucus where actually Republicans listen to Democrats as to what they perceive as the grievances and rank-and-file Democrats listen to our side?

People are off in classified briefings right now. People are in committee meetings. People are doing the work of the Senate whether the public realizes it or not.

We are not listening to each other as rank-and-file Members. I would implore the leadership of this body, next Tuesday let's clear the Old Senate Chamber and get every Republican and every Democrat who wants to be there and actually quit talking past each other and see if there is a way for us to avoid this pivotal watershed moment in the history of the Senate.

Mr. REID. I appreciate the remarks of my friend from Mississippi. I am going to start the process today. I am going to file cloture on a bunch of nominations, and those votes will occur next week when we schedule them. I would be happy to see if there is a way I can meet with a few Senators. I have already done that with a few Republican Senators, and I am happy to see if there is a way of getting us together. We had a nice caucus together not long ago led by Senator MCCAIN, which was really memorable, but I listened to a bunch of them.

I say to my friend, if you are so concerned—and I know you are—about the process, I think you need to take a look at where you are.

About Cordray, I am so tired of hearing this tweaking: All we need is to tweak this a little bit and we will let you have it.

I repeat, I say to my friend, that the tweak is to take away his ability to exist. That is not a tweak; that is further obstruction and distraction from what a law we have is meant to do.

The NLRB, all the happy-talk I hear here—and I don't say that to disparage anyone—we will be happy to help you with that, but get rid of those two people.

No one questions their qualifications.

And I am happy to hear my friend here suddenly so enthused with that court decision. The court decision doesn't stop us from doing anything. The court decision is something that says that we can do whatever we want to do. We are a legislative branch of government. We don't have to follow what the Supreme Court does.

So without going into any more dialog, I appreciate what my friend says. I think what he needs to do with his caucus—we are going to have one today—is take a look at NLRB. There are five of them. We have no problem with the two Republicans. Let's get that done. Let's get Cordray done. Let's get the Secretary of Labor, who has waited such a long time, and we have the Secretary of the EPA.

I say to my friend, I don't know why his caucus has such heartburn over things dealing with labor. My friend said—I don't know exactly—leftwing big labor bosses. We have the Secretary of Labor who is being held up. We have three NLRB people being held up. Let's try to work our way through that. I would be happy to listen to any way he thinks we can get through that. If we can't, Tuesday we know what is going to happen.

Mr. WICKER. Just to understand, is that a yes on trying to get us together, as Republicans and Democrats, as early as lunch Tuesday to see if there is some way we can talk about this?

Mr. REID. I am happy to consider that. I have talked to a number of Republican Senators. One of them called me at home last night. I was happy to take the call. He said: What happens if cloture is invoked on the people you put forward? Well, if that happens, I have no complaints. I would hope everyone would learn from this process.

I think we need to look at what I just said. All you need is six Republicans to agree to do something about NLRB, to do something about Cordray without taking away his abilities.

Are there any appropriators here on the floor? I have been away from the committee for a while. We are not doing much appropriating around here. I know Senator MCCONNELL and I were on the committee together. I gave my spot up to Ben Nelson some time ago. I still have seniority protected there.

So I am happy for the Senator's suggestion. We will take a look at that. But it is a very simple problem here. We need to get the labor—and they are not big bosses. But my culinary workers—70,000 of them in Las Vegas alone—who have problems with management, they want to be able to gripe to somebody.

Mr. WICKER. Would the distinguished leader yield on simply one further matter?

Mr. REID. Sure.

Mr. WICKER. Did the majority leader understand, as I did, Leader MCCONNELL saying just a few moments ago that the Secretary of Labor nominee is likely to go forward very soon?

Mr. REID. That is what he said.

Mr. WICKER. And that the EPA Administrator is likely to go forward almost immediately? So we really are down to the three positions where there has been a U.S. appeals court decision, which arguably could be viewed as an extraordinary circumstance.

Mr. REID. I say to my friend, this is the first time we have dealt with this. As the Senator knows, Senator MCCONNELL is one of those who led the charge a number of years ago. I read part of his statement.

It would seem to me that it would be appropriate for folks to understand what I just said. It doesn't take somebody who has been here as long as Senator Byrd was.

I would also say this. To say to me now: We are going to do McCarthy—well, she has only waited 150 days. We are going to do Perez; we will do him right now. But that is the problem, I say to my friend—we shouldn't be waiting around here for months and months to get a vote on one of these nominees. That is the whole issue.

So I appreciate his consideration. I am going to go now to my office and meet a few people. I am happy to answer any questions while I am here on the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. First of all, I know there have been a number of conversations, and I appreciate the majority leader allowing me to talk with him recently on the phone. And I know we have an issue here. I would just go back to the question from the Senator from Mississippi.

Last night I was on the phone with numbers of Members of high esteem in the Senator's caucus, and when I talk with them about this issue, they have no understanding whatsoever about any background. They just say: Look, I am frustrated, so I am going to vote for the nuclear option.

And I would say, to respond to the Senator from Mississippi, that the Senator is right. So we have some things that are coming up here momentarily. It is possible that many of them—maybe all but many of them—will be resolved. But it seems to me, unless we do the thing the distinguished Senator from Mississippi just mentioned, there is going to be a continual gap of knowledge regarding these issues.

So I would just say that I think the majority leader knows I do everything I can and the senior Senator from Tennessee does everything he can to try to make this place work. We want to solve our Nation's problems.

I think if the majority leader will put the actual votes off to at least Wednesday, there may be some resolve. But I really would please ask that we have that opportunity the Senator asked for so that really both sides—we need to understand the other side's grievances more, and I know very respected Members on the Democratic side need to understand ours. I think that would be very, very helpful, and I really believe it would cause the leadership to be far more productive and worthwhile, and the majority leader could come in every morning smiling the way he is right now.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, to my friend from Tennessee, from the day he got here he has tried to follow on the mold set by Senator ALEXANDER. They are both conciliators. They like to work things out. We haven't been able to work too many things out, but they try. No one tries harder than they do.

I just want to say this: We talk about extreme circumstances. That was the colloquy my friend and I had here on the floor. So to now say the NLRB is extreme circumstances is like somebody setting a house on fire and then complaining their house is gone. The extraordinary circumstances have been created by you guys.

So I say again to my friends here in the Senate that I would be happy to do a joint meeting with the two caucuses but not to come here and just throw numbers around. The point is that I want this resolved and I want it resolved one way or the other. I am through.

Just to remind everyone, for two Congresses—the last one and this one—I have gone against the wishes of the vast majority of my caucus not to have done something before. And we did a few things. Most of them were window dressing that hasn't accomplished much of anything on the rules that we changed.

So I am happy to have a group of Senators indicate to me how we are going to get these people I have on the calendar done. This is no threat. I just think that would be the appropriate thing to do. If we have something positive to report in a joint meeting without going back to the same stalling, obstruction—I don't need to go over this list of people again. Some have been waiting for years to get something done. I just am not going to continue doing that. We have to have something more than my friend coming to the floor and saying: I am not going to do anything unless there are extraordinary circumstances. I think that has been stomped into the ground. So there is name-calling we need to stop.

I am happy to go to my caucus today and make my case. I am very fortunate that I have a pretty good hand on the caucus, and we are going to go ahead and do what is good for the country. I hope that, as everyone knows, the vote will be scheduled anytime we want on Tuesday.

Any other questions?

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time until 12:30 p.m. will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, with the Republicans controlling the first 30 minutes and the majority controlling the second 30 minutes.

The Senator from Tennessee.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader for his statement, for the time he has spent.

I was looking at the Executive Calendar. But, first, I have spent most of this week working on the student loan issue, as the majority leader knows. And we are coming to an agreement, it looks like, as we have with a number of other things. But I would like to renew to the majority leader the suggestion that we all get together next week and talk this through, as the Senator from Mississippi has suggested. I think it would be a wise thing to do.

There are other Senators here who wish to speak, so I will try to be succinct. Let me address just a few of the points the majority leader made.

One reason I think it would be wise for us to get together as Democratic and Republican Senators is what he is saying is different from the way I read the facts, and one of us has to be wrong about that.

For example, have Republicans used the filibuster to deny President Obama's nominees a position in government? The answer is a fact. I invited the Senate Historian and the Congressional Research Service over to my office. I asked them the question. Here is the answer to the question: In the history of the Senate, no Supreme Court Justice has ever been denied his or her seat by a filibuster. There was a little incident with Justice Fortas that Lyndon Johnson engineered, but that was different. So in the cases of the Supreme Court, zero.

How many district judges have been denied their seat by filibuster? The answer is zero.

How many Cabinet members have been denied their seat by a failed cloture vote filibuster? The answer, according to the Senate Historian and the Congressional Research Service, is zero.

How many circuit judges have been denied their seat by a filibuster? The answer is seven. How did that happen? Democrats, for the first time in history, when President George W. Bush came in, blocked five. And we said: Well, if you are going to change the precedent, then we will change the precedent, so we blocked two. That is what happens around here. But other than that, it is zero.

Then the majority leader said there has been some big delay about President Obama's nominees. These are not throwing statistics around. That is either true or it is not true.

Here is what the Washington Post says and the Congressional Research Service says. The Washington Post, by Al Kamen, on March 18, 2013: President Obama's second-term Cabinet members are going through the Senate at a rate that ''beats the averages of the last three administrations that had second terms.''

President Obama is being better treated in terms of his Cabinet nominees than the last three Presidents.

I asked the Congressional Research Service the same question. They said: As of June 27—last month—his nominees were still moving, on average, from announcement to confirmation, faster than those of President George W. Bush, faster than those of President Clinton.

Someone in the Democratic caucus needs to hear this. The number of Cabinet nominees who have been denied a seat by filibuster is zero. President Obama's Cabinet nominees are moving through the Senate faster than his last three predecessors. That is important information.

Now, are there a lot of nominees sitting around for too long a period of time? I have the thing we call the Executive Calendar right here. Senator MCCONNELL referred to it. I could go through it quickly. I count 24 people on the calendar. The one who has been on there the longest was reported by committee on February 26 of this year. That is a little over 4 months ago.

Let's be very elementary about this. The only way you get on this calendar is to be reported out of committee. The only way you get out of committee is for the Democratic majority to vote you on to this calendar. So we can fill this calendar up any time the Democratic committee majority wants to.

Of the people here, there is a brigadier general named Long. The committee has asked that we hold that. There is Jacob Lew to the International Monetary Fund. Bring him up. Bring him up. He will be confirmed.

Let's go back to that. The only way you get a name to a vote on the floor is if the majority leader brings his name to the floor. Jacob Lew has been

reported from Committee since April 16. Bring him up.

Here is an Air Force person. Here is Ms. McCarthy from Massachusetts. She has been reported from the committee. Bring her up. The Republican leader has said she will get cloture. That means she will be confirmed. He said the same thing about the nominee for the Department of Labor. He has been reported since May 16.

Mr. President, I am not a very controversial person. I was held up for 88 days by an ill-tempered Democratic Senator, for what I thought was no good reason, relying on article II, section 2 of the Constitution's right to advise and consent. President Reagan's nominee for Attorney General Ed Meese was held up for 1 year, and nobody thought about changing the rules of the Senate because it used its constitutional authority to advise and consent. Former Senator Rudman was held up by his home State Senator until Rudman withdrew his name, and then he ran against that Senator and was elected to the Senate.

The advice and consent responsibility of the Senate has gone on since the days this country was founded.

If you go down through this list of people, there are only 24 on the list. He could bring them all up. And 24 is not very many.

Then it reminds me that right after that are the privileged nominations. What are those? Those are the result of our rules changes which removed a number of people from Presidential confirmation and created a whole new category for several hundred executive positions so they do not go through a more cumbersome process, and that is working very well.

So zero filibusters denying nominations, Cabinet members going through the Senate more rapidly than the last three Presidents. So what is the beef? What is going on? There are only three judges on this calendar, an embarrassingly small number for us to deal with. We could clear this calendar in one afternoon. How do we do that? The majority leader brings them up—except for three who are illegally appointed.

Now, I will not go into a long thing about the three illegally appointed, except to say they are illegally appointed.

Most of the Founders of this country did not want a king. They created a system of checks and balances, and they created a Congress, and they created an ability for us to restrain an imperial Presidency. That is what this advice and consent is supposed to do, and we should exercise that, as former Senator Byrd used to say most eloquently on this floor. It is our opportunity to answer questions. Just because the majority leader seeks to cut off debate does not mean that person is being denied confirmation.

I will give you an example: Secretary Hagel. The majority leader tried to cut off debate 2 days after he came to the floor from the committee. We said: We want a little more time to consider this. We will be glad to vote for him for cloture in 10 days. He went ahead with the cloture vote and called that a filibuster. But Secretary Hagel is sitting in his spot as Secretary of Defense today.

So you can go down through all of these nominations and really find no evidence—no evidence whatsoever. So we need a meeting of the two caucuses to say: What is going on? Why are you seeking to do this?

The last thing I would like to say is, it is appropriate from time to time in the case of subcabinet members to use the cloture to deny a seat. That has happened seven times. John Bolton was one that the Democrats did to President Bush.

As I conclude my remarks, I would like to say this: The majority leader said: Well, we have changed the rules 18 times.

Never like this. What he is proposing to do is to turn this body into a place where the majority can do whatever it wants to do. That is like the House of Representatives—so the majority can do whatever it wants to do. A freight train can run through the House of Representatives in 1 day, and it could run through here in 1 day if the Majority leader does this. This year it might be a Democratic freight train. In a year and a half it might be the tea party express. There are a lot of people on that side of the aisle who might be very unhappy with the agenda that 51 people who have creative imaginations on this side of the aisle could do if they could do anything they wanted to do with 51 votes.

I like to read a lot of history. John Meacham's book about Jefferson has a conversation between Jefferson and Adams at the beginning of our country. They were President and Vice President, I guess, at the time. Jefferson said to Adams he feared for the future of the Republic if it did not have a Senate. ''[N]o republic could ever last which had not a Senate. . . . [T]rusting the popular assembly''—that means the House, that means a majority vote institution—''for the preservation of our liberties. . . . [is] the merest chimera''—or illusion—''imaginable.''

One other distinguished public servant said the same thing in his book in 2007. This is what HARRY REID said in his book when he wrote about the nuclear option. He was talking about the then-majority leader Senator Frist. He decided to pursue a rules change that would kill the filibuster for judicial nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I will be through in just a minute. I ask unanimous consent to speak for another minute.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALEXANDER. So the leader said:

> Senator Frist of Tennessee, who was the Majority Leader, had decided to pursue a rules change that would kill the filibuster for judicial nominations.

This is HARRY REID writing.

> And once you opened that Pandora's box—

Said Senator REID—

> it was just a matter of time before a Senate leader who couldn't get his way on something moved to eliminate the filibuster for regular business as well.

Senator REID wrote:

> And that, simply put, would be the end of the United States Senate.

I do not want Senator REID to have written on his tombstone he presided over the end of the Senate. Yet if he does what he is threatening to do, that would be what he is remembered for in the history of this country.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I listened very carefully to the majority leader this morning. What he said was confirming nominees should be the norm, not the exception—confirming nominees should be the norm, not the exception.

Well, I would ask, respectfully, that the majority leader take a look at actually the record because you cannot ignore the facts.

Of the 1,564 nominations that President Obama has sent to the Senate, only 4 have been rejected—4 of 1,564. During the first 2 years of the President's first term in office—the 111th Congress—the Senate confirmed 9,020 nominees and rejected 1. In the second portion of that first term—which was the 112th Congress—the Senate confirmed 574 nominees and rejected just 2. Now, during the 113th Congress, the Senate has confirmed 66 nominees and rejected just 1.

In terms of Cabinet nominees—and we heard the majority leader speak of that—the Congressional Research Service shows that President Obama's nominees have waited an average of 51 days. That is shorter than for President George W. Bush and shorter than the time under President Clinton.

When you take a look at judges—and the majority leader talked about that—the Democrats should remember the Senate has already confirmed more judges this year so far than were confirmed in the entire first year of President Bush's second term.

When you go over this item by item, detail by detail, what you see is that confirming nominees is the norm, not the exception.

It was interesting to listen to the majority leader talk about Don Berwick, who was actually nominated to be the head of Health and Human Services, Medicare. As the Medicare nominee, what happened? The Democratic chairman of the committee never ever scheduled a hearing. The Democrats are in charge of that nominee. The President made a recess appointment. There was never even a nomination hearing.

We go through the years and look at the quotes, and here is Senator REID in 2005:

Some in this Chamber want to throw out 214 years of Senate history in the quest for absolute power.

He said:

They think they're wiser than our Founding Fathers.

Senator REID said:

I doubt that that's true.

I think we should all follow that advice. We are not wiser than the Founding Fathers. It is not time to throw out the rules.

Then, even as majority leader, in 2009, Senator REID said:

[T]he nuclear option was the most important issue I've ever worked on in my entire career, because if that had gone forward it would have destroyed the Senate as we know it.

So there is not a problem with President Obama's nominees being treated fairly and being treated in a timely fashion. There is not a problem with his nominees in terms of not being confirmed—1,560 confirmed, 4 rejected.

Senate Democrats should remember—should remember—their prior commitments and abandon this plan before irreparably damaging the Senate.

I yield the floor.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MERKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE RULES

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, this morning a significant debate began on the floor of the Senate as to how to make the Senate function within the framework of the Constitution and within the norms and traditions of the Senate.

Indeed, the Constitution envisioned three coequal branches of government, and it provided checks and balances. One of those was that when the President nominates individuals for executive branch positions, Congress could serve as a check. Specifically, the Senate was given that power, to review the qualifications and make sure there was not something outrageous about the nomination, as a check on the Executive.

This principle was embedded as a simple majority review. Indeed, in the Constitution, it is in the same paragraph that lays out a supermajority standard for treaties, but retains a simple majority standard for reviewing executive branch nominations.

The Senate in recent times has started, however, to use the privilege of having your say; that is, everyone should be heard before a decision was made, as a way to change that fundamental principle in the Constitution from a simple majority to a supermajority. We can't close debate here in the Senate without a supermajority. Even though no one has anything else to say, that power has been used to prevent a simple up-or-down vote.

Under this theory of three coequal branches of government, no one could envision that a minority of one Chamber of the legislature could, in fact, completely undermine either the executive branch or the judicial branch. That certainly was never anticipated. Indeed, the reason it was left as a simple majority is that our Founding Fathers who were writing the Constitution had experienced the challenge of what a supermajority would do. Madison said, regarding the supermajority, ''The fundamental principle of free government would be reversed.''

He said in Federalist Paper No. 22, speaking from the painful experience as a New York representative to the Congress that created the Articles of Confederation, that supermajority rule results in ''tedious delays; continual negotiation, and intrigue; contemptible compromises of the public good.''

Madison was not the only one to observe the deadly nature of paralysis to a Congress. In Federalist Paper No. 76, Alexander Hamilton lays out the nomination process in great detail. Indeed, he says he has kept the nomination power with the President and not the legislative branch to avoid the ''party likings and dislikes, partialities and antipathies, attachments and animosities, which are felt by those who compose the assembly.''

He then went on to argue the Senate is necessary to vet nominees for the ''intrinsic merit of the candidate'' and continued, ''the advancement of the public service.''

Hamilton states that he expects nominees would be rejected only when there were, and I quote, ''special and strong reasons for the refusal.''

This principle of oversight to make sure that something that is outside the bounds of reason is done by the executive branch has now reached a point of deep abuse.

Our majority leader came to the floor earlier today, and he laid out the history of how the nomination process has been bent from an unrecognizable process that neither Madison nor Hamilton nor any of our other Founders could have envisioned, a process that allows this Senate to utilize the privilege of having your say on the floor and turn it into a weapon of destruction against the legislative branch and the judicial branch.

We can take a look at how long it has taken folks to be able from the announcements and their waiting time to get a vote, such as Richard Cordray, 724 days and counting; Alan Estevez, 292 days; Jack Lew, 169; and so on and so forth.

The traditional norm of the Senate, a timely up-or-down vote with rare exceptions, is certainly missing today.

The executive branch is headed by the President, who was elected by the citizens of the United States. In this case President Obama was not elected once, he was elected twice. He was elected with a vision, and people expect, the citizens expect, that the President will operate the Presidency consistent with implementing that vision and carry out the responsibilities of an executive branch.

This cannot be done if the folks necessary to lead different agencies or sit on different boards cannot get through the nomination process in this Senate.

For those who are passionate about believing in the vision we have, the constitutional vision, the balance of power, the coequal branches of government, we must act to remedy the deep abuses we are experiencing today.

Let me first emphasize the extensive delays. Executive nominees who are ready to be confirmed by the Senate have been pending an average of 258 days, the better balance of a complete year, more than 8 months since they were first nominated—258 days. This hardly meets the norm or the tradition of the Senate of timely consideration. This has been a prime cause of the difficulty filling executive branch slots. Not only does it make the vacancies extend for a long period of time and, therefore, dysfunction in executing the responsibilities of government, but it certainly makes it more difficult to recruit qualified folks who don't want to be held in limbo and procedurally tortured by a minority of the Senate in this fashion. This is not new. This did not start this year, but it keeps getting worse.

In that context, let's go back to January. In January, there were a series of bipartisan modest changes in the rules, and they were accompanied by a promise of comity. That is c-o-m-i-t-y, comity. Specifically, the pledge by the Republican leader was this:

Senate Republicans will continue to work with the majority to process nominations, consistent with the norms and traditions of the Senate.

What are those norms and traditions? Those are timely consideration, up-or-down votes, with rare exception.

Let's take a look and see if what has happened over the last 6 months is consistent with the norms and traditions of the Senate and let's start first with looking at the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. Only weeks after the January pledge, 44 Republican Senators sent a letter that said: ''We will not support the consideration of any nominee, regardless of party affiliation, to be the CFPB director''—February 1, 2013, just days after the Republican leader pledged a return to the norms and traditions of the Senate.

This is not within the norms and traditions of the Senate, even going back to our Founders, who pointed out that they were worried about partisan, party-affiliated differences and animosities permeating the system. They laid out a simple nomination-confirmation process about the qualifications of the individual, not about the legitimacy, if

you will, of the agency. It is a policy decision. It is a policy that has been passed in this Senate saying the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau is a valuable addition to end practices that are predatory financial practices.

We had a consumer safety group that looks at things such as keeping lead out of the paint on children's toys. That is very important, and it goes on to monitor the safety of toys and many other aspects.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MERKLEY. I ask unanimous consent to speak for an additional 10 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MERKLEY. We indeed in this case are talking about an agency that will protect our families from predatory financial practices. We all know what those are. They are hidden charges on prepaid credit cards. They are exploding interest rates on mortgages, where there is a teaser rate for 2 years and then the mortgage zooms up from 4 percent to 9 percent, driving defaults. In fact, that was a major factor, not only in the loss of homes of millions of families but also a major factor in the meltdown of our economy.

What is good for the family, building successful families, is also good for building a successful economy. We had that debate, and we as a Senate approved creating this organization. Now we have 44 Senators who say they are going to destroy this agency by blocking a Director from ever being appointed. This is 100 percent outside the norms and tradition of the Senate.

Of course, that restoration of the norms and traditions was the promise made on this floor by the Republican leader just days before this letter was sent.

According to the Senate Historian, this is the first time in history a political party has blocked a nomination of someone because they didn't like the construction of the agency. Let me repeat that. This is the first time in history.

A few weeks later we had another first, the first ever filibuster of a Defense Secretary nominee. The New York Times wrote: ''The first time in history that the Senate has required that a nominee for Secretary of Defense clear the 60-vote hurdle.''

This is the first time in history. The irony, of course, is that the nominee was a former Republican colleague of this Chamber, Chuck Hagel. Certainly this was out of sync for the norms and traditions of the Senate.

Then we come to this spring, again, unprecedented delay tactics. A Republican former House Member called the boycotting of Gina McCarthy ''an unprecedented attempt to slow down the confirmation process and undermine the agency.''

Is that consistent with the norms and traditions that were promised in January? It is not.

In fact, I sit on the committee that voted Gina McCarthy out. When we tried to have the vote, we were faced with the boycott; that is, a quorum was denied because our colleague, Senator Lautenberg, was extremely sick and could not attend. Taking advantage of his illness, Republicans decided not to show up and therefore block that nomination from coming out of the committee. Only when Senator Lautenberg came in, in the midst of an extreme illness, did the Republican members attend the committee. This is part of this ongoing process of unprecedented obstruction.

Real delays involve real hurt. It is not an academic debate. This obstruction is having a real impact on people's lives.

Let's turn to the National Labor Relations Board. In a few weeks in August, there will no longer be a quorum of the NLRB. This means for the first time in 78 years there will be no referee in place between the rules for the conduct of employers and employees. That referee makes sure that illegal practices by workers don't occur and illegal practices by employers don't occur. We lose that referee in a few weeks and that, as Members of this Senate have expressed, is their goal. Again, this is unprecedented—not putting forward a policy debate over eliminating the National Labor Relations Board but instead undermining it by blocking the ability to hold up-or-down votes on the nominees.

Workers are deeply affected by whether this referee is in place. Kathleen Von Eitzen, a Panera baker who tried to organize her fellow bakers, came to Washington, DC, to talk about how they have been unable to get to a final contract and how, in the process, their members have been cut, in some cases their hours have been cut, and a whole host of other retaliatory measures. These are the things you need a referee for—to say that is not acceptable or to judge the evidence as both sides present it. That is why we need the NLRB.

How about Marcus Hedger, who was fired for taking a friend through the shop floor. It just so happened Marcus was a union leader in his shop. He asked permission to escort a friend through the floor and it was granted. Then the employer said: Aha, we got you. We can fire you because you know you are not allowed, under the rules, to escort a friend through the shop floor.

The NLRB ruled quickly, saying this was an extraordinarily flimsy pretext for firing someone because he happened to be a shop steward, and it was during the timeframe of a labor negotiation. The company was trying to send a message. They were trying to say: If you support workers organizing to fight for living wages, you may get fired, and here we have just set an example.

It is the NLRB that is the referee that says those sorts of unacceptable tactics cannot occur.

Back to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. It has refunded Americans $425 million in savings by getting rid of credit card tricks and traps.

I think it is important we fight for the success of our families. These are family values. We should not measure the success of our Nation by the size of the gross domestic product. We should measure it by the success of our families, and eliminating predatory tactics is an incredibly important piece of that puzzle that touches millions.

What we have seen is this: The pledge made on this floor by our Republican leader in January—the pledge that said we will return to the norms and traditions of the Senate for nominations—has not occurred. The Republican leader may indeed have had every good will in making that pledge, but it requires the cooperation of the entire caucus and that certainly has not occurred and we haven't heard a strong effort to abide by that pledge made in January.

So it is time to restore the norms and traditions in the Senate, where the Senate provides a check on outrageous nominations, but it is a check, not a form of paralysis. It is advise and consent, not paralyze or veto.

For those who love democracy, it has been sad to see this Chamber, once considered the premier deliberative body in the world, fall into such a State of paralysis and dysfunction. It is up to us, as Members of this body, to come forward and say that is absolutely unacceptable.

That is the debate that was started today. I applaud the majority leader who in January of 2011 strived to resolve this dysfunction through a gentleman's agreement, but within weeks that gentleman's agreement was in tatters. I applaud the majority leader for his instinct in January when he sought modest bipartisan rule changes with the promise of comity and a pledge from the Republican leader to return to the customs and traditions of the Senate. His instinct was right. We should be able to accomplish these things by restoring the social contract.

The leader, HARRY REID, has gone the extra mile and then another extra mile in seeking to adopt the social contract that held this body together, but now what we see is it has not been reciprocated. The pledges made, the promise of comity, the gentleman's agreement has not resulted in material changes in tactics employed on the floor of the Senate. So now we have to work to restore the vision of our Founders, the vision of simple majority, with timely up-or-down votes on nominations. We owe this to the executive branch, and we certainly owe it to our citizens who reelected President Obama.

I wish to address one last point; that is, it has been argued what the majority leader is proposing—that we, if necessary, change the rule or change the application of the rule in order to make this place work again—is unprecedented.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MERKLEY. I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 more minute.

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

Mr. MERKLEY. I have in my hands a document entitled ''The Senate's Power to Make Procedural Rules by Majority Vote,'' and this lays out a whole host of viewpoints expressed in 2005 that I think would be interesting reading for my colleagues across the aisle because it was their document.

I also have a long list of cases where every other year, on average, we have changed the application of a rule in order to make the Senate function in a different way, a better way. So this is far from unprecedented.

It is time for us, together as Senators, to live up to our responsibility and restore the power to the executive branch to put their folks in place, operating under our advise and consent in the way envisioned in the Constitution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Madam President, I come to the floor to speak about the rules issue that has come to a head in the Senate. We have seen unprecedented obstruction by the other side of the aisle. They have continually blocked nominations—and I will get into the numbers—and this is something that has been building since we came in, in this Congress. We had a debate about rules, and we didn't do the things we should have done. We should have put in place a talking filibuster. There is no doubt about it. We should have put in other rules changes. What has happened is we find ourselves in the situation of a tyranny of the minority.

What is a tyranny of the minority? The Founders talked about it. The Founders saw that if a situation was created where a minority could block the action of the Senate, then the minority would actually be governing, and that is the situation we have before us. The minority governs when it comes to nominees, and they have blocked nominees in a very significant way. I can't repeat enough that this is unprecedented in the history of the country.

The President can't get his team. What is at issue is we have a President of the United States who had a very big win in the last election. He put himself out there, he campaigned on a number of issues, and he won the election. So one would think he can now get his team in place, but he is unable to get his team in place. He tries to propose people.

For example, in talking about the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, we have a very qualified attorney general—and I was a former attorney general a few years back—a young man the President put forward from Ohio who was very well qualified. He has not been able to get a vote. He is in an agency that is tremendously important to the middle class, he is in an agency that is important to consumers, and he is able to do things that are very important for consumers across this Nation when it comes to bank loans, when it comes to safety issues, and all across the board. Yet we have a situation where he cannot be sworn in and do his job as a full-time appointee for that agency. This is absolutely unprecedented, and we have to tackle this issue.

What is happening with the minority side is, if they do not like a nominee or they do not like the policies the nominee stands for or they do not like the administration's policies, they prevent the nominee from taking office at all. In effect, through the minority process that is being utilized, they are determining policy.

That is what the big objection is, and I think we are going to have to address this. I am very supportive of Leader REID coming out and saying we have to address this, we have to deal with this, and I think we are going to deal with it starting today and flowing into the next week or so.

It was mentioned here recently that the Republican policy committee put out a document entitled ''The Senate's Power to Make Procedural Rules by Majority Vote.'' I believe that document was put into the RECORD.

Earlier in the debate this document was referred to, and I just want to make sure everyone understands it is very clear, in reading this document, that at the time of April 2005 and in that period, the Republicans were making very strong arguments that we could go forward with rule changes during the middle of a session. They were pointing out that Majority Leader Robert Byrd—and we all know Robert Byrd was one of the Senators in this institution who studied and knew the rules; most people believe Robert Byrd knew the rules better than any Senator in the last 100 years—always felt we had the right, under the constitutional option, to make changes that needed to be made.

In 1977, 1979, 1980, and 1987, Majority Leader Byrd established precedence that changed Senate procedures during the middle of a Congress, and I think that is what we are talking about, something along those lines. This is a critical issue for us as we try to move forward and we try to govern.

The Democrats have a majority and a big majority, if we consider the Independents who have joined with us, no doubt about it. Yet we cannot govern because of the procedures being utilized today.

I wish to highlight a little of this unprecedented Republican obstruction. Executive nominees who are ready to be confirmed by the Senate have been pending, on average, for 260 days—more than 8 months since they were first nominated. The Senate confirmed only 34 executive nominees by the July 4 recess compared to 118 at this point in the Bush administration. There are 184 pending executive nominees.

Since President Obama took office, Senate Republicans have filibustered 16 executive nominations and two nominees, including Mr. Cordray to be the head of the Consumer Financial Protection Board, via filibuster. For the first time ever, Senate Republicans filibustered a nomination for the Secretary of Defense. As the New York Times noted, ''The vote represented the first time in history that the Senate has required that a nominee for Secretary of Defense clear the 60-vote hurdle before a final simple majority vote.''

That is the New York Times.

Senate Republicans continue to block the nomination of Gina McCarthy to be EPA Administrator, claiming she has been unresponsive. Mrs. McCarthy was forced to answer more questions than ever before—more than 1,100 questions—since Senate Republicans boycotted her hearing at the committee I serve on, the Environment and Public Works Committee.

Mrs. McCarthy was previously environmental adviser to Mitt Romney. She has very good credentials.

I urge my colleagues to look at what she did in New Mexico. Here you have Gina McCarthy. There is a potential for a lawsuit. It is an issue that has to do with air quality in New Mexico. She ended up pulling all the parties together through her Regional Administrator and reached a compromise where we closed down two coal-fired plants and opened in their place two natural gas-fired plants. It was considered by the Governor, the EPA Regional Administrator, and everybody as a win-win for everyone, and she engineered that from her position at air quality there in the EPA.

Another point that should be made about Gina McCarthy is Gina McCarthy is a woman who has already been approved by the Senate. She was approved in a lopsided vote and has been doing her job for 4 years.

So what are we doing that they are saying she has to be filibustered, she has to be stopped because they don't like the policies she is going to put in place. It is absolutely outrageous what is happening, and we need to rein this in. I agree Senator REID is headed in the right direction to do this.

I applaud Senator MURRAY for her good work with Senator REID and the leadership team in terms of trying to address how we govern and very much appreciate how she has tried to shape this issue and tries to always work with the Republicans on this issue. We have tried to work through these things and haven't been able to.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I appreciate the comments of my colleague from New Mexico. As a former chief executive myself, it is remarkable to me that regardless of who is the President of the United States, he or

she ought to be able to get their team in place, with appropriate oversight and review. Unfortunately, it doesn't seem to be the case in this body.

Many of the other debates we have had are important, but in my 4-plus years that I have been here, this supersedes everything else that if we could reach some resolution on, I think might go further than any other action in both lowering some of the rhetoric and lancing some of the boil of partisanship in the Senate, as well as doing more for the kind of job growth that is still so desperately needed. That is getting our fiscal house in order, getting our balance sheet in order.

We have seen some good news as the economy recovers. We have seen our annual deficit numbers go down, although I have to look with somewhat jaundiced eyes when the press is saying: Hallelujah, this year our deficit may only be $746 billion. That is still not good enough, and the solution set we are looking for is not that far away.

I am going to make a couple comments and then ask my colleague, the chair of our Budget Committee, to once again make an offer to proceed with regular order, something that is in the backstop of this debate about rules, something our colleagues on the other side of the aisle—perhaps appropriately—beat us over the head for 3 years about the fact that we ought to have regular order around the budget.

It has now been 110 days since the Senate approved a budget, after a marathon session that went to 5 in the morning—a session that I think even our colleagues on the other side who didn't vote for the budget would agree was open and appropriate to rules and everybody got the chance to have their say and offer their ideas.

Now, for the 16th time, we are going to come and ask our colleagues: Let's abide by regular order and go to a budget conference. Let's do the hard work that is necessary to make sure we finish the job of getting the kind of deficit reduction, getting our balance sheet in order, that will allow this economy to move forward and, quite honestly, allow us to get back to regular order on issues such as appropriations bills and a host of other things. I can't speak for everyone, but people in Virginia and I imagine people in Washington State—and I see colleagues from New Mexico and Florida—and elsewhere are saying: What are you doing? Why can't you get something done?

Every day that we remain in this paralyzed state, while it may be great late-night fodder for comedians about Congress's inability to act, at some point this dysfunction erodes the underlying confidence the American people have in our institutions. That is not good for American democracy, and it is not good as well for the ability of our economy to recover.

One of the things we have seen in press reports and what is starting to seep into consciousness is the actions that were set up in sequestration; that they don't seem to be as bad as people think. But let's remind ourselves that sequestration was set up to be the stupidest option possible, an option so stupid that no rational group of people would ever let it come to pass.

I have cut budgets as Governor. I have cut budgets in business. There is a smart way and a stupid way to cut a budget. We set up a process that was so stupid that no rational group would ever let it happen.

One of the reasons why I think our approval rating hovers around 8 percent is we didn't come together, we didn't let this budget process take place, and we allowed this sequestration to move forward.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time for the majority has expired.

Mr. WARNER. I ask unanimous consent for a 5-minute extension.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent for the Senator from Virginia to finish his statement, for me to have 8 minutes of morning business, and then allow our colleagues on the other side to respond.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, I don't have objection to the time they want to use. What is our order on the time until 12:30?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At 12:30, the Senate will stand in recess.

Mr. RUBIO. I ask unanimous consent that after they are done with their remarks, I have 10 minutes. I may have an objection, and probably will, and would like to speak on that as well. I want to make sure we could have unanimous consent on that. I don't intend to keep us in longer than we need to be.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. I thank my colleague.

BUDGET CONFERENCE

I just want to point out the fact that we are now starting to see furloughs in the Federal workforce. There is no State in our Nation that is more ground zero, that is getting hit harder than the Commonwealth of Virginia with sequestration. There are real people who are being hurt.

We have talked about some of the numbers, whether it is in Head Start or NIH grants, but let me share some of the things I have heard in the last 2 weeks from Virginians.

Pat Hickman, who works at the Department of Defense in northern Virginia, says: ''I'm tired of hearing, 'It's only one day,' and 'it's only 20 percent.' ''

Pat is now starting to decide, because of these 11 days of furlough, whether she is going to have to start to curtail her contributions to her Thrift Savings Plan. Her retirement would be in jeopardy.

Another employee whose name didn't come forward said that if you have kids in school, during the summertime they are in daycare. This Federal employee spends $2,000 a month for daycare, and they are not getting a discount on these expenses that are built into their family budget. How could they have planned 1 year out that they were going to get furloughed 11 weeks in a row?

Craig Granville, who works down at the shipyard in Portsmouth, says that furloughing for the next 12 weeks will hit their expenses hard. He has a wife who is currently going for treatment for an illness and the insurance company only pays half. They have to decide do they cut back on the wife's treatment or do they go into their savings.

I have letters and comments from Virginian after Virginian urging us—begging us—to take off our Democratic and Republican hats and put the interests of our country first and foremost.

I know we have lots of differences on how we want to approach and bridge this gap. We are never going to get to bridge the gap in our differences on the debt and deficit and on the budget unless we can get to conference and try to work it out.

I say in strong support of our Budget chairman, I thank her for the great work she has done in getting a budget in a fair way, where our Republican colleagues had a chance to raise their objections. I hope and pray we will get to that conference so we can get this issue resolved.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Virginia. There is no one in this body more passionate to do the work to get us to a balanced bipartisan deal, to put the budget deficit and the budget issues behind us, and to get our country back on track than the Senator from Virginia. I know he wants to get to a conference committee as badly as I do—not to demand that we only have our position but to work with others to find a bipartisan solution.

As he so eloquently stated, it has been more than 100 days now since the Senate did pass a budget, and we have tried now 15 times to take the next step to move to a bipartisan conference with the House. Every time we have asked, we have been blocked by a tea party Republican with the support of the Republican leadership.

I understand that for some factions in the Republican Party, ''compromise'' is a dirty word. That may explain why they have offered up excuse after excuse for blocking the regular budget order we are trying to work toward. They refuse to allow a conference before we get to a so-called preconference framework. They demand we put preconditions on what can be discussed or talked about in a bipartisan conference, to claiming that moving to a budget conference—which leading Republicans called for just

months ago—was somehow now not regular order, to most recently claiming we need to look at a 30-year budget window before we look at the major problems we have in front of us right now, when we can—and must—do both at the same time.

I know there are significant differences between our parties' values and our priorities. Some of us—Democrats and Republicans—think this is a reason to come together and try to reach a bipartisan deal in a budget conference now. It has been heartening to hear from Senators MCCAIN and COLLINS and many other Republicans who have chatted with me about why they believe we need to have a formal bipartisan negotiation move on this. Unfortunately, there is a small group of Senators who would prefer to throw up their hands and stall until we reach a crisis, when they think they can get a better deal.

Last week, I was home in my State, similar to most Senators, and I talked to a lot of Americans who don't understand that kind of approach. They run their businesses and help their communities and support their families by compromising every single day. They can't afford to wait to reach agreements until the very last minute, because when that happens, they have to deal with the consequences. But that is exactly what my Republican colleagues are doing to thousands of my families in the State of Washington. Because Republicans will not allow us to come to the table, the automatic cuts from sequestration are impacting everything from children who depend on Head Start to our national security. What is more, many of the same colleagues will try to tell you that sequestration is not impacting American families. As the Senator from Virginia just talked about, I can tell you firsthand that the impacts are real.

For thousands of families in my home State, these become a reality tomorrow morning. That is because furloughs for the Department of Defense employees begin this week—equivalent to a 20-percent pay cut for 650,000 defense workers nationwide. Bases in my home State of Washington are being affected, and the first furlough date at Joint Base Lewis-McChord in Washington State is tomorrow. So instead of going to work, thousands of workers in my State will go home. The 9/11 call center and the fire department will be understaffed. Airfields are going to be shuttered except for emergencies. The military personnel office is closed. The substance abuse center is closed. The Army Medical Center is going to close clinics, and even the Wounded Care Clinic is going to be understaffed.

I am reminded of one worker I met last week, Will Silba. Will is a former marine, an amputee. He works now as a fire inspector, and he told me that because of these furloughs he is going to have to get a second job. He is going to struggle with his mortgage payments.

While these furloughs are going to directly impact thousands of people and civilian employees, the leaders at Lewis-McChord have made it very clear that the furloughs are going to hurt our soldiers. They are going to limit their access to medical care. They are going to cut back on the family support programs. They are going to make it tougher to find a job when they finish their military careers. Why? Because our colleagues refuse to work together. To me, this is unacceptable.

Because some Republicans would like to preserve the harmful cuts from sequestration despite these kinds of impacts, we have a $91 billion gap between the House and the Senate appropriations levels for next year. If we do not resolve that gap, we are headed for another round of uncertainty and brinkmanship, another unnecessary burden on our economic recovery and the millions of Americans who are looking for work every day. Some of my Republican colleagues say they are fine with that. In fact, House Republicans are reported, right now, to be busy working on a debt limit ransom note—right now—and so far that ransom note sounds quite a lot like the Ryan budget. As you know, the budget we did pass here in the Senate was very different, but that is exactly why we have to resolve our differences in conference. That is where we come together in a public fashion and talk about our differences and work out agreements.

I believe we have an opportunity, a window of opportunity over the next few weeks to do what Americans across the country have asked us to do—compromise and confront these problems before we head back to our home States for the work period in August. We do not have a lot of time, but I am confident that if those of us who can see working together as a responsibility rather than a liability come to the table, we can get a fair bipartisan agreement.

By the way, I was very discouraged to hear just this week from some tea party Republicans—many of the same ones who are now blocking us going to conference—who are already talking now about shutting down the government in order to defund ObamaCare. Not only do they want to push us to a crisis, but they want to do that in order to cut off health care coverage for 25 million people and reopen that doughnut hole we know so much about, causing seniors to pay more for their prescriptions, and end preventive care for seniors, and the list goes on.

This is an absurd position. We should not be talking about shutting down the government. I really hope responsible Republicans reject this approach and work with us on real solutions, not more political fights. My colleagues and I are going to continue urging the Senate Republican leadership to end their tea party-backed strategy of manufacturing crises and allow us to do the work we were sent here to do and go to a conference. I urge them to listen not just to Democrats but to many Members of their own party who want to get to a budget conference and allow us to get to work to solve the Nation's problems.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H. CON. RES. 25

Today I come to the floor to 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; that 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 appointment conferees on the part of the Senate; that following the authorization, two motions to instruct conferees be in order from each side: the motion to instruct relative to the debt limit and a motion to instruct relative to taxes and revenues; that there be 2 hours of debate equally divided between the two leaders or their designees prior to a vote in relation to the motions; that no amendments be in order to either of the motions prior to the votes; and that all the above occurring with no intervening action or debate.

I ask unanimous consent for that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I do not oppose going to a budget conference with the House. I think I have shown, especially in the last week, a willingness and ability to compromise on important issues—one, quite frankly, very unpopular among people supportive of my candidacy—in my time here in the Senate when we dealt with the issue of immigration. My concern is that when this goes to a budget conference with the House, they will negotiate the debt limit—an issue that I believe is so monumental it should be debated on its own merits and by itself.

So what I am arguing for is a compromise. Let's go to conference but assure everyone here that this is not a conference that is going to deal with the debt limit issue. We need to deal with that issue separately.

I ask unanimous consent of the Senator on a compromise. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator 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. Does the Senator so modify her request?

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I will object, but let me just say this. What the Senator is requesting is that we tell our conferees before they ever get to the conference committee what they can do on a specific issue. What I offered in my original offer is to have a vote on that, which is how we do this here. The Senator is requesting not

that we have a vote but that we have a demand.

I respect the Senator from Florida. He has worked very hard, as he stated, on immigration reform. He is working now to try to get the House to pass that. At some point they will go to conference. What he is saying is that when his bill goes to conference, what he wants to do is allow any Senator on this floor to make a demand of that conference committee before they get there—not a vote, not a majority vote, but a demand from a small minority of what is going to be in that conference. We cannot agree with that.

What I have offered is a vote on that, which is what we are—a democracy. You are allowed to vote, and if enough Senators agree with that position, that is what we would direct the conference to do. But this body is not built on a demand from one Senator or a small group of Senators on a conference before we go there. We are a democracy.

So I again object to his request as he said and renew my request, which will allow a debate and a vote on that issue he is requesting, as happens in a democracy.

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

Mr. RUBIO. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. How much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ten minutes.

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, let me say at the outset on this debt limit issue that we have been told by everyone here that the debt limit is not going to be dealt with; they don't intend to deal with it; that, in fact, we have rules in place that prohibit that from happening. So if the intent is to say we are not going to deal with the debt limit, why not just put it in writing? Why not just agree to it? I think it raises suspicion that they refuse to take the debt limit off the table in writing in a specific motion, even though they told us that is not the case.

But I want to raise a couple of points in regard to all this debate we are having. We heard a lot of debate about the impact of the sequester on this country. I do not dispute that it will have an impact. In fact, I voted against the deal that actually gave us the sequester, and I voted against it because, while I believe deeply we need to constrain spending because we are spending a lot more money than we are taking in, about $1 trillion a year more than we are taking in, borrowing about 40 cents of every dollar we spend in the Federal Government—for the folks visiting here in the gallery, you may be shocked to hear that. Every dollar the Federal Government spends, 40 cents of it is borrowed. When you borrow it, that means you have to pay it back with interest. That is your money. That doesn't come from a tree. That is money taxpayers are eventually going to have to come up with. And for the youngsters here, I want you to understand it is primarily going to come from you in the years to come.

So the reason I thought the sequester was a bad idea is because that sequester is going after things that by and large are not the drivers of our debt. The drivers of our debt are certain programs that are built in a way that are unsustainable, important programs such as Medicare. I believe in Medicare. I support Medicare, as I tell anyone when they ask me about it. My mother is on Medicare. I don't want to see Medicare hurt or changed for her. But I also recognize that if Medicare is going to exist when I retire, we better start making some changes to it for future retirees, people 20 or 30 years from now. That is where we should be focusing our reform efforts.

We cannot get the other side to agree on any sort of changes. There was an effort in the House last year to try to do something very serious about that. They brutally attacked it. There was a reference to the Ryan budget a moment ago. The Ryan budget—I am not saying it was perfect, but it was the most serious effort yet in this Congress, in this city, to reform a program that is going bankrupt on its own.

I think the only thing worse than the sequester is to raise taxes to prevent a sequester because that will hurt job creation in America. The only thing worse than the sequester is not to have any spending reductions at all, which leads me to the point that was raised earlier saying that we are not going to agree to a short-term budget unless ObamaCare is defunded and that we are threatening a crisis by shutting down the government.

Let me say that one of the people who said that was me, so let me address that for a moment. Let me tell you what the disaster is. The real disaster is ObamaCare itself. In fact, it is such a disaster that the people who supported it are now delaying implementing portions of it. Just last week we were told that one of the key components of the law requiring that employers provide insurance—they are going to have to delay that by a year, conveniently until after the next election.

Here is the other thing we found out last week. I know that under ObamaCare, when you go in and say, I make so much money, you can qualify for the government to give you extra money to buy insurance. Guess what. They now admitted they have no way of verifying how much money you really make. Basically, it means people are going to get to show up and say, I only make $20,000 a year, and get their subsidy, with no way to verify the truth about what they make.

It is not limited to that. The disaster that is looming with regard to ObamaCare impacts every single American. Here is a list of them that was recently produced by the Heritage Foundation. They missed a bunch of deadlines.

Most states resisted Obamacare's call to create insurance exchanges, choosing to let Washington create a federally run exchange instead. However, a Government Accountability Office report noted that ''critical'' activities to create a federal exchange have not been completed and the missed deadlines ''suggest a potential for challenges going forward.''

That is right—you may have to go on a Federal exchange—including, ironically enough, the Members of the Congress and their staffs—and the exchange doesn't exist yet. You are going to be expected in a couple of months to sign up for something that doesn't even exist yet. That is one part of the disaster. There are many others.

The administration announced in April that workers will not be able to choose plans from different health insurers in the small business exchanges next year—a delay that [a liberal blogger] called ''a really bad sign of ObamaCare incompetence.''

Here is another one, the child-only plans—one of the things people were excited about. There was a drafting error in the law that actually led to less access to care for children with preexisting conditions.

A 2011 report found that in 17 states, insurers are no longer selling child-only health insurance plans, because they fear that individuals will apply for coverage only after being diagnosed with costly illnesses.

Basic health plan: DELAYED.

This government-run plan for states, created as part of ObamaCare, has also been delayed, prompting one Democrat to criticize the Administration for failing to ''live up'' to the law and implement it as written.

The early retiree reinsurance—it is broke.

The $5 billion in funding for this program was intended to last until 2014—but the program's money ran out in 2011, two years ahead of schedule.

Waivers:

After the law passed, HHS discovered that some of its new mandates would raise costs so much that employers would drop coverage rather than face skyrocketing premiums. Instead, the Administration announced a series of temporary waivers—and more than half the recipients of those waivers were members of union health insurance plans.

It goes on and on. This thing is a disaster. I don't care about how you feel about it, there is an insurance crisis in America, let there be no doubt. People are struggling to find access to quality health insurance. We should deal with that, but this approach is a disaster. No matter how you feel about it, it is a disaster. It cannot be implemented in time. You don't think that is looming over our economy?

I just left a meeting with an owner of a chain of restaurants. They are worried about it. They don't know what to make of it. Why, if you ask what it is going to look like next year, they don't know. They don't know. We are in July already, folks. We are going to implement this? We are going to force this on our economy? You don't think that is a disaster? You don't think in the

real world—not in Washington or the think tanks—small- and medium-sized businesses and individuals are holding back on investing or holding back on making moves? You don't think someone who decided to leave their job, take their life's savings, and open a business because they believe so much in their dream—you don't think this uncertainty is hurting that from happening? It is.

You cannot grow your economy unless people are willing to start new businesses or grow existing businesses, and ObamaCare is keeping that from happening. That is the disaster.

Why would we fund a disaster? Why would we pay for something out of the American taxpayer's wallet we know isn't going to work? When they talk about shutting down the government and how it is going to be a disaster—ObamaCare threatens to shut down our economy. I am telling you this is a disaster. We should not fund it, and we should not have a temporary budget around here that gives money to this thing. It is a disaster, it will not work, and it is going to hurt people.

The other thing about this debt limit that I make such a big deal about—let me tell you why. We owe $17 trillion, and that is bad, and it is bigger than our economy. Here is the worst part about it: There is no plan in place to stop that from continuing to grow. You heard right. There is no plan. This budget the Senate passed—I am glad we passed a budget—only makes it worse; it doesn't make it better.

Where is the urgency? What are we waiting for? This isn't going to take care of itself. We are not going to win the Powerball lottery and pay this thing off. When is someone going to step up and say it is time to solve it?

I have been here now 2½ years. If on the day I got elected you told me we would go 2½ years without seriously dealing with this, I wouldn't have believed you. I would have said: Look, I know it is going to be hard, but we have to do something. We are 2½ years into this, and they are saying: We are going to raise the debt limit, and we don't want any conditions. We don't want to deal with anything that fixes it.

People say: Well, the debt is something that is far off in the future. It is off in the future, but it is also happening now. Do you think when people decide to invest money to start a new business or expand an existing business—which is how you create jobs; that is how jobs are created in the private sector.

If you graduated college, went to school, got your degree, and now you can't find a job, I will tell you why you cannot find a job: The businesses that create those jobs will not create them until all of this is figured out. People do not want to risk their hard-earned and saved money in an economy that is headed for a catastrophe.

Look at what is happening in Europe now. Europe has a debt problem. You know how they have had to deal with it? Disruptive changes in government and tax increases. If you think that stuff attracts investment in business, you are out of your mind. There isn't a chamber of commerce in the world that tells people: Come to us. Here we have high taxes and heavy debt that will make those taxes even bigger in the future.

The bottom line is that the debt limit and the fact that we don't have a solution for the debt is also the reason for the crisis. We need to begin dealing with this seriously and stop playing games. Someone has to draw a line in the sand, and I know many of my colleagues and I intend to do so every chance we get.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator withhold that suggestion.

Mr. RUBIO. Yes.

RECESS

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

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:48 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. HEITKAMP).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant majority leader.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

SENATE PROCEDURE

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, I want to speak about a subject that is on the hearts of most of us now as we approach not what is a coming constitutional crisis, but what is already a constitutional crisis because this body is not functioning as the Constitution intended. The minority, under the rules of the Senate, is protected and has been.

In the early days of the Senate, there was no cutting off of debate. In the early 1900s, a level, a threshold of 67 was established in order to cut off debate. Then, after the abuses of that filibuster requirement to cut off debate in the abuses in the civil rights era, indeed, the threshold was lowered to what we have in the Senate rules today—60. But we are seeing that it is being abused.

Under the Constitution we have the checks and balances of the separate branches. But when a President is elected, the President is entitled to have the people he wants to advise him to be a part of his team to be confirmed. It has always been the practice under the Constitution to have, not a supermajority vote, as is required for treaties, but a simple majority vote in the approval of the nominations.

The issue in front of us is whether the President will be entitled to have approved by the Senate the people he has put forth to head the agencies and the Departments of his administration. That is what has brought us to the constitutional crisis where we are now finding ourselves ready to act.

Congress has failed to put aside political differences to find commonsense solutions not only on the issue of the approval of the President's appointments, but on so many of our Nation's pressing problems.

Let's start out with the charade that we call the sequester. The sequester is a meat cleaver approach to budgeting. I daresay in the minds of most of the Senators it was never intended to go into effect. It was the meat cleaver hanging over the head, a year and a half ago, of the appointed supercommittee that—after the initial $1 trillion of spending cuts were made on the budget over a 10-year period, which was done—the supercommittee was to come along and work out deficit reduction with a target somewhere around $4 trillion in total.

What was to encourage the supercommittee was this meat cleaver hanging over their heads, or guillotine hanging over all the heads that nobody wanted, which was cuts across the board without regard to programs—across the board in discretionary programs, defense and nondefense discretionary programs.

Such across-the-board budget cuts, is that the way to go about making proper appropriations decisions? Those kinds of meat cleaver approaches do real damage to people's everyday lives. In the long run, the sequester is certainly going to hurt our national defense, our national security, and our Nation's ability to compete economically with other countries. If we see these kinds of cuts continue in this ideological fashion without regard to programs, then we are going to be in serious trouble.

We can continue to have both sides of the aisle point fingers at each other, but isn't it about time we get rid of this approach to the budget—the sequester—and start talking about how we can get the job done?

Well, the ranking member of the Finance Committee is here. He is one of my dear personal friends. I believe he is very sincere, along with the chairman of the Finance Committee, to really

take on tax reform. Are we happy with the Tax Code we have? Do we think it has much too much complication? And couldn't its streamlining—particularly with tax expenditures, which are tax deductions and tax credits, and almost every special interest in the world has their own special tax expenditure—could we not clear out a lot of them, which produces revenue, and use that revenue in order to lower tax rates and also use some of it to lower the deficit?

Well, we need to close some of those loopholes, and I am hopeful, with the leadership of Senator BAUCUS and Senator HATCH, we are going to be able to do that. But there are a lot of other things in there.

It is no surprise that I have been speaking of subsidies that go to companies, such as oil companies, that have outlived their usefulness that were given a century ago in the Tax Code as incentives to drill for oil. Do we think oil companies need those financial incentives now? What about the offshore tax dodges?

I think it is also obvious that when you look at the Medicare drug program, you know the taxpayers of this country, through their government, got a break on the cost of prescription drugs that we supply to Medicaid and to the Department of Defense and to the Veterans' Administration. But when it comes to if you have been getting that price break on your drugs through Medicaid, but you now turn 65, and you get your drugs through Medicare, the U.S. Government does not get the break, the discount on the drugs through Medicare. The very same people who were getting them under Medicaid now are getting them by Medicare because they passed the threshold of age 65—same drug, same people; the government is paying it—but the government is paying a much higher price. That could be worth a savings of $150 billion to the U.S. taxpayer over the course of a decade.

You do the math on just these few examples I have given in this short little speech, and it adds up to well over $1 trillion. And that is just a starter. There are hundreds of billions of dollars more that might be saved by closing some of these tax loopholes.

I think we need to keep in mind that not all tax deductions are bad. Some serve very legitimate purposes. But here we are, and we come back to the gridlock we are experiencing. We passed a budget resolution in the Budget Committee. It passed out here on the floor of the Senate. The House of Representatives has passed a budget resolution, albeit much different than ours. The normal process around here is to try to work out our differences and to do it as ladies and gentlemen with comity. But we cannot even get a motion approved in order to go to a conference committee to work out the differences between the House and the Senate budget resolutions.

So I would continue to plead with our colleagues to allow this to move forward. No less than one of the most stellar Members of this body, Senator MCCAIN, has called for the naming of the conference committee. My Republican colleague who helps me lead the Aging Committee, Senator COLLINS, has called for the naming of the conference committee.

So let's do it. Let's end the gridlock on this one little thing. Let's compromise. And let's start using some common sense. If we do, you will see a chorus of amens from our fellow countrymen.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, last month I spoke here about the confirmation process and how the majority was committing filibuster fraud.

The leaders on the other side of the aisle, including the majority leader and the majority whip, voted for judicial filibusters more than 20 times by this point in the previous administration.

They succeeded. There were five times as many judicial filibusters at that time during the Bush administration as there have been today. Looking at executive branch nominations, those same Democratic leaders voted to filibuster President Bush's nominees to be Assistant Secretary of Defense and EPA Administrator, and twice voted to filibuster his nominee to be U.N. Ambassador. They must have thought very differently then about whether the President deserves his team. Their actions then spoke more loudly than their words do today whether they think all nominees do deserve an up-or-down vote.

The Senate recently confirmed the Directors of OMB and the CIA, the U.S. Trade Representative, the Secretaries of Energy, Interior, Treasury, State, Transportation, and Commerce this year by a collective vote of 816 to 61. That does not sound like a Senate that is in jeopardy or trouble. In fact, it does not sound like they even have a case to make to do what they have alleged they are going to do.

The Congressional Research Service says the Senate is considering President Obama's executive nominees faster than during President Bush's second term, but none of that is good enough for this majority. They not only want more, but it appears they are willing to get it by any means necessary.

According to media reports, the majority leader is being pushed by political interests to use a parliamentary gimmick to limit or abolish filibusters. In other words, his political base, especially Big Labor, wants him to put short-term partisan politics ahead of the integrity and tradition of the Senate itself. If simply saying that is not enough to show how dangerous it is, we are in more trouble than I thought.

Thomas Jefferson called the Capitol the first temple to the sovereignty of the American people. The people established our Constitution with its separation of powers. They designed the legislative branch with an action-oriented House and a deliberation-oriented Senate. We call ours a system of government because it includes all of these parts designed to be different and yet to work together.

Many people bemoan the division and conflict in Congress, the partisanship and on and on. Yes, there will be conflict over the important issues facing our country. Men and women of different perspectives, views and ideologies and serving different States serve in Congress. But I always thought we should be of one mind about the long-term integrity of the system of our institutions.

For more than two centuries, the Senate has been designed to play its own particular part in the legislative process. Form follows function, they say. So our rules reflect our role. For more than two centuries the minority has had some basic rights in this body, including the right to debate. That right has always annoyed the majority and empowered the minority. I know that from experience, as I have been among the annoyed, just as today I am among the empowered.

The majority knows it too. A decade ago when they were in the minority they began for a time using that right to debate to defeat judicial nominees who otherwise would have been confirmed. Now back in the majority, they want to ban the very tools they found so useful just a few years ago. Now that the majority leader is done using the opportunity for extended debate, he wants to make sure no one else can use it.

Why? For one simple reason. Because they want their way every time. They think they are entitled to it, and if they cannot get it the old-fashioned way, by persuading their colleagues and the American people, then they will simply rig the rules.

This short-term power grab, however, will cause long-term damage to the Senate and to the system of government of which it is such a vital part. Do not think just because they say they are limiting it to the executive branch appointments, excluding judges, do not think that is not going to lead to all kinds of other obnoxious approaches toward the Senate.

A little dose of history provides a big dose of clarity for this debate. For more than a century the right to keep debate going belonged to each individual Senator. There was no rule at all for ending debate. A single Senator could prevent bills from passing by preventing debate from ending.

We have had a rule for ending debate for nearly a century. Today it is easier to end a debate than at any time since the turn of the 19th century—not the 20th century, the 19th century. Not only that, but the majority is using that rule more effectively today to prevent filibusters than the rule has been

used in the past. It is all there in the public record. When we vote to end debate, we prevent a filibuster. A higher percentage of votes to end debate has succeeded in recent Congresses than in the past.

To top it off, just a few months ago, the Senate overwhelmingly adopted two new standing orders and two new standing rules giving the majority even more power considering nominations and legislation. But using the rules to their advantage is not enough for the majority. Gaining even more power through those new orders and rules is not enough. Now the majority threatens to use a parliamentary maneuver to weaken or abolish the right to debate itself.

But as I said, the Senate rules reflect the Senate's role. Changing those rules, especially in the way the majority is talking about, means changing the Senate's role in our system of government. A few partisan victories simply cannot be enough to justify that.

The minority leader has faithfully reminded us of the majority leader's past promises not to change the Senate's rules or procedures except through the process provided for in the rules. On January 27, 2011, the majority leader said: ''I will oppose any effort in this Congress or the next to change the Senate's rules other than through the regular order.'' My question is this: When the majority leader said: ''I will oppose,'' did he really mean ''I will lead''?

The integrity of this institution and the system with which it is a part should matter more than the politics of the moment. If our commitment to this institution and to keeping our word no longer matter, we will be breaking the trust of the American people and failing in our duty to them.

This must not happen. The Senate is a venerable institution. If the majority continues to go down the road they are going down, it is going to be much less venerable, and it is going to be a broken institution. Keep in mind, their decision, if they do choose to do this, will work against them someday.

I have to say that I am very concerned because I believe that not only is it wrong, what they are going to do, but it is based upon false premises. When the majority leader says we have filibustered hundreds of times, that is totally inaccurate, especially when the leader calls up a bill and files cloture immediately just to make it look like we are filibustering. We are fast moving away from being the most deliberative body in the world to one that is just run by the majority, similar to the House of Representatives.

I hope some of the wiser Senators on the Democratic side will prevail. Right now it does not look like they will. But I will tell you this, if we go down the road that the majority leader is talking about, this institution is going to be dramatically changed for the worse.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Utah for his thoughtful remarks. I have been trying to think of a way to put in context what is at stake because the majority leader said in his remarks today: We have changed the rules 18 times. True. We have changed the rules a lot. But we are not talking about changing the rules of the Senate. We are talking about changing the Senate.

That is what the proposal is, changing the Senate from an institution that protects minority rights by requiring 60 votes out of 100 on major matters of importance instead of a majority of votes. You know we grow up and we go to first grade and we learn that the majority wins. So we get that ingrained in ourselves as we grow up in America. It is a good principle, the majority wins. It is a way to resolve disputes and work things out.

But from the very beginning of our country, our most thoughtful observers and visitors have looked at our country and said: But a democracy needs some protections for the minority, for the people with a minority view.

I have mentioned on the floor before that I have been reading Jon Meacham's book about Thomas Jefferson, about the conversation they had after dinner on February 15, 1798. Jefferson wrote about what Adams said to him. Adams said:

No Republic could ever last which had not a Senate. Trusting the popular assembly for the preservation of our liberties is unimaginable.

''Trusting a popular assembly for the preservation of our liberties.'' What did he mean by that? What he meant by that is that the passions in our country—and they particularly happen that way today because of the Internet—can suddenly grow very strong. They happened back at that time in France with the French Revolution, where the population got excited and began to behead people in connection with the French Revolution.

So popular passions can run strong. Our Founders said: We want a House of Representatives that reflects those popular passions, which is why when you go over to the House, they have a Rules Committee. Whoever wins the House by one vote gets nine of the seats and whoever loses gets four of the seats to make it clear that the party that has four of the seats does not have anything to say about anything, so they can bring it up on Monday and pass it on Tuesday.

That is what a popular assembly can do. So Adams was saying to Jefferson: We need another body. We need a Senate that is not so responsive to the popular passions. President Adams and President Jefferson said at the beginning of our country that they did not believe a Republic could stand without such a Senate. That is what they said then. Our most famous visitor to the United States was Alexis de Tocqueville, a young Frenchman who came in the 1830s.

He wrote a book, ''Democracy in America,'' which is probably the best book ever written about democracy in America. He said in this that there are two great dangers he saw in our future democracy. This is when it was very young. One was Russia. That was a prescient comment. But the other was the tyranny of the majority. That is what de Tocqueville said.

The great danger to our democracy is the tyranny of the majority. That means a majority can run over you with a one-vote margin. What does that mean today? Let's say you care about abortion rights. Let's say you care about gay rights.

Let's say you care about climate change. Let's say you didn't support the war in Iraq, you didn't support the war in Afghanistan. Let's say you don't like government snooping, but the majority does. The majority has a view that is different from your view, so they can run over you—in the Senate they can't because they will have to persuade at least 60. It will take some time to do it, and it doesn't always work. You have to stop and think about any issues.

The House can say: No secret ballot in a union election, and they can pass it in a day. It will come to the Senate, and we will say: Let's think about it. We will think about it even if the Democrats are in charge and they are in favor of no secret ballot in a union election because we protect the rights of working men and women across the country who may be in the minority. But we have to stop and think about whether we want to abolish the secret ballot in union elections.

What the majority leader is proposing doing next week is not just changing a rule, he is changing this institution so that whoever has a majority of one can do anything they want to do, anytime they want to do it, and can run over any minority. It doesn't make so much difference that you run over a person in the minority in the Senate—you know, we are just individuals. But what about the views we represent? What about the views of the farmers in North Dakota, mountaineers in Tennessee, or the civil rights workers in Alabama? What about the people in the 1970s who opposed the Vietnam war? The majority? The majority ran over it.

People who are accustomed to being in the minority know the advantage and the importance of having protection of minority rights. They know—and they have studied American history—that the chief defender of minority rights in the history of our country has been the Senate. This is what the majority leader proposes to change. He proposes to make this place like the House, where a freight train can run through it overnight and change abortion rights, change the war attitude, change civil rights, change environmental policy. One vote can do it. Run the train through the House. Run the train through the Senate. Today it

might be a Democratic train. Tomorrow it might be the tea party express.

Our friends on the other side might wish to think about that. I have some very creative colleagues over here. I will bet they could come up with a pretty good agenda of things we would like to do if we had 51 votes and we could do it anyway.

This is not about a rules change. This is about changing the nature of a Senate that John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, George Washington, and the Founders of our country created to be an alternative to a popular assembly and that every majority leader in our history has, in the end, supported in this way.

We should not take this lightly—especially if you are an American person who has an unpopular view. If you feel as though you are in the minority, if you feel that a majority might not agree with you, might even run over you, you do not want the Senate to suddenly be a place where a freight train could run right through it overnight.

You may say: Well, we have the President and the White House.

You may. You do today. You might not tomorrow. You might not tomorrow.

When I came to the Senate 10 years ago one party had both the Senate, the House, and the Presidency. What if we were 10 years ago and we could run a freight train through the House, to the Senate, and send it down to President Bush? We might say that no State in the country—every State in the country must have a right-to-work law. We believe in right-to-work laws. We might have new rules on public unions. We might have different ideas on abortion. We might have different ideas on climate change. If you are in the minority, you wouldn't be able to stop us. You wouldn't even be able to slow us down for a good conversation. We could just run right through town.

Nearly one-half of this body is in its first term. More than half of my Democratic friends have never been in the minority. I have been in the minority in a variety of ways in my lifetime, and I want some protection—more than just from the popular assembly that might run through.

That is why I said this morning that I hope very much that the Democratic leader will accept the request from those of us on the Republican side for all of us Senators to meet together in the Old Senate Chamber where we can meet privately, where we can talk face-to-face.

We can say: We need to understand how in the world the Democratic side could want to change the character of the Senate in this way when in 2 years they could be on the other side. What would make you so angry that you would want to do that?

If you would say to us, you have been filibustering our nominees, we would say to you, I guess you know that none of your nominees have ever been defeated by filibuster. I guess you know that—except for two circuit judges. And you started that because you did five of ours.

You will say: Well, you have been delaying our nominations.

We will say: I hope you know that the Congressional Research Service and the Washington Post say that President Obama's Cabinet nominees have been moving through the Senate more rapidly than President Bush's did and President Clinton's did in their second terms. I hope you know that.

You may say: But you have been holding people up for years.

We will reply: I hope you will look at the Executive Calendar.

It is on everybody's desk here. This is the list of people who can be confirmed in the Senate. How do they get on the Executive Calendar? They come out of committees. Who controls the committees? Democratic majorities. If there is someone who hasn't been confirmed, put him on the calendar. It is your committee that can do it.

Once they get on the calendar, how do they get confirmed? Only one person can manages that schedule—the majority leader. All he has to do is say: I move the nomination of Jacob J. Lew, of New York, to be U.S. Alternate Governor of the International Monetary Fund. He has been on the calendar since April 16, 2013.

You may say: There is an objection to that.

We will say: So what? The majority leader can bring it up, and under our rules we can ask for a 60-vote vote on Mr. Lew to the International Monetary Fund.

He is already in the administration, so that probably wouldn't happen, but let's say it did. The majority leader can bring it up on Monday. We would vote on Wednesday. He would get 60 votes, and then he would be confirmed. That would take one of the 24 people off of this Executive Calendar.

You might say: Well, they have been waiting for years.

We might say: Wait a minute, I have got it right here. The one who has been waiting the longest came to the floor February 26, 2013. That was 4 months ago. There is no one here who has been waiting longer than 4 months, who has been here waiting for us to do something about it. The only one who could move somebody off this calendar to a vote is the majority leader sitting right over there, so what are you talking about?

This is what we would say to you.

You must be angry about something else or you wouldn't be thinking about changing the character of the whole Senate because no one has been denied their seat by filibuster except a circuit judge, and you set the precedent for that. There is no one left to confirm except these nominees for the National Labor Relations Board that President Obama made unconstitutionally on January 24, 2012.

The Republican leader said: You have a Labor Secretary who is controversial.

We all concede that, but the majority leader hasn't moved that we have a vote on him. He has been reported since May; he has been sitting here since May. The majority leader could have been brought him up.

There is a lady nominated for the Environmental Protection Agency. Bring up her nomination. Let's vote on it. There are a couple of other controversial nominations, but all we have to do is vote—except on these unconstitutional nominees.

What do we do about them? Let's make clear what happened to the National Labor Relations Board. In December of 2011 the President sends us two nominees to the National Labor Relations Board. This is the way it is supposed to happen. Their papers then come over to the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee. Senator HATCH used to chair that. I am on that committee now as a ranking member. Before the papers from the White House even get to the committee, the President recess-appoints them. In other words, he used his power to appoint these persons to the NLRB during a recess when the Senate was in session. How do we know it was in session? It was in session, in a pro forma session, which is a device invented by the majority leader, Senator REID, when George W. Bush was President to keep President Bush from making recess appointments.

President Bush didn't like that, these 3-day pro forma sessions, but he respected it.

He said: Our Founders didn't want a king. They created separation of powers. That means checks and balances. I am the President, but I can't do everything. There is Congress over here, and there is a bill of rights over here.

President Bush said: I don't like what Senator REID did. He created these pro forma sessions so I can't make a recess appointment, but I will respect that.

Senator REID has a pro forma session when President Obama is in, and President Obama doesn't respect it and appoints two people. They are still there. The Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia has ruled that unconstitutional, as has the Third Circuit Court of Appeals—two of the highest courts in the land—and they are still there. They are still there making cases unconstitutionally. They have decided 1,031 cases, all of which will be subject to being vacated if the Supreme Court agrees with the Federal courts. We cannot ignore that in the Senate if we wish to preserve the principle of checks and balances in the United States.

I mentioned at the beginning that I like to read history. I said this on the Senate floor, and I will read it again and then conclude because I know other Senators are here.

I was reading Jon Meacham's book about Thomas Jefferson, which I mentioned, and John Adams and Jefferson and how changing the Senate, not changing the rules—but if you change

the Senate rules in this way, that means that the majority, on any day, any year, could come through and do anything it wants do.

They might decide: We don't like the gas in North Dakota, or we don't like the corn in Tennessee. So we are going to change the rules so we can have an advantage that 51 of us can do something about.

They could do that any day. Do it now; do it then.

I mentioned that history. I mentioned de Tocqueville's history. But here is the last piece of history I will mention once more. This is chapter 7 of Senator REID's book in 2007. Chapter 7 is entitled ''The Nuclear Option.'' I had just come to the Senate. He talks about me in this chapter and gives me some credit for the gang that was formed to preserve the Senate at the time when another majority leader was trying to change the character of the Senate.

I see the distinguished majority leader, so I will defer to his comments. Maybe it is appropriate for me to read them. Senator REID wrote in 2007:

Peaceable and productive are not two words I would use to describe Washington in 2005.

I just couldn't believe that Bill Frist was going to do this.

The storm had been gathering all year, and word from conservative columnists and in conservative circles was that Senator Frist of Tennessee, who was the majority leader, had decided to pursue a rules change that would kill the filibuster for judicial nominations.

This is Senator REID's book. It is an excellent book, and I appreciate being mentioned in it.

Senator REID continues:

And once you opened that Pandora's box, it was just a matter of time before a Senate leader who couldn't get his way on something moved to eliminate the filibuster for regular business as well. And that, simply put, would be the end of the United States Senate.

I believe that. I believe it would be. It is not a mere rules change. Anytime this body changes its rules in the middle of a session without following the 67-vote rules cloture requirement, anytime it does that, it doesn't matter what it is for, it could do it again for a matter of precedent. If it does it for judicial nominations, the importance of the change is not whether it is a good idea to have an up-or-down vote on judicial nominations, the importance of the change is that with 51 votes you can do anything you want at any time. That, in de Tocqueville's words, in his foresight and his prescience in the 1830s, takes away from the people of the United States their greatest protection of their liberties because it encourages the tyranny of the majority.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant majority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I have great respect for the Senator from Tennessee. He is my friend. We have worked together successfully and I hope we will in the future, but I would take exception to his conclusions about the current status of the Senate.

I have been in the Senate—now my 17th year. I have seen this institution change dramatically—dramatically—in 17 years. We have faced more gridlock, more wasted time than I ever imagined could occur in this great institution. It has become commonplace for us to face filibuster after filibuster after filibuster.

People at home who would turn on C–SPAN to watch the Senate Chamber would have to get close to their television screens and look to see if there was any evidence of life on the floor of the Senate. Are those people actually moving? Are they awake? We go on for 30 hours at a time doing nothing around here. Why? Because we are facing a record number of filibusters from the other side of the aisle.

Time and again, when we have important issues come up, they ground to a halt for 30-hour periods of time. We are lucky to do one or two things of substance a week. Oh, there are exceptions. A couple weeks ago we did an immigration bill. I thought it was one of our better moments. But it was a rare moment in the Senate.

Too often now we are facing filibusters on the President's nominees. Make no mistake, President Barack Obama won the election on November 6 last year. Some on the other side of the aisle are in complete denial of that reality. Winning that election, this President has a responsibility to lead this Nation. He wants to put together a team to lead. He brings the names to the Senate for confirmation, but time and again they are facing filibusters from the Republican side of the aisle.

There is one that even precedes the last election. Richard Cordray, who was Attorney General of the State of Ohio—an extraordinarily gifted public servant—was chosen by President Obama to head up the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. This is the only consumer protection bureau in the Federal Government. It is an important agency. We created it with the Dodd-Frank financial disclosure reform bill. For more than 2 years—more than 2 years—Mr. Cordray's nomination has been held on the floor of the Senate by the Republican minority. That is unacceptable and it is fundamentally unfair.

No one has ever raised a question about this nominee's competence or about his integrity. Yet they will not approve him because they do not like the notion of a consumer protection agency. That is it. So to stop the agency from functioning they are going to stop this appointment by President Obama—for 2 years.

The National Labor Relations Board sits down in judgment of labor practices across America for the safety of our workers, the organization of workers. It is an important agency. But in the words of former Senator Dale Bumpers, there are some on the other side of the aisle who hate the National Labor Relations Board like the Devil hates holy water. They do not want to see it exist, but they can't abolish it. They know that. So they stop it from having a functioning majority. They stop nominees the President submits to fill the vacancies at the National Labor Relations Board time and time again.

The same thing is true when it comes to the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives as well. This is an agency opposed by many in the gun lobby. So since the time we have said that agency shall be filled by senatorial appointment, there has never ever been a person appointed.

It is the approach of those on the other side of the aisle to stop agencies from doing their work. This has to come to an end. I don't want to see this happen in the Senate, this confrontation over rules, but I don't want to see the current situation continue either.

Earlier this year Senator HARRY REID, the majority leader from Nevada, met with the Republican leaders, sat down and worked out a bipartisan agreement to avoid what we are facing right now. He was criticized by many Democrats who said: Come on, Harry, they are just leading you along; they are not going to work with you. You will find out, if you don't change the rules of the Senate, you are not going to get the job done.

But HARRY REID said: I would rather try to do it on a bipartisan basis by agreement. He made that effort, and it didn't work. Today we find ourselves in the situation with key executive appointments being stalled and held up.

Listen to this: Gina McCarthy was nominated by President Obama to head the Environmental Protection Agency. What is her background? Her background was serving as head of the EPA in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts—the State of the Presiding Officer—under Governor Romney. She was Governor Romney's cabinet official for the EPA in Massachusetts. She not only has credentials, she is clearly bipartisan in her approach. So her name came before the regular Senate process. What did the other side do? They submitted a few questions for her to answer. No, not just a few, they broke all Senate records. They gave her a list of 1,100 questions to answer before they would consider her nomination. That is what we are up against—clear tactics to delay and stall even good people from serving, holds on nominees that go on indefinitely. These sorts of things have to come to an end. If we are going to end the obstruction in this Senate, if we are going to give to the President the power and the authority to lead this Nation, as he was elected to do, the Senate can no longer stand as a blockade and obstruction to that exercise of authority granted to the President by the people of the United States of America. That is what this is about.

A number of my Republican colleagues have reached out to me in the

last few days saying: Is there a way to avoid this? There is. There is. If we come to the point where we can sit down and work this out together, resolve these nominees, all the better. It would be a good day for the Senate if it could be achieved. But the notion we are going to walk away from these Presidential nominees or other key nominees in the future isn't fair. I invite my Republican colleagues to vote no if they disapprove of the President's nominees. That is their right and it is their duty. But to stop the Senate from even coming to a vote on these nominees has gone on for way too long.

I urge my colleagues to try to find some way to resolve this issue. But if we can't, let's end the obstruction in the Senate and make sure the rules reflect the reality that a President should have the executive appointments he needs to lead this Nation.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I know we have been talking about the nominations process here on the floor and in caucus meetings, but I think it is worth reviewing the facts and comparing President Obama's nominees to how nominees of President Clinton and President George W. Bush have been treated, because I think there is broad misunderstanding. And, of course, when you don't know what the facts are—or the facts you truly believe in are wrong—then you are going to reach the wrong conclusion.

I think a fair look at the facts will demonstrate that President Obama and his nominees have been treated more than fairly. As a matter of fact, 1,560 nominees of President Obama have been confirmed during the 4½ years he has been President, and 4 have been rejected. That is not a bad ratio, 1,560 to 4.

When you start looking at how long it has taken for the President's Cabinet nominees to be confirmed, President Obama's Cabinet nominees have waited, on average, about 51 days from the time they were nominated until the time they were confirmed. For President George W. Bush it was 52 days, and for President Bill Clinton it was 55 days. So certainly President Obama has nothing to complain about, at least relative to President George W. Bush and President Clinton in terms of the amount of time it has taken for his nominees to be voted on by the Senate.

As far as judges are concerned, there have been 199 of President Obama's nominees confirmed to the U.S. District Court; only 2 of them have been defeated. That is a 99-percent success rate, which I think is pretty good in anybody's book.

President Obama has had 28 judges at the district court, circuit court, and other article III courts, so 28 for President Obama and 10 for President George W. Bush at this same point in their Presidency.

Someone once said that facts are stubborn. But if you acknowledge the facts, it is hard for me to understand where this sense of outrage and urgency comes from with regard to the President's nominees.

Indeed, the renewed sense of urgency of our colleagues across the aisle to change the longstanding rules of the Senate is based either on a misunderstanding of the facts or—I am sorry to say—willful ignorance is the only other alternative.

So this is a manufactured crisis with no grounding in objective reality. That is about the nicest way I can say it. The facts show that President Obama's nominees have moved through the Senate at a pace quicker than his predecessors.

So what about the nominees to the National Labor Relations Board? These are a special case, because the Circuit Court of Appeals in the District of Columbia found that the President exceeded his constitutional authority to make an appointment to these NLRB positions in a reported opinion from the court. But—this is important—it wasn't because Congress or the Senate denied the President his choice for these NLRB appointees. In fact, the President nominated them on December 15, 2011, right before Christmas. So the President nominates them right before Christmas, on December 15, 2011, and the President recess-appointed these same nominees on January 4, 2012.

What was so astonishing about that is the paperwork for the nominations hadn't even made its way over to the Senate, and the committee of jurisdiction had not even had an opportunity to have a hearing on these nominees. But in spite of that, the President sought to circumvent the advice and consent function for the Senate that is written in the U.S. Constitution and make what he called a recess appointment.

Another notable fact about that is the President himself decided—not the Senate—when we were in recess, leaving the Court of Appeals, when they reviewed this recess appointment and holding it unconstitutional, to say there is no real difference between what the President did in terms of determining the Senate was in recess and deciding to do it while we were breaking for lunch, and held that it was not constitutional. So Senators were not even given a chance to review his nominees to the National Labor Relations Board, much less block them.

After the court ruled these appointments unconstitutional, the President renominated them this past February. They were reported out of the committee in May, and due to the inaction of the majority leader—who is essentially the traffic cop for the Senate floor—they haven't even been put up for a vote by the majority leader.

This is another important fact that I think most people don't fully appreciate. If I wanted to propose a nominee, I wouldn't have any standing to do so. It is the majority leader of the Senate, representing the majority party, who is the one who determines when these nominees will come up for a vote. So to say that somehow it is the minority's fault these individuals haven't been put up for a vote completely distorts how the Senate operates and is a disingenuous approach, to say the least.

We should recall that Republicans and Democrats came to a genuine compromise on the matter of nominations at the beginning of this Congress and a deal was struck: In exchange for Republican support, the majority leader gave his word here on the Senate floor that he would not attempt to change the Senate rules other than through regular order.

What that means, as the distinguished Senator from Kansas, the ranking member of the Rules Committee, knows, is going through the Rules Committee and coming to the floor, with 67 votes, to change the Standing Rules of the U.S. Senate. So the majority leader gave his word that he would not try to invoke the so-called nuclear option—which we are now threatened with—but would, rather, seek to change the rules through the regular order, which would require 67 votes on the Senate floor.

As it turns out, Senator REID is apparently willing to go back on his word and is now poised to break the rules of the Senate in order to get his way, in order to change the rules.

We have questioned many of our colleagues about, Why would there be such an extraordinary power grab and breaking of one's word when it comes to how the rules changed, and wondered, what is the rationale for this?

When we have gone through the same facts I described earlier, which show President Obama's nominees have been treated at least as fairly—or even more fairly, one could argue—than President Clinton and President George W. Bush, our Democratic colleagues have said, Well, this is a narrow, modest change that would only apply to nominees to positions in this administration.

That is not the way the Senate works. If you break the rules in order to change the rules, in this instance, there is a slippery slope, to say the least, to extend this same practice not only to executive nominations but also to Federal judges and to ordinary legislation, which would allow the tyranny of the majority and deny the minority an opportunity to influence ordinary legislation or to make sure its voice was heard when it comes to nominees. So the argument that this is some sort of a narrow fix designed to break some imaginary logjam with regard to this administration's executive nominees is false.

The fact is, if the majority leader goes through with this nuclear option, as it is called, he will have set a new precedent in the Senate—one that says it is permissible to break the rules of the Senate at any point simply to get your own way, if the majority has the gumption to do it.

I hope the majority leader is aware of the magnitude of this decision. Even more importantly than that, I hope Members of the Democratic caucus understand what this means.

I have been here long enough to have been in the majority and the minority. I can tell you that being in the majority is a lot more fun. But I can also tell you that majorities and minorities are fleeting. The shoe will be on the other foot. It is simply shortsighted and, I believe, an abuse of our process to try to jam these nominees through based on some manufactured and imaginary crisis and change the Senate as we know it forever.

I hope the majority leader understands the consequences will forever alter the nature of this institution—and not one based on just the rules but based on the relationships that are so important to getting anything done here.

We all understand the rules are important. But fundamentally, the way the Senate operates—regardless of whether Republican or Democratic, regardless of where we come from—is your word is your bond. We have to be able to believe it. No matter what their political differences may be, when colleagues across the aisle give their word, you have to be able to depend on it. And if we can't depend on your word and we can't depend on the majority leader's word when he said he won't invoke the nuclear option, it forever undermines the important relationship and bonds of trust and confidence we should be able to have in this institution.

Just to go over a few other short points:

According to the Congressional Research Service, the Senate is considering President Obama's executive nominations faster than any other recent President. I talked about that recently. But here are some of the President's Cabinet nominees who have been confirmed recently:

The Energy Secretary, confirmed 97–0. The only reason we had to vote on it is because the majority leader finally decided to put that nomination on the floor. It was unanimous, 97–0. Everybody who was here voted in favor of that nomination.

The Secretary of Interior was 87–11; Secretary of Treasury, Jack Lew, 71–26; the Office of Management and Budget, 96–0; Secretary of State John Kerry was confirmed 94–3—and he was confirmed only 7 days after the Senate got his nomination; the Administrator for the Centers of Medicare and Medicaid Services was confirmed 91–7; the Chair of the Securities and Exchange Commission was confirmed by voice vote. There wasn't even a recorded vote. That is essentially a unanimous decision of the Senate; Secretary of Transportation, 100–0; Secretary of Commerce, 97–1.

It is worth recalling some of the words that were spoken by different Members of the Senate, because this is the kind of thing that will come back to haunt you if you flip-flop and take a different position later on.

This is Senator HARRY REID, December 8, 2006:

> As majority leader, I intend to run the Senate with respect for the rules and for the minority rights the rules protect. The Senate was established to make sure that minorities are protected. Majorities can always protect themselves, but minorities cannot. That is what the Senate is all about.

Then there is the majority whip Senator DURBIN. This is April 15, 2005:

> Those who would attack and destroy the institution of the filibuster are attacking the very force within the Senate that creates compromise and bipartisanship.

Well, if that is true—and I agree it is true—why in the world would any Senator vote to destroy the very force within the Senate that creates compromise and bipartisanship, particularly when we are making decisions here that affect 319 million Americans.

Then there is the President of the United States when he was in the Senate, April 13, 2005. Then-Senator Barack Obama said:

> If the majority chooses to end the filibuster, if they choose to change the rules and put an end to the democratic debate, then the fighting, the bitterness, and the gridlock will only get worse.

I realize we are passionate about our positions on the various issues that come before the Senate, and that is entirely appropriate. We all have convictions about these important issues. But this is the only place perhaps left in the country, I believe, where we can actually debate these in an open and responsible way and be held accountable by the people who send us here—in my case, 26 million Texans.

But if we are willing to engage in this sort of shifty behavior, if we are willing to break our word in order to get momentary political advantage, then I think the public's confidence in the Senate is going to be completely undermined, and we will have lost our effectiveness. Also, perhaps just as significantly, the very bonds of trust that are so important in order to get things done around here will have been broken.

For what? For a temporary advantage over five or six or seven executive nominees. I daresay if Senator REID had put these nominations on the floor, we would have seen the vast majority of them confirmed a long time ago. The only reason they were not is because he chose not to do so. What he has done is to put them on the floor now, in this period of time before the August recess, to create a manufactured crisis so he can then invoke the nuclear option and somehow convince Members of his own caucus that they ought to be party to breaking the Senate rules in order to gain temporary advantage. It is incredibly shortsighted, and I think it will exacerbate the gridlock and the divisions here rather than help us try to find ways to build consensus and work together in the best interests of the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam President, thank you for being able to maintain order in this very crowded Chamber.

It should be a crowded Chamber. It is not. I say it should be because this should be a required debate. As a matter of fact, we should have had the debate.

I am the ranking member of the Senate Rules Committee. The distinguished Senator from Texas just pointed out if we went to regular order, we would be having a meeting of the Rules Committee, having a very interesting debate, a very educational debate. I think especially for the class of 2010 and the class of 2012 on the majority side, who did not have the advantage of listening to Bob Byrd's lecture to every class that came in, his sermon to every class that came in—we all became born again to our responsibilities as Senators, seeing the light with only his advantage of being both in the majority and the minority. I regret that is not the case. I regret we are not in the Rules Committee.

I rise, like the distinguished Senator from Texas and others who have spoken about this, our leader, Senator ALEXANDER in particular, giving us a real history on what is going on here or what is not going on. We are trying to discuss the so-called nuclear option that the majority leader reportedly wishes to employ.

We are apparently brought to this point as a result of the leader's frustration. I was here when, obviously, he was simply frustrated with the pace of the Senate and how the Senate operates. This really comes down to the NLRB and the appointments to the NLRB and the fact that two courts found these appointments were illegal. That is what our side objects to. It is not especially to the appointments.

Apparently, we are going to have a cloture vote on it, and apparently the nuclear gun is cocked and ready to be pulled. There is a country western song, ''Don't take your guns to town, son. Leave your guns at home.'' HARRY, don't take that nuclear gun to this body. Take it back to Searchlight, NV. Put it back in its holster if in fact the nuclear gun has a holster. That would be my advice.

I would say this about the majority leader. I have known him for a long time. We worked together on the Ethics Committee—and I mean we worked together. As majority leader I have had a good relationship with him. He has a good sense of humor. Sometimes that doesn't show, but he actually does.

I remember one time he was conducting a mini-filibuster. I don't remember the issue. I was the Acting Presiding Officer. I was listening to him talking about how rabbits were eating the cactus in front of his home in Searchlight, NV; whereupon I took the floor and we engaged in quite a colloquy about rabbits and cactus and not to sit on cactus. There are a lot of cactus in the world.

This is probably the biggest one we are attempting to sit on, and I just don't think it is a good idea.

The majority leader was a boxer. He was a good one. His hero is Smokin' Joe, Smokin' Joe Frazier. So when I talk to him, I call him Smokin' Joe. My appeal to him, if he is listening—he probably isn't, but if he reads about this, or if his staff tells him, tell him your old friend from the Ethics Committee had some advice. Smokin' Joe used to wait until the late rounds. He was in better shape. But he knew when to hold them and when to fold them. He was a great champion.

We do not need to go down this road. We really don't need to go down this road. Apparently, the majority leader has determined that—and this is my view—he will have to destroy the Senate in order to save it.

Those are pretty strong words. Those are harsh words, but I intend them to be. We should not be confused about this. By breaking the rules to change the rules the majority seeks to destroy what has made the Senate great, unique in the history of the world. I am repeating the advice we all got from Senator Byrd, the institutional flame of the Senate. Again, every time a new class came in, he would give his sermon or his lecture or his advice or his counsel, and we all took it, regardless of whether we were Democrat or Republican.

The Senate has always been the one place where all Americans could be assured they would have a voice. Every American, no matter what State they happened to live in or what political party they belonged to, knew they would be represented here. Kansas, Massachusetts, wherever; they knew they would be represented. Minority views were respected. Even if your party was not in power, you still had a voice.

Unfortunately, if you pull that trigger on that nuclear gun, the majority will abolish that. If you take that step, that is surely going to lead to complete control of this institution by the majority. That has been predicted by virtually everybody who has spoken, and I intend to quote a lot of majority leaders and a lot of people in the Senate on the Democratic side who have pointed this out.

I know some on the other side, especially those who have never been in the minority, will seek to minimize the import of what they are doing. Oh, it is just a small change. They will claim what they are trying to do is very limited, applying only to executive nominations.

I wish I had a chart. But if you look at the difference of 68 percent on civilian nominations that were confirmed in past administrations in the 106th Congress, and you are talking, 68, 72, in that neighborhood, and then you move clear up here to the 112th Congress, and President Obama is 82 percent, 86 percent—what is the deal? Other than being upset about the NLRB.

Make no mistake. The change itself will be less important than the manner in which it is imposed. Let me repeat that. The change itself will be less important than the manner in which it is imposed. If the majority decides to write new rules with a simple majority vote, regardless of the issue, ignoring the existing rules that require a supermajority to achieve such a change, it will put us on a path that will surely lead to total control of this body by the majority.

As of today there is only one House of Congress where the majority has total control. The majority wishes, apparently, now, there were two—or there will be two.

We do not have to wonder what the Senate will become if they get their wish. We only need to look to the House of Representatives. We will become the Senior House. I don't know about the Upper House or the Lower House—perhaps we will be the Upper House—but we will become the House.

I know that doesn't mean much to many of my colleagues who have never been in the minority or served in the House. I served as an administrative assistant to a wonderful House Member for 12 years and was in the House for 16 years. I have the privilege of now serving my third term in the Senate. I have been in the majority and I have been in the minority. The Senator from Texas is surely right, the majority is better.

Many of you folks who should be here have never served in the House. Many of you have never served in the minority. I have done both, as I have indicated. Let me explain what it means to serve in the minority in the House to those who have never had this wonderful privilege.

In the House, no bill comes to the floor without a rule. The rule governs the length of debate and the amendments that will be considered. If you want to even speak on the bill, you have to get the bill manager to give you some of the very limited time available under the rule. If there is not enough time, you will not be able to even speak on it.

The majority in the House writes the rule, and they decide how much time they will allow. The rule also determines what amendments will be considered. If the rule does not allow for consideration of your amendment it will not be considered, it will not be debated, and it will not be voted on. The majority in the House decides what amendments will be considered.

If you are a member of the majority, they might allow consideration of your amendment—if you are in good standing with the Rules Committee. If you are a member of the minority, you can forget about getting a vote on your amendment. If the majority does not want to allow it, it will not happen. As a member of the minority there is nothing that you can do about it.

I know about this. I remember when I first went to the House Rules Committee under a very determined, aggressive chairman of the Rules Committee. I had an amendment that I thought was well placed, well taken, pertinent. It was on agriculture. It was on something that dealt with the farm bill or agricultural program policy. But I was a Republican. I went in and I thought this amendment would be considered under parliamentary procedure whether it would be germane or not. Guess what. It was just a rehash of a partisan debate because it was not bipartisan. We had a lot of bipartisan support for it.

So my amendment was not allowed. Then I figured it out. Charlie Stenholm was from Texas—well, he still is from Texas and he is still active in the agriculture community. Very active, very respected. Charlie wanted the same amendment. So I finally figured out, let Stenholm introduce my amendment, but don't tell them it is my amendment.

So Stenholm introduced my amendment and then as soon as it was approved by the House Rules Committee, then it became the Stenholm-Roberts amendment. If it passed, obviously, it became the Roberts-Stenholm amendment in Kansas and the Stenholm-Roberts amendment in Texas, and that is how we got things done. So we had the Stenholm-Roberts for quite a few years. I never went into the Rules Committee because if I did I knew I would lose. Boy, talk about one-party rule.

We don't want to do that. Guess what. We had a revolution back in 1994. I became chairman of the Agriculture Committee. All of a sudden the Stenholm-Roberts amendment became the Roberts-Stenholm amendment, and that is how it worked in the House of Representatives.

I don't think we want to do that. It is precisely for this reason that many Members of the House choose to run for the Senate. That is why I did it. The Senate is supposed to be different. Here, if you want to be heard on a bill, it will happen. We haven't been living up to that recently, but that is how the place is supposed to work. In the Senate the Senator's right to speak is not supposed to depend on the whim of the majority. Now it is on a whim and a prayer. That is why people run for the Senate. That is what has distinguished this body from the House since we first convened in 1789.

The majority, unfortunately, wants to erase that distinction. It wants to assure that Members do not have any rights beyond those which the majority is willing to grant.

You don't have to take my word for it. The distinguished majority leader—

whom I affectionately call Smokin' Joe—himself has recognized this. As my colleague, Senator ALEXANDER, from that desk right over there, has previously noted, Senator REID addressed this topic in his book—how appropriate—''The Good Fight,'' from a boxer and now our majority leader. Senator REID wrote about the battle over the nuclear option in 2005. Things were a little different. This is what he wrote:

Once you opened that Pandora's box, it was just a matter of time before a Senate leader who couldn't get his way on something moved to eliminate the filibuster for regular business as well. And that, simply put, would be the end of the United States Senate.

The end of the United States Senate.

The distinguished majority leader said:

It is the genius of the Founders that they conceived the Senate as a solution to the small state/big state problem. And central to that solution was the protection of the rights of the minority. A filibuster is the minority's way of not allowing the majority to shut off debate, and without robust debate, the Senate is crippled.

Senator REID went on to say:

Such a move would transform the body into an institution that looked just like the House of Representatives where everything passes with a simple majority.

Senator REID also wrote:

there will come a time when we will all be gone, and the institutions that we now serve will be run by men and women not yet living, and those institutions will either function well because we've taken care of them, or they will be in disarray and someone else's problem to solve.

Boy, that is pretty heavy stuff; that is meaningful. That is something everybody here should consider.

He described the nuclear option this way at that time:

In a fit of partisan fury—

I am not quite sure we are there yet. I would say it is more of a partisan frustration.

they were trying to blow up the Senate. Senate rules can only be changed by a two-thirds vote of the Senate, or sixty-seven Senators. The Republicans were going to do it illegally with a simple majority, or fifty-one. Vice President Cheney was prepared to overrule the Senate parliamentarian. Future generations be damned.

Do you think the Senator was upset then? He was upset then a heck of a lot more than he was this morning. If only the majority leader would recall his own words.

The Vice President also recognized the damage this would do. This is what Vice President BIDEN said on the floor when he was still a Member of this body. This is important stuff. We all know JOE BIDEN. We are all a friend of JOE BIDEN. He is the Vice President of the United States. When he was a Senator he said something very important:

Put simply, the nuclear option would transform the Senate from the so-called cooling saucer our Founding Fathers talked about to cool the passions of the day to a pure majoritarian body like a Parliament.

Republicans control the Senate, and they have decided they are going to change the rule. At its core, the filibuster is not about stopping a nominee or a bill, it is about compromise and moderation. That is why the Founders put unlimited debate in. When you have to—and I never conducted a filibuster—but if I did, the purpose would be that you have to deal with me as one Senator. It does not mean I get my way. It means you may have to compromise. You may have to see my side of the argument. That is what it is it about, engendering compromise in moderation.

JOE BIDEN went on to say:

If there is one thing I have learned in my years here, once you change the rules and surrender the Senate's institutional power, you never get it back.

Folks, we are about to break the rules to change the rules.

He went on to say:

The nuclear option abandons America's sense of fair play. It is the one thing this country stands for: Not tilting the playing field on the side of those who control and own the field.

Then he said to the Republican side of the aisle, which was then in the majority:

I say to my friends on the Republican side: You may own the field right now, but you won't own it forever. I pray God when the Democrats take back control, we don't make the kind of naked power grab you are doing. But I am afraid you will teach my new colleagues the wrong lessons.

We are only in the Senate as temporary custodians of the Senate. The Senate will go on. Mark my words, history will judge this Republican majority harshly, if it makes this catastrophic move.

I hope the Vice President will listen to his own prayers. We don't need any divine intervention here, but maybe he can share his concerns with the majority leader. It could help us avert a real catastrophe.

The majority leader and the Vice President are not the only people who recognize the damage that would be done by triggering the so-called nuclear option. Our former Parliamentarian, named Bob Dove—a man whose advice I sought when I had the privilege of being the acting Presiding Officer—and Richard Arenberg, a professor and one-time aide to former majority leader George Mitchell, wrote a book on the subject, ''Defending the Filibuster.''

I know I am quoting a lot, but these are important issues. I hope they stick like a burr under your saddle so they make you stop and think about this. They wrote—

If a 51-vote majority is empowered to rewrite the Senate's rules, the day will come, as it did in the House of Representatives, when a majority will construct rules that give it near absolute control over amendments and debate. And there is no going back from that. No majority in the House of Representatives has or ever will voluntarily relinquish that power in order to give the minority a greater voice in crafting legislation.

Do not be fooled by those who would try to minimize the impact of what the majority is actually contemplating.

The rule changes themselves are less important than the manner in which they will be imposed. Once the majority has decided it can set the rules, there is no limit to what the majority might do in the future. I hope you understand that. There are no constraints. The majority claims these changes are necessary to make the Senate function. If it decides further changes are needed, it will make them. The minority will have no voice, no say, no power, and that has never been the case in the Senate.

Tragically, what the majority contemplates is at once both calamitous and totally unnecessary. The filibuster is a product of our dysfunction, not the source.

I know many Members—and I have harped on this—do not even know what it is like to serve in a functioning Senate. They hardly know what it is like to operate under regular order where bills are referred to committee, amended, brought to the floor, debated, amended, and passed.

This matter should be before the Rules Committee. We should have a complete hearing and then bring it to the floor. We averted this at the first of this year. I know people think the filibuster is to blame for this breakdown, but they are wrong. We don't operate under regular order here because the majority leadership doesn't want to. They have an agenda. I understand that.

They have been trying to operate this place like the House of Representatives for years. They want to control debate and to control the amendments.

I know a little bit about this. When we were talking about the farm bill last year, Senator REID said: We can't do a farm bill in less than 3 weeks. I said: We will do it in 3 days. Senator STABENOW and I worked very hard to get common agreement on the farm bill, but we did it. We needed regular order. We needed to open it up. We needed to give Senators here on our side a chance to at least offer amendments, and we did it. We had 73 amendments. We did it in 2½ days. We had regular order and people said: Gee, is this what the Senate used to be all about? And that was the case. So it can work.

I know there are folks over there who think the filibuster is to blame for this breakdown, but they are wrong. Rather than give up that control, they have decided during the past 4 years—with the exception of a few bills I have just mentioned—I think they want to make it official. I think they would rather blow up the Senate rather than let it work its will.

It will be a tragedy. They think it will save the Senate, but it will destroy it. That threat of destruction may not be obvious to some today, but it is real. If the nuclear option is deployed, one day it will become clear to all. And when that day comes and people wonder: What happened to the Senate? When did it die? We will know the answer. It died the day the nuclear option was triggered. That is what nuclear devices do—they destroy. This is not just

a minor shot across the bow to be used only once. This is a mushroom cloud over the Capitol.

Again, I urge the distinguished majority leader: Don't take your nuclear gun to town.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have the remarks by U.S. Senator Robert C. Byrd at the orientation of new Senators, December 3, 1996, printed in the RECORD.

I also ask unanimous consent that Senator Byrd's final speech before the Rules Committee called ''The Filibuster And Its Consequences'' be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS BY U.S. SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD AT THE ORIENTATION OF NEW SENATORS, DECEMBER 3, 1996

Good afternoon and welcome to the United States Senate Chamber. You are presently occupying what I consider to be ''hallowed ground.'' You will shortly join the ranks of a very select group of individuals who have been honored with the title of United States Senator since 1789 when the Senate first convened. The creator willing, you will be here for at least six years. Make no mistake about it, the office of United States Senator is the highest political calling in the land. The Senate can remove from office Presidents, members of the Federal judiciary, and other Federal officials but only the Senate itself can expel a Senator.

Let us listen for a moment to the words of James Madison on the role of the Senate.

''These [reasons for establishing the Senate] were first to protect the people against their rulers: secondly to protect the people against the transient impression into which they themselves might be led. [through their representatives in the lower house] A people deliberating in a temperate moment, and with the experience of other nations before them, on the plan of government most likely to secure their happiness, would first be aware, that those charged with the public happiness, might betray their trust. An obvious precaution against this danger would be to divide the trust between different bodies of men, who might watch and check each other. . . . It would next occur to such a people, that they themselves were liable to temporary errors, through want of information as to their true interest, and that men chosen for a short term, [House members], . . . might err from the same cause. This reflection would naturally suggest that the Government be so constituted, as that one of its branches might have an opportunity of acquiring a competent knowledge of the public interests. Another reflection equally becoming a people on such an occasion, would be that they themselves, as well as a numerous body of Representatives, were liable to err also, from fickleness and passion. A necessary fence against this danger would be to select a portion of enlightened citizens, whose limited number, and firmness might seasonably interpose against impetuous councils, . . .''

Ladies and gentlemen, you are shortly to become part of that all important, ''necessary fence,'' which is the United States Senate. Let me give you the words of Vice President Aaron Burr upon his departure from the Senate in 1805. ''This house,'' said he, ''is a sanctuary; a citadel of law, of order, and of liberty; and it is here—it is here, in this exalted refuge; here, if anywhere, will resistance be made to the storms of political phrensy and the silent arts of corruption; and if the Constitution be destined ever to perish by the sacrilegious hand of the demagogue or the usurper, which God avert, its expiring agonies will be witnessed on this floor.'' Gladstone referred to the Senate as ''that remarkable body—the most remarkable of all the inventions of modern politics.''

This is a very large class of new Senators. There are fifteen of you. It has been sixteen years since the Senate welcomed a larger group of new members. Since 1980, the average size class of new members has been approximately ten. Your backgrounds vary. Some of you may have served in the Executive Branch. Some may have been staffers here on the Hill. Some of you have never held federal office before. Over half of you have had some service in the House of Representatives.

Let us clearly understand one thing. The Constitution's Framers never intended for the Senate to function like the House of Representatives. That fact is immediately apparent when one considers the length of a Senate term and the staggered nature of Senate terms. The Senate was intended to be a continuing body. By subjecting only one-third of the Senate's membership to reelection every two years, the Constitution's Framers ensured that two-thirds of the membership would always carry over from one Congress to the next to give the Senate an enduring stability.

The Senate and, therefore, Senators were intended to take the long view and to be able to resist, if need be, the passions of the often intemperate House. Few, if any, upper chambers in the history of the western world have possessed the Senate's absolute right to unlimited debate and to amend or block legislation passed by a lower House.

Looking back over a period of 208 years, it becomes obvious that the Senate was intended to be significantly different from the House in other ways as well. The Constitutional Framers gave the Senate the unique executive powers of providing advice and consent to presidential nominations and to treaties, and the sole power to try and to remove impeached officers of the government. In the case of treaties, the Senate, with its longer terms, and its ability to develop expertise through the device of being a continuing body, has often performed invaluable service.

I have said that as long as the Senate retains the power to amend and the power of unlimited debate, the liberties of the people will remain secure. The Senate was intended to be a forum for open and free debate and for the protection of political minorities. I have led the majority and I have led the minority, and I can tell you that there is nothing that makes one fully appreciate the Senate's special role as the protector of minority interests like being in the minority. Since the Republican Party was created in 1854, the Senate has changed hands 14 times, so each party has had the opportunity to appreciate first-hand the Senate's role as guardian of minority rights. But, almost from its earliest years the Senate has insisted upon its members' right to virtually unlimited debate.

When the Senate reluctantly adopted a cloture rule in 1917, it made the closing of debate very difficult to achieve by requiring a super majority and by permitting extended post-cloture debate. This deference to minority views sharply distinguishes the Senate from the majoritarian House of Representatives. The Framers recognized that a minority can be right and that a majority can be wrong. They recognized that the Senate should be a true deliberative body—a forum in which to slow the passions of the House, hold them up to the light, examine them, and, thru informed debate, educate the public. The Senate is the proverbial saucer intended to cool the cup of coffee from the House. It is the one place in the whole government where the minority is guaranteed a public airing of its views. Woodrow Wilson observed that the Senate's informing function was as important as its legislating function, and now, with televised Senate debate, its informing function plays an even larger and more critical role in the life of our nation.

Many a mind has been changed by an impassioned plea from the minority side. Important flaws in otherwise good legislation have been detected by discerning minority members engaged in thorough debate, and important compromise which has worked to the great benefit of our nation has been forged by an intransigent member determined to filibuster until his views were accommodated or at least seriously considered.

The Senate is often soundly castigated for its inefficiency, but in fact, it was never intended to be efficient. Its purpose was and is to examine, consider, protect, and to be a totally independent source of wisdom and judgment on the actions of the lower house and on the executive. As such, the Senate is the central pillar of our Constitutional system. I hope that you, as new members will study the Senate in its institutional context because that is the best way to understand your personal role as a United States Senator. Your responsibilities are heavy. Understand them, live up to them, and strive to take the long view as you exercise your duties. This will not always be easy.

The pressures on you will, at times, be enormous. You will have to formulate policies, grapple with issues, serve the constituents in your state, and cope with the media. A Senator's attention today is fractured beyond belief. Committee meetings, breaking news, fundraising, all of these will demand your attention, not to mention personal and family responsibilities. But, somehow, amidst all the noise and confusion, you must find the time to reflect, to study, to read, and, especially, to understand the absolutely critically important institutional role of the Senate.

May I suggest that you start by carefully reading the Constitution and the Federalist papers. In a few weeks, you will stand on the platform behind me and take an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; to bear true faith and allegiance to the same; and take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and to well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter: So help you God.

Note especially the first 22 words, ''I do solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies foreign and domestic . . .'' In order to live up to that solemn oath, one must clearly understand the deliberately established inherent tensions between the 3 branches, commonly called the checks and balances, and separation of powers which the Framers so carefully crafted. I carry a copy of the Constitution in my shirt pocket. I have studied it carefully, read and reread its articles, marveled at its genius, its beauty, its symmetry, and its meticulous balance, and learned something new each time that I partook of its timeless wisdom. Nothing will help you to fully grasp the Senate's critical role in the balance of powers like a thorough reading of the Constitution and the Federalist papers.

Now I would like to turn for a moment to the human side of the Senate, the relationship among Senators, and the way that even that faced of service here is, to a degree, governed by the constitution and the Senate's

rules. The requirement for super majority votes in approving treaties, involving cloture, removing impeached federal officers, and overriding vetoes, plus the need for unanimous consent before the Senate can even proceed in many instances, makes bipartisanship and comity necessary if members wish to accomplish much of anything. Realize this. The campaign is over. You are here to be a Senator. Not much happens in this body without cooperation between the two parties.

In this now 208-year-old institution, the positions of majority and minority leaders have existed for less than 80 years. Although the positions have evolved significantly within the past half century, still, the only really substantive prerogative the leaders possess is the right of first recognition before any other member of their respective parties who might wish to speak on the Senate Floor.

Those of you who have served in the House will now have to forget about such things as the Committee of the Whole, closed rules, and germaneness, except when cloture has been invoked, and become well acquainted with the workings of unanimous consent agreements. Those of you who took the trouble to learn Deschler's Procedure will now need to set that aside and turn in earnest to Riddick's Senate Procedure.

Senators can lose the Floor for transgressing the rules. Personal attacks on other members or other blatantly injudicious comments are unacceptable in the Senate. Again to encourage a cooling of passions, and to promote a calm examination of substance, Senators address each other through the Presiding Officer and in the third person. Civility is essential here for pragmatic reasons as well as for public consumption. It is difficult to project the image of a statesmanlike, intelligent, public servant, attempting to inform the public and examine issues, if one is behaving and speaking in a manner more appropriate to a pool room brawl than to United States Senate debate. You will also find that overly zealous attacks on other members or on their states are always extremely counterproductive, and that you will usually be repaid in kind.

Let us strive for dignity. When you rise to speak on this Senate Floor, you will be following in the tradition of such men as Calhoun, Clay, and Webster. You will be standing in the place of such Senators as Edmund Ross (KS) and Peter Van Winkle (WEST VIRGINIA), 1868, who voted against their party to save the institution of the presidency during the Andrew Johnson impeachment trial.

Debate on the Senate Floor demands thought, careful preparation and some familiarity with Senate Rules if we are to engage in thoughtful and informed debate. Additionally, informed debate helps the American people have a better understanding of the complicated problems which besiege them in their own lives. Simply put, the Senate cannot inform American citizens without extensive debate on those very issues.

We were not elected to raise money for our own reelections. We were not elected to see how many press releases or TV appearances we could stack up. We were not elected to set up staff empires by serving on every committee in sight. We need to concentrate, focus, debate, inform, and, I hope, engage the public, and thereby forge consensus and direction. Once we engage each other and the public intellectually, the tough choices will be easier.

I thank each of you for your time and attention and I congratulate each of you on your selection to fill a seat in this August body. Service in this body is a supreme honor. It is also a burden and a serious responsibility. Members' lives become open for inspection and are used as examples for other citizens to emulate. A Senator must really be much more than hardworking, much more than conscientious, much more than dutiful. A Senator must reach for noble qualities—honor, total dedication, self-discipline, extreme selflessness, exemplary patriotism, sober judgment, and intellectual honesty. The Senate is more important than any one or all of us—more important than I am; more important than the majority and minority leaders; more important than all 100 of us; more important than all of the 1,843 men and women who have served in this body since 1789. Each of us has a solemn responsibility to remember that, and to remember it often.

Let me leave you with the words of the last paragraph of Volume II, of The Senate: 1789–1989: ''Originally consisting of only twenty-two members, the Senate had grown to a membership of ninety-eight by the time I was sworn in as a new senator in January 1959. After two hundred years, it is still the anchor of the Republic, the morning and evening star in the American constitutional constellation. It has had its giants and its little men, its Websters and its Bilbos, its Calhouns and its McCarthys. It has been the stage of high drama, of comedy and of tragedy, and its players have been the great and the near-great, those who think they are great, and those who will never be great. It has weathered the storms of adversity, withstood the barbs of cynics and the attacks of critics, and provided stability and strength to the nation during periods of civil strife and uncertainty, panics and depressions. In war and in peace, it has been the sure refuge and protector of the rights of the states and of a political minority. And, today, the Senate still stands—the great forum of constitutional American liberty!''

MAY 19, 2010—RULES COMMITTEE HEARING, SENATOR BYRD'S OPENING STATEMENT, ''THE FILIBUSTER AND ITS CONSEQUENCES''

On September 30, 1788, Pennsylvania became the first state to elect its United States senators, one of whom was William Maclay. In his 1789 journal Senator Maclay wrote, ''I gave my opinion in plain language that the confidence of the people was departing from us, owing to our unreasonable delays. The design of the Virginians and of the South Carolina gentlemen was to talk away the time, so that we could not get the bill passed.''

Our Founding Fathers intended the Senate to be a continuing body that allows for open and unlimited debate and the protection of minority rights. Senators have understood this since the Senate first convened. In his notes of the Constitutional Convention on June 26, 1787, James Madison recorded that the ends to be served by the Senate were ''first, to protect the people against their rulers, secondly, to protect the people against the transient impressions into which they themselves might be led . . . They themselves, as well as a numerous body of Representatives, were liable to err also, from fickleness and passion. A necessary fence against this danger would be to select a portion of enlightened citizens, whose limited number, and firmness might seasonably interpose against impetuous councils.'' That ''fence'' was the United States Senate. The right to filibuster anchors this necessary fence. But it is not a right intended to be abused.

During this 111th Congress in particular the minority has threatened to filibuster almost every matter proposed for Senate consideration. I find this tactic contrary to each Senator's duty to act in good faith. I share the profound frustration of my constituents and colleagues as we confront this situation. The challenges before our nation are far too grave, and too numerous, for the Senate to be rendered impotent to address them, and yet be derided for inaction by those causing the delay. There are many suggestions as to what we should do. I know what we must not do. We must never, ever, tear down the only wall—the necessary fence—this nation has against the excesses of the Executive Branch and the resultant haste and tyranny of the majority. The path to solving our problem lies in our thoroughly understanding it. Does the difficulty reside in the construct of our rules or in the ease of circumventing them?

A true filibuster is a fight, not a threat or a bluff. For most of the Senate's history, Senators motivated to extend debate had to hold the floor as long as they were physically able. The Senate was either persuaded by the strength of their arguments or unconvinced by either their commitment or their stamina. True filibusters were therefore less frequent, and more commonly discouraged, due to every Senator's understanding that such undertakings required grueling personal sacrifice, exhausting preparation, and a willingness to be criticized for disrupting the nation's business.

Now, unbelievably, just the whisper of opposition brings the ''world's greatest deliberative body'' to a grinding halt. Why? Because this once highly respected institution has become overwhelmingly consumed by a fixation with money and media. Gone are the days when Senators Richard Russell and Lyndon Johnson, and Speaker Sam Rayburn gathered routinely for working weekends and couldn't wait to get back to their chambers on Monday morning. Now every Senator spends hours every day, throughout the year and every year, raising funds for reelection and appearing before cameras and microphones. Now the Senate often works three-day weeks, with frequent and extended recess periods, so Senators can rush home to fundraisers scheduled months in advance.

Forceful confrontation to a threat to filibuster is undoubtedly the antidote to the malady. Most recently, Senate Majority Leader Reid announced that the Senate would stay in session around-the-clock and take all procedural steps necessary to bring financial reform legislation before the Senate. As preparations were made and cots rolled out, a deal was struck within hours and the threat of filibuster was withdrawn.

I heartily commend the Majority Leader for this progress, and I strongly caution my colleagues as some propose to alter the rules to severely limit the ability of a minority to conduct a filibuster. I know what it is to be Majority Leader, and wake up on a Wednesday morning in November, and find yourself a Minority Leader.

I also know that current Senate Rules provide the means to break a filibuster. I employed them in 1977 to end the post-cloture filibuster of natural gas deregulation legislation. This was the roughest filibuster I have experienced during my fifty-plus years in the Senate, and it produced the most-bitter feelings. Yet some important new precedents were established in dealing with post-cloture obstruction. In 1987, I successfully used Rules 7 and 8 to make a non-debatable motion to proceed during the morning hour. No leader has attempted this technique since, but this procedure could be and should be used.

Over the years, I have proposed a variety of improvements to Senate Rules to achieve a more sensible balance allowing the majority to function while still protecting minority rights. For example, I have supported eliminating debate on the motion to proceed to a matter (except for changes to Senate rules), or limiting debate to a reasonable

time on such motions, with Senators retaining the right to unlimited debate on the matter once before the Senate. I have authored several other proposals in the past, and I look forward to our committee work ahead as we carefully examine other suggested changes. The Committee must, however, jealously guard against efforts to change or reinterpret the Senate rules by a simple majority, circumventing Rule XXII where a two-thirds majority is required.

As I have said before, the Senate has been the last fortress of minority rights and freedom of speech in this Republic for more than two centuries. I pray that Senators will pause and reflect before ignoring that history and tradition in favor of the political priority of the moment.

I urge all Members of this wonderful body to read what Senator Byrd said and urged and counseled and advised. I know the new Members have not had this experience.

When you first went in, you thought, my gosh, how long is this going to last? The man wrote a book about the Senate. As it turned out, we hung on every word and took his advice, and it is good advice. It is printed in the RECORD. Read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the material will be placed in the RECORD.

Mr. ROBERTS. We might have a heck of a test on it next week.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Kansas. I am sure he will have to take a call from the Vice President to discuss his remarks on the floor. I appreciate the way in which he talked about all that has been said on the floor in the past by the Vice President, and President Obama, who was then a Senator, and the leaders here in the Senate. We have had lots of statements on the floor and commitments made in the past. The majority leader has committed twice on the Senate floor not to use the nuclear option, with the last time being a few months ago. These were not conditional commitments. They were not commitments with caveats. They were not commitments to not violate the rules of the Senate unless it became convenient for political purposes to violate the rules of the Senate.

As recently as January 27, 2011, the majority leader said, and I quote:

I agree that the proper ways to change Senate rules is through the procedures established in those rules, and I will oppose any effort in this Congress or the next to change the Senate's rules other than through the regular order.

Earlier this year, on January 24, 2013, there was a discussion between the minority leader Senator MCCONNELL and the majority leader Senator REID. Senator MCCONNELL said:

I will confirm to the majority leader that the Senate would not consider other resolutions relating to any standing order or rules of this Congress unless they went through the regular order process?

He was posing a question to the majority leader.

Majority Leader REID said:

That is correct. Any other resolutions related to Senate procedure would be subject to a regular order process, including consideration by the Rules Committee.

That was January 24, 2013.

What has happened since that point that would change the way the majority leader views this issue? Well, let's see. We confirmed the Secretary of Energy by a vote of 97–0. We confirmed the Secretary of Interior with a vote of 87–11. We confirmed the Secretary of the Treasury with a vote of 71–26. We confirmed the Secretary of State 94–3. I might add in that case, that vote happened just 7 days after the Senate got his nomination. We confirmed the Secretary of Commerce 97–1. We confirmed the Secretary of Transportation 100–0. We confirmed the Director of the Office of Management and Budget 96–0. We confirmed the Administrator of the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services 91–7. We confirmed the Chair of the Security and Exchange Commission by voice vote. In other words, he was confirmed unanimously. Not to mention the fact we have passed major legislation out of the Senate. We just completed a 3-week debate on a major immigration overhaul, and it passed with a bipartisan vote. We had a major debate on a farm bill, which passed with a bipartisan vote. Other legislation has moved through the Senate in the last few months.

So it begs the question: Why are we now having this discussion? The majority leader said back in January he wasn't going to change the rules, and to change the rules, you have to break the rules. Let's make that very clear. It takes 67 votes to change the rules of the Senate. What is being talked about here is basically using a procedural device—a gimmick, if you will—to be able to change the rules to 51 votes. In other words, breaking the rules to change the rules.

There is absolutely no basis and no foundation based on the numbers and the facts I just quoted for the majority to be making the argument that they are here today.

If you go back and look at the statements that have been made by others in the past—and I remember coming here in 2005 as a new Member of the Senate from the House of Representatives. At that point we were debating judicial nominations. The Democrats were holding up several of President Bush's judicial nominations. There was a big debate about whether to exercise the nuclear option; in other words, to confirm some of those with 51 votes.

I remember at the time being sympathetic to that. I came from the House of Representatives. In the House of Representatives we moved things in an orderly fashion. The Rules Committee decided what legislation came to the floor, what amendments were made in order, and how much time was allowed for debate on each amendment. It was a very structured and orderly process. Those of us who got here to the Senate were frustrated at times with the slow pace in the Senate. On some levels it made sense to think: Gee, wouldn't it be great if we could make the Senate function more like the House.

Fortunately, cooler heads prevailed because the Senate is not designed to function like the House. It was created for a very different purpose and a very different design. What we are talking about here would completely undermine that purpose and that design for this institution. We have observed traditions, rules, in the Senate for decades. What we are talking about, if the majority has its way, is doing something that would break the rules to change the rules and forever change the Senate in a way the majority leader Senator REID mentioned back in 2009; that doing that would ''ruin'' the country and the Senate would be ''destroyed'' if we went about a rules change along the lines of what is being talked about today. So I hope cooler heads will prevail again. I certainly understand now, as I look back on what happened in 2005, the wisdom of those who had been here a little bit longer and understood a little bit more about the way this institution operates: the importance of having a Senate where you have open debate, where you have the opportunity for amendments—something that in the House oftentimes you do not have the opportunity to do.

It is important, in my view, that Republicans and Democrats come together and recognize if we go back on the traditions, the rules, the precedents in the Senate, we will be forever changing not just the rules, but we will be changing the Senate, and that is certainly not what our Founders had in mind, nor do I think that is what our colleagues on the other side have in mind. They may be well-intentioned, but what they are talking about doing is going to change forever the Senate in a way that would be very perilous to this institution and, more importantly, jeopardize the rights of the American people to have their voice heard in the Senate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I have the greatest respect for my friend from South Dakota. But, obviously, he missed the speeches this morning. We went through all this. I am not going to repeat what has gone on since the broken promise earlier this year.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF RICHARD CORDRAY TO BE DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION

Mr. REID. Madam president, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 51.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Richard Cordray, of Ohio, to be Director, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Richard Cordray, of Ohio, to be Director, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.

Harry Reid, Tim Johnson, Barbara Boxer, Elizabeth Warren, Debbie Stabenow, Jon Tester, Al Franken, Jack Reed, Tom Harkin, Ron Wyden, Patrick J. Leahy, Amy Klobuchar, Robert P. Casey Jr., Jeff Merkley, John D. Rockefeller IV, Max Baucus, Richard Blumenthal, Carl Levin.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. Madam President, I now move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF RICHARD F. GRIFFIN, JR., TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Mr. REID. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 100.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Richard F. Griffin, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Richard F. Griffin, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board.

Harry Reid, Tom Harkin, Jeff Merkley, Benjamin L. Cardin, Richard Blumenthal, Martin Heinrich, Sheldon Whitehouse, Al Franken, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Brian Schatz, Christopher Murphy, Richard J. Durbin, Maria Cantwell, Bill Nelson, Carl Levin, Dianne Feinstein, Patty Murray.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF SHARON BLOCK TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Mr. REID. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 101.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Sharon Block, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Madam President, I have a cloture motion at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Sharon Block, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board.

Harry Reid, Tom Harkin, Jeff Merkley, Benjamin L. Cardin, Richard Blumenthal, Martin Heinrich, Sheldon Whitehouse, Al Franken, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Brian Schatz, Christopher Murphy, Richard J. Durbin, Maria Cantwell, Bill Nelson, Carl Levin, Dianne Feinstein, Patty Murray.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. Madam President, I now move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF MARK GASTON PEARCE TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Mr. REID. Madam President, I now move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 104.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Mark Gaston Pearce, of New York, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Madam President, I have a cloture motion I would ask the clerk to report if the Chair agrees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Mark Gaston Pearce, of New York, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board.

Harry Reid, Tom Harkin, Jeff Merkley, Benjamin L. Cardin, Richard Blumenthal, Martin Heinrich, Sheldon Whitehouse, Al Franken, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Brian Schatz, Christopher Murphy, Richard J. Durbin, Maria Cantwell, Bill Nelson, Carl Levin, Dianne Feinstein, Patty Murray.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII of the Senate be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. Madam President, I now move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF FRED P. HOCHBERG TO BE PRESIDENT OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. REID. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 178.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Fred P. Hochberg, of New York, to be President of the Export-Import Bank of the United States.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Madam President, there is a cloture motion at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented

under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Fred P. Hochberg, of New York, to be President of the Export-Import Bank of the United States.

Harry Reid, Tim Johnson of South Dakota, Benjamin L. Cardin, Christopher A. Coons, Patrick J. Leahy, Charles E. Schumer, Ron Wyden, Patty Murray, Heidi Heitkamp, Tom Udall of New Mexico, Martin Heinrich, Jack Reed, Sheldon Whitehouse, Elizabeth Warren, Richard J. Durbin, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Robert Menendez.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. Madam President, I now move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF THOMAS EDWARD PEREZ TO BE SECRETARY OF LABOR

Mr. REID. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 99.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Thomas Edward Perez, of Maryland, to be Secretary of Labor.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Thomas Edward Perez, of Maryland, to be Secretary of Labor.

Harry Reid, Tom Harkin, Patrick J. Leahy, Bill Nelson, Christopher A. Coons, Amy Klobuchar, Tim Kaine, Jack Reed, Barbara A. Mikulski, Sheldon Whitehouse, Sherrod Brown, Benjamin L. Cardin, Robert P. Casey Jr., Bernard Sanders, Al Franken, Robert Menendez, Barbara Boxer.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF REGINA McCARTHY TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Mr. REID. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 98.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Regina McCarthy, of Massachusetts, to be Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Regina McCarthy, of Massachusetts, to be Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

Harry Reid, Barbara Boxer, Benjamin L. Cardin, Christopher A. Coons, Patrick J. Leahy, Tom Carper, Ron Wyden, Patty Murray, Tom Udall, Martin Heinrich, Bernard Sanders, Sheldon Whitehouse, Max Baucus, Richard J. Durbin, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Jeff Merkley, Brian Schatz.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I have a consent that I think would set up these votes in a much more expeditious way than the way the majority leader is proceeding. But first let me just say, these are dark days in the history of the Senate. I hate that we have come to this point. We have witnessed the majority leader break his word to the Senate.

Now our request for a joint meeting of all the Senators has been set for Monday night—a time when attendance around here is frequently quite spotty—in an obvious effort to keep as many of his Members from hearing the concerns and arguments of the other side as possible. It remains our view that for this to be the kind of joint session of the Senate that it ought to be, given the tendency of the Senate to have sparse attendance on a Monday night, to have this meeting on Tuesday before it is too late.

Having said that, a more expeditious way to accomplish most of what the majority leader is trying to accomplish would be achieved by the following consent: I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday at 2:15, the Senate proceed to consecutive votes on the confirmation of the following nominations: No. 104, that is Pearce to be a member of the NLRB; No. 102, Johnson, to be a member of the NLRB, and No. 103, Miscimarra, to be a member of the NLRB.

I might just say, parenthetically, if those nominees were confirmed, coupled with the two nominees illegally appointed, whose illegal appointments' term continue until the end of the year, the NLRB would have a full complement of five members and able to conduct its business.

I further ask consent that following those votes, the Senate proceed to the cloture motion filed on Calendar No. 99; that is, Perez, to be Secretary of Labor; and, further, if cloture is invoked, the Senate immediately proceed to a vote on the confirmation of the nomination—I would add, parenthetically, that would eliminate the post 30 hours, assuming cloture were invoked on the very controversial nominee, Perez, to be Secretary of Labor—further, the Senate then vote on the cloture motion filed on Calendar No. 98, McCarthy, to be EPA Director; and if cloture is invoked, the Senate proceed to a vote on the confirmation of the nomination—also eliminating the 30 hours postcloture if cloture is invoked on McCarthy; and I might add that the ranking member of the environment committee supports cloture on the McCarthy nomination. Thereby, it is reasonable to assume that cloture would be invoked on what is for a lot of our Members, including myself, a very controversial nomination. I further ask consent that the Senate then vote on the cloture motion that was filed on Calendar No. 178—this is someone named Hochberg, to be president of the

Export-Import Bank—again, if cloture is invoked, the Senate proceed to an immediate vote on the confirmation of that nomination—again, eliminating the 30 hours postcloture, assuming cloture is invoked; and I assume that it will be—finally, I ask consent that following the votes listed above the Senate proceed to the cloture votes on the remaining three filed cloture motions.

Now, before the Chair rules, what this allows, as I indicated, is for the Senate to work efficiently through a series of nominations in a quicker fashion than the majority leader has proposed.

They would get their votes and there would not be a delay. This would only leave discussion and votes on the three remaining illegally—according to the Federal court—the three remaining illegally appointed nominations. That is my unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, no matter how often my friend rudely talks about me not breaking my word, I am not going to respond talking about how many times he has broken his word. That does not add anything to this debate we are having. So he can keep saying that as much as he wants. All we have to do is look back at the record today.

As to the caucus Monday night, my Members will be here. I do not understand—unless this is part of the overall pattern we have come to expect around here, to not do anything today you can do tomorrow. We are going to have a vote at 5:30. Members are usually pretty good at getting here for votes at 5:30.

I also am stunned by boasting about the ranking member on the EPW Committee suddenly seeing the light and he is going to allow Gina McCarthy to get a vote. Now, is that not wonderful? Is that not something to cheer about? He has held up this woman. He is the one who is responsible for 1,100 questions to her. That is what is wrong here. This is so transparent what my friend has asked. He has said he wants to approve two Republican members to the NLRB. Let's have those votes first—only one Democratic nominee. What does this mean? It means within a couple of months Republicans have a majority of the NLRB. I do not blame him for wanting that.

They do not like the organization anyway, just like they do not like Cordray's organization. So I can understand that the Republican leader would like to get consent to create a Republican majority on the NLRB. But it is so obvious. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. REID. We are going to have a caucus Monday at 6 o'clock in the Old Senate Chamber. We are going to vote at 5:30. I would hope with something this important we will have attendance. I know my caucus will be there. If nothing is resolved there, which is the way things have been going today, likely it will not be, so we will have a vote sometime early Tuesday morning on these nominations.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the majority leader always reminds me he can have the last word. I am sure he can have the last word again. Speaking for Senator VITTER, he did ask for a lot of information from the new prospective Administrator of the EPA—so did Senator BOXER. She asked for 70,000 pages herself. But he was satisfied with the responses he got. This is how the process ought to work. This is how it has worked for decades. You are trying to get answer to questions. You are trying to engage in some kind of prediction as to how somebody might operate in the future.

What the majority leader has been saying all along is he wants the confirmation process to be speedy and for the minority to sit down and shut up. He believes that advise and consent means sit down and shut up; confirm these nominees when I tell you to.

The reason he is having to take a lot of heat over this is because he has broken his word to the Senate, given last January, that we had resolved the rules issue for this Congress. I know for a fact, even though he may get his 51 votes, there are a lot of Democrats who are not happy with where the leader is.

When they tell me that—the Republican I expect they would be least likely to want to tell that to—I know what is going on here. They have been hammered into line. This has been personalized by the majority leader: You have to do this for me. What is astonishing is he is saying, you have to do this for me because you have to help me break my word and go back on everything I said in my own biography just a few years ago. You have to help me look bad. You have to help me break my word, violate what I said in my own biography, create unnecessary controversy in the Senate, which has done major bills on a bipartisan basis all year long and had begun to get back to normal.

This is very hard to understand. This is why my Members are astonished at where we are. They are scratching their heads, saying: Who manufactured this crisis? We know who manufactured it, the guy right over here to my left. So this is a very sad day for the Senate. If we do not pull back from the brink, my friend the majority leader is going to be remembered as the worst leader of the Senate ever, the leader of the Senate who fundamentally changed the body.

It makes me sad. Some of my Members are more angry. I am more sad about it. But it is a shame we have come to this. I sure hope all the Democratic Senators are there Monday night. I am certainly going to encourage my Members to be there. It is high time we sat down and tried to understand each other, because many Members on the other side are hearing a different version of the facts that are largely unrelated to reality.

I know my friend the majority leader will have the last word. He reminds me of that frequently, on a daily basis, that the difference between being the majority leader and the minority leader is he gets the last word. So I will yield the floor and listen to the last word.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, no matter how many times he says it, he tends to not focus on what he has done to the Senate. As I indicated earlier, there is lots of time for name-calling. But we know it is replete in the RECORD, as delivered this morning, how he said there would be no filibusters, we would follow the norms of the Senate, only extraordinary circumstances.

The extraordinary circumstances have come because we are in session, I guess. The only person I know who thinks things are going just fine is my friend. The American people know this institution is being hammered hard. He does not have to worry about me for the heat I have taken. I have not taken any heat. I had a very nice caucus today. My caucus was thoughtful. We heard from—out of my 54 Senators, we probably heard from 25 or 26 of them. Attendance was nearly perfect. So I do not want him to feel sorry for the Senate, certainly not for me.

I am going to continue to try to speak in a tone that is appropriate. His name-calling—I guess he follows, and I hope not, the demagogic theory that the more you say something, even if it is false, people start believing it.

It is quite interesting that Richard Cordray, who no one—no one—says there is a thing wrong with this man, former attorney general of the heavily populated State of Ohio—Democrats and Republicans have said he is a good guy—this man has been waiting 724 days; Assistant Secretary for Defense, 292 days; Monetary Fund Governor, 169 days; EPA, 128 days; NLRB, two of them, 573 days. We have 15 of them. Average time waiting is 9 months.

Reshuffling the votes as he wants them, that is a laugher. He wants to have a majority of the NLRB be Republicans. I do not think that is a good idea. We are going to have our caucus Monday. I think it was a good idea. I have tried to have them before. My friend has objected to them. That is replete in the press. But we are going to have this one. I am happy to do that.

My friend said the process works. The process works? The status quo is good. I do not think so.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Of course, the majority of the NLRB would not be Republicans. I have mentioned to the administration on several occasions: Send us up two nominees who are not illegally appointed. But we cannot seem to get that done. I mean, the taint attached to the two NLRB nominees and to Mr. Cordray, who I agree is a good man and many of my Members support, is that they were illegally appointed.

But, of course, the agencies have not been at a disadvantage. They are there

waiting. He may have been waiting to be confirmed, but he is not waiting to do the job. He is in office. The two NLRB members are in office. The question is, do we respect the law? A Federal court has said the two NLRB members were illegally appointed.

Mr. Cordray, unfortunately, was appointed on exactly the same day in exactly the same way. Is the Senate completely lawless? Do we not care what the Federal courts say? I am stunned at where we are. It is pretty clear to me that all the other nominees are highly likely to be confirmed.

What it comes down to is that the majority leader is going to break the rules of the Senate to change the rules of the Senate in order to confirm, with 51 votes, three illegally appointed positions that the Federal courts have told us are unconstitutionally appointed. That is the rationale for the nuclear option?

That is why I say it is a sad day for the Senate, a sad day for America.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, illegally appointed? Why did President Obama recess appoint Cordray and the two NLRB members? Because the Republicans had blocked them, blocked them, blocked them, blocked them. We count Cordray as only 571 days. That went on long before he got there. ELIZABETH WARREN is the one who set up this program. They said: No chance. Do not even think of bringing her here. That is when he came with Cordray. ELIZABETH WARREN found him as attorney general of Ohio. So these big crocodile tears—you have recess appointments because the President had no choice if he wanted his team to work.

He said: Oh, we would be happy to process them quickly, just like Richard Perez has been processed quickly? Just like all of these people have been processed quickly? Sorry. So there is not a chance that we are going to let the NLRB be dominated by Republicans. That one organization, above all, looks out for working men and women in this country, should not be dominated by Republicans. It is not going to be.

So I repeat, this issue can be resolved very quickly. I had somebody out here at my stakeout say: What happens if you get cloture on everybody?

I said: There is no problem. They can all vote against these people. They can vote against them, every one of them. But they, on a procedural basis, they are holding up votes on people who are well qualified and would be approved by the Senate if they got a vote. So this is a little strange deal. Talk about marshaling your troops to do something that is absolutely wrong. It is that. If they are so worried about the rules changes around here, it would seem to me they should approve three qualified people whom no one—no one—suggests there is anything wrong with any of them.

Why were they recess appointed? Because the Republicans forced President Obama to do that. There will be no further votes this week. The next vote will be Monday at 5:30.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MERKLEY). The Republican leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on the issue of delay, I am trying to avoid bursting out in laughter. The two NLRB nominees were sent up to the Senate December 15, 2011—December 15, 2011. Before their paperwork got here, 2 weeks later the President recess appointed them. Delay? Their paperwork had not even arrived. The committee could not do anything with them. A couple of weeks later they were recess appointed.

That is not my definition of a delay, by any objective standard.

The core issue here, no matter how much the majority leader tries to obfuscate and discuss other matters, is that he is prepared to break the rules of the Senate to change the rules of the Senate for three nominees who were unconstitutionally appointed, according to the Federal Circuit Court in Washington, DC. For that, the majority leader proposes to use the nuclear option? It is a sad, sad commentary on today's Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. A sad day in the Senate created by the Republicans. This rules change—he keeps talking about the rules change. The Presiding Officer knows the Constitution is very clear. It is clear that there is one paragraph that says treaties take a two-thirds vote. In that same paragraph, how many votes does it take to confirm a nomination? A simple majority. That is in our Constitution. Since 1977 rules have been changed in this body 17 times—not by fancy things done by the Rules Committee but right here in the Senate.

We have three people who are qualified, and if Republicans want to avoid a problem—obviously they don't. What they want to do is continue.

Can you imagine—the American people are looking at this and saying: The Republican leader thinks the Senate is going just fine, the status quo is good? Look at any poll. The Gallup Poll did one. Eighty-six percent of the American people—why do they think things are bad? Because of gridlock, not doing important things. Sure we were able to get a few things done, but I have been here a while, and we have done some good things this year, but we should be doing lots of good things, not focused on immigration and a farm bill that has been passed twice, on a postal bill that we passed once and we haven't passed again. We talk a lot about WRDA. I am glad we got that done, WRDA, and I am not going to denigrate my friend, the chairman of that committee, but that bill is a mere shadow of its former self because of what the Republicans have done to make a mockery of what goes on here.

All we want is for the President of the United States, whoever that might be, Democrat or Republican, to be able to have the team he wants as contemplated in that document called the Constitution of the United States. That is not asking too much.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MERKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. MERKLEY. Are there any rules currently on how long one may speak?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senators may speak for up to 10 minutes each.

Mr. MERKLEY. I have been listening carefully to the debate that has been taking place here on the floor, and the esteemed minority leader had a couple of phrases that he used any number of times.

One of those was that this debate is about whether to break the rules in order to change the rules, and the second phrase, also involving the word ''break,'' was to repeatedly say to the majority leader: You have broken your word. Those are very powerful words. My mother always told me that when people start saying things like that, it is because they are at a loss for a real argument, but I found them disturbing. I found both of those phrases disturbing. I found them disturbing because they are so at odds with what this conversation is really about.

We are here in the midst of a constitutional crisis. Our Constitution was set up with a balance of powers between three coequal branches, with checks and balances. Never in their wildest dreams did the crafters of our Constitution envision that a minority of the Senate, a minority of one Chamber, would undermine the functioning of the other two branches. In fact, they were very deliberate—very, very deliberate—in their determination that there not be such a possibility. They laid out with clarity that advise and consent on treaties took a supermajority, but when it came to the other branches, the judicial branch and executive branch have a de facto simple majority standard in the Constitution. They are in exactly the same paragraph, so you can compare them, one to the other.

Our Founders talked about this, and they talked about it because they had the experience with the Continental Congress in which a supermajority had caused all sorts of difficulties. So I thought I would remind us a little bit about the framework they laid out in the Constitution.

Alexander Hamilton said on a supermajority it would lead to ''tedious delays; continual negotiation and intrigue; contemptible compromises of the public good.'' Alexander Hamilton felt so strongly that there should be a simple majority standard. He wasn't alone. We have Madison, who wrote that ''the fundamental principle of free government would be reversed'' if a

supermajority was the functioning principle.

So we have this system of coequal branches with simple majority votes on nominations as a check against extraordinarily ill-advised nominations by the executive branch. Indeed, that has been the tradition throughout our Nation's history—simple majority votes on a timely basis on nominations, interspersed by very, very occasional blockades put up by exercising the will to filibuster but very rare use of that until the last few years. Indeed, it was just a few years ago that our Republican colleagues were in charge, and they were upset by a small number of filibusters by the Democrats on judicial nominees, and they came to this floor and they said that is not acceptable. They reminded us of this constitutional history, of this constitutional framework, and they asked for a deal. The deal they asked for was they wouldn't change the rules if Democrats wouldn't filibuster the nominations, and that deal was struck.

But now the tide has turned. The parties are reversed, and suddenly that deal is not holding because we see filibuster after filibuster after filibuster obstructing the ability of the executive branch—with a President reelected by the citizens of the United States—and with vacancies in the judicial branch, with judicial emergencies from hither to yon, with the largest number of judicial vacancies and the largest number of executive branch appointments piled up. Yet my colleagues on the other side are saying: The Senate is functioning just fine. Only about 8 percent of the American people think the Senate is functioning fine, and those 8 percent one would have to recognize are just not paying attention.

This is not the Senate I knew as a young man, coming here as an intern and sitting up in the staff gallery for Senator Hatfield. I would come down to the floor to brief him on the amendments and the debate before each vote. At that time, we had simple up-or-down votes on nominations, with rare exception. Even if we turn the clock back to the time of Lyndon B. Johnson, in the 6 years when Lyndon B. Johnson was majority leader in this Chamber, only once in his 6 years did he need to file a motion in order to close debate, and that wasn't just on executive nominations but a combination of executive nominations, judicial nominations and legislation—just once in 6 years.

Senator REID, in his first 6 years as majority leader, had to file 391 motions. This cloture process is designed to take a long period of time, often up to 1 week, because it was envisioned it would be used rarely.

So here we are with the minority in the Senate doing deep damage to the executive branch, deep damage to the judiciary by the abuse of the filibuster, creating an imbalance or creating unequal branches of government that is completely out of sync with the constitutional vision. Are we, as Members of this body—having taken a pledge to uphold the Constitution and having that responsibility—going to allow this deep abuse of the constitutional vision of equal branches? I don't think anyone who takes their pledge seriously can come to this floor and argue that a small group of the Senate should be able to do deep damage to the other branches.

The Republican leader said the strategy is to break the rules in order to change the rules. I thought I would just remind him that—and I believe he came here in 1985—since the time he first arrived, there have been many times the Senate changed the precedent on the application of rules. Using a simple majority, the Senate changed the application of a rule. It was done once in December 1985, once in September of 1986, then twice in 1987, once in 1995, twice in 1996, once in 1999, and once in the year 2000 and in the year 2011. That is 10 times during the time the Republican leader has been a Member of this Senate.

The minority leader described this as a nuclear option. So using his reasoning, there have been 10 nuclear option bombs exploded in this Chamber during the time he has served here. Yet I didn't hear that mentioned in the presentation he put forward. It might interest the Republican leader to recall that of these instances, where under the standard of a simple majority the application of a rule was changed during the time he has served here, that seven of those times were under Republican leadership. It has occurred three times under Democratic leadership. So seven times under Republican leadership the type of action we are discussing—of reorienting the application of a rule in order to make the Senate work better—and three times under Democratic leadership. All of these instances occurred during the time he has served in this Chamber.

So to come to the floor and talk about breaking the rules in order to change the rules, the Republican leader would have to go back and talk about those 10 times and explain how 7 of them happened under Republican leadership, but somehow that doesn't qualify as being the same standard. I think it is important to get away from the overinflation of the rhetoric that has been put forward.

The second piece that bothered me in this debate was saying the majority leader broke his word. I think everyone who is party to a deal understands there are two parties to a deal and those two parties need to uphold their half. So I would remind folks about what the Republican leader's half of that deal was. I put on this chart, ''The January Pledge.'' This is the pledge made by the Republican leader on the floor of this Chamber. He said: ''Senate Republicans will continue to work with the majority to process nominations, consistent with the norms and traditions of the Senate.''

What are those norms and traditions? Those norms and traditions are that nominations are able to be voted on in a modest period of time with up-or-down votes. If we should have any doubt about what the minority leader meant about norms and traditions, we can go to the Republican policy document from 2005. Here we have the last major debate over the abuse of the filibuster—Democrats in the minority, Republicans in the majority—and this is what the Republican policy argument said:

> This breakdown in Senate norms is profound. There is now a risk that the Senate is creating a new 60-vote confirmation standard. The Constitution plainly requires no more than a majority vote to confirm any executive nomination, but some Senators have shown that they are determined to override this constitutional standard.

I will stop quoting there for a minute and just note this was a very clear delineation of the constitutional standard during the time the Republican leader was in this Chamber, in 2005—not so many years ago. The document goes on to say:

> Thus, if the Senate does not act . . . to restore the Constitution's simple majority standard, it could be plausibly argued that a precedent has been set by the Senate's acquiescence in a 60-vote threshold for nominations.

The document goes on to talk about the role of the Constitution in advise and consent:

> One way that Senators can restore the Senate's traditional understanding of its advice and consent responsibility is to employ the ''constitutional option''—an exercise of a Senate majority's power under the Constitution to define Senate practices and procedures. . . . Exercising the constitutional option in response to judicial nomination filibusters would restore the Senate to its longstanding norms and practices.

So if we want to know what norms and traditions meant in this pledge made in January, it is all laid out in extensive detail in the Republican policy document, and it is laid out in the history of the United States. It means a modest amount of time to have a vote after a nomination comes out of committee, with a simple up-or-down vote, with rare exception.

But that is not what we have had. So I would ask the Republican leader to engage in a discussion about our constitutional role, much like the debate the Republicans led in 2005. Because otherwise we are just casting aspersions, and the citizens looking in wonder at what happened to that great deliberative institution—the Senate.

This standard of processing nominations according to the norms and traditions of the Senate did not materialize after January. Within days, there was the first ever—first ever in U.S. history—filibuster of a nominee for Defense Secretary. Ironically, that nominee was former Republican Senator Chuck Hagel.

Within a short period of time after that, we had a letter from 44 Senators saying they would not allow a vote on

any nominee for the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. Any nominee? That is the advice and consent role embodied in the Constitution that calls for a simple up-or-down vote? They are going to use the filibuster to oppose any nominee, regardless of the person's qualifications?

That is actually using the filibuster in a whole new way to basically say we don't have the votes to undo the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau—which, by the way, is charged with stopping predatory practices that undermine the success of families—so instead of trying to get rid of this institution that protects families—and I am not sure where family values fits in there—we are, instead, going to prevent anyone from exercising leadership authority and sitting in the Director's chair at the CFPB.

I see my colleague is here and waiting to speak, so I will conclude with this. Let's recognize that the deal laid out in January just didn't work. It didn't work. It doesn't make sense to keep saying who didn't make it work. Certainly, from my perspective on this side of the aisle, this issue of continuing to work to process nominations consistent with norms and traditions didn't work. My colleagues across the aisle have a different concept of why it didn't work. But at the heart of it, as they argued in 2005, there is a constitutional vision for the use of advice and consent, and that constitutional vision is in deep trouble. It is not permission for one coequal branch to undermine the other two branches.

That is why the Members of this body need to have this debate. It is why I am on the floor now, and it is why we need to wrestle with restoring the role of this Senate, the proper role in the nomination process.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, we are in an unpleasant time, indeed, in the Senate. I hate to see it happen. This is a robust body. We are at each other. We defend the interests of our constituents and try to advocate for the values we share, and it is a contentious place at times, but we usually work our way through that. I would just say there is no reason we should be at this point today.

I do believe the majority leader has been abusing the powers of his office. I remain dreadfully concerned and firmly believe this consistent practice of using the tactics of refusing to consider certain bills and filling the tree to keep Members of the Senate from having a vote is an abuse maybe even larger than the issue we are dealing with today. In fact, it is larger.

For example, we have been debating the question of interest rates going up on student loans and how to fix that. There are two different bills, two different ideas. One of those bills the majority leader supports. He has brought it up and he wants to vote on it, but he doesn't want to vote on anything else. But there are a number of Senators on this side, along with Democratic Senators who agree with them in a bipartisan way, who have come up with a better bill—I think it is better—and we want to vote on it. But, the majority leader refused to allow us to vote on that alternative. Time and time again, he prevents us from voting on legislation and from engaging in a full and open amendment process.

So in the Senate, on an important issue, on an extremely well-thought-out alternative plan that would fix the student loan interest rate issue, the majority leader basically says: No, you don't get a vote.

This is a change in the history of the Senate, and it goes on every day. Senators have to plead with the majority leader to get a vote on an amendment. This is not the way the Senate should be. It is a very big deal, it goes on every day, and it is time to stop it.

So now we have this idea that nominations have to be moved through at the pace the majority leader would like them to be. Many of these are, frankly, very controversial for very significant reasons. In my opinion, the President's nominations in his second term have been less capable than those from his first. Many of them have serious weaknesses that need to be examined, and many of them should never be approved. Let me talk about one now that is about to come to the floor. We ought to debate that one. The Constitution provides the Senate should advise and consent on nominations.

We have to consent to a nomination. That is the question we are dealing with in many ways here.

We come down to the big issue, though. In essence, it takes two-thirds—67 votes—to change the rules of the Senate. Because of a fight over three nominations that were illegally appointed, as determined by the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, and the President wants to continue to have them serve—which Senator MCCONNELL and many on this side oppose and don't think they should be confirmed—what the majority leader is proposing to do is to say, in essence, you can't block a vote on those nominations and require 60 votes; there only has to be 51.

He will propose that, and what will happen? The Parliamentarian of the Senate will rule that Senator MCCONNELL is correct, that the nomination is not prepared to be voted on because 60 votes weren't obtained, and the majority leader loses.

Then what does he intend to do? He intends to look to the Chair and say, I appeal the ruling of the Chair, and expects all his Members to presumably line up behind him and vote to overrule the rules of the Senate, overrule the independent Parliamentarian of the Senate. That is what he is talking about doing.

So when Senator MCCONNELL says he wants to break the rules to change the rules, that is exactly what he means. That is exactly what we are talking about.

Stability in the Senate requires us not to change the rules willy-nilly when we have a tempest in a teapot, as these nominations are. There will no doubt be times when things get so intense over big issues that actions get taken, and history will record whether they are wise. But we don't need to be changing the rules of the Senate every time it becomes inconvenient for the majority leader. He has already done this once.

He changed the rules of the Senate when Senator DeMint was making a motion to get a vote, after he was denied the right to have a vote. The majority leader filled the tree, wouldn't allow votes, and he used the postcloture technique to force at least a vote relevant to that issue. The majority leader got tired of it, appealed it; the Chair ruled for Senator DeMint, and so he asked his colleagues to join him in overruling the Chair and changing the rules of the Senate. They backed him on that and that was done.

This gets to be a habit around here, and our side is not happy with the power grab from the top, from the majority leader, and how it is impacting everyday life in the Senate, and we are not going to go quietly on this one. It is a big deal and the Senate should avoid it.

I am pleased that at least we will have a conference Monday in which we can talk about the issue openly amongst ourselves and see if we can avoid what could be a serious constitutional crisis. I believe we need to cool our heads down a bit and understand that the nature of the Senate is the majority does not get everything it wants.

I was here, and I remember how the judges' situation developed. Judges have traditionally not been filibustered. There have been a few efforts at delaying votes and people were held up, but systematic filibusters were not at all part of the tradition of the Senate.

After President Bush was elected in 2000, the Democrats went to conference at a retreat somewhere. They had Marcia Greenberger, Laurence Tribe, and Cass Sunstein, three well-known liberal lawyers and professors. They came out, and then announced, We are changing the ground rules of confirmation.

The vast majority of President Bush's early nominees to the Court of Appeals were blocked. Highly qualified nominees, with great skill and ability, there was no basis to oppose them on merit. It went on for over 2 years, and others were being blocked.

As a result, then-Leader Frist threatened this kind of event. At the end, cooler heads prevailed, a compromise was reached, and the agreement was that we would not filibuster Federal judges unless extraordinary circumstances existed. Normally, we

would give an up-or-down vote to Federal judges. That is the way that was settled.

I would say with regard to the nominations we are looking at now, these three illegally appointed nominees present a pretty extraordinary circumstance.

We shouldn't sit here and go quietly when the President of the United States—without any legal basis, in my opinion—makes a recess appointment to avoid the confirmation process, and now we object to these people being confirmed after they were in office. After they were in office, after the court ruled they were illegally appointed, they continued to sit and continued to vote on issues important to Americans. They should not have done that. They should have followed the court's order, even if they previously thought they were legally appointed—which they weren't, pretty clearly, from the beginning—it was never close to being a legitimate recess appointment. I am worried about this. Hopefully cool heads will come together and work this out.

With regard to the traditional norms of the Senate that Senator MCCONNELL talked about, I have been in the Senate long before holds have been put on nominations. You don't move the nominations until you get questions answered relative to their appointment. Nominations don't just go smoothly and get voted the next week. There are a lot of reasons for that process.

This was raised at the beginning of the year. These issues were discussed and an agreement was reached. As part of the agreement, Senator REID said he wouldn't use the nuclear option if the Republicans agreed to certain things, and an agreement was reached. Senators LAMAR ALEXANDER and JOHN MCCAIN and others were in on the agreement and an agreement was reached.

Senator MERKLEY openly says now, Well, the agreement didn't work. Well, there is an agreement out there, it was agreed to, and Senator REID is now changing that agreement—changing the commitment he made in exchange for getting concessions from this side.

This isn't the breaking of a word like, You elect me majority leader and everything is going to be sweet and nice. This was a negotiated agreement of great intensity.

Senator MERKLEY and several other Senators were involved in the discussions, and an agreement was reached. The essence of it was concessions were made by the Republican side, and the Democratic leader accepted those concessions and promised he wouldn't use the nuclear option. Now he is threatening to use the nuclear option.

The nomination of Mr. Jones, to be Director of the Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms, a highly important agency is supposed to happen today. Maybe in committee they determined to move it through. I was a U.S. attorney for 12 years. The closest agency you deal with is the FBI, and you have to deal with them on a regular basis. They know how well you do your job, they know whether you are functioning well, and there is normally a good relationship and you try not to be critical of one another. This is what Mr. Oswald, former Special Agent in Charge of the FBI, wrote about Mr. Jones:

> As a retired FBI senior executive, I am one of the few voices able to publicly express our complete discontent with Mr. Jones' ineffective leadership and poor service provided to federal law enforcement community without fear of retaliation or retribution from him.

Because he is no longer in office, he doesn't have any fear. He is telling the truth. He says he felt ''morally compelled to make [the] committee aware of Mr. JONES' atrocious professional reputation within the federal law enforcement community in Minnesota's Twin Cities area.''

This is the guy they want to promote to the head of the Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms.

The letter describes the frustration with Mr. JONES' ''ineffective leadership and his lack of concern about matters and issues brought to his attention by each of us.''

Each of us, being the other Federal agencies, like the Drug Enforcement Administration, the Secret Service, or the IRS.

> Our common dissatisfaction with Jones' poor leadership, pathetic interaction, and insufficient prosecution support was the theme of many discussion during my tenure. . . . He consistently reacted defensively and often spoke to us disrespectfully, and occasionally with disdain.

Then he went on to note that after he became the U.S. Attorney in Minnesota, they prosecuted significantly less cases of every type. Forty percent fewer defendants were charged in 2012, when Mr. Jones was the U.S. attorney, than the previous year because he wouldn't prosecute the cases, and the Federal investigative agencies were up in arms about it.

This retired SAC tells the truth. I think he should be listened to. But President Obama is determined to make him the head of the ATF, involving leadership of gun enforcement, firearms, and weapons charges all over America.

We have already had the Fast and Furious scandal. So shouldn't the Senate ask questions about this? Should we rubberstamp this? They are rushing it through committee, trying to do it right now: Move him on. Get him confirmed. And anybody who stands in the way? Tough luck.

The majority leader is going to drive it through. He gets to decide who gets confirmed around here. He gets to decide what the rules are in the Senate. They are forgetting the effort they led in the last part of President Bush's term when they blocked John Bolton to be Ambassador to the United Nations. He was blocked by full filibuster by the Democratic Members of the Senate. The rules weren't changed then, and the rules are not to be changed now.

We have a conference coming up Monday. Let's see if we can't work through it. Let's see if we can't work in a way that restores the Senate. The Senate is that saucer that is supposed to provide a cooling opportunity to slow down a rush to judgment. Should the Senate be compelled to confirm three members to lower official appointments in the Federal Government who were illegally appointed and continued to serve in their offices after they were so found? I don't think so. I don't think so. I don't think that dispute is such that it would lead the majority leader to break the rules of the Senate, to override the plain rules of the Senate through a procedure, which is not proper and very dangerous, to get his way on this matter.

There are other things that could go wrong if this goes forward. My impression from talking to my colleagues is that there are very deep feelings about this and people have had about enough of this. There have been all kinds of abuses here about how we conduct our business. We are not going to keep accepting that because when you accept that, the loyal opposition is eroded over a period of time consistently in its ability to exercise the little powers it has, and then the Senate is weakened. Then the Senate's role as the body that slows down problems, that stands up to ATF nominations, that stands up to NLRB illegal appointments, is eroded. We do not need to do that.

I know there is a lot of feeling here.

I see my colleague Senator HATCH. He has been through this for a long time and has seen these disputes. I have seen a few myself in my 16 years—not nearly as long as Senator HATCH, who chaired the Judiciary Committee and has been ranking member on that committee. But what I will say is that this situation does not justify the nuclear option. It does not. It is a dangerous thing, and it can be addictive for the majority leader—every time he is confronted by someone legitimately using the rules of the Senate to raise questions about the majority's agenda, that they are overruled and the rule is changed so the majority leader can advance his agenda. That is what the issue is about.

I ask my Democratic colleagues, let's slow down, let's not go this way. Maybe this conference Monday will help us reach an accord and avoid a very dangerous event for the history of the Senate.

Mr. MERKLEY. Will my colleague yield for a question?

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield for a question.

Mr. MERKLEY. I have in front of me the list of the number of times the application of a rule was changed from the precedent. It was done each time under a simple majority structure, and it was done 10 times since 1985.

I pointed out earlier—I am not sure if my colleague was on the floor—that seven of these times this was done

under Republican leadership. So seven times Republicans came to the floor and said: We are going to change the application of a rule under redirection of the precedent or overruling of the precedent. I want to ask if the Senator is familiar with that because the way he was speaking, it sounded as if this conversation is about something—a procedure that had never been done. Yet it was done seven times since 1985 by my Republican colleagues.

Mr. SESSIONS. I said it is a dangerous trend and it can be addictive and it can undermine the nature of the Senate. I did not say it never happened. But to my knowledge, I would like for the Senator to list for me the number of times since 1985 the majority leader has gone before the Parliamentarian and the Presiding Officer and actually altered the rules by a vote of the Senate, overruling the Chair?

Mr. MERKLEY. I will be happy to do that. I have that in front of me. Let's start on December 11, 1985:

The Senate allows a conference report on the basis that everything included is ''relevant,'' even though multiple provisions have been ruled to violate the scope of the conference committee's authority.

The ruling of the Chair changing the precedent was reversed.

This happened again in September—

Mr. SESSIONS. Was there a vote on that?

Mr. MERKLEY. Yes.

Mr. SESSIONS. How many votes? I am curious. I know it was done before. The big time that I recall, I say to Senator MERKLEY, was the one over Federal judges, similar to this. At the end, cooler heads prevailed, a compromise was reached, and a very significant rule of the Senate was not altered.

Some of these could be technical rulings of the Chair that are not that significant, but I am interested in seeing what others the Senator might mention. I am particularly interested if there was an actual vote of the body, by the Senate.

Mr. MERKLEY. Yes. I can assure my colleague that each and every one of these involved an actual vote, and each and every one of these 10 occasions did reverse the previous precedent. That happens in two fashions.

Mr. SESSIONS. Will the Senator offer that for the record?

Mr. MERKLEY. Absolutely.

Mr. SESSIONS. I would like to look at that and see where we are.

Senator HATCH is here now.

Mr. MERKLEY. I will get the Senator a personal copy.

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

September 25, 1986: The Senate establishes that procedural motions or requests do not constitute speeches for purposes of the two-speech rule (ruling reversed 5–92).

December 11, 1985: The Senate allows a conference report on the basis that everything included is ''relevant,'' even though multiple provisions have been ruled to violate the scope of the conference committee's authority (ruling reversed 27–68).

April 28, 1987: The Senate establishes that the Presiding Officer should defer to the Budget Committee Chair on whether an amendment violates Section 201(i) of the Budget Act (ruling sustained 50–46).

May 13, 1987: The Senate establishes that a Senator may not decline to vote when it is done for the purposes of delaying the announcement of that vote (ruling reversed 46–54).

March 16, 1995: The Senate allows legislating on appropriations bills (ruling reversed 42–57) [this precedent was reversed in 1999 by resolution].

May 23, 1996: The Senate establishes that a budget resolution with reconciliation instructions for a measure increasing the deficit is appropriate (ruling sustained 53–47).

October 3, 1996: The Senate broadens the scope of allowable material in conference reports (ruling reversed 39–56) [this precedent was reversed in 2000 by language in an appropriations bill].

June 16, 1999: The Senate establishes that a motion to recommit a bill with instructions to report back an amendment had to be filed before the amendment filing deadline (ruling sustained 60–39).

May 17, 2000: The Senate establishes that it is the Chair's prerogative to rule out of order non-germane precatory (sense-of-the-Senate or -of-Congress) amendments (ruling reversed 45–54).

October 6, 2011: The Senate establishes that motions to suspend the rules in order to consider non-germane amendments post cloture are dilatory and not allowed (ruling reversed 48–51).

Mr. SESSIONS. Reclaiming the floor, Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's sharing that. We will study them. It is absolutely a practice that can occur, but it is a very dangerous practice. The Senate is a place of a certain amount of collegiality and a certain amount of good judgment and understanding and respect for the body. Sometimes you can carry out a procedure that may be dubious but within the realm of acceptable procedures, and sometimes you can feel and understand that is a dangerous alteration of the precedents of the Senate. That is where I am afraid we are with this vote.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SESSIONS. I will yield for a question from Senator HATCH.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BEGICH). The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. It makes a difference between issues where the Chair has been overruled rather than the nuclear option which changes the rule, which breaks the rule and changes it. That is a significant difference. That is what is being done here by a mere majority vote.

The majority wants to change a very important rule. If we go down that road, I am going to tell you, the majority is going to be a very sorry majority in the future because they may be a minority. This body has always protected the rights of the minority, whether Democratic or Republican. It is what made it the greatest body in the world. We are about to destroy that for no good reason.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I will be pleased to yield to the Senator from Utah and look forward to hearing his remarks. He is a man of great expertise on this particular issue.

Mr. HATCH. I thank my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Let me say that there are differences in how the rules are interpreted from time to time. From time to time the Chair has been overruled. I have been here when it has. I have only been here 37 years, and I have never seen anything like this in the whole 37 years.

I have to say that this is a dangerous thing to do. I predict that if our colleagues on the other side—all of whom I care for—if they do this, they are going to rue the day they did it. It is that simple. They can say: Oh, it is just an eensy-teensy little change. It is not. It is a monumental change. There is going to be a tremendous price to pay for it, to the detriment of our country—it is just that simple—and certainly to the detriment of the Senate, the greatest deliberative body in the world.

It is hard for me to understand, over two NLRB partisans whom the President just recess-appointed, ignoring the rules of the Senate, and over Cordray, who probably under any other circumstances would get through easily, but there is very good reason why he should not go through this way.

OBAMACARE

Mr. President, I rise to speak on what is known as ObamaCare and what the Obama administration did last week, hoping the American people were not paying attention, that impacts huge parts of the President's signature domestic policy achievement as our Nation was celebrating the Fourth of July. I am talking about the administration's decision to suspend for a year—conveniently past next year's election, which is very interesting to me—enforcing what is known as the employer mandate, the requirement that businesses offer insurance to their employees or face the penalty. And then a rule was issued by the Department of Health and Human Services last Friday stating that it would not verify people's incomes before giving out premium subsidies. My gosh, we have fraud all over the Federal Government, and they do something this stupid and undesirable?

I am certainly glad employers got some relief. It is quite a message from the Obama administration, quite a message the Obama administration is sending the struggling families and individuals who will get no relief from this monstrosity of a law and its burdensome individual mandate tax. Republicans in Congress believe this is unfair as such. Senator THUNE spearheaded a letter to President Obama, which I enthusiastically signed, urging him to permanently delay the whole entire law and treat individuals the way he is going to treat businesses. I am glad it has been put over for businesses, even though I question why it was put over for this next year. But

why not do it for the individuals who are suffering from it? If it is good for the goose, it should be good for the gander. Shouldn't the Obama administration give the same relief to everyone?

Furthermore, I would like to point out that we have always known this law was a budget buster. With the employer mandate delayed, I have joined with a group of Republican committee leaders in the House and Senate asking for the Congressional Budget Office to get us an updated cost estimate of the bill. I can't say what CBO will find, but I have a feeling that ObamaCare's price tag will continue to soar. It is already off the charts. Everybody knows it is an abominable bill, and that includes Democrats as well.

What happened last week is just the latest in a series of confirmations that the President's health care is simply not ready for prime time. Unfortunately, it is the American people who pay the price for the largest expansion of government in generations. They will pay the price through higher taxes. They will pay the price through higher health care costs and insurance costs. They will pay the price with more and more government regulations and debt. They will pay the price when they are forced into what are called exchanges that are simply not ready and unlikely to be ready in the near future.

This law, which was jammed through Congress on a purely partisan vote, is simply too big to work. The lesson is that asking government to do this much—when those of us who fought it tooth and nail said at the time it amounts to a government takeover of one-sixth of the American economy—will not succeed and cannot succeed. That is a lesson the Obama administration doesn't seem to get, doubling down on selling ObamaCare that is less popular today than when the President signed it into law. In fact, the White House is rolling out a massive multibillion-dollar PR campaign using taxpayer dollars to try to convince the American people that it is all the administration promised, shaking down the health care industry, professional sports teams, and movie stars in the process.

Where is it going to end? What is the matter with this administration? Can't they just live with the facts and acknowledge that this is a dog? In fact, a cynic might argue that ObamaCare was designed to fail in order for the Federal Government to step in for a true, European-style single-payer system that many on the extreme left wanted all along. In other words, socialized medicine with the Federal Government controlling every aspect of our lives from a medicine and health-care standpoint.

Now it seems as though every day we learn about more and more problems with ObamaCare. What do we know about it less than 4 months out from the open enrollment in the Federal and State health insurance exchanges which are supposed to occur on October 1?

We have heard from countless experts who say the exchanges will be rife with issues once they are supposedly up and running. Indeed, those experts have predicted everything from ''glitches'' to ''consumer horror stories.''

Two GAO reports released in June confirm that the Obama administration is ill-equipped for the implementation of both the federally facilitated health insurance exchange and the so-called Small Business Health Option Program Exchange. And that is two reports from GAO saying the administration is ill-equipped to implement those federally facilitated health insurance exchanges. Citing the programs' delays and missed deadlines, the GAO concluded that there is potential for ''implementation challenges going forward.''

While we have been hearing about the problems with the exchanges for months now, we have not heard an explanation from the administration as to how—despite all of these reports—all of this is supposed to be up and running by October 1. I hope I am wrong, but I have a feeling come October millions of Americans are going to find themselves unable to navigate these waters.

Sadly, the problems with the exchanges aren't the only difficulties with ObamaCare. Over the last several months we have heard numerous reports about the problems at the Internal Revenue Service. Let's face it. The IRS has never been beloved. Indeed, millions of Americans loathe and fear the IRS, and the recent scandal surrounding the targeting of conservative groups has not helped the agency's reputation either.

At the heart of this recent scandal, there are claims by the IRS that they were simply unable to manage the increased workload that came with an influx of applications of groups applying for tax exempt status under 501(c)(4). According to the IRS officials, the increase in applications were so massive that examiners had to find new ways to categorize and screen the documents submitted by these groups. They say that was the main cause of the targeting scandal.

Let's assume these arguments are true for a moment. When all is said and done, the number of applications of groups applying for 501(c)(4) status increased by 1,700 over a 4-year period. The IRS was apparently so flummoxed by an increase of less than 2,000 applications that it had to resort to inappropriate and potentially illegal measures. Give me a break.

If this is true, the country is in real trouble. If the IRS cannot manage an increase of 1,700 applications of groups applying for tax exempt status, how will it handle its significant role in implementing ObamaCare or even handling the so-called premium supports? Under the so-called Affordable Care Act, premium subsidies—complex tax credits designed to defray the costs of purchasing health insurance based on household income—will go to an estimated 7 million tax filers according to the Joint Committee on Taxation. Within 2 years, that number will nearly double. And they can't take care of 1,700 applications for 501(c)(4) that are basically and relatively simple?

In other words, the number of premium subsidy applications will jump from zero to 7 million in just 1 year. That is 7 million applications for people across a wide income spectrum claiming subsidies that did not exist before. Only God knows how many of those claims are going to be made fraudulently since they don't seem to be able to handle them.

Basically, the Obama administration would have us believe that while a 4-year increase of 1,700 applications for tax exempt status was enough to give the agency fits, it is perfectly capable of handling 7 million new filings for a brandnew health care entitlement. On top of that, they want us to believe they can continue processing these subsidies as they double in number over the first 2 years. Needless to say, I am more than a bit skeptical.

Of course, it is difficult to figure out exactly what the Obama administration expects the American people to believe when it comes to the IRS implementing ObamaCare. That is because despite all the upcoming deadlines, it is still not clear how the agency plans to fulfill this new responsibility; and despite numerous Congressional inquiries—as well as those from GAO and the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration, or TIGTA—no one really knows how the Affordable Care Act office in the IRS is going to work.

One of the few things we know for sure is that the person who headed the IRS division that was responsible for targeting conservative organizations now heads the division responsible for implementing ObamaCare. How lucky can we be? That is hardly a comforting thought. Make no mistake, processing these complex premium subsidies will not be a walk in the park. These credits are both advanceable and refundable—meaning they will be paid out first and verified later. Some have referred to this process as ''pay and chase.''

Many of my Democratic friends have referred to tax expenditures they don't like as ''spending through the Tax Code.'' That label is usually not accurate, but when we are talking about refundable credits, it is precisely on target. The problem is that over the years, the IRS has struggled to administer these types of tax credits. One needs to look no further than the earned income tax credit, or the EITC, to see the inherent problems with refundable credits.

In a report issued this past April, TIGTA found that 21 to 25 percent of total EITC payments were improperly given out. If you assume that same percentage of improper payments will apply to the $1 trillion we will spend on

ObamaCare premium subsidies—which is fair, due to the fact that the IRS has no way of verifying household income, and now the Department of Health and Human Services said it will not even try to verify a person's income—we could be looking at $210 billion to $250 billion in improper payments over the next 10 years. When is it going to end? When are the taxpayers going to get a break? This administration doesn't seem to know how to get us there.

Some of that will be the result of fraud and some of it will simply be due to filing errors. Either way, if the IRS's track record with refundable credits is any indication, we are looking at hundreds of billions of dollars in improper payments when it comes to the ObamaCare premium subsidies. Now with the Obama administration abandoning any income verification, we are left with a policy that is little more than an honor system for hundreds of billions of dollars of premium subsidies.

I will say it again: An honor system at a time when the Finance Committee and the administration are trying to crack down on improper government payments both within the tax system and our Federal health programs. If the definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over expecting different results, then this is the definition of insanity on steroids. Couple that with the already soaring pricetag of the subsidies and we have a disaster on our hands.

In his fiscal year 2012 budget, President Obama put the cost of the first year of premium subsidies at nearly $16 billion. In his most recent budget, that number soared to nearly $22 billion without any additional explanation.

Why are these costs going up? There are a number of possible explanations. For example, there is the fact that due to the cost imposed by ObamaCare, more and more employers are opting to drop coverage, thereby pushing more and more people into the exchanges subsidized by these very same tax credits. At the same time, we know in order to avoid providing health care benefits, many employers are moving employees into part-time work, which, once again, pushes more people into receiving premium subsidies in order to purchase health insurance.

Of course, there is the looming fact that despite the President's claims that his health care law would reduce the cost of health insurance, the cost of insurance premiums has continued to skyrocket. All of these are potential explanations of why the estimated cost of the premium subsidies has gone up in the President's budget.

Yesterday a group of my Senate colleagues and I sent a letter to Secretary Lew and Secretary Sebelius asking for an in-depth analysis as to how much of a burden the new health insurance exchanges will be on the Federal budget given the skyrocketing pricetag of these premium subsidies. This is a reasonable question given the magnitude of America's debt.

Between the dramatically increasing costs, the daunting tasks of administering these credits through the Tax Code, and now the administration is pulling back antifraud requirements, the chances for success are extraordinarily slim.

As I said earlier, this law is too big, too cumbersome, too inclusive, and too costly to work. I have never supported it, and for good reasons. What is most disconcerting is that it is the millions of Americans who work hard every day to pay their bills, put food on their tables, and send their children to school who will bear this burden. For their sake, the best solution is a permanent delay of the whole law—and not just for the business sector but for everybody. That is what we need to do.

We have to get rid of this pay-and-chase system that is going on right now where the government just pays in accordance under the honor code they described and later have to chase those who have defrauded the government. It is just unbelievable.

Well, look at the premium subsidies. These are tax credits in ObamaCare designed to defray the cost of purchasing health insurance. These are going to go to some 7 million tax filers in households earning as much as $94,000 a year. How many people who are making much more than that will claim they are making less than $94,000 a year? Well, if we look at the past, there is going to be a lot of them.

What is the IRS going to be able to do? They will not be able to approve it because they don't have the mechanisms to do it. My gosh.

The administration said they are just going to rely on the filer to self-report their income to get access to the credits. Give us a break. My gosh. Like I said, the projected figure for subsidy expenditures has gone from $16 billion to $22 billion in just a couple of years. It is mind-boggling that they get away with it. It is mind-boggling that the American people have not risen up in rebellion against this stupid bill, and it is mind-boggling to me how my colleagues on the other side continue to defend this monstrosity.

Every day we hear about more and more problems with it. Every day we hear about more and more costs. Every day we hear about more and more fraud. Every day we hear about people in the government who don't understand it and can't figure it out.

When are we going to grow up and realize this is a dog and it is hurting America? I will be honest. I believe within a year or two the President is going to throw his hands in the air and say: This is not working. We have to go to a single-payer system—in other words, socialized medicine where the government will control all of our lives and will determine who gets health care and who doesn't. I have to say that is where we are headed. I hope I am proven wrong in the future, but I know I am going to be proven right. I can just see it. If it happens, it will have been done by our friends on the other side—100 percent—who voted for this dog. They don't seem to recognize it is eating America alive.

I don't understand it. I love my colleagues on the other side. We have been friends for a long time. I have been here 37 years. There are only two Senators in that 37-year period whom I thought had no real reason to be here. I have loved everybody else, some more than others, of course.

The fact is what is happening has happened because of the Democratic side of this floor, and we have to get some heroes over there to start standing and saying: We are not going down that road. We are not going to become socialism revisited, even though many of their supporters want that, as is evident to anybody who looks at it. When is our media going to take up and realize this is what is happening to our country and it is wrecking it. On top of that, we have this absolutely idiotic desire on the part of my friends on the other side to change the rules—to break the rule to change it.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

TOO BIG TO FAIL

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, there is broad agreement that overleveraged financial institutions significantly contributed, to put it mildly, to the 2008 financial crisis and that they were bailed out because everyone knows they are too big to fail.

Years later—5 years later now—there is an implicit assumption that the largest megabanks—the five or six largest banks in the country—are still too big to fail. That means the markets give them funding advantages that experts estimate are as high as 50 or 60 or 70 or even 80 basis points.

That means when they go in the capital markets, they can borrow money at close to 1 percent. Eighty-eight basis points is fourth-fifths of 1 percent. They can borrow money at a lower cost than virtually anyone else in our economy.

Studies from Bloomberg have shown that this can mean a subsidy of upward of $80 billion to these five, six, seven megabanks—these large megabanks.

Last year, as a result, my colleague Senator VITTER and I began to push the banking regulators—the Federal Reserve, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, and the FDIC, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation—to use stronger capital and leverage rules to end this too-big-to-fail subsidy.

There is now bipartisan agreement that imposing more stringent capital

and leverage requirements for the largest financial institutions could help prevent the next financial crisis and prevent future bailouts.

Unfortunately, the Basel Committee—named after a city in Switzerland—responsible for the Basel III international capital rules adopted a mere 3-percent leverage ratio.

In 2007, the investment banks Bear Stearns and Lehman Brothers were leveraged 33 to 1 and 31 to 1, respectively. These institutions would have been compliant with the Basel III international leverage ratio, and yet each would have become insolvent, or nearly insolvent, if the value of their assets declined by as little as 3 percent. That meant they only had sort of 3 percent protection, and if their assets declined by more than 3 percent, they would be what you call underwater. They simply would be a failing, unsustainable institution or bank.

I am pleased to say that this week regulators finally went beyond these inadequate rules and proposed a 6-percent leverage ratio for insured banks. I said earlier, Senator VITTER and I had argued for this and were pushing the banking regulators to do what they, in fact, did this week.

The move is a necessary step in the right direction. It shows how far this conversation has gone in a short time. But there is more work to be done. Let me explain several things we can do now.

First, the number needs to be higher. The Wall Street Journal editorial board—not a group of people with whom I often agree or with whom I see eye to eye very often—wrote this morning about these rules:

[O]ur preference would be to go north of 6 percent.

To be higher.

Why not approach the capital levels that small finance companies without government backing are required by markets to hold, which can run into the teens?

They are required by markets. For the megabanks, the market does not quite respond the same way because of their economic and their political power.

Second, I am still concerned that banks can use risk weights and their internal models to game capital rules. This amounts to the banks determining for themselves—this is not some government body or some unaligned group of economists—this amounts to the banks determining for themselves how risky their assets are, thereby setting their own capital requirements.

The Financial Times said today the biggest banks plan to use ''optimization'' strategies—not more equity—to meet the new leverage ratio.

''We're going to be able to pull a lot of levers,'' said an executive at a large US bank on Wednesday. . . . Analysts at Goldman Sachs noted in research for clients that ''banks have a lot of options to mitigate the impact.''

That is why we need simpler rules that cannot be gamed by Wall Street, and this rule cannot be watered down by Wall Street lobbyists.

There is no reason agencies should not finalize these rules and begin implementing their rules tomorrow—not go through the long rules process. We cannot wait. Small businesses and families cannot afford to wait, neither can our economy.

Finally, there is more work to be done to rein in Wall Street megabanks. Senator VITTER and I have a bill that would do this—the bipartisan too big to fail act. It would restore market discipline by raising megabanks' capital requirements and limiting the Federal safety net that supports them.

I have also proposed legislation called the SAFE Banking Act to cap the amount of nondeposit liabilities that any single megabank can have.

The regulators have begun to do their jobs. It is time for Congress to do its job. This week was a good week. It was a step in the right direction, but it is time to finish the job. It is time to end too big to fail once and for all.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

(The remarks of Mr. MCCAIN and Ms. WARREN pertaining to the introduction of S. 1282 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

SAFE RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the following seven letters expressing support for S. 1270, the Secure Annuities for Employee, SAFE, Retirement Act of 2013: Committee of Annuity Insurers, Great American Life Insurance Company, Insured Retirement Institute, Investment Company Institute, Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, National Association for Fixed Annuities, and the National Association of Insurance and Financial Advisors.

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

DAVIS & HARMAN LLP,
Washington, DC, July 3, 2013.

Re SAFE Retirement Act of 2013.

Hon. ORRIN HATCH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HATCH: On behalf of the Committee of Annuity Insurers[1] I am writing to express the Committee's appreciation of your effort to further the retirement security of American workers by introducing the SAFE Retirement Act of 2013. As the Act recognizes, Americans face many obstacles in preparing for and living in retirement. Prior to retirement, they must attempt to accumulate adequate savings while also understanding that at retirement they will need to convert those savings into an income stream that will last the rest of their lives.

There is no one approach that will fully address these challenges. Rather, Americans need a number of options to help them achieve their retirement goals. The introduction of legislation such as the SAFE Retirement Act is an important contribution to the current and future public dialogue on retirement security.

Of course, a key element of retirement security is guaranteed lifetime income. Life insurance companies and the annuities they issue pool the longevity risks of large groups of individuals and thereby provide guaranteed lifetime income to those individuals. Annuities can also help individuals accumulate retirement savings in a manner that suits their personal approach to saving. As a result, annuities are, and should remain, a key means of assuring retirement security, as the SAFE Retirement Act recognizes.

The Committee of Annuity Insurers commends you for your efforts on the SAFE Retirement Act, and we look forward to working with you and your staff to improve the retirement security of all Americans.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH F. MCKEEVER,
Counsel to the Committee of Annuity Insurers.

[1] The Committee of Annuity Insurers is a coalition of 28 of the largest and most prominent issuers of annuity contracts, representing approximately 80% of the annuity business in the United States. The Committee was formed in 1981 to address federal legislative and regulatory issues relevant to the annuity industry and to participate in the development of federal tax and securities policies regarding annuities.

GREAT AMERICAN
LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY,
Cincinnati, OH, July 3, 2013.

Re Safer Pension Act of 2013

Hon. ORRIN HATCH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HATCH: After participating in a NAFA call with Preston Rutledge on July 3, I am writing to express that I appreciate your effort to further the retirement security of American workers by introducing the Safer Pension Act of 2013. As the Act recognizes, Americans face many obstacles in preparing for and living in retirement. Prior to retirement, they must attempt to accumulate adequate savings. After they retire, they must address the challenge of assuring that the savings they accumulated while working will provide them with income for the rest of their lives.

There is no one approach that will fully address these challenges. Rather, Americans need a number of options to help them achieve their retirement goals. The introduction of legislation, such as the Safer Pension Act, is an important contribution to the current and future public dialogue on retirement security.

Of course, a key element of retirement security is guaranteed lifetime income. life insurance companies and the annuities they issue pool the longevity risks of large groups of individuals and thereby provide guaranteed lifetime income to those individuals. Fixed annuities can also help individuals accumulate retirement savings in a manner that suits their personal approach to saving. As a result, annuities are, and should remain, a key means of assuring retirement security, as the Safer Pension Act recognizes.

The National Association for Fixed Annuities and its member companies commend you for introducing the Safer Pension Act and we look forward to working with you and your staff to improve the retirement security of all Americans.

Sincerely,

MALOTT W. NYHART,
Divisional President, Single Premium/Financial Institutions Division.

INSURED RETIREMENT INSTITUTE,
Washington, DC, July 3, 2013.

Re SAFE Retirement Act of 2013

Hon. ORRIN G. HATCH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HATCH: The Insured Retirement Institute (IRI)[1] commends your leadership on increasing retirement security of American workers by introducing the SAFE Retirement Act of 2013. The current state of retirement savings readiness in America is at crisis levels and the need for Americans to insure against the risk of outliving their assets has never been greater.

Seventy-nine million Baby Boomers today face immediate and unprecedented retirement income challenges—challenges that simply did not exist in earlier generations. Research shows nearly half of Boomers, over 30 million Americans, are ''at risk'' for inadequate retirement income, not having sufficient guaranteed lifetime income. These challenges have been created by the shift from defined benefit plans to defined contribution plans, longer life spans, increased medical costs, and inadequate savings rates. In fact, for a married couple both age 65 now, a 60 percent chance exists that one spouse will live to age 90, and a 30 percent chance exists that one will live to age 95.

As a result of these needs, the public policy focus on enhancing retirement security in America has never been greater. Along with other retirement security legislative and regulatory initiatives, the SAFE Retirement Act is an important contribution to efforts to enable Americans to achieve financial security in their retirement years.

Annuities offered by IRI's insurer, broker-dealer, and bank members provide retirees guaranteed lifetime income and should remain a key component of retirement financial planning, as the SAFE Retirement Act recognizes. While many Americans are at risk for having inadequate retirement income, according to IRI research, Baby Boomers who own insured retirement products, including all types of annuities, have higher confidence in their overall retirement expectations, with nine out of ten believing they are doing a good job preparing financially for retirement.

Because annuities help address numerous risks retirees face, including longevity risk and inflation risk, financial advisors and Boomers are increasingly seeing the need for lifetime income provided by annuities, particularly middle-income families who make up the bulk of annuity owners. A number of IRI research reports show that Boomers who own annuities have more confidence in their financial security in retirement and are using more annuities to meet their retirement income needs.

73 percent of annuity owners believe that annuities are a critical part of their retirement strategy.

Baby Boomer annuity owners are more likely to engage in positive retirement planning behaviors than Baby Boomer non-annuity owners, with 68 percent having calculated a retirement goal and 63 percent having consulted with a financial advisor.

Nine out of ten female Boomer annuity owners are confident they will have a comfortable retirement.

84 percent of financial advisors say they are having more retirement income discussions with clients.

71 percent of advisors say they had a client request to purchase an annuity during the last year.

For these reasons, IRI and its member companies commend you for introducing the SAFE Retirement Act. We support improvements to the current employer retirement plan system resulting in greater simplification, increased participation and savings by workers, and access to lifetime income products within retirement plans.

As Congress considers tax reform, we appreciate your continued support of the current retirement security system. We look forward to working with you and your staff to improve the retirement security of all Americans.

Sincerely,

CATHERINE J. WEATHERFORD,
President & CEO.

[1]The Insured Retirement Institute (IRI) is the leading association for the retirement income industry and has been called the ''primary trade association for annuities'' by U.S. News and World Report. IRI proudly leads a national consumer coalition of more than twenty-five organizations and is the only association that represents the entire supply chain of insured retirement strategies. Our members include major life insurers, broker-dealers, banks, asset managers and financial advisors. We currently have over 500 member companies and provide member benefits to more than 150,000 financial advisors and 10,000 home office financial professionals. As a not-for-profit organization, IRI provides an objective forum for communication and education, and advocates for sustainable retirement solutions Americans need to help achieve a secure and dignified retirement.

INVESTMENT COMPANY INSTITUTE,
Washington, DC, July 9, 2013.

Hon. ORRIN HATCH,
Ranking Member, Committee on Finance, U.S. Senate, Hart Office Building, Washington DC.

DEAR RANKING MEMBER HATCH: I am writing to applaud your ongoing efforts to strengthen the U.S. retirement system. You have championed throughout your career public policies that help Americans save for their retirement years. Nearly two decades ago, you authored, along with Sen. David Pryor (D–AK), the Pension Simplification Act of 1995. More recently, you strongly supported retirement savings plan improvements, including provisions in the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 and the Pension Protection Act of 2006, which made permanent the increased contribution limits for IRAs and other qualified plans, including 401(k)s. Building upon the system's tax incentives, plan regulations, and innovation, these improvements have helped Americans accumulate $20.8 trillion for retirement, including $11.1 trillion in defined contribution (DC) plans and individual retirement accounts (IRAs).[1] More than 80 million U.S. households have accumulated retirement savings under employment-based retirement plans and IRAs.[2]

We understand that you plan to introduce the SAFER Pension Act, which aims to build on the strengths and successes of the U.S. retirement system, so that it works even more effectively to help American workers and their families prepare for secure retirements. While we are still reviewing the draft language that was recently shared with us, we note that your bill targets several key areas for improving the system, such as: making it easier and more cost effective for small business owners to offer 401(k) retirement plans to their employees; encouraging employers to enroll workers automatically at higher levels of savings and to escalate the savings more substantially than is perceived appropriate under current law; and enabling greater use of electronic delivery of plan information and tools to help workers understand their savings options and make sound decisions.

We look forward to working with you and sharing our ideas for further improving these and other provisions in this important piece of legislation, to ensure their effectiveness and the product neutrality that has helped create our flexible and innovative retirement system.

Thanks to the strengths of our system, successive generations of American retirees have been better off than previous generations.[3] The Institute stands ready to assist you in continuing this trend by promoting greater retirement savings opportunities for American workers. With very best regards.

Sincerely,

PAUL SCHOTT STEVENS,
President & CEO.

[1]See Investment Company Institute, ''The U.S. Retirement Market, First Quarter 2013'' (June 2013), available at www.ici.org/info/ret_13_q1_data.xls.

[2]See Holden and Schrass, ''The Role of IRAs in U.S. Households' Saving for Retirement, 2012,'' ICI Research Pespective 18, no 8 (December 2012), Figure 1, p. 3, available at www.ici.org/pdf/per18-08.pdf.

[3]See Brady, Burham, and Holden, The Success of the U.S. Retirement System, Investment Company Institute (December 2012), pp. 10–14, available at www.ici.org/pdf/ppr_12_success_retirement.pdf.

METLIFE,
Washington, DC, July 8, 2013.

Hon. ORRIN HATCH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HATCH: MetLife applauds your introduction of the Secure Annuities for Employee (SAFE) Retirement Act of 2013. In introducing this bill, you have highlighted the importance of guaranteed income throughout retirement for millions of Americans. We agree this is of critical importance.

The SAFER Pension Act also serves to increase attention to a number of key challenges, including the importance of stable pension benefit funding, the importance of lifetime income to retirement security, and the importance of regulatory simplification for plan sponsors, all of which strengthen the foundation of our overall retirement system.

For many Americans, worries about their financial future are intensified by weakening employer-based and public safety nets—and by inadequate levels of personal savings and retirement income protection. MetLife believes that policymakers, insurers and employers all play an important role in revitalizing and establishing programs that can provide certainty in today's uncertain world.

In 1921, MetLife became the first life insurance company to develop and offer a group annuity contract to fund defined benefit plans and provide guaranteed income to employees at retirement. We have continued this tradition of innovation more recently with group annuity contracts designed to provide guaranteed income for defined contribution plans. We appreciate that the SAFER Pension Act has helped to highlight the positive role annuities can play, and look forward to working together in this retirement security reform effort.

Sincerely,

PETER R. PASTRE,
Vice President.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
FOR FIXED ANNUITIES,
Milwaukee, WI, July 5, 2013.

Re Secure Annuities for Employee (SAFE) Retirement Act of 2013.

Senator ORIN HATCH,
Hart Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR: NAFA, the National Association for Fixed Annuities, applauds your

efforts to provide a safe and reliable pension plan for employees and supports the goals of the ''Secure Annuities for Employee (SAFE) Retirement Act of 2013.'' Thank you, too, for recognizing the valuable role fixed annuities play to insure retirement. Our nation's retirement security depends upon commitments like yours so that America's workers can look forward to the retirement of their dreams with a guaranteed and steady income.

Providing state and local governments a fixed annuity option issued by an insurance company not only guarantees lifetime income, but the industry's record of strength and solvency also insures that pensions are protected from market crises and cannot be underfunded. In addition, the effective and vigorous regulation of the annuity industry by the state insurance departments has been demonstrated day after day and year after year by high consumer satisfaction and the ever increasing purchase of fixed annuities. The fixed annuity industry already secures the future for millions of American's and continues to be one of the most reliable and steady financial services sector throughout this country's history.

NAFA looks forward to continue working with your office as the bill progresses. NAFA members represent over 84% of the fixed annuities sold through independent distribution and its Board of Directors is pleased to support retirement income security for all Americans.

Sincerely,

KIM O'BRIEN,
President & CEO.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF INSURANCE AND FINANCIAL ADVISORS,
Falls Church, VA, July 2, 2013.

Re SAFER Pension Act of 2013.

Hon. ORRIN HATCH,
Hart Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HATCH: The National Association of Insurance and Financial Advisors (NAIFA) applauds your continued leadership to encourage retirement savings. We look forward to working with you on the ''Secure Annuities for Employee Retirement Pension Act of 2013'' and other initiatives to improve the savings programs available, for both public and private employee participants.

Founded in 1890 as The National Association of Life Underwriters (NALU), NAIFA is one of the nation's oldest and largest associations representing the interests of insurance professionals from every Congressional district in the United States. NAIFA and its members recognize the importance of individuals and families planning and saving for retirement and the significance of employer sponsored plans as a necessary component of that planning, along with life insurance and annuity products. We also are supportive of efforts to assure that middle market investors continue to have access to professional services and advice and they have a choice of financial products that will meet their financial needs and objectives.

NAIFA looks forward to maintaining a continued dialogue with you, and members of Congress on both sides of the aisle, to assure employees, employers, and our members who provide services to them can effectively and affordably save for their retirement needs.

Thank you again for your leadership.

Sincerely,

ROBERT O. SMITH, J.D., CLU, CHFC, LIC,
President.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ''GAME OF CHANGE''

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join the distinguished Senator from Illinois, Mr. KIRK, in submitting a resolution celebrating the 50th anniversary of Loyola University of Chicago's historic season as National Collegiate Athletics Association men's basketball champions. The season is also remembered for the historic matchup with Mississippi State University in the NCAA Tournament, which helped end racial segregation in college athletics.

The Mississippi State and Loyola teams, along with their coaches and school administrators, led with courage and sportsmanship and a love of the game of basketball. That contest a half century ago helped to move my State and our Nation forward in addressing the inequalities of our society.

I appreciate the legacy and inspiring example of these teams, and am pleased to cosponsor the resolution introduced today by Senators KIRK, DURBIN, and WICKER.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the Clarion Ledger newspaper article from March 18, 2013, titled, ''As March Madness nears, so does 50th anniversary of MSU's 'Game of Change'.''

AS MARCH MADNESS NEARS, SO DOES 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF MSU'S ''GAME OF CHANGE''

(By Jerry Mitchell)

Loyola captain Jerry Harkness shakes hands with MSU captain Joe Dan Gold before the historic 1963 game.

As March Madness nears, so does the 50th anniversary of the ''Game of Change,'' where the all-white Mississippi State University basketball team dodged a judge's injunction and the governor's wrath to play the integrated Loyola University of Chicago.

Those across the nation know more about Texas Western's 1966 defeat of Kentucky, becoming the first champion with five African-American starters (depicted in the 2006 film, Glory Road).

While that game, once and for all, settled the question of race on the court, MSU's game against Loyola also played a critical role. The blog, The '60s at 50, quotes from the March 25 edition of Sports Illustrated:

''Literally out of hiding to play Loyola the night before had come Mississippi State, the team that saddened the hearts of segregationists everywhere by agreeing—eagerly—to participate in a tournament open to Negroes. On the eve of his team's departure from Starkville, Coach Babe McCarthy got word that a sheriff was out with a court order that could keep the team in Mississippi. Like Little Eva skipping across the ice ahead of the bloodhounds, McCarthy skipped into Tennessee. University President Dr. D.W. Colvard vanished, too. Early Thursday morning an assistant coach verified that the coast was clear at the airport, hustled the team into a plane and away it flew on a modern underground railroad in reverse.''

McCarthy had faced a series of frustrations as MSU's basketball coach. His teams had dominated nationally, winning the SEC championship in 1959, 1961 and 1962—only to watch Kentucky represent the league in the postseason because Mississippi authorities prevented them from playing any integrated teams.

Former Clarion-Ledger sportswriter Kyle Veazey (currently with The Commercial Appeal) has penned a new book on the subject, Champions for Change: How the Mississippi State Bulldogs and Their Bold Coach Defied Segregation.

He was stunned to find out no one had written the story and decided to write it himself.

When the question of playing an integrated team arose in 1959, MSU's president at the time, Ben Hilbun, received mail 3-to-1 in favor of keeping the team at home.

Four years later, the mail ran 3-to-1 in favor of playing, Veazey said. ''Sports helped personalize the integration issue when it was so often being characterized by polarizing figures.''

He suspects the 1959 and 1962 teams could have won the national championship if permitted to go.

In the 1962–1963 season, the Loyola team, with four African-American starters, faced its own difficulties, encountering vitriol and jeering from some fans during games in the South.

Before leaving for the big game in March 1963, Loyola players received hate mail from the Ku Klux Klan, according to ESPN.

Photographers snapped the legendary picture of Loyola captain Jerry Harkness and MSU captain Joe Dan Gold shaking hands at half court. (Harkness told USA TODAY he decided to play basketball his senior year after a visitor to the Harlem gym urged him to play. That visitor? Baseball legend Jackie Robinson.)

Loyola defeated MSU 61–51 on the way to winning the national championship in a game watched in person by a little-known boxer named Cassius Clay.

Throngs of MSU fans surrounded their team arriving at the airport, and a survey afterward found that Mississippians overwhelming favored letting MSU play the game.

Sports began to change hearts in a way that laws couldn't, Veazey said. ''It was an example of Mississippi doing something right when it was doing so many other things wrong. It showed Mississippians that progress could happen, that men like Babe McCarthy and (MSU President) Dean Colvard could be courageous—and successful.''

MAINE FIREFIGHTERS COMMEMORATION

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, every day across this country, firefighters quietly put their lives on the line in order to protect the communities in which they serve. Few firefighters better exemplify the selfless qualities that

characterize this select group of public safety personnel than those in Franklin County, ME, who recently rushed to the aid of their Canadian neighbors to help combat a deadly fire in the border town of Lac-Megantic, Quebec. I rise today to recognize those firefighters from the Maine towns of Chesterville, Eustis, Farmington, New Vineyard, Phillips, Strong, and Rangeley.

In the early morning hours of Saturday, July 6, 2013, a freight train carrying hundreds of thousands of gallons of crude oil was sent hurtling toward Lac-Megantic, a small, picturesque Canadian village located only 30 miles from the Maine border. The train derailed in the center of town, leveling several blocks and killing numerous residents. This unthinkable loss has touched every member of that close-knit community. My heart goes out to the family and friends of the victims of this tragedy, and my thoughts and prayers are with the residents of Lac-Megantic during this time of mourning. Yet, out of this terrible calamity, I was exceedingly heartened to hear the stories of more than 30 firefighters in nearby Maine who answered their Canadian neighbors' call and reported for duty.

Within mere hours of the accident, the Franklin County Emergency Management Agency had alerted seven area fire departments, and the Maine firefighters were at the scene. Upon arriving in Lac-Megantic, these firefighters overcame tremendous obstacles in order to combat the flames. The initial blasts had severed the town's phone lines, power, and water supply, leaving Canadian firefighters unable to use the fire hydrants. Maine fire trucks, equipped with the capability of drawing water directly from the nearby lake, allowed firefighters to cool off the remaining fuel-laden cars that were in danger of combusting, likely averting additional destruction.

The response of the Maine firefighters demonstrates the best qualities of international cooperation as well as the tenets of the brotherhood of firefighters. Maine and eastern Canada are bound together by history, family ties, and friendship, and that special relationship was clearly evident on the morning of July 6. Despite challenges posed by incompatible hose couplings, different radio systems, and even a language barrier in French-speaking Quebec, Maine and Canadian firefighters worked side-by-side to quickly and effectively douse the flames and mitigate the damage caused by this dreadful accident.

The valiant and selfless efforts of these Maine firefighters are unquestionably worthy of our respect and gratitude. This unassuming group of first responders never thought twice about helping their Canadian neighbors and fellow firefighters. I applaud the firefighters of Chesterville, Eustis, Farmington, New Vineyard, Phillips, Strong, and Rangeley, as well as the effective coordination of these departments by the Franklin County Emergency Management Agency. Truly, we can feel secure knowing these heroes are always willing to answer the call for help.

TRIBUTE TO CYNTHIA M.A. BUTLER-McINTYRE

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, my friend, Mrs. Cynthia M.A. Butler McIntyre, will be retiring her role as the national president of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc, this year. She has served as president since July 2008, and has been a great asset to the organization.

Mrs. McIntyre became a member of Delta Sigma Theta on November 30, 1973, and has served as a leader at the local, State, regional, and national levels. Mrs. McIntyre has an impressive professional resume that includes director of Human Resources for the Jefferson Parish Public School System in Harvey, LA, kindergarten teacher, assistant principal, summer school principal, and personnel administrator in her school district.

Her professional and honorary degrees reflect her passion for education. She received a bachelor of arts in early childhood education from Dillard University and a master of education in curriculum and instruction as well as educational administration from the University of New Orleans. She also received an honorary doctorate of divinity degree in religious education from the Louisiana Bible College.

Under the leadership of Mrs. McIntyre, Delta Sigma Theta Sorority has partnered with Water in Education International, WEI, to open The Cynthia M.A. Butler-McIntyre Campus in Cherette, Haiti which is dedicated to providing access to clean water for children. Members of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority have donated funds to support the Clean Water Haiti Fund and under Mrs. McIntyre's direction, the sorority is set to open a new elementary school in Haiti this summer.

Mrs. McIntyre is a national leader who currently serves on the board of the New Orleans Convention Center and the Martin Luther King, Jr. Task Force. Previously, she served as executive director of the Tech-Prep Summer Program at Delgado Community College in New Orleans and has worked as the assistant coordinator of field experiences and college education supervisor for early childhood student teaching experiences for the University of New Orleans. In 2011, she was appointed by President Barack Obama to the Christopher Columbus Fellowship Foundation board of trustees.

Delta Sigma Theta Sorority has truly benefitted from Mrs. McIntyre's leadership as a pioneer of education reform. Her accolades include Distinguished Delta of the Year, Distinguished Public Servant Award, MLK Outstanding Activist Recognition, Hall of Fame, Distinguished Women of Honor, Who's Who in American Education, YMCA Role Model Recognition, Elementary Assistant Principal of the Year, and Teacher of the Year, just to name a few.

Delta Sigma Theta Sorority will have big shoes to fill in the absence of their president, Mrs. McIntyre. She has made invaluable contributions to the state of education, and her uncompromised leadership has impacted communities, nationally and internationally. I wish her continued success for the future.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO JULIUS CIACCIA

● Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate Mr. Julius Ciaccia, executive director of the Northeast Ohio Regional Sewer District on his election as president of the National Association of Clean Water Agencies, NACWA.

Mr. Ciaccia is an accomplished leader and committed environmental steward who has played a prominent role in the water industry, exemplifying what it means to be a public servant. He is ideally suited to serve as president of one of the Nation's leading proponents of responsible policies that advance clean water. Mr. Ciaccia has served the people of the Cleveland area for decades, and in this new role, will continue to ensure that the Nation's clean water agencies continue to protect public health and improve the environment.

Mr. Ciaccia began his career in public utilities in 1977 when he was appointed as assistant director of the Public Utilities Department for the city of Cleveland. In 1979, he joined the leadership of the city's Division of Water where he served as both deputy commissioner and commissioner until 2004.

During some 30 years with the city of Cleveland's Division of Water, Mr. Ciaccia oversaw the management of more than $1 billion worth of capital improvement projects and maintained the agency's favorable financial position. He was appointed director of the city's Department of Public Utilities in 2004 exercising oversight of the water, sewer collection, and public power systems, with a focus on developing comprehensive financial plans and supporting revenue enhancement initiatives.

Mr. Ciaccia began his current role at the Northeast Ohio Regional Sewer District, NEORSD, in 2007. In his current role at the district, he oversees all aspects of managing one of the Nation's largest wastewater management utilities. Under his leadership, the district has received two awards from the Commission on Economic Inclusion, including a 2009 award for Supplier Diversity, which highlights the success of

his initiative to craft and implement a supplier inclusion program. In 2012, the NEORSD was awarded by the Commission for Senior Management Inclusion, recognizing the diversity of senior staff.

As the district's executive director, Mr. Ciaccia was responsible for confirming their consent decree for a long-term control plan to significantly reduce overflows from combined sewers, as well as the successful development and implementation of a new Regional Stormwater Management Program. Among Mr. Ciaccia's many accomplishments as executive director of NEORSD is the transformation of the district's culture to one of transparency and exceptional financial management.

As a member of NACWA's board of directors, Mr. Ciaccia has served as the secretary, treasurer, and vice president. Mr. Ciaccia has shared his time, passion, energy and ideas to carry out the objectives of the Clean Water Act.

It is my pleasure to congratulate Julius Ciaccia on becoming president of NACWA. I am certain his actions will ensure continued water quality progress for the Cleveland area, the State of Ohio and the Nation.●

2013 NATIONAL BOY SCOUT JAMBOREE

● Mr. ROCKEFELLER: Mr. President, right now tens of thousands of Boy Scouts are gathering in the adventure-filled mountains of southern West Virginia for the 2013 National Scout Jamboree.

At the Summit Bechtel Reserve in Fayette County beginning on July 15, Scouts from across the country will challenge themselves—with biking, swimming, whitewater rafting, zip lining, and rock climbing. But they also will challenge themselves in ways new to the National Jamboree—by giving back to local communities.

For the first time ever, the Jamboree is engaged in a community service effort, one that has ignited in extraordinary ways in West Virginia. Over a 5-day period, up to 40,000 Scouts will work with groups in 9 counties on more than 350 projects—involving wellness, arts, education, infrastructure and beautification—totaling hundreds of thousands of service hours.

It is the biggest community service initiative of its kind in the country. It is an inspiration. And it speaks to the heart of West Virginia, a State where service is deep-rooted in our people; where ''neighbor helping neighbor'' is more than an idea—it is a way of life.

It also speaks to the heart of the Boy Scouts of America, which has a long tradition of community service and dedicates virtually countless hours of volunteer work year round. During the 2013 Jamboree, Scouts from ages 12 to 18 and from every State in the Union will be living out the Scout oath, ''To help other people at all times.''

Today I applaud everyone involved with the Reaching the Summit Community Service Initiative—the Boy Scouts who built this idea, the Citizens Conservation Corps of West Virginia for bringing together all the pieces to make it possible, the many organizations on the ground making a difference side-by-side with our Scouts, and the local communities supporting them. This initiative will make a tremendous difference in West Virginia communities, but it means more than that. It means that thousands of bright young Scouts will continue to experience the unparalleled feeling that comes with helping others.●

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting a nomination which was referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

(The message received today is printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 2:42 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 251. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal features of the electric distribution system to the South Utah Valley Electric Service District, and for other purposes.

H.R. 254. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to facilitate the development of hydroelectric power on the Diamond Fork System of the Central Utah Project.

H.R. 588. An act to provide for donor contribution acknowledgments to be displayed at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Visitor Center, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 1292. A bill to prohibit the funding of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–2233. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20–91, ''Fiscal Year 2013 Revised Budget Request Temporary Adjustment Act of 2013''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2234. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20–92, ''Saving D.C. Homes from Foreclosure Enhanced Temporary Amendment Act of 2013''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2235. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20–93, ''Teachers' Retirement Amendment Act of 2013''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2236. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20–94, ''Attendance Accountability Amendment Act of 2013''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2237. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20–95, ''Fire and Casualty Amendment Act of 2013''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2238. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled, ''Sufficiency Review of the Reasonableness of the District of Columbia Water and Sewer Authority's (DC Water) Fiscal Year 2013 Revenue Estimate totaling $447,479,008''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

EC–2239. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled, ''District of Columbia Agencies' Compliance with Fiscal Year 2012 Small Business Enterprise Expenditure Goals''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2240. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled, ''Audit of the District of Columbia Boxing and Wrestling Commission''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2241. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Food and Drug Administration's report relative to the Fourth Review of the Backlog of Postmarketing Requirements and Postmarketing Commitments; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–2242. A communication from the Surgeon General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the National Prevention, Health Promotion and Public Health Council's 2013 annual status report; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–2243. A communication from the Director, Directorate of Construction, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Cranes and Derricks in Construction: Revising the Exemption for Digger Derricks'' (RIN1218–AC75) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–2244. A communication from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Privacy Act; Implementation'' (45 CFR Part 5b) received during adjournment of the Senate in

the Office of the President of the Senate on June 28, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–2245. A communication from the Program Manager, Health Resources and Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Organ Procurement and Transplantation Network'' (RIN0906–AA73) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 8, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–2246. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Listing of Color Additives Exempt From Certification; Reactive Blue 246 and Reactive Blue 247 Copolymers; Confirmation of Effective Date'' (Docket Nos. FDA–2011–C–0344 and FDA–2011–C–0463) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–2247. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Importer Permit Requirements for Tobacco Products and Processed Tobacco, and Other Requirements for Tobacco Products, Processed Tobacco, and Cigarette Papers and Tubes'' (RIN1513–AB37) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 8, 2013; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–2248. A communication from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report to Congress concerning intercepted wire, oral, or electronic communications; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–2249. A communication from the Director, National Legislative Commission, The American Legion, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the financial condition of The American Legion as of December 31, 2012 and 2011; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–2250. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13–102); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2251. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Scott R. Van Buskirk., United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2252. A joint communication from the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a legislative proposal relative to the Compact of Free Association between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Palau; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–2253. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Energy Efficiency Design Standards for New Federal Commercial and Multi-Family High-Rise Residential Buildings'' (RIN1904–AC60) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2013; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–2254. A communication from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to expenditures from the Pershing Hall Revolving Fund; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mrs. SHAHEEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, without amendment:

S. 1283. An original bill making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113–70).

By Mr. HARKIN, from the Committee on Appropriations, without amendment:

S. 1284. An original bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113–71).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LEAHY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Byron Todd Jones, of Minnesota, to be Director, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives.

Stuart F. Delery, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

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. PAUL:

S. 1278. A bill to prohibit certain foreign assistance to the Government of Egypt as a result of the July 3, 2013, military coup d'etat; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. LANDRIEU:

S. 1279. A bill to prohibit the revocation or withholding of Federal funds to programs whose participants carry out voluntary religious activities; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. THUNE, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. COONS, Mr. INHOFE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1280. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the deductibility of charitable contributions to agricultural research organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL:

S. 1281. A bill to prohibit discrimination on the basis of military service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. MCCAIN, Ms. CANTWELL, and Mr. KING):

S. 1282. A bill to reduce risks to the financial system by limiting banks' ability to engage in certain risky activities and limiting conflicts of interest, to reinstate certain Glass-Steagall Act protections that were repealed by the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN:

S. 1283. An original bill making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Appropriations; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. HARKIN:

S. 1284. An original bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Appropriations; placed on the calendar.

By Ms. BALDWIN:

S. 1285. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to enhance the Small Business Investment Company Program and provide for a small business early-stage investment program; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 1286. A bill to encourage the adoption and use of certified electronic health record technology by safety net providers and clinics; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. 1287. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to raise the limitation on the election to accelerate the AMT credit in lieu of bonus depreciation for 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. COBURN, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 1288. A bill to amend rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to improve attorney accountability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COCHRAN (for himself and Mr. WICKER):

S. 1289. A bill to retain the existing vehicle weight limitations for vehicles traveling along any segment of U.S. Highway 78 within Mississippi after such segment is incorporated into the Interstate Highway System; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 1290. A bill to protect victims of stalking from gun violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. COONS, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 1291. A bill to strengthen families' engagement in the education of their children; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. HELLER, Mr. BURR, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. ENZI, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. ALEXANDER):

S. 1292. A bill to prohibit the funding of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; read the first time.

By Mr. MERKLEY:

S. 1293. A bill to establish a pilot grant program to support career and technical education exploration programs in middle schools and high schools; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. BEGICH, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Ms. HEITKAMP, and Mr. TESTER):

S.J. Res. 20. A joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 264

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 264, a bill to expand access to community mental health centers and improve the quality of mental health care for all Americans.

S. 360

At the request of Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 360, a bill to amend the Public Lands Corps Act of 1993 to expand the authorization of the Secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce, and the Interior to provide service opportunities for young Americans; help restore the nation's natural, cultural, historic, archaeological, recreational and scenic resources; train a new generation of public land managers and enthusiasts; and promote the value of public service.

S. 411

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 411, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 411, supra.

S. 522

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 522, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to award grants to establish, or expand upon, master's degree or doctoral degree programs in orthotics and prosthetics, and for other purposes.

S. 526

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 526, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the special rule for contributions of qualified conservation contributions, and for other purposes.

S. 557

At the request of Mrs. HAGAN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 557, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to medication therapy management under part D of the Medicare program.

S. 569

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 569, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to count a period of receipt of outpatient observation services in a hospital toward satisfying the 3-day inpatient hospital requirement for coverage of skilled nursing facility services under Medicare.

S. 607

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 607, a bill to improve the provisions relating to the privacy of electronic communications.

S. 734

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 734, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation.

S. 783

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 783, a bill to amend the Helium Act to improve helium stewardship, and for other purposes.

S. 888

At the request of Mr. JOHANNS, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 888, a bill to provide end user exemptions from certain provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

S. 909

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 909, a bill to amend the Federal Direct Loan Program under the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for student loan affordability, and for other purposes.

S. 1064

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1064, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for treatment of clinical psychologists as physicians for purposes of furnishing clinical psychologist services under the Medicare program.

S. 1123

At the request of Mr. JOHANNS, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1123, a bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to curb waste, fraud, and abuse in the Medicare and Medicaid programs.

S. 1171

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1171, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to allow a veterinarian to transport and dispense controlled substances in the usual course of veterinary practice outside of the registered location.

S. 1174

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1174, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the 65th Infantry Regiment, known as the Borinqueneers.

S. 1211

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1211, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to prohibit the use of the phrases GI Bill and Post-9/11 GI Bill to give a false impression of approval or endorsement by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

S. 1238

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1238, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to extend the current reduced interest rate for undergraduate Federal Direct Stafford Loans for 1 year, to modify required distribution rules for pension plans, and for other purposes.

S. 1274

At the request of Mr. CHIESA, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1274, a bill to extend assistance to certain private nonprofit facilities following a disaster, and for other purposes.

S. 1276

At the request of Mr. NELSON, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1276, a bill to increase oversight of the Revolving Fund of the Office of Personnel Management, strengthen the authority to terminate or debar employees and contractors involved in misconduct affecting the integrity of security clearance background investigations, enhance transparency regarding the criteria utilized by Federal departments and agencies to determine when a security clearance is required, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 157

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 157, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that telephone service must be improved in rural areas of the United States and that no entity may unreasonably discriminate against telephone users in those areas.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. MCCAIN, Ms. CANTWELL, and Mr. KING):

S. 1282. A bill to reduce risks to the financial system by limiting banks' ability to engage in certain risky activities and limiting conflicts of interest, to reinstate certain Glass-Steagall Act protections that were repealed by the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. MCCAIN. I am pleased to join my colleagues, Senator WARREN of Massachusetts, Senator CANTWELL of Washington, and Senator KING of Maine, and also recognize the hard work of my friend from Ohio who has been heavily involved in this issue in the past.

This legislation is bipartisan. The 21st Century Glass-Steagall Act, which will restore the much needed wall between investment and commercial banking to lessen risk, restore confidence in our banking system, and better protect the American taxpayer. The original 1933 Glass-Steagall Act was put in place to respond to the financial crash of 1929.

Similar to the 21st Century Glass-Steagall Act that we are introducing today, it put up a wall between commercial and investment banking with the idea of separating riskier investment banking from the core banking functions such as checking and savings accounts that Americans need in their everyday life.

Commercial banks traditionally use their customer's deposit for the purpose of Main Street loans within their communities. They did not engage in high-risk ventures. Investment banks, however, managed money for those who could afford to take bigger risks in order to get a bigger return and who bore their own losses. Unfortunately, core provisions of the Glass-Steagall Act were repealed in 1999, shattering the wall dividing commercial banks and investment banks. Since that time, we have seen a culture of greed and excessive risk-taking take root in the banking world, where common sense and caution with other people's money no longer matters.

When these two worlds collided, the investment bank culture prevailed, cutting off the credit lifeblood of Main Street firms, demanding greater returns that were achievable only through high leverage and huge risk-taking, which ultimately left the taxpayer with the fallout.

Leading up to the 2008 financial crisis, the mantra of ''bigger is better'' took over, and sadly it still remains. The path forward focused on short-term gains rather than long-term planning. Banks became overleveraged in their haste to keep in the race. The more they lent, the more they made.

Aggressive mortgages were underwritten for unqualified individuals who became homeowners saddled with loans they could not afford. Banks turned right around and bought portfolios of these shaky loans. I know the 2008 financial crisis did not happen solely because the wall of Glass-Steagall was knocked down. But I strongly believe the repeal of these core provisions played a significant role in changing the banking system in negative ways that contributed greatly to the 2008 financial crisis.

I believe this culture of risky behavior is still in play. For example, the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, on which I serve as ranking member, held a hearing in March of this year to discuss the findings of the subcommittee investigation report entitled, ''JPMorgan Chase Whale Trades: A Case History of Derivatives Risks and Abuses.''

The hearing and the findings of the investigation described how traders at JPMorgan Chase made risky bets using excess deposits that were partially insured by the Federal Government. If they wanted to make these bets on deposits and money that was not insured by the Federal Government, the Senator from Massachusetts and I would not be here today.

They used federally insured deposits, putting the taxpayers on the hook for their risky and ultimately failed investments. I say again, the Dodd-Frank bill, the whole purpose of it, as sold to this Congress and to the American people, was to ensure that no investment company or investment financial enterprise would ever be too big to fail again.

Is there anybody who believes these institutions such as I just talked about, JPMorgan Chase and others, are not too big to fail? Of course they are still too big to fail. The investigation revealed startling failures and shed light on a complex and volatile world of synthetic credit derivatives.

In a matter of months, JPMorgan Chase was able to vastly increase its exposure to risk while dodging oversight by Federal regulators. The trades ultimately cost the bank a staggering $6.2 billion in loss. This case represents another shameful demonstration of a bank engaged in wildly risky behavior. The London Whale incident matters to the Federal Government and the American taxpayer because the traders at JPMorgan Chase were making risky bets using excess deposits, a portion of which were federally insured.

These excess deposits should have been used to provide loans for Main Street businesses. Instead, JPMorgan Chase used the money to bet on catastrophic risk. The 21st Century Glass-Steagall Act will return banking back to the basics by separating traditional banks that offer savings and checking accounts and are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation from riskier financial institutions that offer other services such as investment banking, insurance, swaps dealing and hedge fund and private equity activities.

I believe big Wall Street institutions should be free to engage in transactions with significant risk but not with federally insured deposits. The bill also addresses depository institutions' use of products that did not exist when Glass-Steagall was originally passed, such as structured and synthetic financial products, including complex derivatives and swaps.

Finally, the bill provides financial institutions with a 5-year transition period to separate their activities. Many prominent individuals in the banking world support returning to a modern day Glass-Steagall banking system, including FDIC Vice Chairman Thomas Hoenig. Last year in his opinion piece in the Wall Street Journal, entitled ''No More Welfare For Banks. The FDIC and the taxpayer are the underwriters of too much private risk taking,'' he lays out his plan to strengthen the U.S. financial system by simplifying its structure and making its institutions more accountable for their mistakes, which he calls Glass-Steagall for today. He ends his piece by stating:

Capitalism will always have crises and the recent crisis had many contributing factors. However, the direct and indirect expansion of the safety net to cover an ever-increasing number of complex and risky activities made this crisis significantly worse. We have yet to correct the error. It is time we did.

I could not agree more. Almost 3 years ago, Congress passed Dodd-Frank with the intent to overhaul our Nation's financial system. I did not vote for Dodd-Frank because it did little if anything to tackle the tough problems facing our financial sector.

What Dodd-Frank did, though, was create thousands of pages of new and complicated rules. Is there any Member of this body who believes that Dodd-Frank has resulted in the end of too big to fail? The 21st Century Glass-Steagall Act may not end too big to fail on its own, but it moves the large financial institutions in the right direction, making them smaller and safer.

This bill would rebuild the wall between commercial and investment banking that was successful for over 60 years and reduced risk for the American taxpayer.

I ask unanimous consent that the Thomas Hoenig article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[FROM THE WALL STREET JOURNAL, June 10, 2012]

NO MORE WELFARE FOR BANKS

THE FDIC AND THE TAXPAYER ARE THE UNDERWRITERS OF TOO MUCH PRIVATE RISK TAKING.

(By Thomas Hoenig)

I have a proposal to strengthen the U.S. financial system by simplifying its structure and making its institutions more accountable for their mistakes. Put simply, my proposal would help prevent another 2008-style crisis by prohibiting banking organizations from conducting broker-dealer or other trading activities and by reforming money-market funds and the market for short-term collateralized loans (repurchase agreements, or repos). In other words, Glass-Steagall for today.

Those opposed to taking these actions generally focus on two themes. First, they say that if Glass-Steagall—enacted in 1933 to separate commercial and investment banking—had been in place, the crisis still would have occurred. Second, they argue that requiring the separation of commercial banking and broker-dealer activities is inconsistent with a free-market economy and puts U.S. financial firms at a global competitive disadvantage. Both assertions are wrong.

Advocates of the first argument say the crisis was not precipitated by trading activities within banking organizations but by excessive mortgage lending by commercial banks and by the failures of independent broker-dealers, such as Lehman Brothers and Bear Stearns.

This assertion ignores that the largest bank holding companies and broker-dealers were engaged in high-risk activities supported by explicit and implied government

guarantees. Access to insured deposits or money-market funds and repos fueled the activities of both groups, making them susceptible to the freezing of markets and asset-price declines.

Before 1999, U.S. banking law kept banks, which are protected by a public safety net (e.g., deposit insurance), separate from broker-dealer activities, including trading and market making. However, in 1999 the law changed to permit bank holding companies to expand their activities to trading and other business lines. Similarly, broker-dealers like Bear Stearns, Lehman Brothers, Goldman Sachs and other ''shadow banks'' were able to use money-market funds and repos to assume a role similar to that of banks, funding long-term asset purchases with the equivalent of very short-term deposits. All were able to expand the size and complexity of their balance sheets.

While these changes took place, it also became evident that large, complex institutions were considered too important to the economy to be allowed to fail. A safety net was extended beyond commercial banks to bank holding companies and broker-dealers. In the end, nobody—not managements, the market or regulators—could adequately assess and control the risks of these firms. When they foundered, banking organizations and broker-dealers inflicted enormous damage on the economy, and both received government bailouts.

To illustrate my point, consider that if you or I want to speculate on the market, we must risk our own wealth. If we think the price of an asset is going to decline, we might sell it ''short,'' expecting to profit by buying it back more cheaply later and pocketing the difference. But if the price increases, we either invest more of our own money to cover the difference or we lose the original investment.

In contrast, a bank can readily cover its position using insured deposits or by borrowing from the Federal Reserve. Large nonbank institutions can access money-market funds or other credit because the market believes they will be bailed out. Both types of companies can even double down in an effort to stay in the game long enough to win the bet, which supersizes losses when the bet doesn't pay off. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) fund and the taxpayer are the underwriters of this private risk-taking.

This leads to the second criticism of my proposal—that breaking up the banks is inconsistent with free markets and our need to be competitive globally. The opposite is true. My proposal seeks to return to capitalism by confining the government's guarantee to that for which it was intended—to protect the payments system and related activities inside commercial banking. It ends the extension of the safety net's subsidy to trading, market-making and hedge-fund activities. This change will invigorate commercial banking and the broker-dealer market by encouraging more equitable and responsible competition within markets. It reduces the welfare nature of our current financial system, making it more self-reliant and more internationally competitive.

Capitalism will always have crises and the recent crisis had many contributing factors. However, the direct and indirect expansion of the safety net to cover an ever-increasing number of complex and risky activities made this crisis significantly worse. We have yet to correct the error. It is time we did.

Mr. MCCAIN. I would like to thank the Senator from Massachusetts, whom I will freely admit has a great deal more knowledge, background, and expertise on this issue than I do. I appreciate her leadership. When the Senator sought to join us in the Senate, she committed to the people of Massachusetts and this country that she would be committed to certain significant reforms to ensure that we never again have the kind of crisis that devastated my State.

Still today, nearly half the homes in my State are underwater, which means they are worth less than their mortgage payments, while Wall Street has been doing well for years. That bailout is one of the more unfair aspects that I have seen in American history. We cannot revisit or fix history, but we sure can make sure we have made every effort to make sure these large financial institutions do not gamble with taxpayers' money.

I thank the Senator from Massachusetts. It is a pleasure to join her in this effort as her junior partner.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN). The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the senior Senator from Arizona and to support the 21st Century Glass-Steagall Act. I am honored to join Senators MCCAIN, CANTWELL, and KING in introducing this bill. I particularly commend Senator MCCAIN for his hard work and his long-time dedication on this issue.

Senator MCCAIN is a real leader in the Senate. While we do not agree on every issue, he is a fighter who stands for what he believes. Senator MCCAIN has worked hard to shed light on the too-big-to-fail problem. He has been thinking about how to bring back elements of Glass-Steagall for years. I am proud to join with him to speak about the 21st Century Glass-Steagall Act. I am glad to be his partner in this endeavor.

Washington is a partisan place. This Congress has its share of partisan bills. But we have all joined together today because we want a safe future for our kids and for our grandkids. We know that 5 years ago Wall Streets's high-risk bets nearly brought our economy to its knees, disrupting the lives and livelihoods of hard-working Americans.

We know the economic downturn did not affect just Democrats or just Republicans or just Independents, it affected everyone.

Over the past 5 years we have made some real progress in dialing back the risk of future crises. But despite the progress that has been made, the biggest banks continue to threaten the economy. The four biggest banks are now 30 percent larger than they were just 5 years ago. They have continued to engage in dangerous high-risk practices that could once again put our economy at risk.

The big banks were not always allowed to take on big risk while enjoying the benefits of both explicit and implicit taxpayer guarantees. Four years after the 1929 crash, Congress passed the Banking Act, or the Glass-Steagall Act as it is known, which is best known for separating the risky activities of investment banks from the core depository functions such as savings accounts and checking accounts that consumers rely on every day.

For years, Glass-Steagall played a central role in keeping our country safe. Traditional banking stayed separate from high-risk Wall Street banking. But big banks wanted the higher profits they could get from taking on more risk. Investors wanted access to the insured deposits of traditional banks. So Wall Street investors combined with the big banks to try to weaken and repeal Glass-Steagall. Starting in the 1980s, regulators at the Federal Reserve and the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency responded, reinterpreting longstanding legal terms in ways that slowly broke down the wall between investment banking and depository banking. Finally, after 12 attempts to repeal, Congress eliminated the core provisions of Glass-Steagall in 1999.

The 21st Century Glass-Steagall Act will reestablish the wall between commercial and investment banking, make our financial system more stable and more secure, and protect American families.

Like its 1933 predecessor, the 21st Century Glass-Steagall Act will separate traditional banks that offer checking and savings accounts and are insured by the FDIC from the riskier financial services. It will return banking—basic banking—to the basics.

The 21st Century Glass-Steagall Act also puts in place some important improvements over the original Glass-Steagall. It reverses the interpretations the regulators used to weaken the original Glass-Steagall. Our bill also recognizes that financial markets have become more complicated since the 1930s, and it separates depository institutions from products that did not exist when Glass-Steagall was originally passed, such as structured and synthetic financial products, including complex derivatives and swaps.

The idea behind the bill is simple: Banking should be boring. Anyone who wants to take big risks should go to Wall Street, and they should stay away from the basic banking system.

I wish to be clear—the 21st Century Glass-Steagall Act will not by itself end too big to fail and implicit government subsidies, but it will make financial institutions smaller, safer, and move us in the right direction. By separating depository institutions from riskier activities, large financial institutions will shrink in size and won't be able to rely on Federal depository insurance as a safety net for their high-risk activities. It will stop the game these banks have played for too long. Heads, the big banks win and take all the profits and, tails, the taxpayer gets stuck with all the losses.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation to reduce the risk in the financial system and to

dial back the likelihood of future crises.

Exactly 70 years ago the halls of the Senate filled with excitement and history when it passed the original Glass-Steagall. The financial industry at that time experienced some big immediate changes, but despite all kinds of claims to the contrary, Wall Street survived and the sky did not fall. In fact, the American people enjoyed a half century of financial stability and a strong, growing middle class. The regular financial crises that had occurred over and over before Glass-Steagall faded away, and our economy became stronger and more stable.

Few in Congress have been around long enough to have lived through the Great Depression that led to the first Glass-Steagall, but we were all around during the 2008 financial crisis. It has been 5 years since then, but our economy still has not fully recovered, and the downturn has had an impact everywhere—on our families, businesses, retirees, workers, schoolchildren, and college students. We need a banking system that serves the best interests of the American people, not just the few at the top. The 21st Century Glass-Steagall Act is an important step in the right direction. I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this measure.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 1286. A bill to encourage the adoption and use of certified electronic health record technology by safety net providers and clinics; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Medicaid Information Technology to Enhance Community Health Act of 2013, or the MITECH Act. I am proud to be joined by my colleagues Senator FRANKEN and Senator WHITEHOUSE in introducing this important piece of legislation which would help clinics and health care providers serving our Nation's most vulnerable citizens qualify for incentives to adopt meaningful use electronic health records for their patients.

In recent years, Congress has recognized the benefits of implementing electronic health records in our health care system. Countless experts have determined that electronic health records and other forms of health information technology improve health care quality, reduce medical errors, and lower overall medical costs. We have made unprecedented investments in electronic health records and have seen the benefits of these investments. Since its implementation, these programs have helped hundreds of thousands of providers and hospitals nationwide establish and effectively use electronic health records. However, eligibility requirements for these incentives payments have prevented some low-income providers from receiving them.

While electronic health records are a vital part of any quality health practice, they are in some ways even more important for clinics that serve low income, uninsured, and underinsured populations. These patients often seek services from any number of settings rather than returning to a set primary care provider. When the clinics that serve a particular population are able to establish and maintain electronic health records for their patients, it is far more likely that a patient's record will be available to their health care providers even if the patient is seeing a different provider in a different clinic. This allows an individual's health care providers to have access to a complete medical history, improving their ability to form a diagnosis, preventing unnecessary duplication of tests, and reducing costs for the patients and government. This measure also will allow safety net clinics to better communicate with patients about necessary screenings and help to make sure patients are taking medications as prescribed and not ''doctor shopping'' for inappropriate medication.

The Health Information Technology for Economic and Clinical Health, HITECH, Act created financial incentives called ''meaningful use'' incentives for both Medicare and Medicaid providers to adopt and meaningfully use implement and support electronic health records. While the current program has helped thousands of providers, practices, and hospitals nationwide, many safety net providers and clinics have not been able to benefit from the incentives. Given that Medicaid eligibility levels are so low in many states, it is difficult for many safety net providers to meet the 30 percent Medicaid patient threshold required to participate in the Medicaid electronic health records incentive program even though their patients are predominately low-income.

Congress addressed this problem only for practitioners working in Federally-qualified health centers and rural health centers by creating a 30 percent ''needy'' threshold in the HITECH Act for those providers. Unfortunately, the law failed to provide similar support for other providers serving low-income individuals.

The MITECH Act of 2013 seeks to eliminate these barriers, which prevent many safety net providers from qualifying for Medicaid electronic health record incentive payments. The bill will improve access to incentives for safety net providers that were left out of the HITECH Act's efforts. Additionally, the MITECH Act requires the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop a methodology to allow these safety net clinics to be eligible for payments as an entity, similar to the current process that exists for hospitals.

Access to Medicaid electronic health records incentives will allow safety net clinics to better communicate with patients about necessary screenings, help ensure compliance with prescription drugs, reduce unnecessary duplication of tests and will strengthen the safety net which provides essential care to so many Americans.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill. In doing so, we will offer vital support to safety net providers.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. COONS, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 1291. A bill to strengthen families' engagement in the education of their children; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I introduce the Family Engagement in Education Act with my colleagues Senator COONS and Senator WHITEHOUSE. I thank Representative THOMPSON for introducing the House companion of this bipartisan bill.

Our legislation will strengthen family engagement in education at the local, state, and national levels. It will empower parents by increasing school district resources dedicated to family engagement activities from one percent to 2 percent of the district's Title I allocation. It will also improve the quality of family engagement practices at the school level by requiring school districts to develop and implement standards-based policies and practices for family-school partnerships. It will build State and local capacity for effective family engagement in education by setting aside at least 0.3 percent of the State Title I allocation for statewide family engagement in education activities, such as establishing statewide family engagement centers to continue and enhance the work that had been supported through the Parent Information Resource Centers. For states with Title I–A allocations above $60 million, the State Educational agency will make grants to at least one local family engagement in education center to provide innovative programming and services, such as leadership training and family literacy, to local families and to remove barriers to family engagement, and to support State-level activities in the highest need areas of the State. Finally, at the national level, our legislation will require the Secretary of Education the convene practitioners, researchers, and other experts in the field of family engagement in education to develop recommended metrics for measuring the quality and outcomes of family engagement in a child's education.

Research demonstrates that family engagement in a child's education increases student achievement, improves attendance, and reduces dropout rates. A study by Anne Seitsinger and Steven Brand at the University of Rhode Island's Center for School Improvement and Educational Policy found that students whose parents support their education through learning activities at home and discuss the importance of education perform better in school. Yet too often, family engagement is not built into our school improvement efforts in a systematic way. The Family Engagement in Education Act will promote meaningful family engagement

policies and programs at the national, state, and local levels to ensure that all students are on track to be career and college-ready.

This legislation builds on my successful efforts in the last reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, ESEA, the 2001 No Child Left Behind Act, to incorporate provisions throughout the law to strengthen and boost parental involvement. It is also in line with the administration's blueprint for the ESEA reauthorization, which calls for doubling the amount that school districts are required to set aside for parental involvement and encouraging states to use some of their Title I funding to support local family engagement centers in education.

Developed with the National Family, School, and Community Engagement Working Group, which includes organizations such as National PTA, United Way Worldwide, Harvard Family Research Project, and National Council of La Raza, and endorsed by hundreds of local, state, and national organizations, this legislation represents the broad consensus that we must do a better job of engaging families in all aspects of their children's education.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor the Family Engagement in Education Act, and to work for its inclusion in the forthcoming debate to reauthorize and renew the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will meet in open session on Tuesday, July 16, 2013, at 2:30 p.m. in room 430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled ''Pooled Retirement Plans: Closing the Retirement Plan Coverage Gap for Small Businesses.''

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact Sarah Cupp of the committee staff on (202) 224–5441.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. The hearing will be held on Thursday, July 18, 2013, at 9:30 a.m., in room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony on the current state of clean energy finance in the United States and opportunities to facilitate greater investment in domestic clean energy technology development and deployment.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record may do so by sending it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510–6150, or by e-mail to danielle_deraney@energy.senate.gov.

For further information, please contact Kevin Rennert at (202) 224–7826 or Danielle Deraney at (202) 224–1219.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. The hearing will be held on Tuesday, July 23, 2013, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The purpose of this hearing is to consider S. 1273, the FAIR Act of 2013.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record may do so by sending it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510–6150, or by e-mail to Lauren_Goldschmidt@energy.senate.gov.

For further information, please contact Todd Wooten at (202) 224–3907 or Lauren Goldschmidt at (202) 224–5488.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 11, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 11, 2013, at 11 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled ''Mitigating Systemic Risk Through Wall Street Reforms.''

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

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 11, 2013, at 9:30 a.m., in room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 11, 2013, at 10 a.m., to hold a hearing entitled, ''Assessing the Transition in Afghanistan.''

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 11, 2013, at 2:15 p.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 11, 2013, at 11 a.m., in SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct an executive business meeting.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 11, 2013, at 2:30 p.m.

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

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my intern, Chris Riegg, be granted privileges of the floor for the balance of the day.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON SPOUSAL IRA

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2289 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2289) to rename section 219(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 as the Kay Bailey Hutchison Spousal IRA.

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

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (H.R. 2289) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to H. Con. Res. 43, which was received from the House and is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER.

The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 43) authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony honoring the life and legacy of Nelson Mandela on the occasion of the 95th anniversary of his birth.

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

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 43) was agreed to.

NATIONAL DAY OF THE AMERICAN COWBOY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 191.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 191) designating July 27, 2013, as ''National Day of the American Cowboy.''

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

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution by agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 191) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of June 27, 2013, under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 1292

Mr. REID. I am told that there is a bill at the desk due for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1292) to prohibit the funding of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Mr. REID. I ask for a second reading, and in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be read for a second time on the next legislative day.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived for three of the cloture motions filed earlier today.

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

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JULY 15, 2013

Mr. REID. I now ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 2 p.m. on Monday, July 15, 2013; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that the majority leader be recognized; and following the remarks of the two leaders, the time until 5:30 p.m. be divided equally between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators permitted during that time to speak for up to 10 minutes; further, that at 5:30 p.m. I be recognized.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, then there will be a rollcall vote at 5:30 p.m. on Monday. There will also be an all-Senators joint caucus at 6 p.m. on Monday in the Old Senate Chamber.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, JULY 15, 2013, AT 2 P.M.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the Senate stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:50 p.m., adjourned until Monday, July 15, 2013, at 2 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nomination received by the Senate:

THE JUDICIARY

WILLIAM WARD NOOTER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE A. FRANKLIN BURGESS, RETIRING.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF PIERCE MANUFACTURING

HON. REID J. RIBBLE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 2013

Mr. RIBBLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 100th anniversary of Pierce Manufacturing, located in Appleton, Wisconsin. Pierce Manufacturing is a subsidiary of Oshkosh Corporation, and builds fire and rescue apparatuses. Over the past 100 years, this company has grown from its modest beginnings as Pierce Auto Body Works, Inc. focused on building truck bodies for the Ford Model T to become a world-class manufacturer of quality fire and rescue vehicles.

In the aftermath of 9/11, Pierce Manufacturing donated one of its rescue vehicles to the Fire Department of New York City. According to reports, no ceremony was held to mark the occasion. The workers and leadership at Pierce Manufacturing simply "felt compelled to help." As Congressman, I am incredibly proud of the highly skilled workers in Appleton and Weyauwega that play a vital role in designing, building and maintaining these custom fire and rescue vehicles.

Again, I congratulate Pierce Manufacturing on its 100th anniversary, and encourage all residents in Northeast Wisconsin to celebrate this company's wonderful history on Saturday, July 13th, 2013.

RECOGNIZING THE TACOMA HOUSING AUTHORITY FOR THE RENOVATION OF THE HILLSIDE TERRACE COMMUNITY IN TACOMA'S HILLTOP COMMUNITY

HON. DEREK KILMER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 2013

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Tacoma Housing Authority for breaking ground on the redevelopment of Hillside Terrace in the Hilltop community. This development will provide comfortable, affordable, and environmentally sound units for families in need.

The Tacoma Housing Authority was formed in 1940 in response to the growing need for safe, affordable housing for low-income families in Tacoma. Since then, Tacoma Housing Authority has grown to become the city's largest landlord. They currently serve thousands of families across Tacoma.

Phase I of the redevelopment project will take place at the 2500 block of Hillside Terrace. This phase will include a mid-rise building with 54 units, five townhouse style buildings with 16 units, and a large community education facility.

Mr. Speaker, The Tacoma Housing Authority has been a national leader in the redevelopment of public housing. In the first part of the twenty-first century, Tacoma Housing Authority gained public attention for the redevelopment of Salishan. Salishan, originally built during World War II, fell into disrepair. Through a multi-phase project, Tacoma Housing Authority rebuilt the entire neighborhood, creating safer, more livable homes for the close, multi-cultural community on the city's east side.

Now, Tacoma Housing Authority is engaging in a similar project with Hillside Terrace. Residents will be able to enjoy a sense of community that comes with new, safe homes and a brand new community center.

As I close, Mr. Speaker, I can say with confidence that Hillside Terrace will add to the rich diversity of the Hilltop neighborhood, and will continue Tacoma Housing Authority's strong tradition of providing high-quality affordable housing in the City of Destiny.

MONTROSE, COLORADO TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 2013

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Montrose, Colorado, Montrose has received the 2013 All-American City Award from the National Civic League.

Each year, the National Civic League hosts an expo in Denver where citizens from all over the nation attend to display their community achievements. This year, the conference focused specifically on communities dedicated to providing support for veterans and their families. Ten outstanding proposals are chosen to receive the award, including Montrose.

Montrose is a model of American values, with an outstanding commitment to supporting troops, veterans, and their families, through community efforts including Welcome Home Colorado. In the heart of Colorado, Montrose has a diverse landscape with access to abundant outdoor activities including hiking, skiing, and water sports. The community strives to make these recreational activities available to veterans and returning troops, improving their quality of life.

The spirit of the community in Montrose is an inspiration to other cities across America to support our troops and veterans, and provide returning troops with the opportunity to thrive.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Montrose, Colorado, for its outstanding achievement as a 2013 All-American City, and recognize its residents for their dedication to their community and to our brave men and women who have served our country.

HONORING DOMINGO "PAPO" RODRIGUEZ

HON. ED PASTOR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 2013

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Domingo "Papo" Rodriguez, a resident of Phoenix, Arizona, a constituent and a friend. He has left us too soon, but well after establishing a rich and long legacy that will live on.

Papo devoted over 35 years working with non-profit community based organizations. The last 19 years of his career he served as Vice President of Community Health & Human Services with Chicanos Por La Causa. He managed over 75 different funding contracts and sources that represented over 100 categorical programs and services with 30 facilities serving individuals in 25 cities throughout Arizona. He oversaw programs that impacted the community including the Early Childhood Development program for Migrant & Seasonal and Early Head Start Programs, Community Behavioral Health Services/Managed Care HIV/AIDS, Youth Prevention and Intervention Programs, Pregnant & Parenting Teen Programs, Parenting Arizona, and Rural Social & Immigration Services.

While his career was very demanding, Papo found time to devote himself to other causes and issues in service to his community. Domingo Rodriguez was instrumental in the establishment of a statewide Latino Policy Institute and served as a consultant to federal agencies on many of our communities' pressing issues. Moreover, he was actively recruited to and generously gave of his time to serve on boards and commissions where his input contributed to the creation of many policies and programs, again, to serve the community for which he greatly cared.

Papo's passing is a loss for the State of Arizona. He will be missed by us all, but he will also be long remembered for his generous spirit and his commitment to service.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 250TH ANNIVERSARY OF PLYMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE

HON. ANN M. KUSTER

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 2013

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration of the 250th anniversary of a proud community in my district: the Town of Plymouth, New Hampshire. Nestled between the crystal waters of the Lakes Region and the majestic peaks of the White Mountains, Plymouth serves as the gateway to some of the Granite State's greatest natural treasures. The pristine rivers that meet in this distinguished community symbolize the convergence of education, tourism, and industry that have defined Plymouth since its incorporation in 1763.

People travel from far and wide seeking the town's beautiful mountain vistas, fine hotels and inns, rustic covered bridges, campgrounds, and lakes. Many years ago, snow trains would stop in Plymouth, providing skiers and adventurers headed for the White Mountains with a place to stay at the inns found throughout the town. While enjoying the sights, guests could visit the Draper and Maynard sporting goods store, where Babe Ruth himself would travel to purchase baseball equipment. They could pick up a pair of buck gloves, courtesy of the prestigious glove industry that defined Plymouth's early years. Or, they could visit Plymouth State University to enjoy a collection of letters and works written by a frequent visitor to the White Mountains, Robert Frost.

During the academic year, the population of Plymouth doubles as bustling students fill the historic streets. These students return to experience one of New England's finest universities, where a campus-wide focus on environmental issues and sustainable initiatives has become an integral part of the student experience.

While 250 years have come and gone in Plymouth, the town's focus on education and innovation has set a course of prosperity for countless years to come. On July 20th, the town will officially mark its two and a half centuries with a community-wide celebration. As local citizens enjoy fireworks, dances, concerts, and other festivities to mark this auspicious occasion, I urge all Granite Staters and all Americans to join them in honoring this special town.

IN HONOR OF THE COMMUNITY BAPTIST CHURCH ON THEIR 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 2013

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Community Baptist Church on their 50th year anniversary. The church was started on March 3, 1963 by Reverend Wilmer Wright when they began holding services in a corner barbershop in Bristol, PA. After twenty-four years of service, Reverend Wilmer Wright retired and his son, Joseph Wright, took over as their Pastor in 1987. The year 2013 marks the church's 50th anniversary, and they celebrated their year of jubilee from March 4, 2012 to March 3, 2013. Since 1963, services have been held in a number of locations where they have provided numerous opportunities for their community. They have Sunday school for all ages, Bible study groups, and various charity events, such as their Fashion Show and Silent Auction. The church is also very good at hosting events that include youth with their movie nights and a pep rally event. Throughout its fifty years, the church has been the heart of the community and has provided endless support for its members and the community as well.

IN HONOR OF DEPUTY CHIEF CASSIE McSORLEY

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 2013

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I rise today to honor the career of Deputy Chief Cassie McSorley, who is retiring after 30 years of service to the citizens of Salinas. Since joining the Salinas Police Department in 1983, Deputy Chief McSorley has worked at all levels of the department, including uniformed patrol, DUI enforcement, field training, Narcotics, and Special Operations.

Deputy Chief McSorley was raised in Salinas and attended North Salinas High School before going on to earn a bachelor's degree in Administration of Justice from San Jose State University. She completed graduate studies at the University of San Francisco in Organizational Development. She joined the Salinas Police Department as a patrol officer and a member of the DUI enforcement team before being promoted to Corporal, where she served as a Field Training Officer and a detective in the Vice/Narcotic Unit. She quickly advanced from Corporal to Sergeant, and then to Lieutenant. In 2003, she became Deputy Police Chief taking on various additional law enforcement responsibilities and ran a successful police department securing the streets of Salinas that are plagued by gangs. On many occasions when required, Deputy Chief McSorley has assumed the position of Acting Salinas Police Chief without hesitation.

Her long history of service to the department has included her role in establishing the first in-house training programs and specialized training teams; her work on Salinas' first hostage negotiation team; and her help in establishing the curriculum for the first Crisis Intervention Team training and policy development for Monterey County enforcement agencies.

Deputy Chief McSorley has always been deeply involved in the Salinas community, from the early community policing initiatives in the 10/20 Block and Acosta Plaza to more recent endeavors. She volunteers for many local causes and has served on a number of nonprofit board of directors, including the Salinas Rotary Club, Sun Street Centers, Partners for Peace, Salinas Police Activities League, and others. One of her other noteworthy accomplishments was founding the Salinas Police Department Relay for Life team, serving as team captain in 2001 and 2002.

Mr. Speaker, I know I speak for the whole House and the entire law enforcement community in California as I commend Deputy Chief McSorley for all she has done for this community. I extend my most sincere thanks and warmest wishes for her success and much success and happiness in her retirement.

30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CITY OF MOORPARK

HON. JULIA BROWNLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 2013

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to represent the City of Moorpark in the United States House of Representatives. Moorpark was recently named by the Kosmont-Rose Institute as one of the top ten most business friendly cities in California, which serves to attract new and innovative companies, creating high paying, high-skilled local jobs, that significantly contribute to Ventura County's diverse and vibrant economy.

From its start as a pastoral community built on hard work and rugged individualism, to a thriving community that celebrates its historical roots, Moorpark is the product of determined citizens coming together to establish a better way of life. The city's unique cultural fusion of arts, agriculture, community, family, education, and outdoor recreation make Moorpark an exceptionally desirable place to live. As the city's representative in Congress, I share Moorpark's commitment to protecting local open spaces and preserving the natural beauty of our region for future generations to cherish and enjoy.

I also share with Moorpark a steadfast dedication to education, and I will continue to work on behalf of the teachers and students of this outstanding school district. I believe that investing in our children's future is vital to perpetuating the growth and development of every community in Ventura County and across the nation. I would also like to commend Moorpark for fostering the success of Moorpark College, as I believe community colleges are critical to equipping the next generation with the skills required to excel.

Additionally, I commend the City of Moorpark for its dedication to assisting and memorializing our veterans, who have given immeasurably to our communities. The two memorials in the city are a testament to the important role that the men and women of our Armed Forces play in ensuring communities like Moorpark can thrive.

Once again, congratulations on Moorpark's 30th Anniversary! This is a fantastic accomplishment, and I could not be more proud and driven to work hard to represent the values of our community in Congress.

A TRIBUTE TO JAMIE BOERSMA

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 2013

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Girl Scouts of Greater Iowa CEO Jamie Boersma of Clive for being named a 2013 ''Characters Unite'' award recipient by USA Network.

The Characters Unite program is a national public service initiative that aims to bridge cultural gaps and confront social injustices through the promotion of understanding and acceptance. Each year, this program honors individuals who go above and beyond by contributing ''significant efforts to champion civil and human rights in their communities.'' Awardees are provided a $5,000 grant for their individual projects and are featured on nationwide public service announcements to raise awareness for their cause and the program as a whole.

As CEO of Girl Scouts of Greater Iowa, Mrs. Boersma changes the lives of more than 15,000 girls and 4,000 adults in 70 counties that mostly comprise central and western

Iowa. Additionally, Jamie serves on the Board of Directors for the Rotary Club of Des Moines, is an active member of her church, and a wife and mother to her husband, Dale, and their son, Andrew. In all that she does, Jamie is truly an example that our state can be proud of.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Boersma's tireless efforts to make the world a better place have deservedly been recognized through her selection as a 2013 Characters Unite winner. Jamie is a testament to the humble, hardworking and helpful people who make up the great state of Iowa, and it is a great honor to represent her and her family in the United States Congress. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Mrs. Boersma on receiving this prestigious distinction, thanking USA Network and the Girl Scouts of Greater Iowa for their efforts, and wishing all of those involved in these wonderful programs continued success for years to come.

THE STATE DEPARTMENT 2013 TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS REPORT

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 2013

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, the Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations held the second in a series of hearings on the Trafficking in Persons report and U.S. efforts to combat human trafficking. In April, the subcommittee took a close look at the records of 6 countries which had exhausted all of their allotted time on the Tier 2 Watch list and must, by law, be moved to Tier 2 or Tier 3 in this year's Trafficking in Persons (TIP) Report.

As discussed by experts in the April 18 hearing, the trafficking records of China, Russia, and Uzbekistan were particularly worrisome. An upgrade to Tier 2 would have been completely unmerited and would have damaged the credibility of the TIP Report.

The TIP report was released late last month, and I was pleased to see that it is one of the best yet—and that it faithfully reported and graded the records of China, Russia, and Uzbekistan, which had been skirting accountability for far too long. Now, the Administration is faced with next steps including what sanctions might be imposed to press these nations to reform.

When I wrote the law—the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000—that created not only this report, but also the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons in the U.S. Department of State, and several other provisions to prevent both sex and labor trafficking, protect victims, and prosecute traffickers, it was hoped this report would become the international gold standard and primary means of anti-trafficking accountability around the world. It has. From the halls of parliaments globally to police stations in remote corners of the world, this report is today being used to focus anti-trafficking work in 186 countries.

But with the power of this report to improve situations came the risk that it could also be used to whitewash the truth about a country's trafficking record—it could fail to report accurately and inadvertently give cover to negligent or complicit governments.

I am happy to say that the 2013 report is one of the best ever produced. Special thanks are especially in order for Ambassador Luis CdeBaca and his dedicated staff for faithfully highlighting the good, while exposing the bad and the ugly. The TIP report is faithful in and reflects the hard, meticulous work and leadership of the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons. This office not only analyzes whether a country is complying with the minimum standards for the elimination of human trafficking, but also sets specific recommendations for how a country can move forward.

With this report, countries should have no question about where they rank, or how they can improve. Many countries have publically or privately credited the report as the impetus for real improvement in their trafficking laws and policies. Since the TIP report's inception, more than 130 countries have enacted anti-trafficking laws, and many countries have taken other steps required to significantly raise their tier rankings.

This year, China, Russia, and Uzbekistan finally have to confront their records. The report tells it like it is. For instance, the TIP report states that: ''The Chinese government's birth limitation policy and a cultural preference for sons, create a skewed sex ratio of 118 boys to 100 girls in China, which served as a key source of demand for the trafficking of foreign women as brides for Chinese men and forced prostitution. Women from Burma, Malaysia, Vietnam, and Mongolia are transported to China after being recruited through marriage brokers or fraudulent employment offers, where they are subsequently subjected to forced prostitution or forced labor . . . Traffickers recruited girls and young women, often rural areas of China, using a combination of fraudulent job offers, imposition of large travel fees, and threats of physical or financial harm to obtain and maintain their service in prostitution.''

Because tens of millions of girls have been systematically killed by sex selection abortion over the past three decades—resulting in an unprecedented number of ''missing'' women and girls—demand for prostitutes and so-called ''brides'' is exploding in China.

As a direct consequence of the barbaric one child per couple policy in effect since 1979, China has become the global magnet for sex traffickers. Women and young girls have been and are today still being reduced to commodities and coerced into prostitution. Without serious and sustained action by Beijing, it is only going to get worse.

The TIP Report also makes clear that ''Chinese law remains inadequate to combat all forms of trafficking . . . and the Government of China's efforts to protect trafficking victims remained inadequate . . .'' In addition, China's ''government continued to perpetuate human trafficking in at least 320 state-run institutions.''

I, along with Congressman FRANK WOLF, visited one of those state-run institutions in the early 1990's—Beijing Prison #1. We were shocked to observe the horrific conditions imposed on inmates including more than 40 Tiananmen Square human rights activists. The report makes clear that state-sponsored forced labor is part of a systemic form of repression known as ''re-education through labor. The government reportedly profits from this forced labor, and many prisoners and detainees . . .''

With this report, we have done right by the millions of trafficking victims in China. With this report, we are holding China to account for its complicity in profits off of modern-day slavery. It is my sincere hope that the truth will turn the tide in China.

However, I was disappointed to see that Vietnam was not downgraded to the Tier 2 Watch List or Tier 3. Vietnam's labor export companies—most of which are owned by or affiliated with the Government of Vietnam—have been engaged in practices that lead to debt bondage and forced labor. The Government of Vietnam has yet to pay millions of dollars in damages to Vietnamese labor trafficking victims found in the United States and its territories, as ordered by U.S. courts.

Vietnamese trafficking victims in other countries report that the Government of Vietnam sides with the traffickers to keep them in bondage when the victims seek help. Other reports indicate that the Vietnamese embassy in Russia is actively working with organized crime to enslave Vietnamese nationals in sweatshops and brothels, and the TIP report itself notes reports that officials at border crossings and checkpoints accept bribes from traffickers. Some notable trends in the 2013 include: Tier 1: 30 countries (as compared with 33 in 2012); Tier 2: 92 countries (as compared with 93 in 2012) Tier 2 Watch List: 44 countries (as compared with 42 in 2012); Tier 3: 20 countries (as compared with 17 in 2012).

The Africa region increased its prosecutions by 45% (labor prosecutions by 500%), its convictions by 16%, and its victim identification by 13%. Africa is the region with the greatest number of Tier 3 countries, and does not contain any Tier 1 countries.

The East Asia and Pacific region saw a 23% decrease in prosecutions, but a 28% increase in convictions and a slight increase in the number of victims identified. The number of victims identified remains alarmingly low (8,521) in a region where the International Labor Organization believes there are nearly 12 million enslaved individuals. The number of labor convictions (103) also remains extremely low in the region of the world most plagued by labor trafficking.

The Europe region saw a slight drop in prosecutions, but a 13% increase in convictions and a 17% increase in victims identified. The European region identified the most victims out of all regions in 2013.

The Near East region saw a 19% increase in prosecutions in 2012, and more than doubled its conviction rate (largely due to efforts in the United Arab Emirates). The Near East region also more than doubled its number of victims identified. This region has the greatest relative proportion of Tier 3 countries.

The South and Central Asia region saw slight, but appreciable increases in its prosecutions (7%), convictions (5%), and number of victims identified (13%). India, one of the first countries to be moved off of the Tier 2 Watch List under the TVPRA of 2008 two–year rule, maintained a questionable Tier 2 ranking for a second year. Out of nearly 2 billion people, only 4,415 victims were identified.

The Western Hemisphere region, in which the United States is included, prosecutions increased by 72%, and convictions increased by

44% (including a 650% increase in labor trafficking convictions). However, victim identification decreased by 15% (although there was a significant increase in the number of labor trafficking victims identified). Eight countries in this region improved their anti-trafficking laws in 2012. Cuba is the only country in the region to be Tier 3. Colombia and Nicaragua share Tier 1 status with the United States and Canada.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

SPEECH OF

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2013

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2609) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes:

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Chair, I rise today on behalf of the Safe Climate Caucus to continue our effort to end the conspiracy of silence in this body surrounding the issue of our time: the growing threat posed by climate change.

We have a moral obligation to be responsible stewards of the environment for our children and future generations. History will not judge the House of Representatives kindly if we continue to ignore the mounting danger and act like the last refuge of the Flat Earth Society.

Yet that is what we are doing. The Republican strategy amounts to a conspiracy of silence. Despite our repeated requests for hearings and debate, the Republican majority refuses to hold hearings, continues to deny the science, and passes legislation that recklessly endangers our atmosphere.

In the last Congress, the Republican-led House voted 53 times to block any action on climate change. The Energy and Water Appropriations bill on the floor this week guts funding for research and development for energy efficiency and renewable energy.

It is still not too late to stop the rising CO_2 levels in our atmosphere. The United Sates can still be the world leader in the clean energy technologies of the future. But we must act now.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

SPEECH OF

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 2013

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2609) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes:

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Chair, I represent areas of North and East Harris County and Houston, including a large portion of the Port of Houston and the Houston Ship Channel. Water development projects at the Army Corps of Engineers are critical to our economy and to our safety. We rely on flood control and dredging projects in the Houston /Harris County, Texas area. Flood control projects protect lives and property every year in our district. However, without adequate Army Corps money, necessary maintenance and new projects will be neglected putting our area at risk.

The Energy and Water Appropriations bill is important to us. This bill needs to provide more funding for the Army Corps.

The Port of Houston is the largest foreign tonnage port and the largest petrochemical port in the country. In fact, it moves the second largest amount of cargo in the country, as 8.5% of our nation's cargo moves through the Port of Houston. The commerce that occurs at our port is critical to our nation's energy and chemical sectors and to our country's ability to trade and move goods throughout our country. It is a port of national significance, but has not received the attention that is necessary to answer the challenges we face in the near future.

Despite the national importance of our port, it is facing a dredging crisis.

The President's budget request funded dredging at the Port at around half the actual need. The Energy and Water Appropriations bill doesn't even get us to the President's request level. Infrastructure is a key component of commerce and it is time the House of Representatives starts passing legislation recognizing this important fact.

Additionally, by cutting New Starts completely, this bill prevents funding for a vital project in Houston that will explore widening and deepening the shipping channel to the Turning Basin. This funding is critical to preparing our Port for the years ahead.

In 1998, the Federal Government and the Port of Houston invested $700 million over the course of years, to deepen and widen the Ship Channel. An investment we have benefitted from tremendously.

As the years have passed silt has settled and reduced the draft in the channel significantly. Today, only a small portion of the channel is dredged to its proper depth across the entire width of the channel. That is astounding. Our nation's investment is rapidly deteriorating. Currently, the Houston Ship Channel is dredged to a depth of 43 feet, but it should be 45 feet. The Panama Canal is expanding and when it is completed, the Port of Houston should be at a minimum of 45 feet and we could take advantage of additional depth.

As we confront the dual challenges of adopting policies that create jobs and reduce the debt, funding for dredging projects is an item that, while costly, will have more of a positive impact on our economy than a negative impact on our deficit. The Texas Transportation Institute performed a study and determined that a direct economic impact of the loss of 1 foot of draft is $373 million. The majority of this impact is lost business opportunities due to light loading of non-containerized vessels. As the dredging crisis at the port continues to worsen, the opportunity cost will quickly increase.

The time to increase our investment in our infrastructure is now. We can't wait until the economy improves because strengthening our infrastructure is integral to growing our economy.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

SPEECH OF

HON. JANICE HAHN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 2013

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2609) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes:

Ms. HAHN. Madam Chair, I rise to express my concern about the amendment accepted into the Energy & Water Appropriations bill last night that prevents the Army Corps of Engineers from using any of the funds appropriated in that act for even suggesting expanded uses of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund.

I represent the Port of Los Angeles, a Port which, combined with the adjacent Port of Long Beach, constitutes the busiest port complex in the United States. Forty percent of the cargo that comes into this country flows through the Ports of LA and Long Beach.

The Ports of LA and Long Beach contribute more to the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund than any other port—over $263 million last year. That's money that comes out of the pockets of American businesses, an added cost borne by American consumers who rely on the Ports of LA and Long Beach being efficient and strong.

But because this port complex—arguably the most important port in the Nation—is blessed by geology, we have little need for dredging to remain deep and wide. And so my port sees less than a penny return for every dollar it contributes to the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund. And that means that all those American businesses and consumers who are forking over $263 million every year are seeing practically no benefit.

The port they rely on is cut out of the narrow uses set for the HMTF. I don't think that's fair, and I don't think that's smart. Why have we structured the use of the HMTF in such a way that 40 percent of the Nation's imports are not seeing any benefit?

Every port, big and small, deserves to be completely and promptly dredged. That's why achieving full utilization of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund is so critical. But we also need to address the donor equity issue faced by deep draft commercial ports like mine, who handle so much cargo and see so little investment in return. And so yes, I think we need to examine some expanded uses—including maintenance berth dredging and some landside uses closely tied to the port—so that the HMTF does in fact contribute to the strength of all ports in this great country.

CELEBRATING BILL GRAY

SPEECH OF

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 2013

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor my friend and Congressman, Bill Gray. Reverend Gray was an historic figure in Philadelphia and in this country. His contributions to this Nation are well known to all of us. So, I'd like to take a moment and just focus on his impact in my own life.

Bill represented my community in the House for many years. He was one of my most important mentors and supporters as I rose through the ranks in Philadelphia politics. I was a ward leader in his district and was proud to return his support every two years. I leaned on Bill for his wise counsel on how to serve my constituents. He helped me to be a better ward leader, a better party chair, and a better congressman. But the best counsel I got from Bill was not professional advice. His best advice was about how to be a better father and a better husband while doing this job. He demonstrated that philosophy by his close business relationship with his son, who was by his side at almost every meeting.

During our frequent dinners, Bill would make sure I understood that I had to get back to Philadelphia as much as I can. He told me to put my family and my neighborhood first and to make sure that I didn't ever forget why I came to Washington in the first place.

Bill never lost his love for Philadelphia. He and I were working together until the last weeks of his life. He was doing all he could to help our Free Libraries, to build jobs at Comcast and to protect the people of his beloved North Philadelphia.

Mr. Speaker, Philadelphia, this country and this House will be much poorer for Bill Gray's passing. I urge my colleagues to join the entire Pennsylvania delegation in honoring him today.

CELEBRATING BILL GRAY

SPEECH OF

HON. AL GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 2013

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to honor the memory of a noble public servant and trailblazer, Congressman William Herbert Gray, III. Congressman Gray served in Congress, representing Pennsylvania's Second Congressional District, with exceptional distinction and preeminence. He eventually became the first African American to be both the Chairman of the House Committee on the Budget and Majority Whip of the House of Representatives.

As a leader in Congress and proud member of the Congressional Black Caucus, Congressman Gray used his compassion and experience to boldly fight for those considered the least the world over. Congressman Gray's impassioned fight against Apartheid in South Africa and for assistance to the poor were the hallmarks of his time in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I am fortunate enough to say that I figuratively stand on the shoulders of pioneers like Congressman Gray. I would not be where I am today without the work and sacrifice of individuals like him. I believe that when history records the legacy of Congressman Gray, it will honor his role as a trailblazer and passionate advocate for the least.

HONORING COLONEL JAMES O. FLY, COMMANDER, ROCK ISLAND ARSENAL JOINT MANUFACTURING AND TECHNOLOGY CENTER

HON. DAVID LOEBSACK

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 2013

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank and pay tribute to Colonel James Fly, the outgoing Commander of Rock Island Arsenal Joint Manufacturing and Technology Center. As the 46th commander of RIA–JMTC, Colonel Fly has served with honor and distinction and he deserves our thanks and recognition.

Since taking command in September 2010, Colonel Fly has led RIA–JMTC and its dedicated workforce in building upon the capabilities as the Department of Defense's only multi-purpose and vertically integrated metal manufacturer while manufacturing high-quality equipment for our troops. In addition, Colonel Fly took forward thinking actions to ensure that the equipment manufactured at Rock Island Arsenal is not only of the highest quality, but also the best deal for the Department of Defense and the taxpayer.

During his tenure, Colonel Fly saw RIA–JMTC designated as a Center of Industrial and Technical Excellence in Add-on-Armor development and Foundry Operations. These designations made Rock Island Arsenal the first arsenal to be designated with three CITES, recognition of the depth of its capabilities, forward-thinking management, and highly-skilled workforce.

In 2011, enemies on the battlefield found and began to exploit vulnerabilities in the armor on Caiman MRAPs, endangering our soldiers and requiring immediate action. Under Colonel Fly's leadership, the dedicated Rock Island Arsenal workforce redesigned the armor kit, produced 504 kits, and installed 22 of those kits in theater within 30 days. When our soldiers needed them, RIA–JMTC was there.

On a personal note, I have greatly enjoyed working with Colonel Fly and would like to personally thank him for his leadership at Rock Island Arsenal. Throughout his time as Commander, Colonel Fly has demonstrated a unique passion for his job. He truly cares about the details of every process in the factory, taking the time to walk the floor and speak personally with the workforce to hear their perspective.

Colonel Fly, his wife, Ella, and their two sons are valued members of the Quad Cities community, participating in many community events and ensuring a close bond between RIA–JMTC and the Quad Cities. Colonel Fly has actively engaged the youth in the community, visiting local schools on Veteran's Day to discuss the importance of honoring those who serve. Mrs. Fly has served as the chair of the Rock Island Arsenal Welcome Club Scholarship and Grant Committee, organizing multiple events to help military children attend college. They are integral members of the community, appreciated by the entire Quad Cities for their engagement.

On behalf of all of my constituents, I thank Colonel Fly for his dedicated service as Commander of Rock Island Arsenal Joint Manufacturing and Technology Center and wish him and his family the very best.

PUBLIC SAFETY AND SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHTS PROTECTION ACT OF 2013

HON. RUSH HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 2013

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I have recently cosponsored H.R. 1565. I understand and laud the very good intentions of the bill's sponsors. However, the reality is that as written this legislation would, if enacted, have the effect of making it impossible for the federal government to do what New Jersey has done: require handgun licensing and registration. In New Jersey we have lived comfortably and safely for many years with such laws, and I believe New Jersey's approach should be extended to the federal level. It is my hope that should H.R. 1565 be considered that I and other Members will have the chance to amend it so as to not preclude a national licensing & registration regime.

HONORING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CHATHAM BOROUGH POLICE DEPARTMENT

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 2013

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Chatham Borough Police Department, located in Chatham, New Jersey, which is celebrating its 100th anniversary.

On September 2, 1913, an ordinance used to regulate the Chatham Borough Police Department of Morris County was approved. The Department came from humble beginnings, with only one fulltime police officer in its inaugural year and, today, has 18 fulltime officers. Despite the passage of a century, the Police Department's excellent service and core values have remained unchanged.

The Chatham Borough Police Department prides itself in upholding values of integrity, respect, service, and fairness. The Department strives to promote a safe and secure environment and maintain order and provide safe flow of traffic while demonstrating the core ideals. It has continually responded to the changing needs of Chatham Borough and has looked to help the community in the best possible way. By demonstrating strong leadership qualities, the Chatham Borough Police Department has remained a reliable and strong influence in Chatham Borough.

Throughout the past century, the Chatham Borough Police Department has dedicated itself to the surrounding community, yet, it is

always looking for ways to give back. It influences the youth in Chatham through the D.A.R.E. program, which helps to illustrate the harmful effects of drugs and alcohol. Additionally, it continues to promote internet safety through a program that aims to educate both parents and children on the subject matter.

Overall, the Chatham Borough Police Department has continued to exemplify extraordinary citizenship and values while putting its officers in harm's way to ensure the safety and the betterment of its residents. Officers respond to every call without fear, and their efforts are commended.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Chatham Borough Police Department as it celebrates its 100th anniversary.

HONORING THE LIFE OF AARON JASON

HON. PATRICK MURPHY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 2013

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of an outstanding young man. Aaron Jason, a rising junior at South Fork High School, passed away on June 26, 2013 at the age of 16. Aaron is survived by his mother Roylyn, his father Nigel and his two sisters, Ayanna and Amina.

Aaron was born on May 5, 1997 and attended South Fork High School in Martin County, Florida and was scheduled to graduate in 2015.

Aaron was a member of the Youth in Government program at the YMCA for 3 years, and cared deeply about his country and community. His interest in government and politics lead him to become involved in my race for Congress, in which he was active as an intern and volunteer. It was through this volunteer work that I had the fortune of meeting Aaron and the privilege of getting to know him.

In addition to his community involvement outside of school, Aaron was an active member of South Fork's Key Club and was a member of the track team. Always pushing himself to excel, he was enrolled in the International Baccalaureate program, as well as in Advanced Placement courses. He was a smart young man with an incredibly bright future ahead of him. He always had a smile on his face and was articulate, easy to get along with, and very quick with a joke or kind word. He had an incredible work ethic and was a true pleasure to be around.

Aaron was planning to go to law school and become an attorney or enter public service as an elected official. Having known him personally, I know he would have been successful at anything he put his mind too, and we are all saddened that he was taken from us well before his time. Given Aaron's love for American government and politics, I hope he would have appreciated having his life memorialized in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD here today.

Mr. Speaker, Aaron Jason was a truly special young man with a good heart, a strong will, and a deep commitment to his community. He will be missed by his family and friends, by me, and by everyone whose lives he touched in the Treasure Coast community.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF MIGUEL TIMOSHENKOV

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 2013

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the contributions of Miguel Timoshenkov, for 42 years in the field of journalism. He began his career in Mexico; after 12 years and various publications, he joined The Laredo Morning Times. After 30 years he ended his tenure with the Morning Times.

Mr. Timoshenkov received his degree in Communications from the Valle de Mexico University. Additionally, he has obtained various degrees from other prestigious institutions such as the Autonomous University of Tamaulipas and Texas A&M International University.

After publishing an article in the '80s about the Mexican government and its role in media censorship during the elections, he was penalized and forced to leave his job, after which he was recruited by The Laredo Morning Times. Mr. Timoshenkov, by means of investigative journalism, has enlightened not only our southern neighbors but Americans alike.

Mr. Timoshenkov's fearlessness and sense of commitment to his craft have garnered him many obstacles, security risks and multiple court appearances for his words. However, each and every time the charges lacked merit and one by one they were dropped. To many that would suffice as a deterrent, but he continued to delve and search for the facts.

His extensive resume includes El Diario and El Mañana and Grupo Radio Mil and Radiorama where he served as their news director.

Mr. Timoshenkov's work has been recognized not only by the cities of Laredo, Nuevo Laredo but also by government agencies such as the Department of Homeland Security, the Chamber of Commerce, and United States Border Patrol.

Over the years he has received many awards and accolades from various institutions, including a first, second and third place awarded by The Hearst Corporation.

Mr. Timoshenkov has demonstrated a dedication to excellence for over 40 years, and should take great pride in the work he has accomplished.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize the commitment to service to our communities exhibited by the journalist Miguel Timoshenkov.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOSEPH CROWLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 2013

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, on July, 8, 2013, I mistakenly voted "nay" on rollcall vote 306. I meant to vote "aye" on the Audit Integrity and Job Protection Act (H.R. 1564).

HONORING ROBERT JAMES GOW

HON. JANICE HAHN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 2013

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of a remarkable and hard-working man from my district Robert James Gow. He passed away peacefully on Sunday, July 7, 2013 in his home in Carson, California.

Born on April 16, 1931 to Peter and Regina Gow in Gary, Indiana, Robert, known to many as Bob, was the youngest of seven siblings. An adventurous and fearless spirit, Bob's greatest legacy lives on through his dedication to family and service to others in his community.

As a young man, Bob courageously served in the United States Air Force during the Korean War. After the war, Bob expanded his interest in airplanes, flying, and space exploration while working at McDonnell Douglas, Northrop, North American Aviation, Rockwell, Aero-Jet, Autonetics and Boeing. In addition to being a hard worker, Bob was known as a family man. He married the love of his life, Judith Vanderpool Gow, with whom he had three sons, James, Kenneth, and William. Bob was also the grandfather of five girls, Lauren, Bryahn, Gina, Alice and Michaela, as well as a loving uncle to many nieces and nephews.

Bob loved his community and was deeply involved in the St. Philomena Catholic Church for over 54 years. He was active with the Parent Teacher Association, Little League Baseball, and Boy Scout Troop 950 in Carson. Helping others and improving his community were his life passions.

He will be remembered as a man of dedication and a pillar of our community. I was honored to have met such a remarkable man. He will be missed dearly by his family, friends and loved ones.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all Members of the House to join me in a moment of silence to commemorate the memory of the late Robert James Gow.

TRIBUTE TO THE CITY OF COLTON, CALIFORNIA

HON. GARY G. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 2013

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute today to the city of Colton, California, as their community celebrates their 126th birthday this week.

Colton is a growing center for new business, residential and employment opportunities in the County of San Bernardino. Colton also offers a well-balanced community with affordable housing and many family support and public safety programs. Settled in the 1770's by explorers from Mexico, Colton was formed when the Southern Pacific Railway pushed the final transcontinental leg though on its way to Los Angeles in 1875. The city derived its name from Civil War General David Colton, also the Vice President of the Southern Pacific Railroad Company.

Since incorporation in 1887, Colton's population has grown to 52,940. The city's motto of

"The Hub City" truly fits. Activity associated with the railroad and the citrus orchards made Colton a busy place, with many business and residents working to support railroad operations. In South Colton, where many railroad workers lived, residents built their own homes often using the disassembled wooden crates from railroad shipments as building materials. Established in 1882, the Colton Railroad Crossing is one of the busiest railroad intersections in the Nation. A $270 million project is in process to replace this crossing with a fly-over to raise the east-west Union Pacific tracks over the north-south Burlington Northern Santa Fe tracks.

The residents of Colton have worked hard to make their city one of the best places in Southern California to work, live, and enjoy life. Colton is a diverse community where residents can pursue their dreams in an environment abundant with opportunities for educational and economic advancement. It is indeed my pleasure to represent the residents of this beautiful city, who have contributed much of their time towards making Colton a destination for visitors and a home for those seeking a sense of community and a high quality of life.

Mr. Speaker, on this very special year for the City of Colton, please join me in commemorating their one hundred and twenty sixth anniversary.

HONORING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE JUNIOR LEAGUE OF MORRISTOWN

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 2013

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Junior League of Morristown, located in Morristown, New Jersey, which is celebrating its 75th anniversary.

As a non-profit, charitable organization of women, the Junior League of Morristown aims to "bring people and needs" together through the promotion of voluntarism, the development of potential in women, and the improvement of communities through adept leadership and action. Since its founding in 1936, the Junior League of Morristown has been completely nondiscriminatory in its acceptance of women, as demonstrated by the members' diverse backgrounds. There are over 390 active members that compose the Junior League of Morristown, an organization that is 1 of the 292 total Junior Leagues that make up the Association of Junior Leagues International, which draws from the United States, Canada, Great Britain, and Mexico.

Since its creation in 1936, the Junior League of Morristown has played a significant role in the development of Morristown and the surrounding area. The League has dedicated both time and effort to a plethora of charitable and non-charitable organizations, such as The Neighborhood House, Morristown Hospital, the Girl Scouts, the Red Cross during World War II emergencies, the Children's Theatre, and the Arts Council of the Morris Area, just to name a few. The League has received a number of grants and donations in order to continue its charitable work in the surrounding community. The Junior League is also proud to operate The Nearly New Shop resale and consignment shop located in Morristown.

In most recent news, the Junior League of Morristown made headlines when it finished a project with the Jersey Battered Women's Service that transformed a common room into a multi-purpose room for victims healing from violent acts. The Morristown Patch and The Daily Record, area newspapers, both cover the tremendous effort by the League. The JBWS director, Patty Sly commented: "We are so appreciative of the JLM for sharing their time and talents to create a relaxing and healing environment for our clients. Their efforts offer hope and dignity to those seeking protection from abuse. This is just one of many projects that the JLM has assisted us with over the years and we are grateful for our ongoing partnership." The project is only one of many that the League has pursued over its 75 year existence, yet it symbolizes the values that every community should strive to uphold. While it did receive a little bit of press coverage for a seemingly "small" project, a newspaper cannot do justice in describing what the Junior League of Morristown means to its community.

Charitable organizations, such as the Junior League of Morristown, provide an invaluable and meaningful service to towns such as Morristown. The Junior League of Morristown has always been available and willing to lend a helping hand when it was needed, and with the support of the local residents, its staff and volunteers, it will continue to do so for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Junior League of Morristown as they celebrate their 75th Anniversary.

OBAMA'S ABDICATION OF LEADERSHIP IN SUDAN

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 2013

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, Friday marks three years since the International Criminal Court (ICC) released an arrest warrant for Sudanese President Omar Bashir on charges of genocide in Darfur including overseeing acts of torture, the rape of thousands of women, and forced displacement of hundreds of thousands.

And yet, almost inexplicably, Bashir continues to travel the globe with virtual impunity thanks in no small part to the Obama administration's morally bankrupt posture when it comes to the regime in Khartoum.

For four months now the position of Sudan Special Envoy has been vacant. This vacancy is symptomatic of a president that has all but forsaken the people of Sudan.

Last December a group of prominent Sudan activists and advocates wrote a letter to the administration, which I submit for the Record, expressing their "grave concerns that the current U.S. policy is ineffective at stopping mass atrocities in Sudan." They urged President Obama, in his second term, to embrace "an urgent shift in the U.S. policy to finally end the humanitarian crises and bring about a just and lasting peace in Sudan."

The letter cited the president's own words from 2007 when he rightly called the genocide in Darfur a "stain on our souls" and said that "as a president of the United States I don't intend to abandon people or turn a blind eye to slaughter."

And yet, I can't help but wonder if the people of Darfur, who have been displaced from their homes and brutalized by violence for ten years now, do in fact feel abandoned by this president and this administration.

The United Nations Humanitarian Coordinator in Sudan, Ali Al-Za'tari, released a statement on July 7, prompted by the recent tragic death of two World Vision humanitarian workers caught in a shootout between government forces and rebels in Darfur, in which he commented on the "continuing unstable security" in the region which threatens to disrupt the flow of vital aid to an already desperate populace.

Not only is Darfur's nightmare ongoing, but Khartoum's brutality has only spread, consistent with its decades' long effort to systematically and ruthlessly consolidate power resulting in the death and displacement of untold thousands. More recently the Nuban people have been driven from their homes, targeted for killing and terrorized because of the color of their skin. Khartoum has indiscriminately bombed civilian populations—disrupting an entire way of life for this largely farming population. Starvation, death and despair have followed.

According to the UN Humanitarian Affairs office approximately half a million people have been displaced because of the conflict in Nuba. Last week a Sudanese jet reportedly attacked the routes typically taken by refugees from the Nuba region to the Yida refugee camp in South Sudan killing an unknown number of civilians.

I have visited Yida and talked with the people personally. I have heard their pleas for help and I have conveyed their message to this administration—a message which fell on largely deaf ears.

On March 19, USA Today featured a joint op-ed by actor and co-founder of the anti-genocide organization Not On Our Watch, Don Cheadle, and John Prendergast the co-founder of the Enough Project, in the op-ed wrote, "By excluding all but a narrow clique of Sudanese from access to the power and wealth of the country, marginalized groups from the west (Darfur), south (Blue Nile and the Nuba Mountains) and east have all taken up arms against that regime. . . . Any peace effort should deal comprehensively with all the rebel movements, the unarmed opposition, and civil society, in search of a solution for the whole of Sudan. Until the abusive governing system in Sudan is radically reformed, there will be blood."

Indeed, much blood has been shed, and yet inexplicably this administration has embraced a policy of engagement marked by conciliatory outreach to Khartoum, including the prospect of debt relief for a genocidal government.

While there has been criticism of two successive special envoys, ultimately they were merely the implementers of a policy that is inherently flawed and ultimately ineffective.

In a February 12 letter to Secretary of State Kerry I wrote, "Our approach to Sudan and South Sudan needs reinvigorating. It demands a renewed sense of moral clarity about who we are dealing with in Khartoum—namely genocidaires. It necessitates someone who can speak candidly with our friends in South

Sudan about their own internal challenges, including corruption, and shortcomings as a new nation. While an envoy alone does not a policy make, a high-profile special envoy, from outside the department, with the knowledge and mandate to aggressively pursue peace, security and justice for the people of Sudan and South Sudan, is an important step in the right direction.''

The model of an effective special envoy that I often refer to is that of Senator John Danforth. In 2001, I was at the Rose Garden ceremony when Senator Danforth, standing between President Bush and Secretary of State Powell, was appointed as Sudan Special Envoy. President Bush's leadership in appointing Danforth and giving him this charge was instrumental in securing, after two and a half years of negotiations, the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA), thereby bringing about an end to the war and ultimately paving the way for South Sudan's independence. Danforth was a high-profile envoy. He had the ear of the president and the secretary and didn't get bogged down in the department's bureaucracy. He was uniquely positioned to negotiate and his stature, prior to taking the job, communicated a clear sense of urgency and priority on the part of the U.S. He didn't require a sizeable staff, or even a full-time State Department post, but the diplomatic feat he accomplished, with President Bush's blessing and support, was nothing short of remarkable.

Meanwhile, not only has the Obama administration failed to fill the Sudan Special Envoy post, it has actively sought to block efforts in Congress, which I initiated, to isolate Bashir. Last year I offered an amendment to the State and Foreign Operations appropriations bill which would have cut non-humanitarian foreign assistance to any nation that allowed him into their country without arresting him. The amendment was adopted with bipartisan support by voice vote despite the department's opposition.

This approach of using our increasingly scarce aid dollars to effectuate change and further our foreign policy objectives is a tried and true method. When Malawi allowed Bashir to enter the country to attend a regional trade summit I pressed the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC) to end Malawi's compact. The MCC was initially opposed to this course of action but ultimately, in the face of a deteriorating human rights situation internally, reversed course and suspended Malawi's compact, citing Bashir's visit as one of the reasons.

Fortunately Malawi's new president, Joyce Banda, hoping to reinvigorate her country's relationship with donor countries, last year took a firm stand in refusing to allow Bashir to visit her country for the African Union (AU) summit. President Banda went so far as to decline to host the summit lest her country and her government be placed in the position of being forced to host a war criminal. Given her principled stand I made clear to the MCC Board that I supported Malawi's compact being reinstated which it ultimately was.

However, other countries, including large recipients of U.S. foreign assistance, have not followed suit and the administration has failed to embrace this approach to spur such action. As recently as yesterday, reports surfaced that Bashir would soon travel to Nigeria—yet another country which has signed up to the Rome Statute—the founding treaty of the ICC.

The amendment I proposed would effectively isolate Bashir and make him an international pariah as is befitting a man with blood on his hands. It is noteworthy that the amendment garnered the support of 70 prominent Holocaust and genocide scholars. Dr. Rafael Medoff, director of the Wyman Institute, which initiated a letter of support to the administration from these scholars, said: ''Halting aid to those who host Bashir would be the first concrete step the U.S. has taken to isolate the Butcher of Darfur and pave the way for his arrest. If the Obama administration is serious about punishing perpetrators of genocide, it should support the Wolf Amendment.''

Sadly that support never materialized.

When it wasn't busy opposing Congressional efforts to isolate Bashir the administration was cozying up to elements of the regime in Khartoum and granting them an air of legitimacy. On April 23 the Associated Press reported that ''The Obama administration is preparing to welcome a senior Sudanese delegation to the United States for some rare highest-level diplomacy between the countries.'' The delegation was to include Sudanese presidential adviser Nafie Ali Nafie.

Upon learning of this invitation I immediately wrote the president and expressed my strong opposition citing an October 2008 Los Angeles Times profile piece on Nafie which opened with the following, ''He's accused of torturing enemies, cozying up to Osama bin Laden in the 1990s and plotting to assassinate Egypt's president.'' The Times piece continued, describing him as, ''the leader of the hardline faction in the ruling National Congress Party,'' and the one who ''opposed allowing U.N. peacekeepers into Darfur and believed that the ruling party gave up too much power in signing a 2005 U.S.-brokered peace treaty that ended a 21-year civil war with southern rebels.''

The article quoted a former University of Khartoum science professor and critic of the Khartoum government who was arrested in 1989 as saying that Nafie was his interrogator. Specifically he said, ''I was tortured, beaten and flogged in his presence . . . He was administering the whole thing. He did it all in such a cool manner, as if he were sipping coffee.''

I am not opposed to diplomacy. But there are plenty of locations, including through our embassy in Khartoum, to engage in these talks. Why the administration would choose now to reward Khartoum, specifically the likes of Nafie Ali Nafie, with an invitation to Washington is beyond me. It is further worth noting that the invitation is utterly at odds with Obama's own 2011 Presidential Proclamation refusing entry into the United States of anyone who has ''planned, ordered, assisted, aided and abetted, committed or otherwise participated in, including through command responsibility, war crimes, crimes against humanity or other serious violations of human rights, or who attempted or conspired to do so.''

The administration's misstep in inviting Nafie was met with grave expressions of concern from many in the Sudan advocacy community. Eventually, at a Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission hearing focused on Sudan just last month the administration indicated the invitation was now off the table—although they did not rule out another change of course in the future.

Candidate Obama purported to be deeply concerned by the crisis in Sudan and committed to bold actions.

Have we seen a fraction of that concern or anything close to bold action since he became president?

Candidate Obama was sharp in his criticism of President Bush's handling of Sudan.

Have we seen President Obama take even fleeting interest, beyond the occasional talking point, in the deteriorating situation in Sudan marked in part by a growing humanitarian crisis in the Nuba Mountains?

In a piece in the August 4, 2011 Christian Science Monitor noted Sudan researcher and activist Eric Reeves, wrote, ''If the world refuses to see what is occurring in South Kordofan, and refuses to respond to evidence that the destruction of the Nuba people, as such, is a primary goal of present military and security actions by Sudan, then this moment will represent definitive failure of the 'responsibility to protect.' ''

Meanwhile in an April 23, 2012 speech at the U.S. Holocaust Museum President Obama lauded his commitment in the realm of genocide and mass-atrocities prevention, saying, without a hint of irony, ''We're making sure that the United States government has the structures, the mechanisms to better prevent and respond to mass atrocities. So I created the first-ever White House position dedicated to this task. It's why I created a new Atrocities Prevention Board, to bring together senior officials from across our government to focus on this critical mission. This is not an afterthought.''

He continued, ''. . . we need to be doing everything we can to prevent and respond to these kinds of atrocities—because national sovereignty is never a license to slaughter your people.''

I couldn't agree more. And yet, I think most in the Sudan watchers would hardly be able to claim that this administration has done everything it can to prevent and respond to Khartoum's assault on its own people.

Arguably, the Obama administration's moral equivalency and silence in the face of atrocities in Sudan has only, in the words of famed Holocaust survivor Elie Wiesel, helped the oppressor and encouraged the tormentor.

With tensions between Sudan and South Sudan on the rise and nearing a tipping point, thousands starving in the Nuba Mountains, refugees fleeing aerial bombardment and pouring over the border into South Sudan, violence persisting in Darfur and an internationally indicted war criminal at the helm in Khartoum who travels the globe with seeming impunity, it is time for a fresh policy and a renewed commitment to peace and justice in Sudan.

To date, this president has offered nothing more than an abdication of leadership and a failure of vision, which has culminated in human suffering and misery.

Obama has failed the people of Sudan who yearn for peace, justice and basic human rights.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TOM COLE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 2013

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, on July 10, 2013, I was unavoidably detained and was not present for rollcall vote No. 330 and rollcall vote No. 331. Had I been present, I would have voted no on vote No. 330 and no on vote No. 331.

IN SUPPORT OF MOLDOVAN PARLIAMENT DECLARATION ON THE CURRENT SITUATION OF THE TRANSNISTRIAN CONFLICT SETTLEMENT PROCESS

HON. JOSEPH R. PITTS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 2013

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the peaceful reintegration of the young and aspiring Republic of Moldova. I also want to acknowledge my colleagues Reps. DAVID PRICE, Rep. ELIOT ENGEL, Rep. WILLIAM KEATING, Rep. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, Rep. MARK MEADOWS, Rep. DIAZ-BALART, Rep. ALCEE HASTINGS, Rep. PATRICK MCHENRY, who have agreed to associate themselves with this statement.

Most importantly, we support the recent conclusion of negotiations between the Republic of Moldova and the European Union on Moldova's Association Agreement, held in Luxembourg on June 25, 2013. We welcome the progress instituted by Prime Minister Iurie Leanca and the Moldovan government in strengthening democratic institutions and the rule of law, as well as in preparing for economic and political association with the European Union.

As the goals and promotion of values of the Eastern Partnership are of utmost importance to U.S. strategic policy, we encourage Moldova to remain united in its continued focus on the domestic reforms integral to eventual European Union accession. We hope that the forthcoming EU Summit in Vilnius in November will result in an opportunity to reaffirm Moldova's EU aspirations, and call on the U.S. State Department to assist in every aspect of this challenging transition. Doing so affirms the United States' commitment to our allies in this region.

While encouraged by Moldova's increasing harmonization with EU norms and standards—as evidenced by its recent agreement on the Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement as part of the European Union's Association Agreement—Moldova is being forced to fight for its own internationally recognized sovereign, independent and territorial integrity.

We are concerned with the unilateral set of actions undertaken by the self-proclaimed leaders of the breakaway region of Transnistria, who recently launched provocative actions by adopting the so-called ''legal act on the border.'' These unilateral actions violate Moldova's sovereignty, as the leadership of Transnistria has claimed territories that are fully in the control of the Republic of Moldova. We are also concerned by recent entreaties by the leadership in Transnistria—entreaties that threaten Moldova's territorial integrity and European Union accession prospects. These actions undermine the July 1992 ceasefire as well as the ''5+2'' conflict settlement process. We call on the U.S. State Department to secure a fair and democratic settlement process while maintaining Moldova's independence and sovereignty.

Today, we stand in support of the Moldovan Parliament's Declaration on the Current Situation of the Transnistrean Conflict Settlement Process, adopted consensually on June 21, 2013, and urge leaders of the self-proclaimed Transnistria, as well as all parties involved in 5+2 negotiation process, to conclude negotiations on the legal status of the Transnistrian region and its rightful role in the Republic of Moldova. Only a legal status agreed upon through the 5+2 framework will prevent further escalation of conflict. At the same time, we firmly recognize the need to finalize the withdrawal of Russian troops and munitions from the region, according to its internationally recognized obligations assumed at the 1999 summit of the Organization for Security Cooperation in Europe.

We call on the United States and the international community to take all the diplomatic steps possible to prevent further escalation of conflict, protect Moldova's European Union accession aspirations, resume talks on the political status of Transnistria and ensure the reintegration of a sovereign and independent Moldova.

TRIBUTE TO BETH GROVES

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 2013

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to an individual whose dedication and contributions to the community of Norco, California are exceptional. Norco has been fortunate to have dynamic and dedicated community leaders who willingly and unselfishly give their time and talent and make their communities a better place to live and work. Beth Groves is one of these individuals. This year, Beth will end her tenure as the City Manager for the city of Norco after four years of service.

Beth's passion and commitment for providing for the community began early. After graduating from Central Michigan University with a Bachelor of Arts in Applied arts, she went on to hone her talent, receiving a Masters in Public Administration from California State University Long Beach, and a Doctorate in Public Administration from the University of Laverne. Beth began her career as Community Relations Coordinator for Mission Hospital, in Mission Viejo, California, and eventually landed a position in the City Manager's Office of Corona, where she served from 1996 to 2008, ultimately becoming the City Manager of Corona. It is the expertise and knowledge gained through these experiences that have allowed to Beth lead Norco for the past four years in such a dynamic manner.

Under Beth's leadership, the city administration has actively promoted and supported the community. Beth is credited with many accomplishments during her time, including negotiating the Silverlakes agreements, establishing a new animal shelter despite many budget restraints, and maintaining the Preservation and Development Zone (PAD) program by working closely with both the planning director and historic commission. She has also encouraged economic development and a family-centered entertainment atmosphere by increasing filming and events that have taken place within the city.

In 2002, Beth received the ''Woman of Distinction'' Award in the category of International Good Will and Understanding from Soroptimist International of Corona, and the title of ''2007 Distinguished Citizen of the Year'' from the Temescal District of the Boy Scouts of America. She has also served as a Community Council Member for the Corona-Norco Chapter of the American Cancer society. The highlights of her extensive volunteer experience include The Foundation for Community and Family Health, Alternatives to Domestic Violence (ADV), Inspire Life Skills, and Peppermint Ridge.

Beth is no stranger to Southern California, having been a Corona resident for many years, where she is a mother to two adult sons and is a member of the Crossroads Christian Church. At the conclusion of her time as City Manager, Beth will remain a fixture in our community, serving as a full time professor at Cal Baptist University in Riverside, CA.

In light of all Beth has done for the city of Norco and the greater community, it is only fitting that she be honored for her many years of dedicated service. Beth's tireless passion for public service has contributed immensely to the betterment of Corona and Norco and I am proud to call her a fellow community member, American and friend. I know that many community members are grateful for her service and salute her as she moves forward.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 2013

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 316, had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

On rollcall No. 317, had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

On rollcall No. 318, had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

On rollcall No. 319, had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

On rollcall No. 320, had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

On rollcall No. 321, had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

On rollcall No. 322, had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

On rollcall No. 323, had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

On rollcall No. 324, had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''
On rollcall No. 325, had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''
On rollcall No. 326, had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''
On rollcall No. 327, had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''
On rollcall No. 328, had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''
On rollcall No. 329, had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''
On rollcall No. 330, had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

CELEBRATING THE CENTENNIAL OF DELTA SIGMA THETA SORORITY, INC.

HON. JOYCE BEATTY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 2013

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the founding of my sorority, Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc.

I am a proud member of this sisterhood—a sisterhood of more than 200,000 predominately Black-college educated women with some 900 chapters across the United States.

This week, tens of thousands of my sorors will travel to Washington, DC, to honor our sisterhood, which was founded at Howard University on January 13, 1913.

We will trace our journey from the halls of Howard where twenty-two visionary undergraduate students created an organization committed to fostering a spirit of sisterhood, scholarship, and service among women.

We come together to honor the memory of all our sorors who came before us and contributed to our great Delta Sigma Theta, Inc. legacy.

We stand on the shoulders of greatness and in the midst of greatness.

And, I am certain our legacy of leadership, service, and friendship will endure for another one hundred years and beyond.

HONORING THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF SAINT CLARE'S HEALTH SYSTEM

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 2013

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Saint Clare's Health System, located in the Township of Denville, Morris County, New Jersey, which is celebrating its 60th anniversary.

The history of Saint Clare's Health System dates back to 1895, when the Sisters of the Sorrowful Mother, the founders of Saint Clare's, came to Denville. After building a health resort that saw tremendous success, the Sisters decided it was time to go forth with another project in 1940. However, World War II intervened, and the project did not take root until 1949. With the post-war housing boom and migration to the suburbs, the Sisters saw a growing need for a hospital in Denville and the surrounding area. Finally, after building a 157-bed hospital at a cost of $3.25 million and hiring a staff of 35 nurses and medical technicians, the Sisters opened Saint Clare's Hospital Auxiliary on September 24, 1953.

Saint Clare's commitments and expectations in the community have grown, as it continues to explore new ways to enhance its medical care. Saint Clare's now encompasses hospitals in Denville, Dover, and Boonton Township, with other facilities scattered throughout both Morris and Sussex Counties, featuring the most up-to-date technology and offering the most compassionate care in the community. Denville and the surrounding area have come to rely on Saint Clare's in its times of need, and Saint Clare's has always responded with open arms.

The Saint Clare's Health System tradition is built on values such as reverence, integrity, compassion, and excellence. In exhibiting those core values, Saint Clare's has become one of the most prestigious health services in northern New Jersey. Saint Clare's aims to nurture those in need of medical help by offering a wide range of medical services, like women's health, maternal-child care, emergency services, pediatrics, behavioral therapy, cardiovascular care, weight loss surgery, and a world-class cancer center. Through those medical services, Saint Clare's has been able to provide the most personal and most advanced health care to Denville and the surrounding municipalities, while emphasizing human dignity and social justice by helping create healthier communities.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in congratulating Saint Clare's Health System as it celebrates its 60th anniversary.

TIME WARNER CABLE DATA CENTER IN COLORADO

HON. CORY GARDNER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 2013

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a valuable, job creating project that broke ground in the great State of Colorado.

On June 25, Time Warner Cable unveiled an $85 million data center in Centennial, Colorado.

This center will support the equipment needed to deliver digital video and IP based services to many Time Warner Cable customers and will complement the company's data center in Charlotte, North Carolina.

Construction of this project will last through much of 2014 and the center will go online in January of the following year.

Upgrades at the facility have been ongoing since 2011 and when the new development is complete, Time Warner Cable will have invested more than $141 million in my home State.

That's a big project for any municipality, but in a town with a population of 102,603, it is an economic game changer. The jobs created by the construction and staffing of the finished facility will have an immediate impact on the town and surrounding area.

Time Warner Cable's commitment to diversifying Colorado's economy and providing opportunities for Colorado's working families is to be commended.

IN HONOR OF ROY HARRIS

HON. KEVIN BRADY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 2013

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I stand today to honor my friend, Roy Harris of Cut and Shoot on his 80th birthday.

All across America, there are living legends every American should know about and Montgomery County, Texas has a special icon: Roy Harris.

To fully understand Roy's legendary status, we have to take a trip back in time. Roy's first brush with fame came during his early teenaged years when he and his brother captured a 14 foot alligator and brought it to a pond on their family's property. At the time, that was the largest alligator ever captured in Texas.

In his early 20's, Roy stepped into the boxing ring with determination. He won his first 23 fights, beating some of the top boxers of his generation, earning Ring Magazines' progress of the year for 1957. He was featured on the coveted cover of Sports Illustrated which played up his East Texas roots having him stand on a cabin porch with a 19th century rifle and loyal canine companion at his side.

Roy's legend grew even larger when he stepped into the ring to battle reigning world champion and Olympic Gold Medalist Floyd Patterson for the world's heavyweight boxing title.

The referee stopped the fight after 12 rounds, but not before Roy became a national hero. It was Roy's fame, and a boost from his hit record ''Cut'n Shoot, Texas USA'', that literally put his hometown on the map and garnered it an official U.S. Post Office.

But Roy is so much more than an alligator wrangler, a top flight boxer or radio hit maker, Roy was also a college honor student and a reserve officer in our military. He taught elementary school before becoming a lawyer, real estate mogul and popular public servant serving several terms as our county treasurer. I can tell you from personal experience, no one campaigns harder, longer, and more for the people than Roy Harris.

He and his wonderful wife, Jeannie, raised six impressive children. He told his story much better than I could in his book ''Roy Harris: Backwoods Battler.'' My only question was how is this autobiography not in multiple volumes?

With 30 wins in the ring and many, many more wins in life, it was fitting that our community came together last month for a public birthday bash for Roy's 80th.

Roy, thanks for being a great example for your children, my children, and millions of others. Your legend will only keep growing.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. YVETTE D. CLARKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 2013

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained in my district and missed the votes on Monday, July 8, 2013.

Had I been present, I would have voted ''no'' on rollcall No. 305, H.R. 1341—Financial

Competitive Act of 2013, "no" on rollcall No. 306, H.R. 1564—Audit Integrity and Job Protection Act, as amended, and "yes" on rollcall No. 307, H.R. 1171—FOR VETS Act of 2013.

IN RECOGNITION OF MR. JOE BISCEGLIA'S 16 YEARS OF DEDICATED SERVICE TO THE MASSACHUSETTS SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 2013

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of a great friend and a true public servant, Mr. Joseph Bisceglia, for his years of dedicated service to the constituents of the Massachusetts Second Congressional District. After 16 years as District Representative in my Worcester Congressional office, Joe is moving on to another position.

Joe joined my Worcester office early in my first term in 1997. Since that time he has exhibited consistent excellence and shown a thoughtful and compassionate hand in all of his work. Joe has helped so many people—too many to count. I believe, and I know that many of my colleagues will agree with me, that constituent casework is one of the most important things we do as members of Congress. Whether it was helping a veteran get the benefits he rightfully earned or helping a family to find a decent place to live, Joe exemplified the true meaning of "public service."

It will be difficult to say goodbye to such a loyal friend and colleague, but I am confident that Joe will continue to display his good humor and dedication in his new position. I know my colleagues will join me in recognizing Joe Bisceglia for his many years of faithful service to the people of Massachusetts and in wishing him and his family the very best in the years ahead.

DELTA SIGMA THETA 51ST NATIONAL CONVENTION

HON. MARCIA L. FUDGE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 2013

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to salute the women of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Incorporated as 100 years of sisterhood, scholarship and service is celebrated in our nation's capital—the home of the Sorority's founding. Tomorrow thousands of women will convene on the National Mall to kick off the sorority's 51st National Convention.

I pay tribute to 100 years of trailblazing in honor of the sorority's 22 courageous and visionary Founders, and its members who have also served in Congress, including Barbara Jordan, Shirley Chisholm, Carrie Meek and Stephanie Tubbs-Jones.

A sisterhood called to serve, Delta Sigma Theta has developed and implemented many programs to promote educational and economic development, improve physical and mental health, and increase international and political awareness and involvement.

I welcome my Sorors to the Nation's capital, and salute a century of distinguished serve here at home and around the globe.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $16,738,227,772,946.05. We've added $6,111,350,724,032.97 to our debt in 4 and a half years. This is $6 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RUSH HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 2013

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, July 8, I was not present for Recorded Votes under a suspension of the rules. Had I been present I would have voted as follows:

"No" on rollcall vote 305 on motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1341;

"No" on rollcall vote 306 on motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1564;

"Yes" on rollcall vote 307, on motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1171;

On Tuesday, July 9, following debate of H. Res. 288, the rule providing for consideration of the H.R. 2609 making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year 2014, I was not able to be present for Recorded Votes.

Had I been present during the vote series, I would have voted as follows:

"No" on rollcall vote 308, On Ordering the Previous Question;

"No" on rollcall vote 309, On Agreeing to the Resolution to provide for consideration of H.R. 2609;

"No" on rollcall vote 310, On Approving the Journal.

On Wednesday, July 10, during debate of amendments to and on passage of H.R. 2609 making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year 2014, I was unable to be present for Recorded Votes. Had I been present during these vote series, I would have voted as follows:

"Yes" on rollcall vote 328, on agreeing to the Hastings (FL) amendment;

"Yes" on rollcall vote 329, on agreeing to the Garamendi amendment;

"No" on rollcall vote 330, on agreeing to the Broun (GA) amendment;

"Yes" on rollcall vote 331, on agreeing to the Jackson Lee amendment;

"Yes" on rollcall vote 332, on agreeing to the Quigley amendment;

"No" on rollcall vote 333, on agreeing to the Heck (NV) amendment;

"Yes" on rollcall vote 334, on agreeing to the Polis amendment;

"Yes" on rollcall vote 335, on agreeing to the Burgess amendment;

"Yes" on rollcall vote 336, on agreeing to the Burgess amendment;

"Yes" on rollcall vote 337, on agreeing to the Titus amendment;

"Yes" on rollcall vote 338, on agreeing to the Lynch amendment;

"No" on rollcall vote 339, on agreeing to the Whitfield amendment;

"No" on rollcall vote 340, on agreeing to the Fleming amendment;

"Yes" on rollcall vote 341, on agreeing to the Garamendi amendment;

"Yes" on rollcall vote 342, on agreeing to the Speier amendment;

"No" on rollcall vote 343, on agreeing to the Chabot amendment;

"Yes" on rollcall vote 344, on motion to recommit with instructions;

"No" on rollcall vote 345, on passage of H.R. 2609.

RECOGNIZING THE SECOND ANNUAL NATIONAL TENNIS CAMP FOR WOUNDED, ILL, AND INJURED SERVICE MEMBERS AND VETERANS

HON. SUSAN A. DAVIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 2013

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the United States Tennis Association, San Diego District Tennis Association, Naval Medical Center San Diego, and Balboa Tennis Club for working together on the second annual National Tennis Camp for Wounded, Ill, and Injured Service Members and Veterans.

This remarkable event took place on June 12, 2013 through June 15, 2013 and brought military heroes together to play tennis while working to improve their well-being and overall quality of life.

I would like to also acknowledge the U.S. Olympic Committee, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and private donors for providing all funding for the costs for each participant.

Since 2009, the Balboa Tennis Club, in collaboration with Naval Medical Center San Diego and the San Diego District Tennis Association, has provided hundreds of free tennis clinics to more than 400 ill and injured service members and veterans from all the military services as part of Naval Medical Center San Diego's Balboa Warrior Athlete Program.

The Balboa Warrior Athlete Program's tennis program and tennis camp have been recognized nationally and are the model for similar tennis programs for ill and injured service members and veterans that have been established at other major military medical centers, Warrior Transition Units, and VA hospitals across the country.

The United States Tennis Association and its member organizations have a long and proud history of supporting veterans and wounded warriors. The USTA Military Outreach mission is to provide sustainable worldwide tennis support, training and programming options to America's service members, families and veterans. The USTA utilizes its existing initiatives and programs to reach, support and provide direct services to military families, service members and veterans. The USTA has introduced more than 300,000 deployed service members to the recreational, therapeutic and social benefits of tennis.

These efforts have made a positive impact in the lives of ill and injured service members and veterans. Tennis allows them to work on eye-hand coordination, balance, endurance, and the ability to transfer weight. It also decreases stress and anxiety and helps with reintegration into the community.

All the above-mentioned parties who came together to put on a successful National Tennis Camp for Wounded, Ill, and Injured Service Members and Veterans deserve our thanks and gratitude.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S5625–S5673

Measures Introduced: Sixteen bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 1278–1293, and S.J. Res. 20. **Page S5667**

Measures Reported:

S. 1283, making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014. (S. Rept. No. 113–70)

S. 1284, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014. (S. Rept. No. 113–71) **Page S5667**

Measures Passed:

Kay Bailey Hutchison Spousal IRA: Committee on Finance was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2289, to rename section 219(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 as the Kay Bailey Hutchison Spousal IRA, and the bill was then passed. **Page S5672**

Authorizing the Use of Emancipation Hall: Senate agreed to H. Con. Res. 43, authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony honoring the life and legacy of Nelson Mandela on the occasion of the 95th anniversary of his birth. **Page S5673**

National Day of the American Cowboy: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 191, designating July 27, 2013, as ''National Day of the American Cowboy'', and the resolution was then agreed to. **Page S5673**

Measures Considered:

Keep Student Loans Affordable Act: Senate began consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 1238, to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to extend the current reduced interest rate for undergraduate Federal Direct Stafford Loans for 1 year, to modify required distribution rules for pension plans. **Pages S5625–28**

Cordray Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Richard Cordray, of Ohio, to be Director, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection. **Pages S5651–52**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur on Tuesday, July 16, 2013. **Page S5673**

Griffin Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Richard F. Griffin, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board. **Page S5652**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Richard Cordray, of Ohio, to be Director, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection. **Page S5673**

Block Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Sharon Block, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board. **Page S5652**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Richard F. Griffin, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board. **Page S5673**

Pearce Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Mark Gaston Pearce, of New York, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board. **Page S5652**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Sharon Block, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board. **Page S5653**

Hochberg Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Fred P.

Hochberg, of New York, to be President of the Export-Import Bank of the United States.

Pages S5652–53

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Mark Gaston Pearce, of New York, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board. Pages S5652–53

Perez Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Thomas Edward Perez, of Maryland, to be Secretary of Labor. Page S5653

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Fred P. Hochberg, of New York, to be President of the Export-Import Bank of the United States. Page S5653

McCarthy Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Regina McCarthy, of Massachusetts, to be Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency. Page S5653

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Thomas Edward Perez, of Maryland, to be Secretary of Labor. Page S5653

Nomination Received: Senate received the following nomination:

William Ward Nooter, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years. Page S5673

Messages from the House: Page S5666

Measures Read the First Time: Page S5666

Executive Communications: Pages S5666–67

Executive Reports of Committees: Page S5667

Additional Cosponsors: Page S5668

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: Pages S5668–72

Additional Statements: Pages S5665–66

Notices of Hearings/Meetings: Page S5672

Authorities for Committees to Meet: Page S5672

Privileges of the Floor: Page S5672

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:50 p.m., until 2 p.m. on Monday, July 15, 2013. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S5673.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Appropriations: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

An original bill (S. 1284) making appropriations for Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014; and

An original bill (S. 1283) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE OPERATIONS

Committee on Armed Services: Committee received a closed briefing on Department of Defense operations conducted pursuant to the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force and the presidential policy guidance on counterterrorism from Michael G. Vickers, Under Secretary for Intelligence, Michael A. Sheehan, Assistant Secretary for Special Operations and Low-Intensity Conflict, Vice Admiral Kurt W. Tidd, USN, Director for Operations, and Commander William Gallagher, both of the Joint Staff, J3, and Brigadier General Richard Gross, Legal Counsel to the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, all of the Department of Defense.

WALL STREET REFORMS

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine mitigating systemic risk through Wall Street reforms, after receiving testimony from Mary J. Miller, Under Secretary, and Thomas J. Curry, Comptroller of the Currency, both of the Department of the Treasury; Daniel K. Tarullo, Member, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; and Martin J. Gruenberg, Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

U.S. TERRITORIES BILLS

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine S. 1237, to improve the administration of programs in the insular areas, and S. 1268, to approve an agreement between the United States and the Republic of Palau, after receiving testimony from Representatives Faleomavaega, Christensen, Bordallo, Sablan, and Pierluisi; Eileen Sobeck, Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Insular Areas; Vikram J. Singh, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for South and Southeast Asia, Office of the Secretary of Defense for

Policy; and Edgard Kagan, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs.

TRANSITION IN AFGHANISTAN

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine assessing the transition in Afghanistan, after receiving testimony from James F. Dobbins, Special Representative for Afghanistan and Pakistan, Department of State; Peter R. Lavoy, Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense for Asian and Pacific Security Affairs; Stephen Hadley, United States Institute of Peace, and Sarah Chayes, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, both of Washington, D.C.; and Nader Nadery, Fair and Free Elections Foundation of Afghanistan, Kabul, Afghanistan.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Victoria Nuland, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for European and Eurasian Affairs, Douglas Edward Lute, of Indiana, to be United States Permanent Representative on the Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, with the rank and status of Ambassador, and Daniel Brooks Baer, of Colorado, to be U.S. Representative to the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, with the rank of Ambassador, all of the Department of State, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Byron Todd Jones, of Minnesota, to be Director, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives, and Stuart F. Delery, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Attorney General, both of the Department of Justice.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 34 public bills, H.R. 2653–2686; and 3 resolutions, H. Res. 297–299 were introduced. **Pages H4482–83**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H4485–86**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H.R. 5, to support State and local accountablility for public education, protect State and local authority, inform parents of the performance of their children's schools, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 113–150, Pt. 1). **Page H4482**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Meadows to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H4373**

Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the guest chaplain, Reverend Dr. Paul Binion II, Westside Church of God, Fresno, California. **Page H4373**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by voice vote. **Pages H4373, H4475**

Motion to Adjourn: Rejected the Sewell (AL) motion to adjourn by a yea-and-nay vote of 125 yeas to 260 nays, Roll No. 346. **Pages H4375–76**

Motion to Adjourn: Rejected the Fudge motion to adjourn by a yea-and-nay vote of 138 yeas to 265 nays, Roll No. 348. **Page H4389**

Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013: The House passed H.R. 2642, to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, by a yea-and-nay vote of 216 yeas to 208 nays, Roll No. 353. **Pages H4376–89, H4390–H4475**

Rejected the Esty motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Agriculture with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 198 ayes to 226 noes, Roll No. 352. **Pages H4470–74**

During the course of debate on H.R. 2642, Representative Watt raised a point of order against the ruling of the Chair regarding what constitutes embellishment of a unanimous consent request, and the point of order was overruled. Representative Watt appealed the ruling of the chair, and Representative Lucas moved to table the motion to appeal the ruling of the chair. The motion to table was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 226 yeas to 189 nays, Roll No. 350. **Pages H4462–63**

During the course of further debate on H.R. 2642, Representative Thompson (MS) raised a point of order against the ruling of the Chair regarding what constitutes embellishment of a unanimous consent request, and the point of order was overruled. Representative Thompson (MS) appealed the ruling of the chair, and Representative Lucas moved to

table the motion to appeal the ruling of the chair. The motion to table was agreed to by a recorded vote of 221 ayes to 181 noes, Roll No. 351.

Page H4467

H. Res. 295, the rule providing for consideration of the bill, was agreed to by a recorded vote of 223 ayes to 195 noes, Roll No. 349, after the previous question was ordered without objection.

Pages H4376–94

During the course of debate on H. Res. 295, the Chair stated that it was not in order to embellish a unanimous consent request with additional remarks in the form of debate. Representative Hoyer raised a point of order against the ruling of the Chair regarding what constitutes embellishment of a unanimous consent request, and the point of order was overruled. Representative Hoyer appealed the ruling of the chair, and Representative Sessions moved to table the motion to appeal the ruling of the chair. The motion to table was agreed to by a recorded vote of 226 ayes to 196 noes, Roll No. 347.

Pages H4383–84

Meeting Hour: Agreed that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. on Monday, July 15th. **Pages H4476, H4481**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today appears on pages H4389–90.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Four yea-and-nay votes and four recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H4375–76, H4383–84, H4389, H4394, H4463, H4467, H4474, H4474–75. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 4:52 p.m.

Committee Meetings

REGULATION OF NEW CHEMICALS, PROTECTION OF CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS INFORMATION, AND INNOVATION

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy held a hearing entitled ''Regulation of New Chemicals, Protection of Confidential Business Information, and Innovation''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

IMPROVING FCC PROCESS

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Communications and Technology held a hearing entitled ''Improving FCC Process''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

STATE DEPARTMENT 2013 TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS REPORT

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations held a hearing entitled ''The State Department 2013 Trafficking in Persons Report''. Testimony was heard from Luis CdeBaca, Ambassador-at-Large, Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, Department of State.

ASSESSING ATTACKS ON THE HOMELAND

Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee continued a hearing entitled ''Assessing Attacks on the Homeland: From Fort Hood to Boston''. This portion of the hearing was closed.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURE

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law held a hearing on the ''Responsibly and Professionally Invigorating Development (RAPID) Act of 2013''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

AMERICA'S HELIUM SUPPLY

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources held a hearing entitled ''America's Helium Supply: Options for Producing More Helium from Federal Lands''. Testimony was heard from Tim Spisak, Deputy Assistant Director, Minerals and Realty Management, Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management; and public witnesses.

WILDFIRE AND FOREST MANAGEMENT

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Public Lands and Environmental Regulations held a hearing entitled ''Wildfire and Forest Management''. Testimony was heard from Representatives Lamborn; Tipton; Gosar; and Kirkpatrick; Jim Hubbard, Deputy Chief, State and Private Forestry, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture; James Douglas, Acting Director, Office of Wildland Fire, Senior Adviser, Public Safety, Resource Protection and Emergency Services, Department of the Interior; Joe Duda, Deputy State Forester, Colorado State Forest Service, Colorado State University; and public witnesses.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL LABORATORIES AND SCIENCE ACTIVITIES

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Energy held a hearing entitled ''Oversight and Management of Department of Energy National Laboratories and Science Activities''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

ONGOING INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Ongoing Intelligence Activities''. This was a closed hearing.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, JULY 12, 2013

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the **SENATE**

2 p.m., Monday, July 15

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: The Majority Leader will be recognized. Senators should expect a roll call vote at 5:30 p.m.

(At 6 p.m., there will be an all-Senators joint caucus in the Old Senate Chamber.)

Next Meeting of the **HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

10 a.m., Monday, July 15

House Chamber

Program for Monday: The House will meet in pro forma session at 10 a.m.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Congressional Record The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Printing Office, at *www.fdsys.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Printing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.