

majority. They do not only cut \$20 billion—\$20 billion, \$20,000 million—\$20 billion in cuts, when the average family gets \$4.45 per day. Cutting \$20 billion was bad enough. That was not good enough for those Members of the House of Representatives who want to see cuts twice as big. Many of those Members of the House of Representatives—or at least some of them—are farmers themselves who get huge farm subsidies. It begs the issue a little bit.

For some of my colleagues who have seen the movie “Lincoln,” at one point, President Lincoln—listening, but perhaps not entirely hearing his staff, who exhorted him to spend more time in the White House, winning the war, freeing the slaves, preserving the Union—President Lincoln said: I need to go out and get my public opinion baths.

Well, I suggest that maybe more of us—those particularly who are voting to cut SNAP, to cut food stamps \$40 billion—they may want to go out and listen to what people—not dressed like this, not working around here who get good benefits and decent salaries, not highly paid Congressmen and Senators, not the lobbyists who they may brunch with on Sunday when those Members do not go back home—but go out and talk to somebody at a labor union hall, go out and talk to somebody in a shopping mall, go out and talk to somebody at a school, where children—I heard a story today at my weekly coffee, where a woman told us that her daughter, who teaches in Columbus, has seen during the school lunch program children take some of the food and put it in their pockets so they can take it home for their brothers and sisters or for the weekend or for their moms or dads.

In this still difficult economy—when people receive \$4.45 per day, on the average, for SNAP, for food stamps—people in the House of Representatives want to cut it nearly \$40 billion.

It was not enough that 2 million Americans could lose SNAP benefits. It was not enough to them in the first bill that more than 200,000 children could lose access to the free and reduced-price lunch program. They want to make it harder, and they can say whatever they want. They can say: Well, people—I don’t know. Do they get addicted to food stamps? Do they dig food stamps because they don’t want to work?

The fact is, as Chairwoman STABENOW points out, the chair of the Agriculture Committee, in the next 10 years, 14 million Americans will leave SNAP. Why is that? If we do not do this, why will 14 million people leave SNAP? Because they will get better-paying jobs because they do not want to be in SNAP. Most people who get stamps would rather not. They would rather have enough food on the table. They would rather have enough purchasing power to go to the grocery store and buy food with their own money that they have earned so they can bring that food home and serve

their children. That is what most people want to do.

I spoke to a woman in Hamilton, OH, some time ago who told me that early in the month she would occasionally take her 9-year-old son to McDonald’s or to another fast food restaurant—maybe once in the first week of the month.

The second week, she could maybe serve him a hamburger, she could serve him meat. The third week of the month, she began to scrape. This is a woman who had a full-time job, volunteered, taught Sunday School, volunteered with the Cub Scouts for her son, was a very devoted single mother. The fourth week of the month, what typically happened was—she looked at me with her blues and she said: You know, I say to my son—I was sitting there with my son that last week of the month.

He said: Mom, how come you are not eating?

She said: Well, I am just not hungry. Well, she was hungry; she just had to choose at the end of the month, does the money go for my son or does it go for me? Like most mothers and fathers, she chose to do it for her child. That is the backdrop.

If more of my colleagues would follow the admonition of Abraham Lincoln and go out and get a public opinion bath and listen to what real people are saying—not people who dress like this, not people who sit in Congress, not lobbyists who may buy them lunch and come to their fundraisers, but really listen to what people have to say about what this means and understand, as Presiding Officer knows from the work he has done in his State of Connecticut, that most of the people getting benefits are children. Eighty-five percent of people receiving food assistance are children or their parents or people with disabilities or seniors. Many of them have jobs, but their jobs pay \$9 an hour. Again, this is not something they do by choice in a great majority of cases; it is something they feel they have to do. They are mothers and fathers who get up in the morning and try to give their children a better future. These are millions of Americans who head out every day looking for work so they can pay their bills and put food on the table.

As I said, almost 90 percent—80-some percent of SNAP households are made up of seniors and the disabled and families with children. One out of six Americans worries about where their next meal is coming from—one out of six Americans. How many people in this body have ever really thought that way, have talked to people that way, have tried to put themselves in the place of the—that is 50, 60, 70 percent of Americans—one out of six who worries about where their next meal will come from.

Then we have the body down the hall, the House of Representatives, who voted—\$20 billion in cuts is not enough; let’s do \$40 billion. Maybe we will do more than that.

My colleagues in the Congress suggest that SNAP participation has grown too big. They bemoan the state of our economy, the still-too-high unemployment rate. We all do. I share that concern. But we must do more to help jump-start our economy. I will work with anyone who seeks to do so. We know how important these benefits are to our brothers and sisters from Cleveland to Cincinnati, from rural Appalachia to farmlands in western Ohio, all across this country. It is important that we stand strong. We need a farm bill. We need a farm bill that serves agriculture. We need a farm bill that serves rural development. We need a farm bill that serves conservation and the environment. We need a farm bill that helps us provide energy. We need a farm bill that provides nutrition assistance.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT
AGREEMENT—H.J. RES. 59

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate receives H.J. Res. 59 from the House, the measure be placed on the calendar with a motion to proceed not in order until Monday, September 23.

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

RESPONSIBLE HELIUM ADMINISTRATION AND STORAGE ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the energy committee is discharged from further consideration of H.R. 527 and the Senate will proceed to the immediate consideration of the bill, which the clerk will report by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 527) to amend the Helium Act to complete the privatization of the Federal helium reserve in a competitive market fashion that ensures stability in the helium markets while protecting the interests of American taxpayers, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1960

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the substitute amendment, No. 1960, is agreed to.

(The amendment is printed in today’s RECORD under “Text of Amendments.”)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 15 minutes of debate equally divided between the Senator from Oregon, Mr. WYDEN, and the Senator from Texas, Mr. CRUZ, or their designees.

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, as I said this morning, Washington, DC, seems to have an inexhaustible capacity to manufacture false crises. I am here to say that this is not one of them. If the Congress does not act immediately to pass the legislation Senator MURKOWSKI and I advance today, scores of

American manufacturing and technology companies employing millions of American workers are going to find it impossible to continue their current operations.

Our government got involved with helium after World War I because the defense sector needed it. Ever since, President after President and Congress after Congress has tried to come up with a policy that gets government out of the helium business while still meeting the needs of our middle-class workers, our businesses, and our taxpayers.

Senator MURKOWSKI and I are here to say that our bipartisan bill does that. The reality also is that it raises some revenue. With that revenue, we will be able to meet—we talked about it in the committee—ongoing needs, particularly for folks hurting in rural communities where the Federal Government owns most of the land. They are concerned about their schools and their police and their roads. And because of the good work by colleagues on the other side of the aisle—particularly Senators RISCH and FLAKE—we were able to secure an additional \$51 million to pay down the deficit.

We have 7 minutes on each side. I know colleagues are anxious to vote. I yield time to Senator MURKOWSKI. I thank Senator CRUZ for his courtesies in this matter. I would yield to Senator MURKOWSKI. I would urge all colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this legislation that came out of our committee unanimously.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, thanks to the chairman of our energy committee, we have been working on this legislation for some time now—a couple of years. As the chairman has noted, what we are doing with the reauthorization of this Helium Program is we are getting the government out of the business of helium. We are on our way to completing a process that has been underway effectively in Congress since 1996.

We have an opportunity today to do the right thing, but we also have a very clear opportunity to make sure that we do not have a helium crisis, that we do not see a disruption in supply. That is effectively what could happen if we here in the Senate do not act quickly and work with the House to get this resolved before an October 1 deadline. So that is the imperative to take this vote this afternoon and move it across the line so we can conclude our business as it relates to the Helium Program. This is significant. It is important. We have a chance to make a difference. We can prevent a massive disruption to the helium supply chain.

We recognize that when we are talking about helium, it is not just party balloons; we are truly talking about an impact on our high-tech sector, our manufacturing sector, so many sectors of our economy that are reliant and dependent on helium. We should also finish the business we started back in

1996—fully privatize the helium business so that the government is out of the way. Truly, what we are doing is making sure helium supplies are determined by market forces.

As the chairman has noted, we need to address other priorities here in the Congress. We have done that with the revenues and the distribution that the chairman has outlined and that I have outlined previously here on the floor, and at the same time we have seen fit to direct a good portion of revenues toward deficit reduction. These are good, responsible decisions.

Our legislation here in the Senate differs from what our counterparts in the House have done. We end the government's intervention or activities within the helium business. We have a thoughtful glidepath out.

It is legislation that is not only thoughtful, it is bipartisan. It moved through the energy committee unanimously. I am pleased to be able to stand here today with the chairman of the energy committee urging colleagues to support this critically important legislation.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise today in support of H.R. 527, the Helium Stewardship Act, as amended by the Wyden substitute. This bill is very important to protecting the U.S. supply of helium. Helium is used in MRI scanners, superconductors, and has many other very important uses. For example, helium is even used to test mechanical heart valves to make sure they don't leak.

Helium also has important security implications. It is used by DoD, NASA, and other agencies. The bill helps those efforts by extending the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to sell helium from the Federal Helium Reserve.

The bill also includes important reforms such as provisions ensuring that the Secretary sells helium at market prices, and most importantly, it gets the Federal Government out of the helium business once and for all.

The bill would also reduce the Federal debt and deficit by \$51 million. The bill has bipartisan support. In June, the Energy Committee voted to report the helium bill by voice vote. The Senate should pass this bill as soon as possible so we have an opportunity to negotiate with the House.

I understand that some of my colleagues had some concerns with the bill. I appreciate them giving me the opportunity to speak with them before the vote about those concerns. I also thank my colleagues for agreeing to allow this bill to come to a vote. While I do not support every item in the bill, I believe it is a critical piece of legislation that needs to be passed.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I rise in support of the substitute amendment to H.R. 527, the Responsible Helium Administration and Stewardship Act, which would reauthorize the Federal Helium Reserve and extend its operation for commercial sales. This bill prevents a severe disruption to the Na-

tion's helium supply which threatens critical industries, hospitals, national security, and scientific research.

I would like to thank Chairman WYDEN, Ranking Member MURKOWSKI, and their staffs for excellent work on this bill, which would ensure continued access to helium so that New York hospitals, our successful chip industry, and other high-tech companies will not go over the helium cliff, while making critical reforms to the sale process and reducing the deficit. Passage of this bill will prevent shortages for businesses and hospitals as well as skyrocketing prices that would have resulted from closure of the Federal Helium Reserve on October 7.

Helium's unique physical and chemical properties have made it critical to the manufacturing of a broad range of technologies from aerospace to semiconductors, medical devices, and fiber optics. It is also widely used in medical research, cutting-edge science, and hospital care. Helium is also essential to our national security, as the Department of Defense relies on it for a range of weapons systems and intelligence applications.

Here is just a sampling of how critical helium is.

MRI scanners at hospitals use helium to cool powerful magnets. Without helium, \$2 million machines couldn't be operated without risk of damage.

Semiconductors cannot be made without helium, which serves as an essential coolant during the manufacturing process. Semiconductors are the core of all electronics embedded in cars, computers, health devices, weapons systems, nuclear reactors, et cetera. A robust supply of helium allows American semiconductor manufacturers, like GlobalFoundries and IBM, to create good-paying, high-tech jobs in upstate New York.

The production of optical fiber—the backbone of all telecom infrastructure—uses helium to prevent impurities.

The Department of Defense uses significant quantities of helium as part of the guidance correction systems for air-to-air missiles used by our military. It also relies on it for surveillance of combat terrain, helping protect our troops.

Our DOE National Laboratories, such as Brookhaven National Laboratory in my State, relies on helium for cutting-edge science.

Failure to act would hurt our economic competitiveness, cause job losses, and harm our national security when we can least afford it.

If we don't reauthorize the Reserve, we would have to get helium from one of two places: Russia or the Middle East, the only other regions in the world producing it.

I strongly urge my colleagues in the Senate to support this important legislation and I look forward to its swift passage.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. I thank my colleague from Alaska for all of her work. We await our colleague from Texas who would like to speak.

How much time remains on our side? The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 2½ minutes.

Mr. WYDEN. Let me yield 1 minute at this time to our friend who in the House had begun working on this literally years ago. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for all of his efforts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon. This bill is something that shows we can work across the lines of politics in this institution.

I began this bill with DOC HASTINGS, a Republican from Washington State, in the House of Representatives a year ago. It passed over there. Now it is over here in the Senate, and the same kind of bipartisanship is working to pass this critical bill which is central for companies like Siemens, Philips, and GE just in Massachusetts that support thousands of jobs in the high-tech sector.

There was a shutdown that was looming, but it was a shutdown in the helium industry. This is one shutdown that we are going to make sure does not happen. I thank the chairman for making this possible because it took a lot of leadership to make sure that House bill, the Hastings-Markey bill, is now over here, and it has been solved in a way that every Member should feel very comfortable voting yes for because it really is going to solve a big problem that was going to hit our high-tech industry in the United States.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I believe we have 1½ minutes left. Let's go to Senator CRUZ, and then hopefully we can vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I am going to be brief and not take my entire time. I think the underlying extension and reform of the Helium Program in this bill is a good provision. It maintains the program. Helium is critical for our businesses, for our industry, for our high-tech community. So I salute the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Alaska for working together.

As written, the Senate bill raises \$500 million over 10 years in new revenue. The House bill took the revenue raised by this program and put it to deficit reduction and reducing our debt. The Senate bill—I think unfortunately—instead of using the revenue for deficit reduction, uses \$400 of the \$500 million for new spending.

I raised internally an objection and asked my colleagues if they would consider reducing spending in other parts of the budget to balance it given that we have nearly a \$17 trillion national debt. I think the more fiscally responsible thing to do, if we have \$500 million in new revenue, is to use it to pay down the deficit and the debt.

We have worked together in a bipartisan way to allow this to come to a vote. I thank the Senator from Oregon for agreeing to do that. I intend to vote no, but I am hopeful that in conference committee perhaps the House and Senate can work together to take care of the important concerns with the Helium Program but at the same time demonstrate some additional fiscal responsibility, which I think would be a win-win for everyone.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, we have a minute and a half. I will be very brief. I thank the Senator from Texas for his courtesy.

The bottom line is that the House bill, which the Senator is calling for, does not get the government out of the helium business. That is the single most important distinction. We are reaching out to all those hard-hit middle-class workers in aerospace and tech and a whole host of industries. We are doing it in a way that protects taxpayers. It gets the government out of the helium business.

This legislation passed the Energy and Natural Resources Committee unanimously. I urge my colleagues to vote yes.

I ask unanimous consent that all time be yielded back and the Senate now proceed to vote on the passage of the bill, as amended.

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

The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll. The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HIRONO). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 97, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 203 Leg.]

YEAS—97

Alexander	Casey	Flake
Ayotte	Chambliss	Franken
Baldwin	Chiesa	Gillibrand
Barrasso	Coats	Graham
Baucus	Coburn	Grassley
Begich	Cochran	Hagan
Bennet	Collins	Harkin
Blumenthal	Coons	Hatch
Blunt	Corker	Heinrich
Boozman	Cornyn	Heitkamp
Boxer	Crapo	Heller
Brown	Donnelly	Hirono
Burr	Durbin	Hoeben
Cantwell	Enzi	Inhofe
Cardin	Feinstein	Isakson
Carper	Fischer	Johanns

Johnson (SD)	Mikulski	Scott
Johnson (WI)	Moran	Shaheen
Kaine	Murkowski	Shelby
King	Murphy	Stabenow
Kirk	Murray	Tester
Klobuchar	Nelson	Thune
Landrieu	Paul	Toomey
Leahy	Portman	Udall (CO)
Lee	Pryor	Udall (NM)
Levin	Reed	Vitter
Manchin	Reid	Warner
Markey	Risch	Warren
McCain	Roberts	Whitehouse
McCaskill	Rockefeller	Wicker
McConnell	Sanders	Wyden
Menendez	Schatz	
Merkley	Schumer	

NAYS—2

Cruz
Sessions

NOT VOTING—1

Rubio

The bill (H.R. 527), as amended, was passed.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. DONNELLY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business until 5 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

EMISSION STANDARDS

Mr. DONNELLY. Madam President, I am here today with my colleague from Missouri, Senator BLUNT, to talk about our efforts to bring some common sense to the EPA's emission standards.

It is my firm belief that we can establish emission standards that protect our environment without hurting our economy and without hurting the pocketbooks of families in Indiana and across the country.

When the EPA released draft standards in 2012 that would regulate greenhouse gas emissions from powerplants, it was clear that the administration's standards far exceeded the level of carbon reductions that would be available using existing technology. They also failed to acknowledge that different fuel types pose different challenges when trying to reduce emissions.

If we don't address these standards in a commonsense way, the affordable, reliable energy that Hoosier families and businesses depend on will be in doubt. It is absolutely critical that the EPA understand the impact of these standards and the price their proposed regulation would ask Hoosiers to pay.

Our amendment urges the EPA to use common sense when putting together emission regulations by ensuring that efforts to regulate carbon dioxide emissions are realistic about existing technology and do not negatively impact our economy.

Our amendment states that if the EPA puts together regulations to control carbon dioxide emissions from an industrial source, the EPA must develop the regulations using emission