

time again. He has twice been named Campbellsville/Taylor County Chamber of Commerce Educator of the Year, in 1992 and 2000. He was awarded the Sears-Roebuck Foundation Teaching Excellence and Campus Leadership Award in 1989 and the Campbellsville University Student Government Association Challenger Award a year later. In 1996, he received the Board of Advisors Academic Excellence Distinguished Professor award, and in 2002, he became a Campbellsville University Distinguished Alumnus.

Despite his tireless devotion to teaching, Dr. Cheatham has also found time to pursue his passions outside the classroom. Among his many extra-curricular pursuits, he led the discussion on bringing the internet to Campbellsville University in 1994, and served as president for the Consortium for Computing in Small Colleges. He also served as the national president of Sigma Zeta, the science and math honor society, and is on the board of directors at Taylor Regional Hospital.

Those who have crossed paths with Dr. Cheatham—whether as one of his students, as a colleague, as a fellow member of Frank's Campbellsville Baptist Church, or as a friend—know just how much he will be missed at Campbellsville University. His lifelong commitment to education and his devotion to bettering the lives of his students deserve the praise of this body.

Thus, I ask my Senate colleagues to join me in commending Dr. Cheatham for an exemplary career and wishing him nothing but the best as he enjoys retirement with his wife, Shirley, his daughter, Tammy, and his grandson—a junior at Campbellsville University—Drew.

THE AGRICULTURAL ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, after more than a year of debate, negotiation and compromise, the farm bill has finally been approved. This legislation is a win for the family farmers and rural economy that is at the heart of Upstate New York. While the final product does not include everything that we fought for, the farm bill's passage was of the utmost importance to New York. It maintains or grows scores of programs for our dairies, fruit and vegetable farmers, maple syrup producers, rural development projects and iconic New York companies like Hickey Freeman in Rochester, NY.

The farm bill is unique in that it touches the lives of all Americans by ensuring the health of our nation's food supply. It does that by supporting our hard working farmers. The bill supports innovative agricultural research that helps make our farms some of the most productive on the planet. I am proud that this will include the Acer Access and Development Program or Maple Tap Act, which will provide grants to promote maple tapping and research across New York. This bill makes common sense reforms like

eliminating direct payments and expanding opportunities for crop insurance and even linking crop insurance with conservation compliance. This bill does this all while providing a safety net for our farms that often face unpredictable natural disasters.

However, this bill is more than just an agriculture bill; it is the bedrock of our food and agriculture policy for the next 5 years. The Farm Bill will drive our rural economy into the 21st Century by making investments not only in our farms, but in water, broadband, and energy infrastructure. This bill provides opportunities to grow small business in rural communities, such as helping a rural entrepreneur turn grandma's award winning jam into a commercial product ready to be sold on store shelves across the great state of New York and across the country. This farm bill pulls our rural and urban communities ever closer, as it expands opportunities for farmers markets and food hubs to communities that for so long have lacked access to local fresh food.

Another very important provision in this bill that I would like to highlight is extension of the Wool Trust Fund. For more than a decade we have had in place this successful program to protect the workers at American manufacturers of men's suits from an unfair trade anomaly. While we allow finished suits to be imported into this country duty-free from many countries, we impose a 25% duty on the fabrics that our domestic suit manufacturers must import. This anomaly has acted as a huge tax on companies that wanted to stay and manufacture here in the United States. Therefore, more than a decade ago, we enacted the Wool Trust Fund program to provide both duty refunds and licenses to import limited quantities of suiting fabrics at reduced duties. The combination of these steps helped to level the playing field and keep manufacturing jobs from moving abroad.

The Farm Bill will extend and modify this program. For example, it will consolidate the duty refunds and duty reductions with the intention of maintaining the same amount of benefits for the same manufacturers as would have been achieved under the current program. While the program has been modified it continues its central purpose—providing a mechanism to reduce the tariff burden of companies that stay in the United States to manufacture apparel without harming the domestic textile industry.

I am proud to say that one company that benefits from this program today, and that will continue benefiting, is Hickey Freeman and its 410 employees in Rochester, New York. I am proud to be a customer of this iconic brand. I am also proud to have stood up for these workers by helping establish this program more than a decade ago and extending it through the years. I am certain that the provisions of this bill will be implemented as intended so

that Hickey Freeman and its employees—along with many other companies in New York and across the country—will continue to benefit fully from this program in the same way that it has benefited for more than a decade.

From suit manufacturing in Rochester to maple taps in the Adirondacks, from dairies in the Central part of my state, to apple, pear, cherry and berry growers in the Hudson valley, from the wineries at end of Long Island to those near Niagara Falls, the industries that bring life to our rural communities will be better because we passed this Farm Bill. Their crops will grow fuller and stronger, and so will our economy.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 2014

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Farm bill policies touch the lives of all Americans, not just those who work in the agricultural sector. In addition to reauthorizing farm programs, this legislation deals with domestic and international food aid, conservation and the environment, trade, rural development, renewable energy, forestry, and financial markets, among other issues. This year's reauthorization presented an opportunity to enact significant reforms in these areas. While some progress was made, I believe the bill falls short of its potential, and ultimately I could not support it.

The farm bill takes an important step toward reform by ending the longstanding practice of giving direct payments to farmers of certain commodity crops regardless of whether they experienced losses or even planted a crop. It also tightens limits on the amount of farm payments an individual can receive, expands crop insurance opportunities for specialty and organic crops, establishes conservation compliance as a requirement for receiving premium insurance subsidies, and invests in rural broadband.

In spite of these successes, however, the farm bill does not do enough for Rhode Island families.

Of greatest concern to me, it cuts \$8.6 billion over 10 years from the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, SNAP, also known as food stamps. These cuts could reduce food stamp benefits for as many as 850,000 households across the country, including tens of thousands in Rhode Island. SNAP is our Nation's most important antihunger program. In this challenging economic climate, it is wrong to cut critical food-assistance funding.

In addition, this farm bill, like its predecessors, fails to provide adequate support for our fishermen in Rhode Island and nationwide. Farm bill programs provide billions of dollars in subsidies and technical assistance to farmers every year. In comparison, fishermen have little access to similar kinds of Federal assistance. Despite attempts to correct this inequity, fishermen remain second-class citizens when it comes to Federal support.

Finally, American agriculture springs from the richness of our land

and natural resources, and the farm bill has long supported programs to conserve and protect those resources. As the harmful effects of climate change become more prevalent, our agricultural policy should reflect the threat posed to farming and food production by these changes. In this farm bill, “climate change” and “extreme weather” are hardly mentioned. Congress can start by opening the Regional Conservation Partnership Program to climate change adaptation and mitigation projects.

The farm bill is important and wide-ranging legislation. Unfortunately, the conference report leaves out essential protections for low-income Americans, hard-hit fisheries, and precious natural resources.

THE USS FORRESTAL

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, today marks the last voyage of the Ex-USS *Forrestal*, the world’s first supercarrier. On this occasion, I believe it is fitting to recognize the ship and all who sailed on her in service to a grateful nation. Launched almost 60 years ago in Newport News, VA, she was named after former Navy Secretary and first Secretary of Defense James Forrestal.

Forrestal represented American ingenuity and shipbuilding excellence, integrating operational needs, and engineering insight that created the first steam catapult, angled flight deck, and use of optical landing systems.

During her 38 years of active service, *Forrestal* and its attached air wings were involved in missions around the globe. At the beginning of her sea life, she was sent to the eastern Mediterranean during the Suez and Lebanon Crises and over the course of her service life was involved in dozens of NATO operations, overseas deployments, patrol missions, and strategic port visits around the Atlantic and Sixth Fleets. She was “home” to thousands of the Nation’s finest sailors and aviators this country has ever known.

Forrestal’s contributions to the war effort in Vietnam are well documented. Unfortunately, so is the terrible fire that engulfed the flight deck on July 29, 1967, killing 134 shipmates, injuring 161 more, and destroying more than 20 aircraft. I will never forget when that Zuni rocket hit my A-4 Skyhawk after it was accidentally fired from across the flight deck, rupturing the fuel tank and setting that horrific, costly fire.

I will always remember and honor my brave comrades who died in the *Forrestal* fire. Although the ship is

being towed to Brownsville, TX, to be physically dismembered, her legacy, the bonds forged, and memories created among shipmates will live forever. I bid her a final “fair winds and following seas.”

HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, earlier this week I spoke to the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF INDEPENDENT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

A few weeks ago, the National Conference of State Legislators gave me an award—for defending the 10th Amendment. It’s the first time in ten years they were able to give that award. There hasn’t been much protection of the 10th Amendment going on in Washington. As grateful as I am for both awards, the award that I am working even harder to earn is one for deregulating and simplifying the federal role in higher education.

If I were to earn that, it would be the first time in American history that honor had been bestowed. Truth is, for a long time it wasn’t needed.

The federal government didn’t begin to focus on colleges and universities—almost all of them private at the time—until 1862 when President Lincoln signed the Morrill Act. That Act provided each state with 30,000 acres of federal land for each member in their congressional delegation. States were then required to sell the land and use the proceeds to fund public colleges that focused on agriculture, engineering, and military science. States were expected to contribute to the maintenance of its land-grant institution as well as to provide its buildings. But Congress was otherwise sparse on advice for how to establish these institutions and there was little federal intervention.

The federal government didn’t focus much more on higher education again until 1944, when Congress passed the G.I. Bill. This included federal financial assistance to help any veteran who served at least 90 days between December 1941 and 1946 pay for college or vocational training programs at the public or private institution of their choice. This even included high schools. The big news here was not just the new federal money, but the way it was spent. Instead of establishing a Washington program for colleges serving the needs of veterans, the federal money followed veterans to the college of their choice.

Not all of the independent private colleges thought this was such a good idea. The president of the University of Chicago said the G.I. Bill would turn universities into an “educational hobo jungle.”

The only limitation on choice of institution for those using the G.I. Bill was that it

had to be approved by the appropriate state educational agency or by the Administrator of the Veterans Administration.

So you see, the dreaded “voucher,” which raises the hackles of the K-12 establishment, was the very foundation of federal funding for colleges and universities for seventy years.

Last week I introduced a bill to give federal money to elementary and secondary students in the same way we do with the G.I. Bill, Pell Grants and student loans—let the money follow students to the schools they choose. If you just take 41 percent of the federal dollars we are already spending on K-12 education, you can turn that into \$2,100 scholarships for 21 million low-income children.

But as you can imagine, these Pell Grants for Kids created an uproar from the K-12 establishment. My response was, if vouchers helped created the best system of colleges in the world, why don’t we try it for our schools?

But back to the history of federal involvement in higher education.

After the G.I. Bill, the number of Americans enrolled in college more than doubled in just six years between 1943 and 1949.

Then came the Korean G.I. Bill in 1952.

And this brought more federal regulation. The Korean G.I. Bill specified that institutions of higher education needed to be accredited by a federally recognized accreditor in order for a veteran student to use their benefits.

Still it was not much regulation. Only a single page of paper.

By the way, in 1952, roughly 35 percent of students were graduating from high school and only 6 percent were completing college.

Now move ahead to Sputnik in the late 1950s. Congress passed the National Defense Education Act that created the first federal loan program in order for students to attend college. Between 1952 and 1965, college enrollment increased from more than 2.1 million to nearly 6 million (almost 30 percent of the 18-24-year-old population).

Still, after 100 years of federal involvement, there were not many rules and regulations.

This brings us to 1965 and the passage of the Higher Education Act.

Now here is the problem. Congress has reauthorized the Higher Education Act eight times since 1965. With each reauthorization came many well-intentioned good ideas and another stack of additional regulations. The laws and regulations have piled so high since 1965 that I voted against the 2008 reauthorization because the stack of regulations was as tall as I was then and I believed that a new bill would eventually double that stack.

Here is a concrete example of unnecessary complication in the higher education system: the application for federal aid.

It is a ten-page document that asks more than 100 questions and is accompanied by a 72-page instruction booklet.

This is considered a victory in Washington. I know that when I came here 11 years ago, I was determined to simplify this application