The resolution (S. Res. 65), as amended, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 65

Whereas, on May 14, 1948, the people of Israel proclaimed the establishment of the sovereign and independent State of Israel;

Whereas, on March 28, 1949, the United States Government recognized the establishment of the new State of Israel and established full diplomatic relations;

Whereas, since its establishment nearly 65 years ago, the modern State of Israel has rebuilt a nation, forged a new and dynamic democratic society, and created a thriving economic, political, cultural, and intellectual life despite the heavy costs of war, terrorism, and unjustified diplomatic and economic boycotts against the people of Israel;

Whereas the people of Israel have established a vibrant, pluralistic, democratic political system, including freedom of speech, association, and religion; a vigorously free press; free, fair, and open elections; the rule of law; a fully independent judiciary; and other democratic principles and practices;

Whereas, since the 1979 revolution in Iran, the leaders of the Islamic Republic of Iran have repeatedly made threats against the existence of the State of Israel and sponsored acts of terrorism and violence against its citizens;

Whereas, on October 27, 2005, President of Iran Mahmoud Ahmadinejad called for a world without America and Zionism;

Whereas, in February 2012, Supreme Leader of Iran Ali Khamenei said of Israel, ''The Zionist regime is a true cancer tumor on this region that should be cut off. And it definitely will be cut off.'';

Whereas, in August 2012, Supreme Leader Khamenei said of Israel, ''This bogus and fake Zionist outgrowth will disappear off the landscape of geography.'';

Whereas, in August 2012, President Ahmadinejad said that ''in the new Middle East . . . there will be no trace of the American presence and the Zionists'';

Whereas the Department of State has designated the Islamic Republic of Iran as a state sponsor of terrorism since 1984 and has characterized the Islamic Republic of Iran as the ''most active state sponsor of terrorism'' in the world;

Whereas the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran has provided weapons, training, funding, and direction to terrorist groups, including Hamas, Hizballah, and Shiite militias in Iraq that are responsible for the murder of hundreds of United States service members and innocent civilians;

Whereas the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran has provided weapons, training, and funding to the regime of Bashar al Assad that has been used to suppress and murder its own people;

Whereas, since at least the late 1980s, the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran has engaged in a sustained and well-documented pattern of illicit and deceptive activities to acquire a nuclear weapons capability;

Whereas, since September 2005, the Board of Governors of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) has found the Islamic Republic of Iran to be in non-compliance with its safeguards agreement with the IAEA, which Iran is obligated to undertake as a non-nuclear-weapon State Party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, done at Washington, London, and Moscow July 1, 1968, and entered into force March 5, 1970 (NPT);

Whereas the United Nations Security Council has adopted multiple resolutions since 2006 demanding of the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran its full and sustained suspension of all uranium enrichment-related and reprocessing activities and its full cooperation with the IAEA on all outstanding issues related to its nuclear activities, particularly those concerning the possible military dimensions of its nuclear program;

Whereas the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran has refused to comply with United Nations Security Council resolutions or to fully cooperate with the IAEA;

Whereas, in November 2011, the IAEA Director General issued a report that documented ''serious concerns regarding possible military dimensions to Iran's nuclear programme,'' and affirmed that information available to the IAEA indicates that ''Iran has carried out activities relevant to the development of a nuclear explosive device'' and that some activities may be ongoing;

Whereas the Government of Iran stands in violation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights for denying its citizens basic freedoms, including the freedoms of expression, religion, peaceful assembly and movement, and for flagrantly abusing the rights of minorities and women;

Whereas in his State of the Union Address on January 24, 2012, President Barack Obama stated, ''Let there be no doubt: America is determined to prevent Iran from getting a nuclear weapon, and I will take no options off the table to achieve that goal.'';

Whereas Congress has passed and the President has signed into law legislation imposing significant economic and diplomatic sanctions on Iran to encourage the Government of Iran to abandon its pursuit of nuclear weapons and end its support for terrorism;

Whereas these sanctions, while having significant effect, have yet to persuade Iran to abandon its illicit pursuits and comply with United Nations Security Council resolutions;

Whereas more stringent enforcement of sanctions legislation, including elements targeting oil exports and access to foreign exchange, could still lead the Government of Iran to change course;

Whereas, in his State of the Union Address on February 12, 2013, President Obama reiterated, ''The leaders of Iran must recognize that now is the time for a diplomatic solution, because a coalition stands united in demanding that they meet their obligations. And we will do what is necessary to prevent them from getting a nuclear weapon.'';

Whereas, on March 4, 2012, President Obama stated, ''Iran's leaders should understand that I do not have a policy of containment; I have a policy to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon.'';

Whereas, on October 22, 2012, President Obama said of Iran, ''The clock is ticking . . . And we're going to make sure that if they do not meet the demands of the international community, then we are going to take all options necessary to make sure they don't have a nuclear weapon.'';

Whereas, on May 19, 2011, President Obama stated, ''Every state has the right to self-defense, and Israel must be able to defend itself, by itself, against any threat.'';

Whereas, on September 21, 2011, President Obama stated, ''America's commitment to Israel's security is unshakeable. Our friendship with Israel is deep and enduring.'';

Whereas, on March 4, 2012, President Obama stated, ''And whenever an effort is made to delegitimize the state of Israel, my administration has opposed them. So there should not be a shred of doubt by now: when the chips are down, I have Israel's back.'';

Whereas, on October 22, 2012, President Obama stated, ''Israel is a true friend. And if Israel is attacked, America will stand with Israel. I've made that clear throughout my presidency . . . I will stand with Israel if they are attacked.'';

Whereas, in December 2012, 74 United States Senators wrote to President Obama ''As you begin your second term as President, we ask you to reiterate your readiness to take military action against Iran if it continues its efforts to acquire a nuclear weapon. In addition, we urge you to work with our European and Middle Eastern allies to demonstrate to the Iranians that a credible and capable multilateral coalition exists that would support a military strike if, in the end, this is unfortunately necessary.''; and

Whereas the United States-Israel Enhanced Security Cooperation Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–150) stated that it is United States policy to support Israel's inherent right to self-defense: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved,

SECTION 1. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

Congress—

(1) reaffirms the special bonds of friendship and cooperation that have existed between the United States and the State of Israel for more than sixty years and that enjoy overwhelming bipartisan support in Congress and among the people of the United States;

(2) strongly supports the close military, intelligence, and security cooperation that President Obama has pursued with Israel and urges this cooperation to continue and deepen;

(3) deplores and condemns, in the strongest possible terms, the reprehensible statements and policies of the leaders of the Islamic Republic of Iran threatening the security and existence of Israel;

(4) recognizes the tremendous threat posed to the United States, the West, and Israel by the Government of Iran's continuing pursuit of a nuclear weapons capability;

(5) reiterates that the policy of the United States is to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon capability and to take such action as may be necessary to implement this policy;

(6) reaffirms its strong support for the full implementation of United States and international sanctions on Iran and urges the President to continue and strengthen enforcement of sanctions legislation;

(7) declares that the United States has a vital national interest in, and unbreakable commitment to, ensuring the existence, survival, and security of the State of Israel, and reaffirms United States support for Israel's right to self-defense; and

(8) urges that, if the Government of Israel is compelled to take military action in legitimate self-defense against Iran's nuclear weapons program, the United States Government should stand with Israel and provide, in accordance with United States law and the constitutional responsibility of Congress to authorize the use of military force, diplomatic, military, and economic support to the Government of Israel in its defense of its territory, people, and existence.

SEC. 2. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this resolution shall be construed as an authorization for the use of force or a declaration of war.

AGRICULTURE REFORM, FOOD AND JOBS ACT OF 2013—Continued

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

AMENDMENT NO. 925

Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form prior to a vote in relation to the Shaheen amendment No. 925. Debate will commence on the Shaheen amendment No. 925.

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, my understanding is Senator SHAHEEN is going to take the first 30 seconds of 1 minute on behalf of speaking in favor. I don't see her on the floor. I will take the second half.

I believe I see her now, so at this time, if she is ready, I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

This amendment would address the only program within the farm bill that hasn't been reformed: the Sugar Program. What we have now is a sweet deal for sugar growers and a bad deal for consumers.

Right now, according to the Department of Commerce, we are losing three jobs in manufacturing for every one job we save in the sugar grower industry. That is not a good deal for job creation in this country. We need to change it.

I yield to my colleague from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Hampshire. She is absolutely right. It makes no sense to have a program that forces American consumers to pay at least 30 percent more than the going rate for sugar to force taxpayers to subsidize these producers. Also, we can lose jobs because, as the Senator pointed out, our own Commerce Department has found that for every job it saves, three manufacturing jobs are lost. This is a modest amendment that takes us back to the 2008 levels.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, on our side, let me tell my colleagues if they want to preserve jobs, vote against the Shaheen-Toomey amendment. The U.S. policy on sugar defends more than 142,000 jobs in 22 States and nearly $20 billion in annual economic activity. Their amendment is bad policy. The taxpayers do not pay a penny on the Sugar Program. Domestic production is supported by import restrictions which have been used wisely over time, so this amendment would effectively kill America's no-cost Sugar Program.

Senator COCHRAN will take the last 30 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, this amendment is being portrayed as a reform of sugar policy, but it is far more harmful than that. These proposed changes would undermine the policy of our domestic industry by transferring American sugar-producing jobs to other countries. Those producers are less efficient and heavily subsidized.

U.S. sugar policy has operated at zero cost to taxpayers for the past decade and has provided American consumers dependable supplies of safe high-quality sugar at low prices.

I urge Senators to oppose the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 54, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 134 Leg.]

YEAS—45

Alexander	Cowan	McConnell
Ayotte	Cruz	Menendez
Baldwin	Durbin	Murphy
Blumenthal	Feinstein	Paul
Blunt	Flake	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Reed
Brown	Heller	Roberts
Carper	Inhofe	Rockefeller
Casey	Johnson (WI)	Scott
Coats	Kaine	Sessions
Coburn	Kirk	Shaheen
Collins	Lee	Toomey
Coons	Manchin	Warner
Corker	McCain	Warren
Cornyn	McCaskill	Whitehouse

NAYS—54

Barrasso	Harkin	Murray
Baucus	Hatch	Nelson
Begich	Heinrich	Pryor
Bennet	Heitkamp	Reid
Boxer	Hirono	Risch
Burr	Hoeven	Rubio
Cantwell	Isakson	Sanders
Cardin	Johanns	Schatz
Chambliss	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Cochran	King	Shelby
Crapo	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Donnelly	Landrieu	Tester
Enzi	Leahy	Thune
Fischer	Levin	Udall (CO)
Franken	Merkley	Udall (NM)
Gillibrand	Mikulski	Vitter
Graham	Moran	Wicker
Hagan	Murkowski	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The amendment (No. 925) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, if it pleases the Chair, I would like to say a few remarks about sugar, but I am not sure about the chairwoman's plans.

I thank the chairwoman of the committee and the ranking member. I know they are deciding what other amendments we are going to take up later this evening and how the votes will proceed. But let me again just thank my colleague from Michigan for her great lead and leadership on the farm bill.

This sugar amendment was very important to the people of Louisiana whom I represent, and I want to just thank my colleagues for their vote to keep a program in place that has worked at no cost to the taxpayer—no direct cash. It is monitored or organized or designed through an import restriction program that allows for the robust production of sugarcane and sugar beets in our Nation.

I thank Senator SHAHEEN for the wonderful way she handled the debate. We have different views about this, but we are colleagues and we work together very well. There are two sides to this issue. I think the evidence on our side is stronger. She would probably disagree. But I thank our colleagues for supporting the sugar caucus.

In Louisiana, sugarcane is being produced on over 427,000 acres in 22 parishes. Production is about 14 million tons, which is about 20 percent of the total sugar grown in the United States.

Last year, in 2012, Louisiana sugar mills produced 1.6 million tons of raw sugar, the largest amount we have ever produced in our State. This production represents a huge part of our State's economy. The loss of market for this product would be devastating. Let me say that the State of Hawaii, the State of Florida, states such as Minnesota and North Dakota and South Dakota that have strong sugar beet crops, it is very important for them as well.

Are the consumers hurt by this? Absolutely not. The U.S. sugar price is 14 percent below the world average, and 24 percent below the average for developed nations. So our policy is a good balance of encouraging domestic production and keeping prices stable and affordable for the consumer.

Let me say for candy production—and I have a small amount of candy produced in Louisiana. I am very proud of these companies. American food manufacturers say they are shedding jobs, but in my view this has nothing to do with U.S. sugar policy. In fact, U.S. sweetened product manufacturers are prospering and expanding. Candy production is rising, not falling, up by 9 percent since 2004. In addition, sugar represents just a tiny portion of the price these food retailers charge for their products—1 percent of the cost of a cupcake, 2 percent of the cost of a candy bar, 3 percent of the cost of a carton of ice cream, and 5 percent of a bag of hard candy. So I think our arguments won the day. I appreciate our colleagues supporting the sugar caucus. We thank you for keeping this bill intact with the balance it needs to move forward so we can have a robust farm agriculture reauthorization bill for this United States.

I yield the floor.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, as we heard last summer and again throughout this week's debate, government subsidies are at the heart of both our agricultural and nutritional policies here in the United States. Subsidizing food costs in the form of payments for groceries is the core of our supplemental nutrition assistance program. Insurance premiums paid by our corn

and soybean growers are directly subsidized in the farm bill on the floor today. And adverse market payments, what we once called direct payments, are available to crops such as peanuts and rice if the price for those commodities fall below a certain threshold. These government subsidies are used all across our country—from Iowa to North and South Carolina; and from Missouri down through Kansas, Arkansas, and Texas.

Now we have heard from several members from these and other States the many opinions about the validity or usefulness of these subsidies. And I certainly have my own opinion about how the agricultural policy in the United States should be reformed and shaped. However, today, I stand to discuss a unique program—our country's Sugar Program. For those of you who are not familiar with the program, it consists of three components—a domestic allocation component, a tariff quota component, and a loan component. Now, aside from the loan component, uniquely, the Sugar Program in the United States does not require a direct government subsidy. In fact, from 2002 to 2011, the Sugar Program in the United States cost the government zero dollars, a glaringly low amount compared to the various other commodity programs that I previously listed.

There is a reason for this difference. Our Sugar Program is not an agricultural program—it is a trade program. We do not set the price of sugar in the United States artificially high by sending taxpayer money directly to that industry as we do with corn, soybeans, peanuts, or all the other various agricultural commodities here in the United States. We set the price of sugar in the United States by limiting the amount of sugar that we import from foreign countries.

This distinction cannot be ignored. This distinction creates a fundamentally different set of policy decisions for my colleagues here in the Senate as we continue this important debate on our Sugar Program.

Furthermore, this distinction requires acknowledgement in the sense that it changes our discussion about the Sugar Program here in the United States from how it impacts our domestic industries to how it interacts with same industries and policies in the international community. We cannot support any policy that ignores international realities at the detriment of our own domestic industries.

In implementation, and by necessity, this reality means two things: One, in debating the sugar policy here in the United States, because it is inherently a trade policy, we must do so with international realities in mind, and No. 2—when viewed through this lens, does any amendment that would reform this program without consideration of these international realities make the best sense and, more importantly, set a positive precedent?

I would argue it does not and would offer my colleagues, in the context of trade, the following facts: The Brazil Government, through the form of direct payments, forgiven loans and pension payments, and fuel mandates, subsidized the sugar industry in their country to a tune of $2.5 billion last year alone. Brazil controls 50 percent of all the world's sugar exports. To put that into context, Saudi Arabia controls only about 19 percent of the world's oil exports. Countries such as China, Thailand, and India, countries that the United States does not have free-trade agreements with, all subsidize their sugar industries in some form. And even in Mexico, the government owns and operates 20 percent of the country's sugar industry.

These countries, regardless of whether we repeal our sugar program here in the United States, will continue to generously subsidize sugar production for their own countries. In this context, I would ask my colleagues to seriously question the appropriateness, the benefits, and more importantly the risks to American jobs, if reforms to our Sugar Program were to pass without any link to the overall international dialogue. The 142,000 jobs and the $20 billion annually that our domestic industry provides to our economy would be at risk while at no point in our discussion have we accounted for the protectionist policies that exist for the sugar industry in other countries all around the world.

To be clear, I am not arguing that, as a country, we need to be trade protectionists. To the contrary, I think our country will excel in the 21st century only if we eliminate barriers to trade and increase the flow of goods all around the world. But what I am saying is that if we are going to eliminate a trade program, let us do it in the context of a trade debate. Otherwise, we will lose jobs, industries, and overall leverage to other countries without even bringing them to the table to negotiate. I would argue it would be more appropriate to address reform of our Sugar Program in the context of international trade.

Very simply, we should repeal our entire Sugar Program if the largest sugar-producing countries in the world eliminated their own trade protectionist policies as well. We must ensure that we do not negotiate against ourselves in this international context by eliminating a program important to an industry in our country that is unfortunately forced to deal with these international realities. And I encourage my colleagues to consider the precedent they would set for their own industries in their own States when they consider the various amendments offered in this debate introduced to reform our Sugar Program. We must put this debate in the proper context while at the same time acknowledging the benefits of free trade to the United States and to citizens in countries all across the world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. President, I am here to talk about the importance of a bipartisan, commonsense, 5-year farm bill to Indiana's agriculture and rural communities as well as our entire country.

This bill, passed with bipartisan support in the Agriculture Committee, protects the estimated 16 million agriculture-related jobs across the country. Last year, Indiana and many other States were plagued by severe drought, leading to a loss of crops and livestock, hurting our food supply and the livelihoods of farmers and their communities. Farmers in Indiana and around the Nation need the certainty of a 5-year farm bill that reflects and addresses the inherent risk of feeding and fueling our world. The Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013 strikes the right balance, ending direct payments and improving risk management tools to give farmers what they need to manage natural disasters or severe market downturns that are completely outside of their control.

In this budget environment, where we are looking for ways to cut spending and make government more efficient, it is important to note this bill would reduce the deficit by $23 billion. We made the tough decisions necessary to cut spending, increase accountability, and eliminate duplicative or unnecessary programs to continue our efforts to get our fiscal house in order.

In my home State of Indiana, this bill is critical. Nearly 190,000 Hoosiers work in agriculture. Eighty-three percent of the State's land is devoted to farms or forests. Agriculture contributed nearly $38 billion to Indiana's economy in 2011. Clearly, the certainty of a 5-year farm bill is important not only for the producers in our State but to the entire State's economy and overall well-being.

While no bill is perfect, there are a few areas of this bill I worked to improve based on feedback from Hoosiers. During the Agriculture Committee debate, I introduced an amendment with Senator ROBERTS that would give the next generation of bio-energy crops access to base levels of risk management so a reasonable safety net will be in place for energy crops. This bipartisan amendment, passed as part of the overall bill, would amend the Noninsured Crop Disaster Assistance Program to offer coverage for crops producing feedstock for energy purposes.

Further, the amendment would direct USDA to research and develop risk management tools for promising new sorghum crops. I support the many Indiana farmers who have and continue to contribute to our domestic energy security. Also, during the committee discussion, I helped introduce an amendment that would put the USDA, not the OMB, in charge of conservation program technical assistance funding levels. This gives USDA the authority to make sure that technical assistance

reflects the needs of producers in the field and the stakeholder community, while allowing conservation practices to be adopted on a broader scale. We need robust technical assistance to give producers the assurances they need to know they are implementing practices correctly. These decisions should be made more reflective of needs on the ground.

Further, I have continued my efforts from the 2008 farm bill to ensure that there are not restrictions on Hoosier farmers who want to grow fruits and vegetables. After a successful Farm Flex pilot program, I worked to expand full planting flexibility for farmers in Indiana and across the country wanting to grow what they want to grow on their own farms.

Finally, I am proud to cosponsor an amendment with Senator GRASSLEY. We should pass this amendment. It protects livestock and poultry farmers from having their personal information released by the EPA. It is outrageous that earlier this year the EPA released the personal contact information of over 80,000 livestock and poultry owners from across the Nation, including many from Indiana. This blatant violation of privacy must not happen again. I hope my colleagues will support the Grassley-Donnelly amendment when it comes up for a vote.

Put simply, this farm bill makes sense. It is an example of Republicans and Democrats working together to do good things for the American economy and America's people. I look forward to working with our colleagues in the House on a farm bill that we can get signed into law. No one is going to get 100 percent of what they want, but it is 100 percent necessary to get this farm bill done. I urge prompt passage of this bill by the Senate and for our colleagues in the House to do the same.

Farmers in Indiana and across our great Nation deserve more than partisan political gridlock that prevented a 5-year bill last year. This year we need to get it done.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate as in morning business.

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

STARTUP ACT

Mr. MORAN. Thank you very much.

I want to tell a story. It goes back to the summer of 2011. Back at that point in time, we had 30 straight months of unemployment above 8 percent. I decided it was important to work on legislation to jumpstart the economy and to work in every way possible with my colleagues to put Americans back to work.

With a foundation of compelling data showing that nearly all of the new net jobs created since 1980 had been created by companies less than 5 years old, Senator WARNER and I introduced the Startup Act in December of 2011. The Startup Act was a jobs bill written to help entrepreneurs who have been responsible for most of the job creation in our country over the last 30 years.

The legislation made changes to the Federal regulatory process so that the cost of new regulations did not outweigh the benefits and encouraged Federal agencies to consider the impact of proposed regulations on startups, particularly.

Our bill made commonsense changes to the Tax Code to encourage investment in startups and reward patient capital. The Startup Act also sought to improve the process of commercializing federally funded research so that more good ideas out of the laboratories were put into market where these innovations could be turned into jobs by companies and spur economic growth.

Finally, the Startup Act provided new opportunities for highly educated and entrepreneurial immigrants to stay in the United States where their talent and new job ideas could fuel economic growth and create American jobs.

When I began work on the Startup Act, I did not intend to write an immigration bill. My goal was simple: Find the most cost-effective way to jumpstart the economy and create American jobs. After reviewing the academic and economic data, it became clear that these strategies to create American jobs must include highly skilled and entrepreneurial immigrants. Immigrants to the United States have a long history of creating business in our country. We can all think of examples of individuals who have done so: Sergey Brin cofounded Google; Elon Must cofounded PayPal, SolarCity, SpaceX, and Tesla; Min Kao founded Garmin in my home State of Kansas. There is a long list of people from other countries who created businesses here in the United States that now employ thousands and thousands and thousands of Kansans and Americans. Of the current Fortune 500 companies, more than 40 percent were founded by first-or second-generation Americans. Immigrants are now more than twice as likely as native-born Americans to start a business. In 2011, immigrants were responsible for more than one in every four U.S. businesses founded.

Today, one in every 10 Americans employed at privately owned U.S. companies works at an immigrant-owned firm. The immigration bill drafted by eight of our colleagues and reported by the Judiciary Committee recognizes the importance of entrepreneurial immigrants. The legislation creates new visas for immigrant entrepreneurs and awards points for the merit-based visa for successful entrepreneurship. Yet this bill could be improved significantly to reflect more accurately how new businesses grow and hire workers.

Done right, an entrepreneur's visa has the potential to create hundreds of thousands of needed jobs for Americans. Now in its third version, Startup 3.0 creates an entrepreneur's visa for foreign-born entrepreneurs currently in the United States. Those individuals with a good idea, with capital and a willingness to hire Americans, would be able to stay in the United States and grow their businesses. Each immigrant entrepreneur would be required to create jobs for Americans.

In many instances our country already has made a commitment to these entrepreneurs, allowing them to study in our universities and work temporarily at American companies. Providing a way for immigrant entrepreneurs to stay in the United States and create American jobs makes economic sense.

Earlier this year the Kauffman Foundation studied the economic impact of immigrant visas in the entrepreneur's visa in Startup 3.0. Using conservative estimates, the Kauffman Foundation predicts that the entrepreneur's visa could generate 500,000 to 1.6 million jobs over the next 10 years. These are real jobs with real economic impact that could affect real American families and boost our GDP by 1.5 percent or more, a 1.5-percent increase in our gross domestic product by this provision of the legislation alone.

Anticipating floor consideration of the immigration bill, I have been speaking with entrepreneurs, investors, and startup policy experts to develop an amendment that would improve the legislation. In my view, we have an opportunity to create jobs for Americans by making certain highly skilled and entrepreneurial immigrants are able to start a new business and contribute to the growth of American companies. If we miss this opportunity, we risk losing the next generation of great entrepreneurs and the jobs they will create. I will offer an amendment to the immigration bill to accomplish these goals and hope my colleagues will join me in supporting the changes to the legislation that would result in the creation of jobs for Americans.

While it is important to provide a straightforward and workable way for entrepreneurial immigrants to stay in the United States so they can employ Americans, we also need to make sure the immigration bill addresses the needs of growing American businesses.

The current problem is twofold. American schools are not producing enough students with the skills our economy demands. While American universities do a great job of attracting foreign students to study advanced subjects, few pathways exist for these talented graduates to remain in the United States and contribute to American prosperity.

One reason for this problem is our Nation's high schools have fallen behind in STEM education—science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. Forty percent of high school seniors test at or below basic levels in math. Fifty percent of our high school seniors test at or below basic levels in science. By 12th grade only 16 percent of students are both math proficient and interested in a STEM career, and fewer than 15 percent of high school graduates have enough math and science to pursue scientific or technical degrees in college. It is no wonder that by the time American students go to college few are choosing to major in a STEM area subject. According to the National Science Foundation, college students majoring in non-STEM fields outnumber their math and science-minded counterparts 5 to 1.

Moreover, the growth rate of new STEM majors remains among the slowest in any category. Unfortunately, research shows that this gap continues to widen at a time when the number of job openings requiring STEM degrees is increasing at three times the rate of the rest of the job market. The number of students pursuing math, science, and engineering is declining. The demand for the jobs is increasing. Should this trend continue, American businesses are projected to need an estimated 800,000 workers with advanced STEM degrees by 2018, about 4 years away, but will only find 550,000 American graduates with those degrees they need.

How do we solve this problem and prepare America for the future? First and foremost, we need to do more to prepare Americans for careers in STEM fields. This will take time, but our efforts to improve STEM will yield positive results across the economy, even for those without STEM skills.

Second, as we work to equip Americans with the skills for the 21st century economy, we also need to create a pathway for highly educated foreign students to stay in America where their ideas and talents can fuel economic growth.

Startup 3.0, the legislation Senator WARNER and I have introduced, addresses this immediate need by creating STEM visas. Foreign students who graduate from an American university with a master's or a Ph.D. in science, technology, engineering, or mathematics would be granted conditional status contingent upon them filling a needed gap in the U.S. workforce. By working for 5 consecutive years in a STEM field, the immigrant would be granted a green card with the option of becoming an American citizen.

The immigration bill we will soon consider attempts to address the immediate needs for more qualified STEM workers and the longer term need for Americans to develop the skills needed to fill those jobs. I am hopeful these aspects of this bill will be strengthened in order to provide growing American businesses with the skilled employees they need now and in the future. If growing American companies are unable to hire qualified workers they need, these businesses will open locations overseas.

I was in Silicon Valley last year, and executives at Facebook told me they were ready to hire close to 80 foreign-born but United States-educated individuals, when their visas were denied. Rather than forgo hiring these skilled workers, the company hired them anyway, but they placed them in a location in Dublin, Ireland, instead of the United States. Facebook was ultimately able to get the visas for these workers after training them in Ireland.

All too often companies end up housing these jobs permanently overseas. When this happens, it is not only those specific jobs we lose but also the many supporting jobs and economic activity associated with them. Even more damaging, more damning to me than the loss of those highly skilled workers who are now working in some other country, the end result is that someone among that group will start another company such as Google, be an entrepreneur, and start another company that creates jobs, but not in the United States—in Canada or in Dublin, Ireland. The United States loses both employment today and an opportunity for American jobs to be created in the future because our immigration policies failed to help our country retain highly educated and skilled individuals.

To me, this story and many others like it illustrate the importance of getting the policy right. Creating workable ways to retain highly skilled, American-educated workers and entrepreneurs is about creating jobs for Americans and growing our Nation's economy.

The United States is in a global battle for talent. If we fail to improve our immigration system, one that currently tells these entrepreneurs and highly skilled individuals we don't want you, they will take their intellect and skills to another country and create jobs and opportunities there.

Some of my colleagues may think I am exaggerating what is at stake, but this week Canada's Immigration Minister was in Silicon Valley recruiting entrepreneurs and promoting Canada's new startup visas. They have billboards in California encouraging those STEM-educated individuals to move to Canada where they have an immigration policy beneficial to them and their jobs. This Minister's message was simple: The United States immigration system is broken, so bring your startups to Canada, where we will get you permanent residency and the opportunity to build your business. Canada put up billboards along Highway 101 between Silicon Valley and San Francisco enticing entrepreneurs to ''pivot to Canada.''

In fact, six other countries besides Canada in the short time I have been a Member of the Senate have changed their laws and policies to encourage these individuals to find jobs and create businesses in their countries. We have done nothing. For the sake of our country and the millions of Americans looking for work, we cannot afford to lose talented entrepreneurs.

As the Senate begins debate of the immigration bill in the near future, I encourage my colleagues to keep in mind the other 11 million, those 11.7 million American workers who are looking for work and the many others who have become so discouraged they have given up.

The United States is the birthplace and home of the American dream. For years our country has been seen as the land of opportunity for innovators and entrepreneurs. We must do everything possible to make certain that remains true in the face of growing competition. When the immigration bill comes to the Senate floor, I will offer amendments to improve the bill and encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting commonsense changes that will allow the United States to win the global battle for talent. Doing so will make certain that immigrant entrepreneurs have a home in the United States. In their pursuit of the American dream, they will create jobs for Americans and strengthen the American economy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

AMENDMENT NO. 965

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President I call up amendment No. 965 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS], for himself and Mr. BEGICH, proposes an amendment numbered 965.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to setting aside the pending amendment?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANDERS. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To permit States to require that any food, beverage, or other edible product offered for sale have a label on indicating that the food, beverage, or other edible product contains a genetically engineered ingredient)

On page 1150, after line 15, add the following:

SEC. 12213. CONSUMERS RIGHT TO KNOW ABOUT GENETICALLY ENGINEERED FOOD ACT.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Consumers Right to Know About Genetically Engineered Food Act''.

(b) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) surveys of the American public consistently show that 90 percent or more of the people of the United States want genetically engineered to be labeled as such;

(2) a landmark public health study in Canada found that—

(A) 93 percent of pregnant women had detectable toxins from genetically engineered foods in their blood; and

(B) 80 percent of the babies of those women had detectable toxins in their umbilical cords;

(3) the tenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States clearly reserves powers in the system of Federalism to the States or to the people; and

(4) States have the authority to require the labeling of foods produced through genetic engineering or derived from organisms that have been genetically engineered.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) GENETIC ENGINEERING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''genetic engineering'' means a process that alters an organism at the molecular or cellular level by means that are not possible under natural conditions or processes.

(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term ''genetic engineering'' includes—

(i) recombinant DNA and RNA techniques;

(ii) cell fusion;

(iii) microencapsulation;

(iv) macroencapsulation;

(v) gene deletion and doubling;

(vi) introduction of a foreign gene; and

(vii) changing the position of genes.

(C) EXCLUSIONS.—The term ''genetic engineering'' does not include any modification to an organism that consists exclusively of—

(i) breeding;

(ii) conjugation;

(iii) fermentation;

(iv) hybridization;

(v) in vitro fertilization; or

(vi) tissue culture.

(2) GENETICALLY ENGINEERED INGREDIENT.—The term ''genetically engineered ingredient'' means any ingredient in any food, beverage, or other edible product that—

(A) is, or is derived from, an organism that is produced through the intentional use of genetic engineering; or

(B) is, or is derived from, the progeny of intended sexual reproduction, asexual reproduction, or both of 1 or more organisms described in subparagraph (A).

(d) RIGHT TO KNOW.—Notwithstanding any other Federal law (including regulations), a State may require that any food, beverage, or other edible product offered for sale in that State have a label on the container or package of the food, beverage, or other edible product, indicating that the food, beverage, or other edible product contains a genetically engineered ingredient.

(e) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commissioner of Food and Drugs and the Secretary of Agriculture shall promulgate such regulations as are necessary to carry out this section.

(f) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, shall submit a report to Congress detailing the percentage of food and beverages sold in the United States that contain genetically engineered ingredients.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I will be very brief, as I spoke on this issue before. Here is the story, using my own State of Vermont as an example, but it exists all over the country. This year the Vermont House of Representatives passed a bill by a vote of 99 to 42 requiring that genetically engineered food be labeled.

Yesterday, as I understand it, the Connecticut State Senate, by an overwhelming vote of 35 to 1, also passed legislation to require labeling of genetically engineered food. In California this issue was on the ballot. Monsanto and the other biotech companies spent something like $47 million against the right of people of California to have labeling on GMO products, and they won. The people who support labeling got 47 percent of the vote despite a huge amount of money being spent against them.

In the State of Washington, over 300,000 people have signed petitions in support of an initiative there to label genetically engineered food in that State.

A poll done earlier this year indicated that some 82 percent of the American people believe labeling should take place with regard to genetically engineered ingredients.

This is a pretty simple issue, and the issue is do the American people have a right to know what they are eating, what is in the food they are ingesting and what their kids are eating.

The problem is that a number of States, including Vermont, have gone forward on this issue. They have been met with large biotech companies like Monsanto who say if you go forward, we are going to sue you. And it will be a very costly lawsuit, because we do not believe you have the right as a State to go forward in this direction because you are preempting a Federal prerogative.

I happen not to believe that is correct. What this amendment does is very simple. It basically says States that choose to go forward on this issue do have the right. It is not condemning GMOs or anything else. It is simply saying that States have the right to go forward.

There have been some arguments against this amendment, and let me briefly touch on them. Genetically engineered food labels will not increase costs to shoppers, as we all know. Companies change their labels every day. They market their products differently. Adding a label does not change this. Everybody looks at labels. They change all the time. This would simply be an addition, new information on that label. In fact, many products already voluntarily label their food as GMO-free.

Further, genetically engineered crops are not better for the environment. Some will say, well, this is good for the environment. The use of Monsanto Roundup-ready soybeans engineered to withstand exposure to the herbicide Roundup has caused the spread of Roundup-resistant weeds which now infest 22 States, 10 million acres in 22 States, with predictions for 40 million acres or more by mid-decade. Resistant weeds increase the use of herbicides and the use of older and more toxic herbicides.

Further, there are no international agreements that permit the mandatory identification of foods produced through genetic engineering.

As I mentioned earlier, throughout Europe and in dozens of other countries around the world, this exists. It is not a very radical concept. It exists throughout the European Union and I believe, very simply, that States in this country should be able to go forward in labeling genetically modified foods if they want, and this amendment simply makes it clear they have the right to do that.

I look forward to the support of my colleagues with that amendment.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Let me say, for purposes of the Members, now that we have completed our official voting for today, I want to thank everyone for all of their hard work and the staff for all of their hard work. It is a continuing pleasure to work with my ranking member Senator COCHRAN. We are in the process of securing a time for a vote, hopefully in the morning, and then we have a number of votes tomorrow.

We are on a path to getting this done. With the cooperation of the Members, we are hopeful we will have a number of votes tomorrow and be able to complete this very important bill.

I would just remind colleagues that 16 million people work in this country because of agriculture. It is probably the biggest jobs bill that will come before this body, and we are very grateful for everyone's patience and willingness to work with us to bring this bill to completion.

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. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I would like to thank the chairwoman of the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry for her great work in bringing a bill to the floor today that does a lot of justice for families in Connecticut and across the country who are fighting every single day to put food on the table for their loved ones.

The fact is, although people have an impression that our State is a wealthy one, we have a handful of the poorest cities in the country, and we have tens of thousands of people who have been ravaged by this economy. These nutrition programs funded in the underlying bill are an absolute lifeline for families who have been, largely temporarily, hit straight across the brow by this devastating recession.

In Connecticut, though, for some people who don't know our State, it is hard to imagine that 11 percent of the population is today receiving SNAP benefits. One out of every ten people—one out of every ten families in Connecticut—right now relies on food stamps to either pay for their food in whole or in part. That is over 400,000 people in Connecticut.

These are people such as the 87-year-old retiree from Southbury, CT, who lives in a small, very reasonable condo. She lives on about $1,100 a month. She has gone through a $100,000 home equity line of credit, but her condo fees and her electric bill—because she lives in a little condo that is heated by electricity alone—basically eat up the entirety of her budget. She couldn't eat without foods stamps. She couldn't eat without these benefits. They keep her alive, as they do for millions of seniors all across this country.

On the other end of the age spectrum is another Southbury resident. Southbury, frankly—Connecticut, in general—doesn't have a reputation as being a town in need, but they have hundreds of SNAP recipients, just as in every town across Connecticut. Mrs. Smith is an unemployed mother. She made a six-figure salary for decades. When her husband became disabled, she was the sole breadwinner for her family. The recession hit her, just as it has hit hundreds of thousands of others across the country, and she lost her job. It is now the $300 she gets per month in SNAP benefits that allows her to feed her kids.

She is out there doing everything we ask. She is looking for a job. She is trying to get back to work, but she has lost her unemployment benefits. They have been exhausted, and now she needs this money in order to live.

The fact is 61 percent of all SNAP participants are families with children, and 33 percent of all SNAP recipients are families with elderly or disabled members in their families. These are the most vulnerable in our country, and they need a strong SNAP program in this bill.

I am one of a handful of Senators who cast a vote yesterday to add some money back, but the fact is the real comparison is not the difference between the underlying bill and that amendment. The real comparison is between the bill we are debating now and the budget pending before the House of Representatives today.

The House Republican budget would absolutely devastate, eviscerate, obliterate the Food Stamp Program—basically rescinding this Nation's longstanding commitment to making sure kids have enough to eat when their families are out of work or have hit hard times.

One of the reasons Republicans in the House in particular have come so hard, so consistently against foods stamps is because they categorize it as an overly generous handout to people who don't need it. Well, this week I am testing that theory. This week, because we are debating this bill on the floor of the Senate, I decided to see what it would be like to live on the average food stamp benefit for people in my State of Connecticut.

That average benefit in Connecticut is about $4.80 a day. I am finding out—now 3 days into this—even on this budget for just a week, it is pretty hard to eat enough to just not be hungry, never mind eating healthy foods. I went to the grocery store to buy some fruit and vegetables for the week and could barely find anything that fit within that budget. I was able to buy some bananas for 69 cents a pound. I wanted to get some peanut butter, but the only kind of peanut butter I could get was the kind loaded with preservatives because the stuff that is better for you costs a lot more.

Over and over again, people who are right now on food stamps are going hungry, never mind the kind of hunger they would be confronted with if we further cut this program. They have to make choices every day when feeding their kids: Do I give them enough calories so they will go without hunger pains for the day or do I try to get them a smaller amount of food that is maybe a bit better for them? That is what these families have to think about every single day.

I am not suggesting doing this budget for a week allows me to walk more than a few steps in their shoes, but it is an education on how little one gets out of this benefit today, and it is a caution for this body to stand up to the House of Representatives, if the farm bill gets to conference, to make sure these cuts don't get any worse.

The stories of the senior citizen and the unemployed mother in Southbury, CT, are two of millions of stories all across this country. These are people who have paid their dues, who are playing by the rules, but who just need a little help from us in a bad economy. By no means is this program an overly luxurious handout.

Let me tell you, from a very brief anecdotal experience, it is pretty hard to go without hunger on $4.80 a day, never mind trying to provide a healthy meal for your kids.

I just wanted to come to the floor this evening and applaud the efforts of our colleagues who are trying to push through a bill that will get to conference so we can be in a strong position to defend the nutrition titles of this bill which are keeping people—kids, the disabled, and the elderly—alive today.

There are those of us who would have liked to have seen even more support in this bill for nutrition programs. We failed in that attempt earlier this week, but we are united in the fact that a farm bill that comes out of the House and the Senate and goes to the President's desk has to keep the promise we have made to generations of kids across this country—we are going to make sure you have enough to eat.

I yield the floor, and 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.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, May 23, following the cloture vote on the Srinivasan nomination, and notwithstanding cloture having been invoked, if invoked, the Senate resume legislative session and consideration of S. 954; further, that the Senate then proceed to vote in relation to the pending Sanders amendment No. 965; that there be no second-degree amendments to the Sanders amendment prior to the vote; that the amendment be subject to a 60-affirmative vote threshold; finally, that the time consumed during consideration of S. 954 count postcloture.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I want to discuss my amendment regarding the Environmental Protection Agency's release of farmers' information. By now, many of my colleagues have heard about the Environmental Protection Agency's release of individual personal information to environmental activists.

This should not have happened. The EPA released information on over 80,000 farmers nationwide, and over 9,000 Iowans. I can't even characterize some of these Iowans as livestock producers; many of them are simply hobby farmers. There is a person on the list who has 12 horses; another gentleman on the list has one pig.

It is downright absurd that EPA would collect this kind of information and then hand it over to environmental activists. Given what we have seen recently with the egregious actions by the Internal Revenue Service, we should all be outraged by the continuing pattern of overreach by this administration.

This whole situation just doesn't pass the commonsense test. We have seen acts of eco-terrorism in the past against farmers. Farmers shouldn't have to fear their personal information being released to groups who may want to use the information to harass or terrorize family farmers. This amendment would restrict EPA's ability to release such data.

Since EPA can't put an end to this reckless behavior, then Congress needs to step in and fix the problem for EPA. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, today I wish to discuss amendment No. 945, which was accepted by the Senate yesterday via unanimous consent. This is an important amendment, and I would like to thank the chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, Senator STABENOW, and the ranking member, Senator COCHRAN, for their willingness to work with me to see that this amendment was accepted.

My amendment will help farmers in Alabama and many other States benefit from Federal agricultural irrigation programs. Expanding irrigation can help protect against drought and can dramatically increase agricultural production, which is why I supported

the creation of the Agricultural Water Enhancement Program, AWEP, several years ago.

AWEP, which receives approximately $60 million annually, is a ''voluntary conservation initiative that provides financial and technical assistance to agricultural producers to implement agricultural water enhancement activities on agricultural land to conserve surface and ground water and improve water quality,'' according to the USDA. AWEP assists farmers with the use of upland water storage ponds, irrigation system improvements, water quality improvement, and other similar efforts. It is a good program. According to ALFA—the association representing Alabama's farmers:

Since 2009, the AWEP Initiative has made available over $3.5 million to benefit the local economy. In Alabama, 102 farmers have improved efficiency in their irrigation operations which resulted in savings of about 875 million gallons of water per year.

However, USDA currently limits access to AWEP to farms that have been irrigated previously a requirement that prevents most Alabama farmers from being eligible for this useful program. Farmers are often required to show past irrigation records, irrigation water management plan documentation, or a map showing farm acres with irrigation history. This prior history requirement prevents some worthwhile agricultural water enhancement projects from being eligible for AWEP assistance, particularly in States where irrigation has not been significantly used. According to data in the 2007 USDA Agriculture Census, many farm acres throughout the country do not have a history of agricultural irrigation. This is especially true in my State. According to ALFA, ''only about 5% of Alabama's farms have irrigated cropland,'' and this prior history requirement ''has prevented the program from being more widely utilized'' in Alabama.

My amendment No. 945, which was accepted, as modified, by unanimous agreement in the Senate yesterday, eliminates this unwarranted restriction and will help ensure that more farmers are eligible for USDA irrigation assistance programs. I thank the chairman and ranking member for their work in modifying my amendment to ensure that this clarification of law only applies ''in states where irrigation has not been used significantly for agricultural purposes, as determined by the Secretary.'' As a State with relatively little agricultural irrigation in present use, Alabama and other similarly-situated States are clearly covered by the relief provided by my amendment.

MORNING BUSINESS

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to 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.

TRIBUTE TO ADAM SCOTT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise to honor Adam Scott, a former member of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas golf team, and the first Australian to win the Masters Tournament.

Through his determination and will to win, Adam was able to come back from a heartbreaking loss at the 2012 Open Championship to win the 2013 Masters in truly stunning fashion. In a tie for the lead heading into the 72nd hole, Adam birdied with a 20-foot putt. At that point, I thought Adam had clinched the title, but another great golfer, Angel Cabrera, was able to force a playoff with his own birdie. It was not until the second hole of that playoff that Adam, through yet another birdie, was able to call himself the Master's champion. This was his ninth PGA Tour win, but first major championship.

Adam hails from Adelaide, Australia, later moving to Queensland at the age of 9. In 1998, Adam came to my home State of Nevada to study and play golf at UNLV. While at UNLV, Adam was an All-American, finishing 11th at the 1999 NCAA Golf Championships. His victory at the Masters was the first major championship to be won by a former UNLV men's golfer.

UNLV's golf program has produced a lot of great players over the years, but until now, none had ever won a major championship. There have been several second-place and third-place showings, but never a champion. As a Nevadan, it is amazing to see a former UNLV player wearing the famous Augusta National Gold Club's green jacket.

On behalf of the Senate, I congratulate Adam Scott on his victory at the Masters Tournament and look forward to continuing to follow a career that has already made Australia and the University of Nevada, Las Vegas very proud.

MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, today I pay tribute to the men and women of our Armed Forces who have given their lives in defense of the United States. Memorial Day has, since its inception in the years immediately after the end of the Civil War, been a special time for us to remember and honor all Americans who have died in military service. Nearly 150 years after the first ''Decoration Day'' was observed, it remains important that we as citizens of this great Nation take time to reflect on the brave servicemen and women who made the ultimate sacrifice on our behalf.

As I have noted, Memorial Day grew out of a practice started in April 1866 in Columbus, MS, with the decoration of the graves of Confederate and Union soldiers alike. The tradition of honoring both those who fell on both sides of that conflict evolved into our modern observance of this sacred day.

Today, tens of thousands of American men and women continue to put their lives on the line to preserve and perpetuate the freedoms and liberties established with the birth of our Nation. The freedoms we enjoy in this country have often been paid for with the lives of these servicemembers. Their selfless example of service, whether made at Bunker Hill, Vicksburg, Iwo Jima, Inchon or the remotest regions of Afghanistan, inspires us to sacrifice and work for the good of our Nation.

This Memorial Day, Mississippians will again honor all brave fallen warriors, including the men and women from our State who have recently died in the service of our nation in Afghanistan and around the world.

For the RECORD, I offer the names of three brave heroes with roots in Mississippi, who have fallen since the nation commemorated Memorial Day last year. They are:

SSG Ricardo Seija, 31, of Tampa, FL, who died July 9, 2012

SFC Coater B. DeBose, 55, of State Line, MS, died Aug. 19, 2012

Specialist Patricia L. Horne, 20, of Greenwood, MS, died Aug. 24, 2012

We mourn their loss and honor them for their courage, dedication and sacrifice, and resolve that their lives were not given in vain.

This Memorial Day, the people of my State and throughout our great Nation will rightly set aside their day-to-day tasks to remember and say a prayer of thanksgiving for those who have laid down their lives for their country. We will also think of their families who share most acutely in their loss. I join them in saying thank you to those who made these great sacrifices.

TRIBUTE TO RICHARD BENDER

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, when Richard Bender retires at the end of this month, the Senate will say farewell to one of its most respected, talented, and accomplished staff members. And I personally will be saying farewell to my longest serving legislative counselor.

They say that there are no indispensable people here in Washington. Don't believe it. For the last three and a half decades, Rich Bender has been my indispensable person—a staffer with an encyclopedic knowledge of parliamentary procedure, the legislative process, the Federal budget, as well as the rules and traditions of this body.

I am by no means the only Senator who has found Richard indispensable. In fact, he is a legend among Senators and staffers alike. Many times, the distinguished majority leader, Senator REID, has come to me with some version of this request: Tom, I am having trouble with this bill. Opponents are raising all kinds of legislative and parliamentary hurdles. Have Bender give me a call. And, by the way, Leader