United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 9, 2014 *No. 106*

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable EDWARD J. MARKEY, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Spirit, we rejoice in the hope we receive from Your mercies. Fill our lawmakers with strength for today and faith for tomorrow. Show them Your unfailing love as You provide them with Your wisdom to meet the challenges they face. May they trust You completely, whether in the sunshine or storm. Help them to remember the many times You have helped them when they had no solutions for their problems. Lord, lead them to be such true stewards of our national trust that they will transmit this Nation to our descendents far greater than it is today.

We pray in Your strong Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, Wednesday, July 9, 2014.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable EDWARD J. MARKEY, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MARKEY thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 12 noon today. During that period of time Senators will be permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each with the time equally divided and controlled between the leaders or their designees.

At noon the Senate will turn to executive session and proceed on votes on the confirmation of three nominations: Julian Castro, the mayor of San Antonio, TX, to be the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development; Darci Vetter to be Chief Agricultural Negotiator, Office of the United States Trade Representative; and William Adams to be Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Humanities. There will be a rollcall vote on the confirmation of the Castro nomination, and we expect only voice votes on the confirmation of Vetter and Adams.

Upon disposition of the Adams nomination, there will be a vote on the motion to proceed to S. 2363, the bipartisan Hagan sportsmen's act. We expect that vote to be by voice also.

Senators should expect one rollcall vote then today at noon.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 2569

Mr. REID. Mr. President, S. 2569 is due for a second reading, I am told.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title for a second time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2569) to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, this is legislation sponsored by Senator WALSH of Montana. I object to any further proceedings at this time, and I look forward to working with him in the future on this legislation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

SALUTING THE FLAG

Mr. REID. Mr. President, yesterday I mentioned to the Senate that I had been reading a book by Caroline Kennedy called ''A Patriot's Handbook.'' I have been looking at the book. It was given to my wife for Mother's Day a number of years ago.

I mentioned yesterday that I read about one of JOHN MCCAIN's experiences in a Vietnam prison camp. It will take me just a minute and a half or so to read this, but this is what I paraphrased yesterday that I will read today. It is ''The Mike Christian Story'' by Senator JOHN MCCAIN in his book ''Faith of Our Fathers.''

Mike was a Navy Bombardier-navigator who had been shot down in 1967, about 6 months before I arrived. He had grown up near Selma, Alabama. His family was poor. He had not worn shoes until he was 13 years old. Character was their wealth. They were good, righteous people, and they raised Mike to be hardworking and loyal. He was 17 when he enlisted in the Navy. As a young sailor, he showed promise as a leader and impressed his superiors enough to be offered a commission.

What packages we were allowed to receive from our families often contained handkerchiefs, scarves, and other clothing items. For some time, Mike had been taking little scraps of red and white cloth, and with a needle he had fashioned from a piece of bamboo he laboriously sewed an American flag into the inside of his prisoner's shirt. Every afternoon, before we ate our soup, we would hang

Printed on recycled paper.

Mike's flag on the wall of our cell and together recite the Pledge of Allegiance. No other event of the day had as much meaning to us.

The guards discovered Mike's flag one afternoon during a routine inspection and confiscated it. They returned that evening and took Mike outside. For our benefit as much as Mike's, they beat him severely, just outside our cell, puncturing his eardrum and breaking several of his ribs. When they finished, they dragged him bleeding and nearly senseless back into our cell, and we helped him crawl to his place on the sleeping platform. After things quieted down, we all lay down to go to sleep. Before drifting off, I happened to look toward a corner of the room, where one of the four naked light bulbs that were always illuminated in our cell cast a dim light on Mike Christian. He had crawled there when he thought the rest of us were sleeping. With his eyes nearly swollen shut from the beating, he had quietly picked up his needle and thread and begun sewing a new flag.

I witnessed many acts of heroism in prison, but none braver than that. As I watched him, I felt a surge of pride at serving with him, and an equal measure of humility for lacking that extra ration of courage that distinguished Mike Christian from other men.

I mentioned this yesterday because I had it in my mind when we saluted the flag. I said yesterday—and I will repeat and paraphrase today—when we salute the flag, we should remember the Mike Christians of the world who sacrificed so much so that we can salute the flag.

A FAIR SHOT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I love baseball season. I have never had the good fortune of having a team I grew up with, as has my colleague, the senior Senator from Illinois—Cubs fan, where he lives, White Sox fan—but I have loved baseball since I was a little boy. I love baseball season. I go to games. I think I can go to one this Saturday, unless something comes up. But I do go home at night—and I have spoken with the Republican leader about the pleasure we get from watching a little bit of the baseball games every evening. I do enjoy that.

I have watched over the years these managers. I spent so much time in southern Nevada, in Las Vegas. The baseball team most everyone in Las Vegas watched and listened to was the Los Angeles Dodgers, and the manager for much of that time, after I came back here, was Tommy Lasorda, and he was like so many managers, he was a character. He was a showman. I assume he picked some of the times to pick a fight with the umpire because he was upset with a call, but I think part of it was his idea that the team needed something a little extra. Tommy Lasorda would go out there, and he was famous for kicking the dirt and yelling loudly at the umpire and making sure he used a lot of swear words. That was the manager. He wasn't the only one. Tommy Lasorda comes to my mind. And, on occasion, he would get thrown out of the game.

Why did he do this? Was he upset at the call? At times it got real ugly, with chest thumping and, as I indicated, kicking dirt. Lou Pinella was famous for that. He would kick dirt sometimes on an umpire and it usually got him kicked out of the game. As I indicated, they tried to keep it clean, but those baseball managers and players sometimes have a vocabulary that is for locker rooms and they would say mean-spirited things to the umpire, and certainly what they said wasn't suitable for children.

A lot of times they exited the game after being told they were ejected to divert attention from what was going on with their team. It was a gimmick many times, a distraction meant to sidetrack one side and rally the other.

In the House of Representatives, the Republican leadership is trying a similar tactic by threatening to bring a lawsuit against the President of the United States. They are searching desperately for something—anything—to keep the radicals within their own pockets over there happy. That is hard to do, as we have seen. They want to do this to divert the American people's attention from their very own inaction.

The Presiding Officer doesn't have to take my word for it—no one has to—because conservative pundits are falling over themselves to criticize this ploy. Even last night, Sarah Palin—what did Sarah Palin say? She said, ''You don't bring a lawsuit to a gun fight, and there's no room for lawyers on our front lines.'' That is Sarah Palin. That is what she thinks of the action by the Republican leadership in the House. She wants to go even further, whatever that is.

One Republican pundit said it was political theater. Another called the lawsuit feckless.

However they choose to label it, there is one thing that conservatives, liberals, and moderates agree on: This lawsuit is nothing more than a political stunt. It is nothing more than kicking dirt at the umpire. This feeble attempt to pick a fight with President Obama is intended to draw attention away from the House's inertia on issues important to the American people, such as immigration. More than a year ago we passed immigration and the other House has refused to do anything about it, creating lots of problems, and causing this great country of ours to go further in debt. One trillion dollars would result in reducing our debt if we could pass that legislation. We did it; the House should do it.

All we are asking is that the middle class get a fair shot, whether it is raising the minimum wage, whether it is student debt, which is stunningly high—the highest debt we have in America today is student debt, $1.3 trillion. We need to do something about fair pay for women, that they get the same money men get for doing the very same work. A fair shot—that is what the American middle class deserves, and the House Republicans are refusing to give them any shot at fairness.

Instead of considering all of these important legislative initiatives—I mentioned only a few—the tea party House is content to put on a show, to kick a little dirt—a big, expensive show, in many instances. Who pays for the charade they are talking about over there? The American taxpayers.

Let me give one example. Benghazi. Benghazi was a tragedy, but there is no political conspiracy. Here is what they have done, mostly in the House: 13 public hearings, 15 Member and staff briefings, over 25,000 pages of documents from the White House. Now they are using taxpayer money on a large-scale stunt that isn't new for them. They have other stunts such as the supposed lawsuit. But they have now set up a 12-member Benghazi panel they are creating. They intend to spend $3.3 million this year—this year, which has just a few months left in it—$3.3 million, as they try once again to turn a real tragedy into some kind of a conspiracy.

To put that number in perspective, think about this: The Benghazi panel will outspend the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs has 25 Members of Congress and it has about 30 staff members. The Benghazi little program they are putting on over there will spend more money than the entire Veterans Affairs' Committee in the House.

We are still waiting for the House to come together with us to do something about the veterans emergency we have. They have forgotten about what is going on around the country. We need thousands of new personnel in the Veterans Affairs Department, and the House refuses to complete the conference with Chairman SANDERS.

Much like the other sideshows put on by the Republican-controlled House of Representatives, this so-called lawsuit is baseless. When Sarah Palin thinks you are going too far, you better take a look at it by the tea party-driven House over there. And the House direction of the lawsuit—people keep asking the House leadership: On what are you going to sue him? They do not know. They are working on it. But they are going to have a lawsuit. They are going to kick around a little dirt. I am in no position to offer legal guidance, but I have been in court a few times. You know your case is in big trouble when you cannot specify the reason you are filing the lawsuit.

So the leadership in the House of Representatives should put aside this ill-fated venture and leave the chest-bumping and dirt-kicking charade to baseball managers.

President Obama is doing something to solve problems, and Republicans are suing him because they want to do nothing, and that is sad. Republicans in the House would be better served spending their efforts and resources passing legislation, giving the middle class a fair shot.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

ENERGY REGULATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, earlier this week I hosted a tele-townhall with people from across western Kentucky, from places such as Lyon County and Webster County. These constituents shared their thoughts on a range of issues, from ObamaCare to taxes, but one issue kept coming up over and over again. The Kentuckians I spoke with were truly worried about the Obama administration's war on coal jobs. They have seen the devastation in eastern Kentucky, and they know what the President's newest regulations will likely mean for middle-class families such as theirs: skyrocketing utility bills, higher prices, fewer jobs. They know the administration's war is an elitist crusade that threatens to shift good, well-paying jobs overseas, splinter our manufacturing base, and throw yet another load onto the backs of middle-class Kentuckians who have already struggled so much.

The hard-working people I represent are worried enough just about making their mortgage payments and paying for car repairs and coping with energy bills and summer vacations. These are the people whom President Obama and his Washington Democratic allies should be listening to—not to liberal elites who have been begging the President to go after the coal industry and the people whose livelihoods depend on it. But President Obama does not seem terribly interested in those folks or their problems. Once again he will be off campaigning this week. He will huddle with more leftwing ideologues—the folks who love to make a buck off of coal and then attack coal families with ego-driven political crusades, such as the ideologue the President rolled out the red carpet for just a few weeks ago down at the White House.

Meanwhile, here in the Senate the Democratic majority will continue to block and tackle for the President and his anticoal offensive. Senate Democrats block basically every attempt—every attempt, however small—to inject congressional oversight into the administration's energy regulations. They shut down votes. They obstruct the committee process that should be at the heart of our work. They even gag their own Members.

They blocked commonsense legislation such as the Coal Country Protection Act. What that bill—my bill—would do is require the administration to certify that jobs will not be lost and utility rates will not go up as a result of the President's energy regulations. That is not too much to ask. But Washington Democrats are blocking my bill because they know the President's regulations will cost jobs and will raise utility rates, and they are more interested in protecting the President's ideological agenda than jobs.

In other words, Senate Democrats block and tackle and obstruct—all to defend the President's war on coal jobs. It is a clear case of extreme devotion, and it makes sense because the Democratic majority really only has one mission these days: Protect the President and the left at all costs. That is why the average Democratic Senator has almost no power anymore. Our friends on the other side of the aisle do not ever get to do anything. They are just another backbencher fortifying President Obama's Senate moat—the place where good ideas go to die. It is a shame.

The Senate used to be a place where big ideas were debated and serious solutions were explored. Committees operated and amendments were offered. I remember a time not too long ago when there was even such a thing as an independent-minded Senate Democrat. But today's Democratic leadership has put an end to all of that.

It is about time our Washington Democratic friends open their eyes to the true cost of the President's policies, both in my State and in theirs.

It is time for these Washington Democrats to stop pretending they are not complicit in the administration's war on coal jobs or in the harm it is causing to our constituents because there is real pain out there. Beyond the Democratic echo chamber, there is real pain out there, out in the real world, in places such as Pike County.

Washington Democrats need to understand that Kentuckians are more than just some statistic on the bureaucratic balance sheet. These are real Americans who are hurting, and they deserve to have their voices heard. One way to do that, as I have suggested, is for the administration to hold some listening sessions on its new energy regulations in the areas that stand to suffer the most from them, in places such as eastern and western Kentucky. I have already issued multiple invitations for the President's people to visit places in my home State. I am issuing one again today.

The sad truth is that officials in Washington do not want to come anywhere near coal country. They just want to impose their regulations, hear some ''feedback'' from the echo chamber in order to check a box, and then move right along to the next front in their war on coal. They do not even want to talk to the very people they intend to put out of work. Well, several tele-townhall participants want to know why the President will not come down to see the mines and the coal families themselves. I am wondering too.

Mr. President, the campaign trips can wait. You recently expressed an interest in hanging around middle-class Americans for a change. What I am saying is, here is a perfect chance. Come on down to Kentucky and talk to some coal miners.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

SPECIALIST KEVIN J. GRAHAM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the life of one soldier from Kentucky who gave his life in service to our country. SPC Kevin J. Graham of Benton, KY, was killed in Kandahar, Afghanistan, on September 26, 2009, when the enemy attacked his vehicle with an IED. He was 27 years old.

For his service in uniform, Specialist Graham received many medals, awards, and decorations, including the Bronze Star Medal, the Purple Heart, the Army Good Conduct Medal, the Combat Infantryman Badge, the National Defense Service Medal, the Afghanistan Campaign Medal with Bronze Service Star, the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, the Army Service Ribbon, the Overseas Service Ribbon, the NATO Medal, the Expert Marksmanship Badge, the National Defense Service Medal, and the Army Service Ribbon.

Soldiering was not simply a vocation to Specialist Graham; it was a way of life and it was a calling. From a young age, friends and family recall his strong desire to become a soldier.

''Before he went into the Army, he would see guys in uniform and say he needed to be doing something like that,'' says the Reverend Jonathan Goodman, Kevin's pastor from Benton's Calvary Baptist Church. ''He felt like it was his life's work, and he was honored to serve his country.''

Kevin was born in 1982 in Illinois and raised in Wisconsin. He moved with his parents to Marshall County, KY, about 5 years before his death. As a child Kevin received his education through Christian Liberty Academy as a homeschooler. He was a member of Paddock Lake Baptist Church in Wisconsin, where he was involved with the youth group and assisted the youth pastor.

As a young boy Kevin and his best friend used to dress up in Army fatigues and patrol the neighborhood. Neighbors would say they felt safe because they knew someone was watching out for them. Kevin's interest in the military also included a love of military history. He would read endlessly about the Civil War and World War II and talk often with his father, grandfather, and others who had served about their experiences. Kevin collected memorabilia from different conflicts, including some given to him by veterans. His interest in military aviation led him to spend his summers at an airfield in Kenosha, WI, to see hundreds of World War II planes gather in formation.

Kevin also learned to shoot at an early age. By the time he was 16, he had earned a job overseeing the skeet range at the local shooting facility. He

earned many badges for his marksmanship, including one for hitting his target 73 out of 75 times.

Kevin also had a love for old cars. He bought a 1965 Pontiac Le Mans and rebuilt it from the ground up. He attended countless car shows and won several trophies.

In July 2007 Kevin fulfilled a lifelong goal and honored the service of his father Daniel, who earned a Purple Heart for his service in Vietnam, by enlisting in the U.S. Army. He completed basic training that November.

One of Kevin's closest friends, Tristan Miller, joined the Army within months of Kevin. Kevin ''was enlisting in a time of war and he chose to enlist as an infantryman,'' Tristan recalls. ''Kevin knew what he was going into. This was something he volunteered to do. Kevin knew something was wrong out there, and he was going to take a stand about it.''

Kevin was later based at Fort Lewis, WA, where he met the woman who would become his wife, Krystal, in the fall of 2008. On March 22, 2009, they were married, just a few days before Kevin's 27th birthday. Kevin also grew very close to Krystal's son Brian and enjoyed spending time as a dad.

Then, in July, Kevin was deployed to Afghanistan—his first deployment. He deployed as part of 4th Platoon, Alpha Company, 1st Battalion, 17th Infantry Regiment, 5th Stryker Brigade Combat Team, 2nd Infantry Division, based out of Fort Lewis. He was promoted to specialist and assigned to be a mortar carrier driver, a responsibility given to those soldiers among the best able to remain calm in the face of a crisis. No doubt Kevin's lifetime of preparation, going back to his boyhood neighborhood patrols, served him well for his greatest and final role.

''It was an honor to be his parents,'' says Sandra Graham, Kevin's mother. ''Truly an honor.''

We are thinking of Kevin's family and friends today, including his wife Krystal, his stepson Brian, his mother Sandra, his brothers Daniel, Sean, and Scott, and many other beloved family members and friends. Kevin's father, Daniel Graham, a hero in his own right, has sadly passed on.

Mr. President, I know my U.S. Senate colleagues join me in expressing our deepest condolences to the family of SPC Kevin J. Graham and great gratitude for his life of honorable service and his enormous sacrifice in uniform. Without heroes like Specialist Graham, our country could not be free. I hope it is some small measure of comfort to his family that the life of Specialist Graham has been remembered and appropriately honored here in the U.S. Senate.

Those of us in this body must never forget the men and women such as Specialist Graham who built the foundation upon which our democracy stands.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). Under the previous order the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 12 noon, with the time equally divided between the two leaders or their designees with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant majority leader.

GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, 14 dead, 82 wounded—that grim statistic was reported this weekend. It was not from Baghdad. It was not from Damascus. It was not from Gaza. No, it was not from the Middle East. It was from the Midwest. It was from the city of Chicago—14 dead, 82 wounded over the Fourth of July weekend.

This morning the Chicago Tribune headline read: ''2 dead, 9 hurt in shootings on the South, West sides''—last night. A 17-year-old boy who would have started college orientation Thursday was shot to death Tuesday night in the Brainerd neighborhood, one of at least 11 people shot across the city since Tuesday afternoon. A boy was struck in the chest and back and died on the scene. Four minutes later, on the West Side, a 23-year-old man was fatally shot as he rode his bicycle in a Humboldt Park neighborhood.

The story goes on to recount each and every incident. These numbers cloak the grief that families are now going through as someone they love is either gone or seriously injured. When you listen to their voices, you understand what life is like in the mean streets on the South Side and West Side of Chicago.

Greg Baron, a 20-year-old from Chicago's South Side, has already been a victim of gun violence once. He spoke to the Chicago Tribune yesterday and said: ''I have to watch my back every day because I do not want to get killed or shot again.''

Marsha Lee, a Chicago mother, has already lost one son to gun violence. She recently described how she had to teach her three little girls how to take care of themselves when it came to the gunfire. She told National Public Radio: ''You have to get down low, get down on the ground, and stay on the ground until it's over, and when it's over you have to check yourself and check one another to see if anybody has been hit.''

Life in Chicago, life in America—I agree with Mayor Rahm Emanuel of Chicago. This type of violence is absolutely unacceptable. While the number of murders in Chicago statistically is, thankfully, down compared to last year, there are still too many deaths from gun violence and too many people living in fear. Who pays the price? The families do, but all of us do.

The University of Chicago Crime Lab calculates the total cost of gun violence in America at around $100 billion a year—$100 billion. That is a staggering number. Cook County, which, of course, contains the city of Chicago, estimates the trauma care for each shooting victim costs $52,000 on average. So for last weekend, with 80 wounded Chicagoans, we just added $4 million in health care costs, assuming that they can be treated and released at some point in the near future.

It is time to do something about it. It is time to stop talking about it. I did some polls across our State, and even more important, as I visited the State, I asked questions from one end to the other. We are quite a diverse State. Southern Illinois is the South. As the late Paul Simon used to say: Southern Illinois is the land of grits and gospel music—small town America. It is rural. It is where my family roots are. I know what they think about guns. Guns are part of the culture. Guns are part of the family experience. A father taking his son or even his daughter out to hunt is an important moment in each of their lives.

They value the ownership of guns and overwhelmingly use them responsibly and legally for hunting and for target practice. Still, when you speak to those people about gun violence in the cities and ask them a very basic question, these proud gun owners respond in a way that I am proud of. They agree that no convicted felon and no person mentally unstable should be able to buy a gun, period.

We considered that on the floor of the Senate—the Manchin-Toomey amendment. Close the gun show loophole. Ask the question: Have you been convicted of a felony? Is there something in your background that suggests a mental instability that should prohibit you from owing a gun? We could not pass that measure.

But I offered another measure as well. It is one that relates to this basic issue. If we want to keep guns out of the hands of those who would misuse them, if we want to protect the rights of law-abiding, respectful citizens who own firearms and follow the law, then we should take care and make sure we do everything in our power to keep guns out of the hands of folks who will use them to hurt and kill innocent people.

The superintendent of police in Chicago is Gary McCarthy. I like Gary a lot. He came to Chicago from New York, hired by Mayor Emanuel. He really has rolled up his sleeves and gone out in the streets and tried to tackle this terrible issue of gun violence. They asked him about this weekend, with 14 dead and 82 wounded in Chicago.

He said: ''Something has to happen to slow down the straw purchasing that happens in this State.'' Let me explain

that. Here is what the Superintendent meant. The law says that if you are a convicted felon you cannot buy a gun. So how do they get their hands on guns? Many of them send someone else who does not have a history of criminal convictions to buy the guns. That so-called straw purchaser, a third-party purchaser, purchases the firearm, walks out the door, and either gives it or sells it to the person who can go use it in the commission of a crime. Superintendent McCarthy identifies that as one of the key problems in the city of Chicago. It is a problem across America. Mayor Emanuel pointed out yesterday we need tough Federal gun laws ''so that the guns of Indiana and Wisconsin are not flowing just into the streets.''

Well, I agree with him. We have a bill before us, pending before us in the Senate. It is not technically a bill about guns and firearms. It is about sportsmen. A lot of provisions in there are good provisions. Some I may question. But by and large, it is all about sportsmen. Now we are being told that colleagues are going to come forward and offer amendments related to firearms and guns.

I may be an exception, but I welcome this debate. I want this debate. I want an opportunity to raise important issues about gun violence and gun safety in America. I am going to offer an amendment, an amendment which stiffens the penalties for those who purchase guns to give them to another person or sell them to another person to commit a crime.

What I said in Chicago I will say on the floor of the Senate. Girlfriends, wake up. When that thug sends you in to buy a gun, under this amendment you run the risk of spending 15 years of your life in a Federal prison. So think about it. Is he really worth it? Are you willing to take that risk and give away 15 years of your life so some gang member or thug can have a gun to go out on the street and kill an innocent person—so that another 15-year-old child can be gunned down, killed in the streets of Chicago or any other city and see their dreams absolutely disappear in the blood on the sidewalk?

I want to offer this amendment. I hope my colleagues, whatever their views on guns, will agree with me. This is no violation of a basic right under the second amendment to the Constitution. This just says that if you are going to buy a gun to give it to a thug to commit a crime, we are going to put you in jail for 15 years. Think about it. It is the only way that we can address this in a manner that will start to shut down this pipeline of guns flowing into the city of Chicago and cities across America.

Some of my friends in Illinois see this issue a lot differently. They think if everybody carried a gun then good people would shoot down the bad people. I am skeptical. History tells us that most of the time the guns that good people carry are not used as effectively as they hoped they would be used and sometimes even injure the person carrying it. I still trust law enforcement as a first line of defense for families and neighborhoods all across my State. Law enforcement has told us loudly and clearly: Stop wasting your time in Washington. Address the issues that make a difference in the neighborhoods and lives of families of Chicago and Illinois and this Nation. Make this a safer Nation—14 dead, 82 wounded over the weekend in Chicago.

I guess the question to be answered by the Senate is: Do we care? Will we do anything? This Senator is going to offer this amendment. I hope I get my chance. I hope the filibusters on the other side and from other people do not stop me. Is this a guarantee that this will become law? No, but it is a guarantee this week will not go by without an effort from this Senator and I hope from others to address this issue of gun violence.

I hope it is evidence that many of us believe the Senate is still an important part of American government that can address the problems that threaten good, decent law-abiding families all across America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

COAL PRODUCTION TAX CREDIT

Mr. WALSH. Madam President, I rise today regarding the Indian coal production tax credit that is being held up by bipartisan politics in the House of Representatives and this body. I have supported this important provision from my first days in the Senate. Chairman WYDEN and Ranking Member HATCH did commendable work to bring the tax extenders bill to the floor in May. But since then, political brinkmanship has won out at the expense of good-paying jobs and certainty for millions of American businesses and taxpayers.

This particular provision not only helps tribes responsibly develop their natural resources, but it also creates and sustains jobs and economic development in Indian Country to support self sufficiency and self determination for several American tribes. This tax credit will help to employ more people at a good wage and continue a policy that has a track record of working for Montanans.

The Crow Nation in Southeast Montana relies on this tax credit to drive their economy. Like many of our tribal nations, the Crow Nation suffers from a much higher unemployment rate than the rest of the country. Unemployment for the Crow Nation is around 50 percent. That is unacceptable. I was proud to work with Chairman WYDEN to have this provision added to the EXPIRE Act. The political games being played to bring down an important piece of bipartisan legislation are a clear example of why Washington is broken. Congress must take action now. This vital provision will keep tribal jobs and revenue intact. Extending this provision also means more money for our schools and public infrastructure in Indian Country. When I traveled to Montana's tribal nations in my first week as a Senator, Crow leaders, including tribal chairman Darin Old Coyote, shared with me how important this tax credit is for the future of the Crow Nation.

I urge my colleagues to set partisan differences aside and support the tax extender legislation put forward by Senators WYDEN and HATCH.

The bill they put forward contains some provisions that I would not support as stand-alone measures, but overall the bill will be a driver of economic development for small businesses. This bill contains many provisions that are essential for job creation, and the 2-year timeframe helps give individuals and businesses the certainty they need to move our economy forward.

Small businesses across Montana rely on many of the provisions in this bill to keep their companies going, from the new markets tax credit, which spurs development in economically distressed and underserved communities, to the work opportunity tax credit, which creates incentives for hiring veterans. These provisions are driving Montana's economy.

It is irresponsible for Congress to continue to keep these businesses in a state of uncertainty. We must move forward with a real plan to encourage business investment and innovation. I urge my colleagues in both Chambers to put aside their political gamesmanship and show the courage our constituents expect and deserve.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. First, let me commend my colleague from Montana. Since he has been here he has been one of the strongest and most stalwart voices in defending the rights of Native Americans, and I know they populate his State in large numbers. I know he has made it a passion and he has been extremely effective and I compliment him for that.

ISRAEL

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I rise to dispel a dangerous notion, one I have seen too frequently in newspapers, heard on TV and among people, commentators and others in the wake of the violence in Israel.

The dangerous notion is that there is a moral equivalence between the actions and reactions of Israel and the Palestinian State to the violence and response in the Middle East—or the Palestinian people more so than the State. It must be said there is no moral equivalence between the actions and reactions of Israel and Hamas and the Palestinian Authority to the violence that has occurred there.

Two instances make that very clear. We all witnessed terrible tragedies occurring in that tortured region of the

world. We are now all familiar with both the kidnapping and cold-blooded murder of three Israeli boys and, in what seems to be payback, the killing of a young Palestinian teenager. Both were abhorrent—both were abhorrent—and the losses of the families on both sides cannot be understated, but I think what we ought to focus on—we all know each side has its fanatics. Each side experiences tragedy of the highest order. What I am saying does not apply to all the people on either side, particularly the Palestinian side, but the reaction is what counts.

What was the reaction among too many Palestinians to the murder of these three boys? They were almost exultant. They were treated as heroes. The mother of one of the supposed murderers, people who are suspected of the murder of the Israelis, Abu Aysha, said: ''If he [my son] truly did it—I'll be proud of him till my final day.'' That is what she said: ''I'll be proud. . . .''

Those who were purported to kill the three Israelis were regarded as heroes, not just among a small segment in the West Bank and in Gaza but among large numbers of people. There were parades. They were honored. That was the reaction.

Let's compare that to Israel's reaction when a group of Israeli fanatics killed the Palestinian teenager. The Israeli people, in large part, were aghast. They said we have to find who did it and bring them to justice. Prime Minister Netanyahu called them terrorists, those who might have killed that Palestinian, equal to the terrorism on the other side of the three who killed the Israelis.

Israel made every effort to find those and have now made arrests. While the leader of the Palestinian Authority condemned the killing of the three Israeli boys, there was no such effort on the Palestinian side to find those who did it, to bring them to justice. There were no calls of universal condemnation.

How can we compare the two sides? How can people say: Oh, the Israelis. Oh, the Palestinians. It is one big fight. They are all the same.

It is not. Again, regretfully, there are fanatics on both sides, and I abhor the Israeli fanatics. They make things bad for the vast majority of Israelis who want to live in peace in a two-state solution, but the vast majority of Israelis condemn the Jewish fanatics. The vast majority of Palestinians seem to praise the Palestinian terrorists. Hamas, one of the two main governing organizations in Gaza and the West Bank, loudly praises the kidnapping and killing of the three Israeli boys.

Is there moral equivalency here? Are both sides sort of acting the same?

By the way, when you read Palestinian textbooks and go to schools and read about what the children are taught—vitriolic hatred, not only of Israel but of the Jewish people—you sometimes understand maybe why not support but condemn and sort of gain some inkling of understanding of why so many are filled with hatred. But who is putting out those textbooks? Not just Hamas—the Palestinian Authority and many Palestinian governing units.

So the reaction of Israel, its government and its society, to the killing of an innocent Palestinian youth and the reaction of the Palestinian authorities and people, in large part, to the killing of three Israeli youths showed there is no moral equivalency because the reaction was totally different.

Then let's take what happened yesterday. It is the same thing. You read all the headlines, Israelis and Palestinians fighting with each other, rockets sent on both sides, air raids sent on both sides, but let's look at what happened. Hamas sent rockets into the heart of Israel to kill innocent civilians—no warnings, not in response to anything Israel did. They just decided to send these rockets. Some commentators say it is because they are weak now that Egypt will no longer let them get all those supplies through the tunnels.

What is Israel's response? Of course they have to eliminate the rockets and rocket launchers, but what other society sends leaflets to the houses that have these rocket launchers, saying: Please vacate.

What other society tries to call people on cell phones to say: Leave. We have to get rid of the rocket launchers. We don't want to kill innocent people.

That is what Israel did. Did Hamas send any warnings to the people of Sderot or Beersheba or Jerusalem or Tel Aviv that they were going to indiscriminately send rockets into civilian areas? No. Did Hamas do this in response to Israel? No. So this idea again in the papers—oh, both sides are fighting, what can we do, they are both sort of equally wrong—is morally abhorrent to me and to many others.

There is, in conclusion, no moral equivalency, no moral equivalency to weigh these two states and, frankly, in large part, with two exceptions, how two societies react: the horrible murders of young people, Israel, sad, condemning the Israelis who did it, and too many Palestinians praising the Palestinians who did it. In response to rockets sent into civilian areas, Israel tries to limit its response to military targets and lets civilians who might be near those targets know they should evacuate.

We all pray for peace in the Middle East. I certainly do. There has been too much death, too much anguish, too much insecurity, but we are not going to achieve peace by equating the two sides and saying they are equivalent, morally or in any other way.

The steps the beleaguered nation of Israel takes to try and protect itself are far different than so many of the aggressive actions of too many on the Palestinian side, with too much support from too many of the Palestinian people.

There is no moral equivalency.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

BIPARTISAN SPORTSMEN'S ACT

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I come to the floor this morning to speak on the Bipartisan Sportsmen's Act of 2014.

I have been working on this bill with my colleague from North Carolina, Senator HAGAN. We have been working on this bill together for about 1 year. Our package is very reflective of its name. It is a bipartisan sportsmen's package.

We have, as of this morning, 46 Members signed on in support of this legislation. I think most would agree that at this time to have 46 Members across the aisle reaching together on any issue is quite extraordinary, and one would think we would have a clear path forward as to how we can advance a measure that has brought together a very diverse group of Senators, diverse from different parts of the country. But it speaks to how important and how widely accepted and supported these issues are, and this is in no small part due to the fact that America's sports men and women come from all over the country. They are not just in the rural areas and out in the country, but they are in the big cities, they are in urban centers, they are in the North, and they are in the South. For so many of us, outdoor activities and traditions define who we are.

I don't know how it is in North Dakota, but September 1 in our household—I recognize that is Labor Day for us around the country, but for most Alaskans I know, it is opening day. It is opening day, and it is when everybody is getting ready to go out duck hunting, and then we have moose season, we have caribou season. We define our seasons not by the calendar but by what is happening with hunting.

Right now, in my State, all that anyone is talking about is fishing. The reds are running on the Kenai. That is where I am going to be this weekend with my husband. Last week it was all about the kings on the Nushagak.

This morning an article in the newspaper around the State is about a sports angler who caught a 482-pound halibut off of Gustavus. It described the fisherman as a 77-year-old man who came up to the State. This is his third visit to Gustavus because he likes going out for the halibut. For a small community such as Gustavus to have fishermen come in to their town and bring the dollars they do, this is big for us. This helps our economy. It is not only fun, it is an economic driver in so many parts of my State.

Whether it is hunting or fishing, these are issues Alaskans care about. I think they are also issues people in North Dakota, Virginia, and Maryland and all over the country care about.

What we have done in this very bipartisan bill is combined a host of

measures that speak to some of the regulatory reforms that will provide greater access for our sports men and women, whether on the water or on the land, whether it is the Hunting, Fishing, and Recreational Shooting Protection Act, the Target Practice and Marksmanship Training Support Act, which provides for revenues and dollars to help with hunter education programs—very important for us around the country—electronic duck stamps, Farmer and Hunter Protection Act, Hunting Heritage Opportunities Act—again, all provisions and measures Senator HAGAN and I have worked on to build these initiatives into one package to focus on how we can do more to provide for greater access for our sports men and women around the country.

But we also provide for some very important conservation principles. We include the North American Wetlands Conservation Act and the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Reauthorization Act, some very important measures. We have a provision we have included from Senator HEINRICH, the Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act reauthorization. So it is not just on the access side, but it is also focused on the conservation side as well.

There is very strong support not only within this body but also within sports organizations all over the country. Some 42 different organizations have come together to sign a letter in support of advancing this measure through the Senate.

We spend a lot of time here on the Senate floor talking about: Well, we might be able to advance something in the Senate, but we don't know how it is going to fare on the House side. We have already seen good action, similar legislation sponsored by Congressman LATTA from Ohio, that passed the House on February 5 of this year by over a 100-vote margin. So clearly the support is not only bipartisan, it is bicameral.

What we have done, working together with Senator HAGAN and her good staff, is worked hard to try to coordinate these efforts to ensure that the House and Senate bills are closely aligned, so that when we move something out of here we don't have to guess as to what might happen, we know we are going to have good, strong support.

I am obviously very hopeful that we can complete our work on this bill. But before we complete the work on the bill, we have to be able to start work on the bill.

I also recognize that unless we can agree to an open and a fair amendment process where we actually take some votes around here on amendments offered by folks on both sides, we are probably unlikely to make progress on this bill. I think that is very unfortunate, because I know there are a lot of folks in my State hoping we are going to move on this, who are saying: If the Senate can't come together on something like a bipartisan sportsman package, where you have 46 Members coming together to do this, wow, how are they going to do anything? We need to be able to demonstrate we can work together on some of these initiatives where there is a good level of consensus.

I hate to be in the place where we are right now, arguing about whether we are going to be able to take up any relevant amendments. I want us to take up these relevant amendments.

I like the bill Senator HAGAN and I worked on. If I didn't like it, I wouldn't be standing here trying to advance and encourage my colleagues that we move forward to it. But I also know that as good as Senator HAGAN and I are in representing these issues, we don't have a monopoly on all the good ideas. We don't have a monopoly on everything coming from different parts of the country. We need to have input from our colleagues.

I will remind us that the measure in front of us is not a measure that has gone through the full committee process. This is a measure that has advanced to the floor through a process known as rule XIV, where it hasn't had the benefit of Members advancing their amendments through the committee process.

I want to have an amendment process. I want to have the debate on some of the measures we have in front of us. I want to stand and tell people why I think it is important we provide for additional access for our sports men and women on our public lands and that we can be doing more to help incentivize that. But we have to have that amendment process.

As many of my colleagues know, we have been here before. We have been here as recently as 2012. It was a highly frustrating experience. We had a similar sportsmen's bill that was bogged down—basically, it was political posturing—late last Congress and it didn't go anywhere as a result.

So with that history in mind, and knowing what we went through in 2012, I decided last July 2013 to introduce my own sportsmen's package. What I wanted to try to do is figure: OK, let's see if we can take some of the politics out of this measure, try to be very bipartisan, try to be nonpolitical.

As the ranking member of the committee with jurisdiction and as one who wasn't up for election at this point in time, I felt I was in perhaps a good spot to maybe lead this thing forward. So we put the ideas out there in November. Senator HAGAN introduced her own bill, the SPORT Act. What became very apparent to both of us was that if we continued down this two-track path, we would not be successful in passage.

Senator HAGAN and I agreed: We know what the goal is, passage of good bipartisan legislation. So we sought middle ground and we put together what we think is common sense. We took good ideas that both of us had, we melded them and we put together what we think are the best interests of the sportsmen's community around the country. Then we went out and recruited our cosponsors, we secured the time for floor consideration, and now we are here, caught in the same argument about whether relevant amendments from our caucuses should be allowed.

My answer on this is pretty simple. It is a flatout yes. Yes, of course relevant amendments should be allowed. Yes, we should actually be doing our job here in the Senate, taking good ideas from both sides and advancing a package that, again, hasn't gone through the traditional path of the committee process.

Senator HAGAN and I have again built this, and many of our colleagues agree with it; otherwise, they would not have signed on as cosponsors. We greatly appreciate their support. But, again, I think it is important to get their perspectives on this initiative before we take a final vote on the bill.

I do want to be very clear, because I heard comments this morning that Republicans are somehow or another filibustering this bill. I find that kind of stunning. The Republican conference is absolutely prepared to vote on all relevant amendments. We have a list. Last evening when I left, there was a list of 13 that had been filed. This morning, that list has grown. It has doubled. It is probably growing as we speak. Let's get moving on these relevant amendments—these amendments that are tied to the bill itself.

It is not just Republican amendments. We have a good handful of them I would like to see advanced. There are amendments on both sides, and some of these amendments are very relevant to specific States.

I know Senator LANDRIEU has an amendment that is very unique to Louisiana. It is the Kisatchie National Forest deer hunting amendment, very specific to Louisiana. It wasn't included in the package Senator HAGAN and I built because we were trying to do it broader, more comprehensive, national in scope. But if Senator LANDRIEU feels this is an important piece to have, she should have an opportunity to weigh in on that.

Senator CARDIN and Senator CRAPO have introduced an amendment, the National Fish Habitat Conservation Act—again, a bipartisan amendment led by Senator CARDIN, clearly relevant to this measure. Why would we not want to have the opportunity to advance some of these provisions that Members feel will enhance a bill that already has good, strong support.

I want to make sure Members know I am fully committed to a full and open amendment process; that Republicans would like to see a full and open amendment process; and that we get moving. Instead of talking about getting moving, we actually make that happen.

I thank those who have come forward and offered their support for this measure. A lot of work has gone into

crafting the bill. But I am fearful that, once again, we are at risk of basically being cast aside because of political concerns.

I ask the majority leader to reconsider his view that relevant amendments are too difficult to vote on. We have to return to regular order. We have to have a fair and healthy debate on legislation—especially legislation such as this that has not gone through the committee process, has good, strong support, but needs to have further input from Members all over the country.

I appreciate the consideration of the body here in trying to advance a measure that will help us not only when it comes to access for our fishermen and our sports men and women, provides for further conservation measures, but also helps us to advance a process in this body that at this time we so desperately lack.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, I rise to speak about a very troubling issue—to speak about innocent lives being stolen from communities and neighborhoods across our country and around the globe. I speak of the issue of human trafficking.

Last month, in more than 100 U.S. cities—just last month—168 children were rescued from sex trafficking and 281 pimps were arrested on Federal and State charges.

The weeklong campaign known as Operation Cross Country was conducted by the FBI, law enforcement officials, and the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. It underscores a heartbreaking reality: Human trafficking is not a far-away problem. It is happening right here in America, in all 50 States.

Each year thousands of men, women, and children are robbed of their basic freedom to live as they choose. They become victims of a rampant and evil crime, coerced through intimidation and even through violence to work as laborers or prostitutes. According to estimates from the Polaris Project, a nonprofit organization dedicated to fighting human trafficking, there were more than 5,000 potential trafficking cases in America last year. However, the precise number of domestic victims is unknown.

It should be noted that sex trafficking affects individuals of all backgrounds and races, but it disproportionately impacts women, both domestically and internationally. According to the Polaris Project, 85 percent of sex trafficking victims in the United States are women. Although news headlines often glibly refer to a ''war on women'' in political terms, we as policy makers might well devote more of our energy to the issue of sex trafficking—a real war, a daily war, a nightmarish war—faced by the most vulnerable among us—young women who are bought and sold against their will for sex.

I stand with colleagues from both political parties in calling for an end to this nightmare. We must not ignore the horror stories on our doorsteps. Earlier this year 16 children ranging in age from 13 to 17 years old were rescued from a sex trafficking operation at the Super Bowl, one of our most celebrated events—the scenario of horror for these 13- to 17-year-olds. These young Americans deserve justice and they deserve rehabilitation.

Our friends in the House of Representatives have recently passed a package of bills on antitrafficking, and I hope we will soon consider similar efforts in the Senate. To highlight a few, Senator RUBIO has introduced a bill to help protect children in foster care from becoming victims of trafficking; Senator CORNYN has introduced legislation for increasing federal resources available to trafficking victims; and Senator KLOBUCHAR has introduced legislation to help ensure that minors who are sold for sex are not prosecuted as perpetrators but properly treated as the victims they really are.

This week I have introduced the End Trafficking Act of 2014. Similar to the legislation put forward by my colleagues, my bill would ensure victims of trafficking receive the treatment they need to lead healthy, free, and productive lives. One proposal in my bill would be a court-based pilot program modeled after Hawaii's girls courts, similar to the Federal drug court system. Rather than being correctly treated as victims, trafficked juveniles are often charged with a delinquency offense and detained. Many do not receive the counseling or support they need while in detention and some even return to the trafficker who abused them.

My bill supports a specialized court docket and integrated judicial supervision that would put the well-being of the victim first. Detention does not amount to rescue, and these victims need to be rescued. They should have an opportunity to return home and receive treatment.

Human trafficking is a complex problem that demands multifaceted solutions. Supporting the victims is only one part of the equation. We must also target those who perpetuate these atrocious crimes. The legislation I have introduced also seeks to punish those responsible for trafficking—the providers and the buyers—the pimps and the johns. First, there should be strict enforcement of laws already on the books that prohibit the purchase of sex with minors. Second, child victims should have a longer statute of limitations period during which to file civil lawsuits against their traffickers. Finally, those who distribute or benefit financially from commercial advertising that promotes prostitution should face criminal charges also. My bill would do all three.

We have seen the value of coordination among local, State and Federal agencies to fight trafficking. This was certainly true in Operation Cross Country. Working together, agencies and law enforcement partners can improve the ways they target traffickers to help victims.

We all need to realize that in the United States—the freest, most prosperous nation in the world—traffickers still find and transit victims. Our efforts to fight trafficking within our borders are important to fight against trafficking worldwide. There are some 21 million people around the world who endure this cruel form of modern day slavery. There is no other way to put it. Although the United States cannot single-handedly eradicate the problem, we can serve as a model for other countries to follow by preventing trafficking and supporting victims here at home.

Again, the title of the bill is the End Trafficking Act of 2014—introduced this week. I am looking for cosponsors. I am looking for Republicans, Democrats, and Independents to come forward and say with a unified voice that this Senate, this Congress, this Federal Government, intends to put the full weight of our efforts toward combating this serious national and international problem.

I suggest the absence of a quorum and, following procedure, Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the time be equally divided between Republicans and Democrats for the remaining period of morning business.

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

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING). Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROTECTING WATER AND PROPERTY RIGHTS

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, today I rise in support of Barrasso amendment No. 3453 to the underlying bill. This amendment actually has 36 cosponsors—36 of my fellow colleagues have cosponsored legislation called the Protecting Water and Property Rights Act of 2014, and this legislation is identical to the amendment we have on the floor today.

The amendment restricts the expansion of Federal authority by this administration's EPA to encompass all the wet areas on farms, ranches, and suburban homes all across America. More specifically, the amendment eliminates the administration's proposed rule—a rule to implement this

expansion of Federal authority, an expansion which I don't think the Federal Government should have or does have. But we do have a recently proposed rule, and through this proposed rule, Federal agencies are attempting to expand the definition of waters of the United States. They want to expand the definition—it is a specific term, waters of the United States—to now include ditches and other dry areas where water does flow, but only flows during a short duration, basically after a rainfall. Federal regulations have never defined ditches and other upland drainage features as waters of the United States. So this is an expansion of the way we view waters of the United States.

This proposed rule does and will have a huge impact on farmers, ranchers, and small businesses needing to put a shovel into the ground to make a living. The rule, in a sense, amounts to a user's fee for farmers and ranchers to use their own land after it rains. It forces suburban homeowners to pay the EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers to use their backyards after a storm.

To me this is one of the worst things we could ever do to Americans, let alone during this poor economy. That is why the Protecting Water and Private Property Rights Act is endorsed by the American Farm Bureau and the National Cattlemen's Beef Association. It is endorsed by the National Federation of Independent Business and by the American Land Rights Association. They have endorsed this amendment because they know how devastating the rule is to farmers, ranchers, small business owners, and even to homeowners.

This administration claims it is providing flexibility for farmers and ranchers in the proposed rule, but farmers and ranchers across the country who read this are not deceived.

Bob Stallman, president of the American Farm Bureau, released a statement on June 11 of this year stating that ''the rule would micro-manage farming via newly-mandated procedures for fencing, spraying, weeding and more. Permitting meanwhile, could delay time-sensitive tasks for months, potentially ruining crops in the process.''

According to the June edition of the publication National Cattleman in an article entitled ''EPA's Ag Exemptions for WOTUS,'' waters of the United States, the article states: ''Although agriculture exemptions are briefly included, they don't come close to meeting the needs of cattlemen and women across the country.''

The president of the National Cattlemen's Beef Association, Bob McCan, stated in an article:

> For example, wet spots or areas in a pasture that have standing water, under this rule, could potentially be affected. We'd now need permission to travel and move cattle across these types of areas.

The article lists some of the major areas of agriculture which are not exempted by the EPA's proposed rule. The article states:

> Activities not covered by the exemptions include introduction of new cultivation techniques, planting different crops, changing crops to pasture, changing pasture to crops, changing cropland to orchard/vineyard and changing cropland to nurseries.

Those activities are not included.

The rule also provides no flexibility for investments by small businesses across the country.

According to the National Federation of Independent Business:

> Unfortunately, despite claims by the Agencies, the proposed rule will only increase uncertainty.
>
> The proposed rule still requires the Agencies to determine on a case-by-case basis whether many common land formations fall under federal jurisdiction.
>
> Often, this determination does not occur until after substantial investments and planning by a small business have taken place—thus chilling investment and expansion. Small businesses cannot be speculative with their resources and capital.

Private property owners would also face no flexibility. My own constituent, Mr. Andy Johnson, Uinta County, WY, has been threatened by the EPA with penalties calculated to reach an estimated $187,000 a day for building what he believes is a stock pond on his property. In a month's time, he could be liable for more than $5 million in penalties.

What are homeowners to do when faced with this kind of threat? They could choose to fight city hall with limited resources or give in to strong-arming by the Federal Government. Given the Agency's plans to expand the jurisdictional limits of the Clean Water Act, the EPA could easily use the proposed rule to bankrupt small landowners for something as simple as building a pond or a ditch anywhere near a wetland or stream.

Congress never intended for the Clean Water Act to be used this way. To me it defies logic to think this proposed rule will benefit anybody but bureaucrats in Washington who are far removed from the communities between the coasts.

I think it is time for the EPA and Army Corps of Engineers to keep out of the lives of our constituents' backyards, and it is time to do it by opposing the proposed rule.

I wish to end with a broader point about how the Senate operates these days.

Today the Washington Post had an editorial specifically about the legislation, and it is entitled ''Clear rules for clean water,'' which is the proposal I have here today. The editorial board of the Washington Post writes: ''If lawmakers don't like the call the EPA is making''—and I don't like the call the EPA is making—''they should clarify the terminology themselves.''

In an ideal world, I agree with them. If we don't like something, we should be able to propose a better idea and then we should be allowed to vote on it in the Senate. The reality is the majority leader, Senator REID, has essentially shut down the Senate and refuses to allow us to vote on new ideas that would actually solve challenges such as this one.

In fact, Republicans and Democrats have proposed hundreds and hundreds of amendments, and we have only been able to vote on a very small number of those—and very select ones at that. The truth is the majority leader, HARRY REID, refuses to allow any votes on almost any amendment and is enforcing a gag order on real debate, discussion and, most importantly, on votes. He has imposed a gag order on important issues that impact the lives of all Americans.

To prove my point, I put together a chart. I wish to take a moment to review the voting record over the past full year in this body. This calendar has the headline ''Reid Blocks Votes.'' The Republican votes are in red. We have the last full year of calendar months, and July is down here as the 13th month because we started last year on July 1.

The red Xs are days when there were votes on Republican amendments, and votes on Democratic amendments are in blue. Over the past 12 months—from July of 2013 to July of 2014—Majority Leader REID has allowed Republicans to vote on their amendments a total of 8 days—8 days out of the entire 12 months there have been votes on Republican amendments. There have been a total of 11 amendments which Republicans have had a chance to offer and have votes on even though we have introduced hundreds of amendments.

It is interesting. HARRY REID has actually been tougher on his own party. The Democrats have been more restricted and more limited. If you look at this calendar, you will see the days in blue. HARRY REID has only allowed Democrats to vote 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 days over this past year that Democrats have had votes on their own amendments on the floor of the Senate. Over that time Democrats have proposed hundreds and hundreds—over 500—of amendments, and there have only been 7 Democratic amendments over the course of 5 days that have had a vote. Democrats have not had a vote on an amendment proposed by a Democratic Senator since March 27. It has been 103 days and counting since the Democrats have had an amendment that one of them has proposed and offered here in the Senate for a vote.

It is so interesting because as I look at the Presiding Officer—of the Democrats newly elected to the Senate in 2012, Members of the Presiding Officer's entire class have not had a single rollcall vote on one of their own amendments on the floor of the Senate—ever. It is an astonishing display of what the majority leader has done to muzzle an entire legislative body of both parties.

I will tell the Presiding Officer I think it is an embarrassing record. It is

an embarrassing record for the majority leader, and I think it is an embarrassing record for the Democrats—who control the Senate—to tolerate.

I think it is important for Americans to pay close attention to not just what Senators say when they go home, but actually what happens and what they do and what they stand for and what they vote on. So I would say the next time Democrats go home and tell their constituents they are introducing legislation to solve a problem, the constituents ought to ask, when? When is the vote? That is what I want to know. When is the vote? When is the vote, Mr. President? When is the vote, Senate Democrats? When is the vote, Majority Leader REID? When is the vote?

As usual, when the question is asked, silence. That is all we get in return.

So I actually believe we have a majority of Senators, Republicans and Democrats, who would actually vote to pass my amendment. This amendment I have to this bill on the floor—a majority of Senators, Republicans and Democrats, bipartisan, would vote to pass this amendment to stop the EPA's extreme takeover of waters across America. But under Senator REID's command-and-control style of leadership, I don't think we will ever know. I don't think we will have that vote, and I think Senator REID will block it.

So I would say that if my colleagues agree with the editorial board of the Washington Post, ''Clear rules for clean water''—today's Washington Post editorial—then they should be able to stand and be counted. Democrats should demand it. In the recent history of the United States, if that history is any indication, as we can see by this embarrassing vote calendar, I am not at all confident that this body will ever be given the opportunity to stand and be counted, and the reason is because Majority Leader REID won't allow Republicans or Democrats to vote on my amendment or hardly anyone else's amendment.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor, and I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Republicans control the time from 2 p.m. until 3 p.m. and the majority leader control the time from 3 p.m. until 4 p.m. today.

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

AFGHANISTAN

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I have just returned from Afghanistan, where I met with the two Presidential candidates, Dr. Ashraf Ghani and Dr. Abdullah. Both Dr. Ghani and Dr. Abdullah are impressive men who have committed to reformist agendas and campaigned throughout the country. Afghanistan is fortunate to have two such capable Presidential candidates.

In the course of my meetings with the two candidates last Sunday and indeed during many meetings over the years, each has told me that he appreciates the support the United States has provided to their country, and each will sign a bilateral security agreement with the United States as soon as possible after the next President is inaugurated.

This is a particularly sensitive time for Afghanistan, which has not had a peaceful transition of power in the 50 years since Zahir Shah was overthrown in a coup. More than 7 million ballots were cast in the first round of the Presidential election back in April, and more than 8 million ballots were recorded in the runoff election last month. All agree there was an impressive turnout in a country where the Taliban has repeatedly threatened violence against those who vote.

There have been dramatic improvements in Afghanistan over the last decade in the number of schools and universities, in the number of students and teachers—particularly female students and female teachers—in Afghan life expectancy, in average income, and in many other areas. The Afghan Army and the Afghan National Police, who have taken over security responsibility from U.S. and coalition forces, have shown great capability by successfully securing two rounds of elections and repelling a concerted Taliban attack in the Helmand region of the country.

If the ongoing dispute about the outcome of the Afghan Presidential election is not resolved in a fair and credible manner, however, these achievements would be at risk. The Taliban does not have the ability to defeat the Afghan Army or to take over Afghan cities and population centers. However, if a disputed election were to lead to infighting or to the establishment of parallel governments, the army could be severely weakened and divided, providing new opportunities for the Taliban.

The United States and our coalition allies would be much less likely to provide the continued military and economic assistance that Afghanistan needs if that country's leaders cannot pull together and resolve their disputes through the existing election process.

The State Department stated on Monday:

> The continued support of the United States for Afghanistan requires that Afghanistan remains united and that the result of this election is deemed credible.

Both candidates told me personally on Sunday that they believe a comprehensive audit of the election results is necessary and appropriate and that they will abide by the results of such an audit. They also stated that they understand the outcome of the election will not be final and will not be credible until such an audit has been completed.

The two campaign teams have been working with the United Nations and other international elections experts over the last few days to develop an appropriate audit scope to recommend to the elections commission. I had hoped that an agreement on this review could be announced at the same time that a preliminary vote count was released on Monday. While that did not happen, the head of the Independent Election Commission said the following:

> The announcement [of] preliminary results does not mean the winner has been announced. The investigation of votes could have impacts on the final results.

The two campaigns have already agreed on audit triggers that will result in the review of nearly half of the ballots cast, but they have not yet reached full agreement on the measures to be taken. I hope they will be able to do so in the very near future. But this is the bottom line: Whether or not they are able to reach agreement in full, the Electoral Complaints Commission, working with the Independent Election Commission, has a responsibility to decide how many ballots to audit, and they have that responsibility on their own initiative. The Independent Election Commission must then announce a winner.

The path to resolution of the matter is not unclear. On the contrary, the Afghan Constitution and election law are very clear. There is no uncertainty about this path. The Independent Election Commission and the Electoral Complaints Commission have the responsibility to proceed on their own to determine how many ballots need to be audited and to conduct an audit with or without the agreement of the candidates. Indeed, the United Nations Assistance Mission in Afghanistan has already called on the election commissions to do just that.

I said to the two candidates on Sunday that the Afghan people and the Afghan security forces have shown great bravery in standing up for their country and that it is now time for the country's leaders to do the same. It would be truly unfortunate if the great progress made in Afghanistan at the expense of so much Afghan, American, and coalition blood and treasure were to be jeopardized by political infighting and the failure of political leadership.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF JULIAN CASTRO TO BE SECRETARY OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

NOMINATION OF DARCI L. VETTER TO BE CHIEF AGRICULTURAL NEGOTIATOR, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR

NOMINATION OF WILLIAM D. ADAMS TO BE CHAIRPERSON OF THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nominations of Julian Castro, of Texas, to be Secretary of Housing and Urban Development; Darci L. Vetter, of Nebraska, to be Chief Agricultural Negotiator, Office of the United States Trade Representative, with the rank of Ambassador; and William D. Adams, of Maine, to be Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Humanities.

VOTE ON CASTRO NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form prior to the vote on the Castro nomination.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, I support the nomination of Mayor Julian Castro to be the next Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

As Mayor of San Antonio, Mayor Castro has been on the front lines of helping his community reach its housing and economic development goals. In his tenure as mayor, he has focused on attracting well-paying jobs in 21st century industries, raising educational attainment, and revitalizing the city's urban core. HUD is a critical partner in these efforts nationwide. Mayor Castro will bring both direct experience with and an appreciation of the importance of HUD's programs to families and communities to the role of HUD Secretary.

Mayor Castro's nomination has been endorsed by a wide spectrum of stakeholders, including the National Association of Realtors, National Association of Homebuilders, and housing, local government, civil rights and Hispanic leadership organizations. He has also been endorsed by several recent HUD Secretaries who have served in both Democratic and Republican administrations, including Henry Cisneros and former Senator Mel Martinez.

I urge my colleagues to support Mayor Castro's nomination.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Julian Castro, of Texas, to be Secretary of Housing and Urban Development?

Mr. GRASSLEY. 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 legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

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

The result was announced—yeas 71, nays 26, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 219 Ex.]

YEAS—71

Alexander	Gillibrand	Murkowski
Ayotte	Graham	Murphy
Baldwin	Hagan	Murray
Begich	Harkin	Nelson
Bennet	Heinrich	Portman
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Pryor
Blunt	Heller	Reed
Booker	Hirono	Reid
Boxer	Hoeven	Rubio
Brown	Isakson	Sanders
Cantwell	Johanns	Schumer
Cardin	Johnson (SD)	Shaheen
Carper	Kaine	Shelby
Casey	King	Stabenow
Chambliss	Klobuchar	Tester
Cochran	Landrieu	Udall (CO)
Collins	Leahy	Udall (NM)
Coons	Levin	Walsh
Corker	Manchin	Warner
Cornyn	Markey	Warren
Donnelly	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Durbin	Menendez	Wicker
Feinstein	Merkley	Wyden
Franken	Mikulski	

NAYS—26

Barrasso	Flake	Moran
Boozman	Grassley	Paul
Burr	Hatch	Risch
Coats	Inhofe	Roberts
Coburn	Johnson (WI)	Scott
Crapo	Kirk	Sessions
Cruz	Lee	Thune
Enzi	McCain	Toomey
Fischer	McConnell	

NOT VOTING—3

Rockefeller	Schatz	Vitter

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON VETTER NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate divided in the usual form.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I yield back the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Darci L. Vetter, of Nebraska, to be Chief Agricultural Negotiator, Office of the United States Trade Representative, with the rank of Ambassador?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON ADAMS NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate divided in the usual form.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the nomination of Dr. William ''Bro'' Adams to be Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities, NEH.

The NEH is one of the largest supporters of humanities programs in the United States. The individual scholars, museums, libraries, universities, and other cultural institutions it supports enrich communities across the country. Through his extensive and impressive work in public service, education, and the humanities, Dr. Adams is well-qualified to lead the Endowment.

A Vietnam war veteran, Fulbright Scholar, college president, and board member for both the Maine Film Center and the Maine Public Broadcasting Corporation, Dr. Adams' diverse experiences have prepared him to lead the Nation's cultural agency. He is a graduate of Colorado College and earned his Ph.D. in the history of consciousness from the University of California at Santa Cruz.

Dr. Adams recently retired from a successful tenure as president of Colby College in Waterville, ME, where he served from 2000 through June of this year. He launched and executed an ambitious plan to expand the school and its cultural presence, overseeing a $376 million capital campaign—the largest ever in the State of Maine. In doing so, Dr. Adams helped found the Goldfarb Center for Public Affairs and Civic Engagement, construct the Diamond Building for Social Sciences, launch a film studies program, and expand Colby's creative writing curriculum. Additionally, he played a pivotal role in growing Colby's Museum of Art into one of the largest art collections in Maine.

Under Dr. Adams' leadership, Colby College has supported several projects that have helped to reinvigorate the humanities in the Waterville community. These have included forging partnerships on major renovation projects such as of the Waterville Opera House, the Hathaway Creative Center's historic mill property, the Waterville Public Library, and the Maine Film Center.

Dr. Adams is a proven leader whose engagement and direction have enriched the State of Maine. I am confident that Bro Adams will lead the NEH and serve our country with great vision and integrity. I urge my colleagues to support this nomination.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the time be yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of William D. Adams, of Maine, to be Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Humanities for a term of 4 years?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

BIPARTISAN SPORTSMEN'S ACT OF 2014

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 2363, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read the motion as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 384, S. 2363, a bill to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time is considered expired.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2363) to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3469

Mr. REID. On behalf of Senator UDALL of Colorado, I call up amendment No. 3469.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the Udall of Colorado amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], and Mr. RISCH, for Mr. UDALL of Colorado, proposes an amendment numbered 3469.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To clarify a provision relating to the non-Federal share of the cost of acquiring land for, expanding, or constructing a public target range)

On page 14, line 25, insert ''use the funds apportioned to it under section 4(c) to'' after ''a State may''.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3490

Mr. REID. I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 3490 to amendment No. 3469.

The amendment is as follows:

In the amendment, on line 1, strike the word ''the''.

MOTION TO COMMIT WITH AMENDMENT NO. 3491

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have a motion to commit S. 2363, and it has instructions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The bill clerk read the motion as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] moves to commit the bill to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources with instructions to report back forthwith the following amendment numbered 3491.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end, add the following:

This Act shall become effective 3 days after enactment.

Mr. REID. I ask for the yeas and nays on that motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3492

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 3492 to the instructions to the motion to commit.

The amendment is as follows:

In the amendment, strike ''3 days'' and insert ''4 days''.

Mr. REID. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3493

Mr. REID. I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 3493.

The amendment is as follows:

In the amendment, strike ''4'' and insert ''5''.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. I have a cloture motion at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on S. 2363, a bill to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes.

Harry Reid, Kay R. Hagan, Patrick J. Leahy, Tim Kaine, Angus S. King, Jr., Thomas R. Carper, Bill Nelson, Jon Tester, Patty Murray, Claire McCaskill, Mark Begich, Sheldon Whitehouse, Martin Heinrich, Debbie Stabenow, Tom Harkin, Tom Udall, Joe Donnelly.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

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

TERRORISM RISK INSURANCE PROGRAM AUTHORIZATION ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to Calendar No. 438, S. 2244.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 438, S. 2244, a bill to extend the termination date of the Terrorism Insurance Program established under the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

BIPARTISAN SPORTSMEN'S ACT

Mr. REID. I want the record to reflect how much I appreciate the hard work of the Senator from North Carolina, Senator HAGAN, working on this bipartisan bill. She did it with the ranking member of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, Senator MURKOWSKI, and they have done good work coming up with this bill.

But the Senator from Alaska spoke this morning about her desire for consideration of amendments. Typical, typical, typical of the last 6 years here. This bill has 26 Republican cosponsors. This bill was brought up 2 years ago. They have worked hard to improve the bill since then, and you would think with 26 Republican cosponsors to this bill we could move forward on it. But, as usual, they come down here and they say, well, a good bill, but we want to have a bunch of amendments.

I am all for consideration of amendments on this bill. We all are. But the Republicans can't agree on what amendments they want.

I just met with a number of people earlier today about this and explained to them how we used to do things. There wasn't on virtually every piece of legislation a necessity to get cloture on a bill and now even to get on a bill we need cloture, as we find on the bill we just finished some procedural work on, the sportsmen's bill. It affects millions and millions of Americans, but they want amendments. They want amendments because they want to kill the bill as they have tried to kill everything in the last 6 years.

So I repeat, I am all for consideration of amendments. But as we have repeatedly done, we need to have a list of amendments from which to work. Senators have for decades and decades started with a list of amendments and worked through those lists. So I ask Republicans, if you want an amendment process, bring me a reasonable list that leads to passage of the bill.

They can't do that because they can't agree on what amendments they want, and there are so many examples. Energy efficiency is something similar to this, where the senior Senator from New Hampshire worked on a bill with—it doesn't matter if it was the senior or junior Senator—Senator PORTMAN. They worked together on this legislation for months and months—in fact, about a year—and we had a bill on the floor and we were moving forward. I was told before the bill, by the Republicans, let's get this done; it is a great bill.

So I am again reflecting on what happened with the history here.

They said before recess, we need a sense-of-the-Senate on Keystone. I said we have an agreement. Why do we need to do that? But I said OK, a few hours later, you want that, let's do it, because this bill is important.

We need to do that. The recess was a week. We came back. They said: Well, we want to change things a little bit. We want an up-or-down vote on Keystone. They keep changing things. That is not right.

I said: OK, we will vote on Keystone.

They couldn't take yes for an answer. We agreed for an up-or-down vote for Keystone. They wouldn't take it. It is the same thing on this, a bill the Republicans support. They oppose their own legislation. So we are going to move forward.

Now we have the terrorism insurance legislation that I just moved to proceed to. This is an important piece of legislation. Let's hope we can get this done. If we can't, construction in America—whether it is in Indiana, Nevada, Maryland, Iowa, Oregon or Mississippi; it doesn't matter where it is—won't go forward because people won't be able to get insurance.

So I would hope we can get this bill done, but we will see. There are discussions going on, and we will get the same: Yes, I think we can work something out. But when it comes right down to it, Republicans can't agree on what they want. I hope on that important piece of legislation we can get a list of amendments from the Republicans. I am told they are willing to do that. I hope that in fact is the case, because it would be a shame for our country if we couldn't get this done.

The economy is doing better. We added almost 300,000 jobs last reporting period. But if we can't get this done and we can't get the highway bill done, it is going to be a slam to our economy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to enter into a colloquy with my colleagues Senator WICKER and Senator HARKIN.

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

U.S. HELSINKI COMMISSION

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I have the honor of being the Senate chair of the U.S. Helsinki Commission, and the ranking Republican Member is Senator WICKER. We join with our House colleagues in the work of the Helsinki Commission.

I mention that because this past week, from June 28 through July 2, the 23rd Annual Parliamentary Assembly was held in Baku, Azerbaijan, in which over 300 parliamentarians participated. We had a very strong representation from the Senate and the House of Representatives representing the United States. I was proud to join with Senator WICKER and Senator HARKIN as well as Congressman SMITH, Congressman ADERHOLT, Congressman GINGREY, Congressman SCHWEIKERT, and Congressman SCHIFF in representing U.S. interests.

By way of background for some of my colleagues who may not be familiar, the Helsinki Commission is a U.S. participant in the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. This followed up on the Helsinki Accords which took place in 1975, when all the countries of Europe—including the Soviet Union—joined the United States and Canada and agreed to principles that recognized the importance of good governance, human rights, and economic opportunities, as well as territorial security, in order to have stability within the OSCE participating States. The United States has been an active participant in this process.

I think we saw the value of the OSCE directly when Russia invaded Crimea, and the OSCE mission there was our eyes and ears on the ground and helped restore some semblance of order in Ukraine as it now is moving forward.

In our work in Baku, we were representing the United States on some extremely important issues, and I will talk about some of those issues and my colleagues on the floor are going to talk about issues they championed.

But I must say, Russia sent a very strong delegation to Baku to represent their country. On behalf of the U.S. delegation, I brought forward a resolution in regard to violations entitled: ''Clear, Gross and Uncorrected Violations of Helsinki Principles by the Russian Federation.'' This resolution became the principal debate of the 23rd Parliamentary Assembly.

We held a plenary debate. We don't normally do that. We normally debate issues in different committees, but the entire assembly debated the issues concerning Russia's activities within Ukraine because of the seriousness of this matter.

Russia violated all 10 core principles of OSCE. We had that in the resolution. We were very clear about that. We believe that the best way to bring about compliance with these universal values is to put a spotlight on those who are violating them.

In Russia's invasion into Ukraine and taking over Crimea and in their interference in Eastern Ukraine, they have violated each of the 10 core principles including: sovereign equality, refraining from the use of force, inviolability of frontiers, territorial integrity of states, peaceful settlement of disputes, nonintervention in internal affairs, respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, equal rights and self-determination of peoples, cooperation among states, and fulfillment in good faith of obligations under international law.

Our delegation brought that forward. Russia countered with justifications we found totally unacceptable, but it was a very spirited debate. Many amendments were offered to our resolution because by the time we debated the resolution and the time we filed it, there had been some changes in Russia's behavior. So the resolution was actually made stronger through the amendment process, which is what we intended at the time.

Russia made various pleas to try to delete various sections of our resolution. By an overwhelming vote of the parliamentarians of Europe, Central Asia, the United States, and Canada, we passed this resolution that the United States brought forward pointing out the clear violation of Russia's commitments under the OSCE in its activities in Ukraine. It passed by over a 3-to-1 vote among the parliamentarians. We were very proud of the work we had done to bring forward that clear statement on behalf of the parliamentarians of the OSCE.

I am extremely proud of the role my colleagues played. We were involved in many other issues. Senator WICKER was one of the key spokesmen on several issues relating to our involvement within the OSCE. He was involved in bringing out our involvement in Afghanistan, which is of continued interest.

In addition to the 57 participating countries of the OSCE, we have partners of cooperation. These are countries not located within our geographical bounds but which have interests in the OSCE. Afghanistan is one of our partners for cooperation.

We just finished a hearing of the Helsinki Commission on our Mediterranean partners, which includes Tunisia, Algeria, Israel, Jordan, and Egypt, and we worked with Morocco—all partners for cooperation. So the reach of Helsinki is far beyond just Europe and Central Asia. In this parliamentary assembly, we took up issues that involved many of these other matters.

Mr. President, I yield for my colleague Senator WICKER for comments he might wish to make with regard to the work we did in Baku.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, I thank my two colleagues from the other side of the aisle for joining with us today in this colloquy.

Let me say how proud I was as a Republican Senator from Mississippi to

stand shoulder to shoulder with my colleague from Maryland BEN CARDIN. There are probably many places in Maryland he would rather have been at the beginning of July 2014, but he is someone who year after year has taken the time to travel to sometimes some rather unknown capital cities such as Baku or Chisinau, Moldova, and represent the United States in our partnership with the OSCE on the Helsinki Commission.

As Senator CARDIN said, the 1975 Final Act of the Helsinki Commission recognized 10 principles that 57 countries in Europe and Eurasia said we believe we can stand by and live with and live under, issues such as territorial integrity, sovereignty, refraining from the use of force—very important cornerstones of peace, democracy, self-determination and the rule of law in Europe.

It is certainly a fact well known within the OSCE and the delegations that come from far and wide to attend these that BEN CARDIN is respected internationally, that his word carries weight, that he speaks on behalf of the United States of America, and on behalf of the OSCE countries with authority, evenhandedness, and fairness. So I think it meant a lot for someone of Senator CARDIN's stature to come forward and present these.

Indeed, we did have overwhelming support for the supplemental item authored by Senator CARDIN. The amendments to water it down by the Russian delegation were rejected time and again by overwhelming votes. In the end the final resolution was adopted by over 90 votes in favor of the Cardin resolution and only 30 votes against it. Of course, the delegates from the Russian Federation and several of their closest allies and neighbors voted against it. But country after country, delegation after delegation, small brave nation after small brave nation voted in favor of it because internationally we realized that the words of the resolution were correct.

The action of Russia in Crimea—invading this defenseless peninsula and annexing it illegally—that action violated all 10 principles of the Helsinki Final Act, and it needed to be said. It needed to be said not only by the United Nations, which has in effect said this in the General Assembly, and it needed not only to be said by a major power like the United States of America, through our State Department and through the Congress, but it also needed to be said by the collective body that represents these 57 countries from Europe and Eurasia.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the final supplemental item as adopted by the Parliamentary Assembly be printed in the RECORD.

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

BAKU DECLARATION AND RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE OSCE PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY AT THE TWENTY-THIRD ANNUAL SESSION

[Baku, 28 June to 2 July 2014]

RESOLUTION ON CLEAR, GROSS AND UNCORRECTED VIOLATIONS OF HELSINKI PRINCIPLES BY THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

1. Noting that the Russian Federation is a participating State of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe and has therefore committed itself to respect the Principles guiding relations between participating States as contained in the Helsinki Final Act,

2. Recalling that those principles include (1) Sovereign equality, respect for the rights inherent in sovereignty; (2) Refraining from the threat or use of force; (3) Inviolability of frontiers; (4) Territorial integrity of States; (5) Peaceful settlement of disputes; (6) Non intervention in internal affairs; (7) Respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms; (8) Equal rights and self-determination of peoples; (9) Co-operation among States; and (10) Fulfilment in good faith of obligations under international law,

3. Recalling also that the Russian Federation is a signatory, along with the United States of America and the United Kingdom, of the December 1994 Budapest Memorandum on Security Assurances, which was made in connection with Ukraine's accession to the Treaty on Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons,

4. Concluding that the Russian Federation has, since February 2014, violated every one of the ten Helsinki principles in its relations with Ukraine, some in a clear, gross and thus far uncorrected manner, and is in violation with the commitments it undertook in the Budapest Memorandum, as well as other international obligations,

5. Emphasizing in particular that the 16 March 2014 referendum in Crimea was held in clear violation of the Constitution of Ukraine and the Constitution of Crimea as an autonomous republic within Ukraine, and was further conducted in an environment that could not be considered remotely free and fair,

6. Expressing concern that the Russian Federation continues to violate its international commitments in order to make similarly illegitimate claims in the eastern part of Ukraine, as it has done, and threatens to continue to do, in regard to other participating States,

7. Asserting that improved democratic practices regarding free and fair elections, adherence to the rule of law and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms in the Russian Federation would benefit the citizens of that State but also contribute significantly to stability and confidence among its neighbours, as well as enhance security and co operation among all the participating States,

8. Noting the particular vulnerability of Crimean Tatars, Roma, Jews and other minority groups, along with those Ukrainian citizens opposed to the actions undertaken or supported by the Russian Federation, to attacks, harassment and intimidation by Russian supported separatist forces,

9. Welcoming the efforts and initiatives of the OSCE to develop a presence in Ukraine, including Crimea, that would support de-escalation of the current situation and monitor and encourage respect for the Helsinki principles, including the human rights and fundamental freedoms of all Ukrainian citizens, as well as the work of the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities, the OSCE Representative on Freedom of the Media, and the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR),

The OSCE Parliamentary Assembly:

10. Condemns the clear, gross and uncorrected violation of the Helsinki principles by the Russian Federation with respect to Ukraine, including the particularly egregious violation of that country's sovereignty and territorial integrity;

11. Condemns the occupation of the territory of Ukraine;

12. Considers these actions, which include military aggression as well as various forms of coercion designed to subordinate the rights inherent in Ukraine's sovereignty to the Russian Federation's own interests, to have been unprovoked, and to be based on completely unfounded premises and pretexts;

13. Expresses unequivocal support for the sovereignty, political independence, unity and territorial integrity of Ukraine as defined by the country's Constitution and within its internationally recognized borders;

14. Affirms the right of Ukraine and all participating States to belong, or not to belong, to international organizations, to be or not to be a party to bilateral or multilateral treaties including the right to be or not to be a party to treaties of alliance, or to neutrality;

15. Views the 16 March 2014 referendum in Crimea as an illegitimate and illegal act, the results of which have no validity whatsoever;

16. Calls upon all participating States to refuse to recognize the forced annexation of Crimea by the Russian Federation;

17. Also calls upon all participating States further to support and adhere to mutually agreed and fully justified international responses to this crisis;

18. Deplores the armed intervention by forces under the control of the Russian Federation in Ukraine, and the human rights violations that they continue to cause;

19. Calls on the Russian Federation to end its intervention in Ukraine and to bring itself into compliance with the Helsinki principles in its relations with Ukraine and with all other participating States;

20. Demands that the Russian Federation desist from its provocative military overflights of the Nordic-Baltic region, immediately withdraw its military forces from the borders of the Baltic States and cease its subversive activities within the ethnic Russian populations of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania;

21. Supports continued efforts and initiatives of the OSCE to respond to this crisis, and calls on all OSCE states to provide both resources and political support and to allow the OSCE to work unhindered throughout Ukraine, including Crimea;

22. Urges the Russian Federation to contribute to regional stability and confidence, generally enhance security and co-operation by engaging its civil society and all political forces in a discussion leading to liberalization of its restrictive laws, policies and practices regarding freedom of the media, freedom of speech, and freedom of assembly and association, and abide by its other commitments as a participating State of the OSCE;

23. Encourages Ukraine to remain committed to OSCE norms regarding the building of democratic institutions, adherence to the rule of law and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms of all its citizens;

24. Exhorts the Russian Federation to fully utilize the expertise and assistance of the OSCE and its institutions, including the Parliamentary Assembly, to enact meaningful improvements in its electoral laws and practices;

25. Congratulates the people of Ukraine and commends the authorities of that country for successfully holding presidential elections on 25 May 2014 which were conducted largely in line with international commitments and characterized by a high voter

turnout despite a challenging political, economic and, in particular, security environment;

26. Expresses a continued willingness to provide the substantial assistance to Ukraine in these and other matters at this critical time.

Mr. WICKER. It may be that Senator HARKIN will want to touch on this issue also, but I think it is significant that we have such great leadership in both bodies—in the Senate and in the House—with the OSCE, people who are willing to take the time to get to know our European neighbors at the parliamentary level and have that exchange there, people such as Congressman ROBERT ADERHOLT, who is a vice president of the Parliamentary Assembly and who has been very diligent, again, in traveling to some of these exotic locations that nobody perhaps envies; and Congressman CHRIS SMITH, a veteran House Member who speaks out so eloquently and so firmly not only for the rule of law and human rights internationally, but he has actually been recognized by the Parliamentary Assembly as a special representative on the issue of human rights and trafficking. I commend our colleague from the House of Representatives Chairman SMITH for his leadership in getting passed a resolution condemning the trafficking of minors internationally and getting the Parliamentary Assembly to make a strong statement on the record on this very serious problem that faces, not only us here domestically, but also on the international front.

Mr. CARDIN. Will my colleague yield on that point.

Mr. WICKER. Indeed.

Mr. CARDIN. I appreciate the Senator mentioning Congressman SMITH's resolution on child sex trafficking. That was a separate resolution that was approved by the parliamentary assembly. The Helsinki Commission has been in the forefront on trafficking issues. The Trafficking in Persons Report that is prepared annually is used by the State Department and is known globally as the document on evaluating how States have proceeded on trafficking issues.

The work started in the parliamentary assembly of the OSCE, to the leadership of our commission and Congressman SMITH who has been our champion. It led to the passage of legislation in 2000 that had the Trafficking in Persons Report and followed up with this year's parliamentary assembly on child sex trafficking. I do congratulate Chairman SMITH and our delegation for continuing the sensitivity. The OSCE now has a special representative in trafficking. So you do provide technical assistance in each of our participating States to deal with the trafficking issue.

I wanted to point out that we do a lot of our work in the three committees, and one of those committees is where Senator HARKIN was extremely valuable in pointing out that the original document prepared by the committee did not mention the very important human rights concerns of people with disabilities. There is no stronger voice in the Senate than Senator HARKIN with regard to the rights of people with disabilities. I must tell you, I heard from many of my colleagues in the parliamentary assembly how honored they were that Senator HARKIN was in that room to bring this issue to the attention of the parliamentary assembly, to give it its proper attention, and the matters he brought forward were overwhelmingly adopted at the parliamentary assembly.

If I might yield for Senator HARKIN to talk a little bit about the work he did in that group.

Mr. HARKIN. First, I want to thank my colleagues Senators CARDIN and WICKER for their leadership in the OSCE.

I was honored to join my colleagues Senator CARDIN and Senator WICKER last week at the 23rd annual session of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, OSCE, in Baku, Azerbaijan. It's important that Members of Congress uphold our shared interests and responsibilities in this vital organization, whose mission is to address issues of national and regional security, to promote mutual economic prosperity, and to improve the lives of citizens in all OSCE member States, especially through promotion of human rights.

I was proud to be part of the eight-member delegation from the United States led by Senator CARDIN, who is Chairman of the U.S. Helsinki Commission, our lead entity for participation in the OSCE. I congratulate Chairman CARDIN and the U.S. Commission's co-chairman, Representative CHRIS SMITH, on their accomplishments in advancing security and human rights last week. Chairman CARDIN was able to pass a needed resolution holding Russia accountable for violating OSCE principles and its own international commitments through its destabilizing actions in Ukraine. And Representative SMITH achieved passage of a key measure at the Assembly to help combat child sex trafficking.

As my colleagues have stated, the OSCE and thus also the U.S. Helsinki Commission were formed to ensure there is long-term security for the Europe and its allies and to promote cooperation among member States. Part of that cooperation is to foster economic development and growth, and it was within this area of cooperation that I sought to direct my efforts last week as a U.S. delegation member.

The Assembly's Second Committee, the Committee on Economic Affairs, Science, Technology and the Environment, is charged with promoting activities that will enhance the economic development of member States. It was there that I was able to offer three amendments to this year's committee resolution focusing on individuals with disabilities.

I am grateful that all three amendments were adopted. The economic health of all nations is tied to equal opportunity and equal protection for all citizens.

Our own Americans with Disabilities Act recognizes the importance of opportunity and access in daily life for all citizens, particularly those with disabilities. Without access, without equal opportunity, people with disabilities are relegated to poverty and second class citizenship.

My amendments to the Second Committee resolution called for three things: ensuring equal opportunity and access for all persons with disabilities in daily activities of all member states; the ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities by all OSCE members; and the prohibition of discrimination against people with disabilities in employment and the workplace.

As I mentioned, I am happy that these amendments could pass with overwhelming support and were added to the final resolution of the Second Committee. They were then subsequently adopted by the full Parliamentary Assembly as part of what will now be known as the ''Baku Declaration.''

I thank our leader Senator CARDIN for inviting me to this important meeting and allowing me the opportunity to offer these amendments which focus on the issue of equal opportunity for people with disabilities in the member States and across the globe.

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, I congratulate my colleague from Iowa, a senior Member of this body, someone who is respected around the globe for being willing to meet fellow parliamentarians and to successfully put forward language that was adopted by consensus.

If I could mention a couple of other matters that pertain to this trip, First of all, it is interesting that the capital of Azerbaijan, Baku, on the western shore of the Caspian Sea, would be the host of this parliamentary assembly.

Azerbaijan is an important ally of the United States. I think it is important for Americans and for Members to know that their neighbor to the north is Russia and their neighbor to the south is Iran. This is a very tough neighborhood that our ally exists in. Yet they are oriented to the West. They are oriented to the United States. They want to be allies of ours. They were steadfast friends of ours in Afghanistan and have been during the entire time we have been there. They are steadfast allies of the Nation of Israel. Again, I think for a majority Muslim State such as Azerbaijan to take that stand in a troubling neighborhood speaks well of them. There are steps we wish they would take further toward transparency and openness and the rule of law, and maybe their elections weren't all we hoped for in the past, but they are an ally that continues to make progress. So I salute our host nation.

I think it should also be said, and I will yield to Senator CARDIN on this point, that we stopped back by Chisinau, Moldova, on our way back from Baku, a member of the OSCE, a nation that is also in a troubling neighborhood that feels the breath of Moscow breathing down their collars and the threats by people from the Russian Federation who would like to exert undue influence on that great little nation.

It happened that we were there on the day the Moldovan Parliament ratified the agreement associating Moldova with the European Union. This was a wonderful day for the friends of freedom and the European-oriented citizens of Moldova. It was great to see the young people walking through the city with the flag and hear Beethoven's Ode to Joy, the European anthem, as it were, and to be there for this very significant, pivotal day in the history of Moldova and to say we will continue to stand with the great people of that country. I know Senator CARDIN was thinking of those things when he scheduled that stop.

Mr. CARDIN. First, the Senator was able to meet with the President of Azerbaijan. We thank him for that. He was able to adjust his calendar to do that and we appreciate it because it was very important to hear the message the Senator gave on the floor of the Senate.

Azerbaijan is an important ally to the United States. They have issues they need to deal with on human rights. We were clear about that. We met with the NGO community while we were there. But I think the Senator's leadership and the way the Senator balanced that presentation was very important.

There is also the energy issue with Azerbaijan that is very important to us in that region as an energy source for Europe. It is an important, strategic country.

And, yes, they do have issues on human rights. We did meet with the NGOs and we will continue to voice those concerns.

I am glad the Senator from Mississippi mentioned Chisinau and Moldova. We also on the way visited Georgia, and Georgia and Moldova have some common interests: They are both moving toward Europe with the association agreements. They recognize their economic and political future is with Europe and they both have Russian troops in their country, and they are both very much concerned about what is happening in Ukraine. We got tremendous interest about what we did in Baku on taking on the Russians directly about their violations of the OSCE principles in their activities in Ukraine. Moldova, as you know, is in the Transnistria area which borders the Ukraine. There are Russian troops there, and the independence of Moldova is very much impacted by Russia's presence in Transnistria. Even though there is no border between Moldova and Russia, they still have that real threat that Russia could use its force to try to dictate policy in Moldova. And Georgia, of course, with the territories being controlled by the Russians—you saw what happened there, the bloodshed—is a country that is very much concerned about being able to control their own destiny. They want to be independent and they don't want to be dominated by Russia's intimidation. I think our presence in both of those countries was a clear signal that the United States stands for an independent Georgia and an independent Moldova. We want them to make their own decisions. We believe their future is clearly with integration into Europe. They believe their future is with integration into Europe and we will continue to be very supportive of those activities.

I have one more comment in regard to our work in Baku. There were a lot of issues that were taken up through declaration. For example, our delegation brought forward a resolution on the 10th anniversary of the Berlin conference dealing with antisemitism. Congressman SMITH and myself were both involved in the original Berlin issues.

My colleague has already put into the RECORD the resolution concerning Russia and Ukraine.

I must tell you I was so proud of my participation in this forum. I think the United States learned a lot more about the OSCE during the Ukraine crisis when they saw it was the OSCE mission that was on the ground giving us independent information about what was happening in Ukraine, the importance of our participation, and what Senator WICKER said in the beginning, our work here knows no political boundaries. This is not a partisan effort. It has been Democrats and Republicans working over the last 40 years to use the Helsinki principles to advance good governance, economic opportunity, and human rights throughout not just the OSCE countries but globally.

It has been a real pleasure to work with Senator WICKER on these issues and I thank him for his dedication and leadership. There has been no stronger voice on the floor of the Senate in regard to human rights issues. I have been on the floor listening to Senator WICKER as he talked about individual cases of human rights violations in Russia and other countries. He speaks his mind on these issues and I am proud to be associated with him on the Helsinki Commission.

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, I will let Senator CARDIN have the last word on this matter, and I see there are others who want to speak on other issues. Let me emphasize to everyone within the sound of our voices that diplomacy and foreign policy are carried out not only through the executive branch, the State Department, the other good offices that we have in the executive branch. Foreign policy is alive and well through the participation of Members of the House and Senate, the parliamentary assembly, and in the OSCE. It is important we keep our role there.

My hat is off to the leaders of this Congress—House and Senate—who have, over the years, been willing to exercise leadership and to earn credibility in the OSCE. I am proud to have stood with them this year in this delegation. I believe we came back with a better understanding.

I appreciate the role of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty in covering our participation there and getting that out to the rest of the world.

I am proud to have stood with this delegation—eight Members from the House and Senate, senior Members and relatively new ones. We stood for the principles of the rule of law and transparency and democracy among our allies in Europe and Eurasia.

I yield for my friend.

Mr. CARDIN. I wish to be identified with Senator WICKER's comments, and again I thank all the participants, the eight Members who took their time to participate on behalf of the United States.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT 50TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. DONNELLY. Madam President, to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the signing of the Civil Rights Act in 1964, I rise to pay tribute to a few Hoosier leaders who played important roles in the passing of this landmark legislation.

The story of the Civil Rights Act can be told through the leadership and vision of a long list of extraordinary Hoosiers, including many in the Indiana congressional delegation who supported the bill regardless of party. Yet to truly understand the Indiana leadership behind the Civil Rights Act, we need to start back home.

During World War II, Rev. Andrew Brown vowed to dedicate himself to social justice while in a hospital bed after being told by a doctor that one of his legs would need to be amputated. Brown promised God that if his leg was saved, he would spend the rest of his life fighting for justice for all people.

Later, recalling this moment during an interview, Brown said:

> That's the miracle in my life. That's the commitment that I made. . . . I'll keep fighting until I fall, because that's what I told God I would do.

Brown did just that. He went on to fight for civil rights as a young pastor at St. John's Missionary Baptist Church in Indianapolis in the 1950s and 1960s. Brown organized African Americans to show voting strength in 1963. He was the founder of the Indiana Black Expo, started Operation Breadbasket—a radio show devoted to promoting economic and social justice—and served as the president of the Indiana chapter of the NAACP.

He marched with Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., in Selma, AL, in 1965. He welcomed King directly into his home during trips to Indianapolis. He worked closely with Martin Luther King, Jr., on the national civil rights movement, and he was at the home of Dr. King's parents on the night of Dr. King's tragic assassination in April 1968.

Another renowned, homegrown Indiana leader was Willard Ransom. They are all featured here. After graduating from Harvard Law School as the only African-American member of his class, he was drafted into the military during World War II. While serving, Ransom spent much of his time in Alabama, where he was distraught by the discriminatory manner in which fellow Americans were being treated.

Resolving to see these practices come to an end, Ransom returned to his home community of Indianapolis, where he quickly became a leader in the fight for greater civil rights. He spoke against housing discrimination and school segregation. He played a role in drafting civil rights bills before the State legislature. He served as the State President of the NAACP five times, and he was the first African American to run for Congress in Marion County.

Henry Johnson Richardson, Jr., moved to Indianapolis from Alabama to attend Shortridge High School and went on to attend law school at Indiana University in Indianapolis. Richardson became a judge in Marion County and then a State representative during the struggle for civil rights.

He actively fought to desegregate schools and university housing and helped change the State Constitution to allow African Americans to serve in the Indiana National Guard.

These men brought together Hoosiers from every corner of the State, every socioeconomic class, race, and religion to further their efforts. They knew if we wanted to improve together, we have to work together.

In 1959 University of Notre Dame president Father Theodore Hesburgh and his fellow members of the Civil Rights Commission found themselves in Shreveport, LA, while conducting hearings across the country on voting rights. Noticing the Commission was uncomfortable in the heat of the Shreveport Air Force Base, Father Hesburgh made arrangements for the Commission to move their work to Notre Dame's research facility in the Presiding Officer's home State of Land O'Lakes, WI.

While the Commissioners relaxed and enjoyed the flight to their new location, Father Hesburgh reportedly sat in the back of the plane drafting resolutions that would come to make up the core of the Commission's report.

After an evening of fishing together in Land O'Lakes, WI, Father Hesburgh strategically presented the Commission with his 14 resolutions, 13 of which were approved unanimously.

After learning of how Father Hesburgh brought the potentially divided Commission together, President Eisenhower remarked, ''We have to put more fishermen on commissions and have more reports written at Land O'Lakes, Wisconsin.''

Congress would later go on to enact approximately 70 percent of the Commission's recommendations, including the recommendations in legislation such as the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Father Hesburgh knew that if we want to improve together, we have to work together.

A like-minded Indiana leader serving in the Senate in 1964 was Senator Birch Bayh, who was also the father of Evan.

On June 19, 1964, exactly 1 year after President John Kennedy submitted the Civil Rights Act to Congress, Senator Bayh helped the Senate pass the most important and sweeping civil rights legislation since Reconstruction.

The clerk announced the bill passed 73 to 27 at 7:40 p.m. According to a copy of a draft press release amongst Bayh's papers at Indiana University, Senator Bayh stated:

> Reason replaced emotion. Respect for another's view replaced blind refusal to hear a differing opinion . . . and when this bill is signed into law, we shall have established the basis for fulfillment of Thomas Jefferson's hope for a nation in which all of the people are treated equally under the law.

Indiana's other Senator, Vance Hartke, also helped to pass the Civil Rights Act out of the Senate on the evening of June 19, 1964. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., wrote Senator Hartke after the vote, saying:

> The devotees of civil rights in this country and freedom loving people the world over are greatly indebted to you for your support in passing the Civil Rights Act of 1964. I add to theirs my sincere and heartfelt gratitude.

Senators Bayh and Hartke brought to the Senate a belief that if we want to improve together, we have to work together.

Another Hoosier who stepped up to help shepherd through the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was then-minority leader of the House, Congressman Charles Halleck, from Rensselaer, IN.

While working to move civil rights legislation forward, President Kennedy and leaders in the House went to Minority Leader Halleck to ask for his help to get the bill through the Judiciary Committee. Congressman Halleck, despite having a small percentage of African-American constituents and despite receiving some criticism, agreed to help.

When the Civil Rights Act came to the Judiciary Committee, some committee members took issue with several of its provisions. After working with other committee members to take out some of the controversial provisions in the bill, Congressman Halleck and others went to work to convince their colleagues to support a more moderate version of the bill.

In the end, the bill passed the committee with bipartisan support. No one got 100 percent of what they wanted, but thanks to Congressman Halleck, the Judiciary Committee was able to move forward a strong bill of which both Republicans and Democrats could be proud.

In private conversations shortly thereafter, Congressman Halleck admitted that his vocal support for the Civil Rights Act was endangering his position as House minority leader. He said he would likely lose his position after the next elections because of his support, and he was right.

Despite the personal cost and consequences, Congressman Halleck's work to bring Republicans together with Democrats to support the Civil Rights Act was key to its success. He showed if we want to improve together, we have to work together.

On August 28, 1963, another Indiana Congressman stood behind Martin Luther King, Jr., on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial and bore witness to a speech that would change the arc of American history. John Brademas came from Mishawaka, IN, and grew up hearing stories of the KKK boycotting his father's restaurant simply because he was Greek Orthodox.

These stories, coupled with John's progressive Methodist faith, instilled in him a deep sense of social justice that guided him throughout his career in public service. Congressman Brademas became an instrumental supporter of civil rights during his 22 years in Congress.

After witnessing Dr. King's ''I Have a Dream'' speech, Congressman Brademas welcomed King to speak in Indiana's Third District. Years later, Coretta Scott King remembered his work and helped campaign for Brademas' last bid for reelection.

A pioneer in Federal education policy, Congressman Brademas worked hard to both integrate schools and increase their funding across the entire country.

Minority Leader Halleck and Congressman Brademas were not alone in supporting the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Indiana U.S. Congress Members Madden, Adair, Roush, Roudebush, Bray, Denton, Harvey, and Bruce all supported the Civil Rights Act to help it pass the House with bipartisan support on July 2, 1964. They knew that if we want to improve together, we have to work together.

The list of Hoosiers involved in fighting for civil rights is long, and we should not forget the everyday Hoosiers, the men and women who did their part in their daily lives to broaden opportunities for all Americans. We may never read their names in history books or know what the United States would be like if they had not done what they did, but what we do know is they understood that if we truly want to improve our country, to strengthen who we are as a people, we have to all work together.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 would not have passed without leaders who were willing to set aside their differences and work together. No one got everything they wanted, but America got what was so crucially needed. Our

country took a monumental leap forward.

This 50th anniversary is a powerful reminder that if we truly want to improve our country, we have to work together.

I am honored to follow in the footsteps of these and many more great Hoosiers who fought for civil rights. I am humbled to have the chance to talk about them today.

I thank the Presiding Officer and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

BIPARTISAN SPORTSMEN'S ACT

Mrs. HAGAN. Madam President, it is with great pride that I rise to speak about the Bipartisan Sportsmen's Act of 2014.

Before proceeding, I wish to thank Senator MURKOWSKI for being a true partner in developing and building support for the sportsmen's package. I am proud to say that by working together, the Bipartisan Sportsmen's Act is cosponsored by 18 Democrats, 26 Republicans, and 1 Independent. It is endorsed by a very diverse group of more than 40 different stakeholders.

When I became cochair of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus in early 2013, I was committed to advancing bipartisan legislation that would benefit our hunters, our anglers, and our outdoor recreation enthusiasts in North Carolina and around the country. Taken together, I believe the 12 bills included in this bipartisan act accomplish that objective and do so in a fiscally responsible manner. This package does not add a dime to our deficit. It actually raises $5 million over the next 10 years for deficit reduction.

Outdoor recreation activities are part of the fabric of North Carolina. From the Great Smoky Mountains National Park in the West to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore in the East, North Carolinians are passionate about the outdoors—me included. Hunting, fishing, and hiking are a way of life, and many of these traditions have been handed down through my own family.

According to a recent report, 1.4 million sports men and women call my State home, and that is nearly 20 percent of the State's entire population. In 2011 a total of 1.6 million people hunted or fished in North Carolina. To put that in perspective, that is roughly the same amount of people who live in the Raleigh and Durham metropolitan areas.

Nationwide, over 37 million people participate in these activities. That is the equivalent of the population of the State of California. While many of these men and women live in our rural areas, they are just as likely to hail from some of our much more urban areas.

To ensure that future generations have an opportunity to enjoy our great outdoors as we do today, this act, the Bipartisan Sportsmen's Act of 2014, reauthorizes several landmark conservation programs. For example, the package includes legislation to reauthorize NAWCA, which is our North American Wetlands Conservation Act. This voluntary initiative provides matching grants to organizations, States and local governments, and to private landowners to restore wetlands that are critical to our migratory birds. These partnerships actually generate $3 in non-Federal contributions for every dollar of Federal NAWCA funds, and they have actually preserved more than 27 million acres of habitat over the last two decades.

The benefits of this program to outdoor recreation enthusiasts nationwide cannot be overstated. The abundance of migratory birds, fish, and mammals supported by these wetlands translates into multibillion-dollar activities for hunting, fishing, and wildlife viewing. In North Carolina, NAWCA has advanced numerous projects to improve waterfowl habitats and to enable the acquisition of thousands of acres of land used for increasing public opportunities for activities of hunting, fishing, and other wildlife-associated recreation.

Here is a photo of the Cape Fear Arch region. As part of the Southeastern North Carolina Wetlands Initiative, the North Carolina Coastal Land Trust, Ducks Unlimited, the North Carolina Wildlife Resource Commission, and the Nature Conservancy received a $1 million NAWCA grant to protect wetlands and associated uplands in this Cape Fear Arch region. The Federal grant then is matched by close to $3 million in non-Federal funding.

The Bipartisan Sportsmen's Act also includes legislation sponsored by Senators HEINRICH and HELLER that reauthorizes the FLTFA, which is the Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act, which enables the Bureau of Land Management to sell public land to private owners, counties, and others for ranching, community development, and other projects. This ''land-for-land'' approach has created jobs and generated funding for the Bureau of Land Management, the U.S. Forest Service, the National Park Service, and the Fish and Wildlife Service to help those entities acquire critical inholdings of land from willing sellers. This takes place in 11 Western States as well as Alaska.

Our sportsmen's package also contains Senator WICKER's bipartisan bill that will enable hunters in all States to purchase duck stamps electronically. Currently, eight States are now participating in a private program that enables the issuance of e-duck stamps. Since that program began, hunters in those eight States have actually purchased 3.5 million electronic duck stamps.

I can personally vouch for the benefits of enabling hunters in all States to actually purchase duck stamps online. There have been occasions when members of my own family were unable to take a visitor hunting because we couldn't find a physical stamp. Let me give an example. Our son-in-law came to visit last year. My husband had planned to take him duck hunting. Unfortunately, three different places my husband visited were out of duck stamps. So now when my husband buys his duck stamps for the season, he purchases two or three extra just in case a family member or a visitor decides to go hunting with him.

Enabling all hunters to purchase these duck stamps online will not cost taxpayers any money, and it will help preserve additional wildlife habitat across the country because a portion of the proceeds of duck stamps goes to protecting the habitat.

Another bipartisan bill in this package reauthorizes the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, NFWF. This poster actually shows the number of different habitats that are included in the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation. For example, in Florida right now there are 658 different preserves and projects.

The National Fish and Wildlife Foundation is a nonprofit that preserves and restores native wildlife species and habitats. Since its inception, NFWF has awarded over 11,600 grants to more than 4,000 different organizations nationwide. Funding from the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation consistently generates $3 in non-Federal funds for every $1 in Federal funds.

One priority that NFWF is currently working on is designed to introduce America's youth to careers in conservation. In addition to employing youth, NFWF is also exploring ways to expand conservation employment opportunities for our Nation's veterans.

Our package also includes regulatory reforms and enhancements that will benefit sports men and women across the country. Another example is bipartisan legislation that was introduced by Senator MARK UDALL of Colorado. His bill is included, and it will enable States to allocate a greater portion of the Federal Pittman-Robertson funding to create and maintain shooting ranges on public lands. There is currently a shortage of public shooting ranges across the country. In North Carolina, a principal impediment to target range development is the initial cost of acquiring the land and then constructing the facility. By reducing the non-Federal match requirement from 25 percent currently to 10 percent and then allowing the States to access funds over a greater period of time, this legislation will enable the States to move forward with new public ranges.

The Bipartisan Sportsmen's Act will also help improve access for hunting and fishing and wildlife viewing on public lands. Right now nearly half of all the hunters conduct a portion of their hunting activity on public lands, and a lack of access to these public lands is cited as a primary reason people stop participating in these traditional activities; they just can't get

there. The Bipartisan Sportsmen's Act would require that at least 1.5 percent, or $10 million, of annual Land and Water Conservation Fund money be used to improve access to our public lands.

The State of North Carolina is home to four national forests that comprise 1.25 million acres. Our outdoor recreation enthusiasts regularly have problems with actually getting access to this gorgeous place depicted here, which is the Pisgah National Forest. I probably spend more time backpacking in this forest than any other one. This legislation will help dedicate funding to expanding the access here and on public lands across the country.

Outdoor recreation activities are not only engrained in North Carolinians' way of life, they are also huge economic drivers in my State and in States across the country. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has found that hunting, fishing, and wildlife-related recreation activities contribute $3.3 billion annually to North Carolina's economy. Nationwide, the same report found that 90 million Americans participate in this wildlife-related recreation, resulting in close to $145 billion in annual spending. That is shown on this chart, the actual economic impact for wildlife-related recreation. In 2011 sports men and women spent a total of about $34 billion on hunting, which is depicted on the chart, $41 billion on fishing, and $56 billion on wildlife watching. The biggest amount of money spent while enjoying the outdoors is on wildlife watching. An extra $14 billion is spent on other activities.

According to the Outdoor Industry Association, all of these activities support over 192,000 jobs just in North Carolina and a total of 6.1 million across the country. So this really does have a huge economic impact across our Nation.

I often say I don't care if an idea is a Democratic idea or a Republican idea, only that it is a good idea, and I will put work behind that. I believe this bill embodies that spirit.

The Bipartisan Sportsmen's Act of 2014 is a balanced, bipartisan plan that is endorsed by more than 40 stakeholders, from Ducks Unlimited to the Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership, and it is fiscally responsible. I urge my colleagues to approve this legislation for the benefit of our economy and the more than 90 million sports men and women across the country.

Thank you, Madam President. 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. MCCAIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to address the Senate as in morning business and engage in a colloquy with the Senator from Arizona and the two Senators from the State of Texas, Mr. CORNYN and Mr. CRUZ.

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

BORDER CRISIS

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, as my colleagues know and the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Arizona both understand, we are facing a crisis on our border. It has been changed now to a ''situation.'' I understand that it is no longer a crisis but a situation, according to the White House.

The Senator from Texas has been to the border. I have been to our border. We have seen this veritable flood of young people who have come to our country under the belief that they will be able to stay.

The real human tragedy here of many, as my colleague from Texas and my friend from Arizona know, is that the trip from Central America to the Texas border, which is the closest place of arrival, is a horrible experience for these young people. Young women are routinely violated. Young men are mistreated. It is a terrible experience for them. Those who are for ''open borders,'' those who think this is somehow acceptable ignore the fact that this is a human rights issue of these young people who are enticed to come to our country under false circumstances and suffer unspeakable indignities and even death along the way.

The President of the United States, who initially stated that they would—and I would quote him—he said that we had to stop this and initially said that we needed to reverse the legislation that has encouraged the people to come here. I quote him:

> Kids all over the world have it tough, he said. Even children in America who live in dangerous neighborhoods. . . . He told the groups [that he was addressing that] he had to enforce the law—even if that meant deporting hard cases with minors involved. Sometimes, there is an inherent injustice in where you are born, and no president can solve that, Obama said. But presidents must send the message that you can't just show up on the border, plead for asylum or refugee status, and hope to get it.
>
> Then anyone can come in, and it means that, effectively, we don't have any kind of system, Obama said. We are a Nation with borders that must be enforced.

Unfortunately, the proposal—and I would ask my friend from Texas—that has come over for $3.7 billion has nothing to do with dispelling the idea and the belief in the Central American countries that they can come here and if they get to our border they can stay. They cannot stay. They cannot stay. If they believe they are victims of persecution, they should go to our consulate, go to our embassy. But we cannot have this unlimited flow of individuals.

Finally—I will yield for my colleagues—what about people in other parts of the world? Do they not need this kind of relief? Are they not persecuted? What about the Middle East? What about Africa? This is selective morality that is being practiced here, I would say to my friend from Texas.

We want people to come to this country legally. We want them to come if they are persecuted. But we want an orderly fashion. Finally, could I just say and remind my friends that despite what may be said, the fact is—and the numbers indicate it—for young people these terrible coyotes are bringing them for thousands of dollars. The Los Angeles Times reports: In fiscal year 2013, 20,805 unaccompanied children from El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras were apprehended by the Border Patrol and only 1,669 were repatriated.

I ask my friend from Texas: What kind of message does that send?

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I would say to the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona that the administration has been sending mixed messages. First they called this a humanitarian crisis. Then they called it—I think the Senator said—a ''situation.'' They are sort of walking this back. But I just wanted to remind my colleagues from Arizona of what the President said a few years ago in El Paso when people said we needed better border security measures in place.

He ridiculed people. The Senators may remember this. He said—this is the President talking in El Paso in May 2011—he said:

> You know, they said we needed to triple the Border Patrol. Now they are going to say we need to quadruple the Border Patrol, or they will want a higher fence, or maybe they will need a moat, or maybe they want alligators in the moat. They will never be satisfied. I understand that. That is politics.

But the truth is, the measures we put in place are getting results. The truth is, they are not getting the kind of results the American people expect—nor these children who are being subjected to horrific conditions as they are smuggled from Central America up through Mexico to the United States. One of the most puzzling things to me—I see my colleague from Texas here. I know Governor Perry has implored the President to come visit the border.

Now he said: Well, I will invite the Governor to an immigration roundtable—where I doubt the Governor will get in a word because the President will probably just deliver another lecture. He is pretty good at that. But that is 500 miles from where the problem is. How can you have a humanitarian crisis, as the White House has called this, and not want to go see it for yourself? Maybe you will actually learn something.

I agree with the Senator from Arizona. In the bill the administration sent over, they stripped out all of the reforms that would actually go to solve the very problem we all know needs to be solved here and instead asked for a blank check.

Mr. MCCAIN. Could I ask the Senator a question? The first thing that needs

to be done is to amend the legislation which basically would then make every country treated the same way contiguous countries would be. That has to be the first step. Again and again, I think it is important to emphasize here that this is a humanitarian issue, but it is a humanitarian issue about these children who are taken—for how many days? Fifteen, twenty days on top of a train they are being taken and exploited by these terrible coyotes.

So should we not have a system where if someone deserves asylum in this country we could beef up our consulates, beef up our embassies, and have them come there and make their argument, and then be able to come to this country, I would argue?

Mr. CORNYN. The Senator is exactly right. What we need is a legal system of immigration, not an illegal system, because the people who control illegal immigration are the cartels and the coyotes the Senator mentioned earlier and the criminal gangs. By the way, they have discovered a new business model. They treat these children as commodities, and they hold them for ransom. They sexually assault the young women, as the Senator pointed out.

We do not know how many of these children start this perilous journey from Central America, some 1,200 miles away, and never make it to the United States because they simply die along the way. So this is a horrific situation.

I know both the Senators from Arizona might want to speak to this. The President has acknowledged that even under the Senate immigration bill that passed the Senate, none of these children would qualify. I would ask maybe the junior Senator from Arizona if he would care to comment.

How did this situation get created where even under the law that the President has advocated for, the Senate immigration bill, none of these children would be able to stay?

Mr. FLAKE. That is correct. The Senator from Texas is correct. Neither the President's deferred action program nor legislation passed by the Senate would allow people coming now to have some type of legal status. In the case of the President's DACA, or Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program, you would have to have been here by 2007. Under the Senate legislation you would have to have been here by 2011 at a minimum. So it would not apply.

The problem here—the root of it or the main part of it—is that people coming from noncontiguous countries to the United States, meaning Central American countries like Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala, are treated differently than kids who come from Mexico or Canada. In the case of kids coming—unaccompanied minors—from Mexico or Canada, the average is 3 days that we take care of them and then repatriate them or send them back.

Here in this case, partly because of the law we have under the Trafficking Victims Protection Act, kids who come here need to be placed with a guardian or family. The President's proposal is asking nearly $2 billion for the Department of Health and Human Services, which has no role in border enforcement at all—none. It has no role in deportation or to repatriate these children back. It is simply to settle these children with families or guardians around the country.

I should note that HHS does no due diligence whatsoever to ensure that the people they are placing them with are here legally. So the net effect is, when a child goes to a legal guardian or a parent, it is very unlikely that they will then show up later for deportation hearings.

So, in effect, you are telling the cartels and the human smugglers and others: Keep doing what you are doing because it works. When those unaccompanied minors get here, they will be able to stay. They will be taken care of.

As Senator MCCAIN said, that is the least human thing we can do—to encourage parents and relatives in these countries to send their children or put them in the care of smugglers and others. If we want to stem the tide here, the way to stem the tide is to have parents and relatives in these countries seeing these children come back to these countries as we do to children in Mexico or Canada who come across the border.

So I thank the Senator from Arizona for arranging this colloquy. We have to take action.

Mr. CORNYN. If I may, the junior Senator from Texas had visited Lackland Air Force Base recently and observed some of these 1,200—if I am not mistaken—children who are being essentially warehoused because we do not have any other place to put them. If he might comment on what we are going to do if the numbers continue to grow at the level they are growing now. I know in 2011 there were about 6,000 unaccompanied minors detained at the southwestern border.

This year since October, it is somewhere in the 50,000 range. If that number continues to escalate, where are we going to put all of these kids?

Mr. CRUZ. I thank my friend the senior Senator from Texas. I am honored to stand here with the senior Senator from Texas and the Senators from Arizona as we speak out together against the humanitarian crisis that is unfolding on our border.

President Obama today is down in the State of Texas. But, sadly, he is not visiting the border. He is not visiting the children who are suffering as a result of the failures of the Obama policies. Instead, he is doing fundraisers. He is visiting Democratic fat cats to collect checks. Apparently, there is no time to look at the disaster, at the devastation that is being caused by his policies.

Just a couple of weeks ago, as the Senator from Texas observed, I was down at Lackland Air Force Base where there are roughly 1,200 children being housed. There is one thing President Obama had said about what is happening that is absolutely correct. This is a humanitarian disaster. But it is a disaster of the President's own making. It is a disaster that is a direct consequence of President Obama's lawlessness. A quick review of the facts makes that abundantly apparent.

In 2011, just 3 years ago, there were roughly 6,000 unaccompanied children apprehended trying to cross illegally into this country. Then in 2012, in the summer of 2012, right before the election, President Obama illegally granted amnesty to some 800,000 people who were here illegally who had entered the country as children.

The direct, predictable, foreseeable consequence of granting that amnesty is the number of children—unaccompanied children—immediately began to skyrocket. This year, the estimates are that 90,000 unaccompanied children will enter this country illegally. That is up from 6,000 just 3 years ago—6,000 to 90,000. Next year the estimate is 145,000.

This explosion is the direct consequence of the President's lawlessness. It is worth underscoring. The people who are being hurt the most are these kids. The coyotes who are bringing them in are not well-meaning social workers trying to help out some kids. These are violent, hardened transnational criminal cartels. These mothers and fathers, sadly, are handing over their children to violent criminals who are physically abusing and who are sexually abusing small children.

When I was down at Lackland Air Force Base, a senior official there described to me how those cartels—with some of these children after they have taken them and after they have begun coming to this country to take them here illegally—would hold these children captive, hold them hostage to extract additional money from the families.

If the families did not send them additional money, as horrifying as it is, these drug cartels would begin severing body parts of these children. I listened to the senior official at Lackland describe how the cartels would put a gun to the back of the head of a little boy or little girl and force that child to cut off the fingers or the ears of another little boy or little girl. If they do not do so, they will shoot them and move to the next one.

So on our end, we are having children come to this country whom we are having to deal with who are maimed. They have been maimed by the brutality of these criminal cartels. Others of them have deep, deep psychological trauma from a child forced to do something so horrific. This is a tragedy that is playing out. It is happening in real time.

Now, the administration has suggested the cause of this is violence in Central America. I would suggest to my friends, the senior Senator from

Texas and the Senators from Arizona, that argument is a complete red herring. With violence in one country, you would expect to see the number of immigrants from that country to go up. But there is no reason unaccompanied children would go up. That is something unique and distinct.

There have always been countries across the world, sadly, that have been plagued by violence. When that happens, we have always seen an influx in immigrants, both legal and illegal, from those countries. What we are seeing here is particular, though. It is particularized towards children. The reason it is particularized towards children is because the President granted amnesty in a way that was particularized towards children.

If you want to understand just how false the administration's talking point is for the cause of what is happening, you need to look no further than a report which was prepared by our border security that Senator CORNYN and Senator FLAKE and I all saw in the Senate Judiciary Committee. A couple of weeks ago we had a hearing on this humanitarian crisis, and a whistleblower at the Border Patrol handed over this confidential document to a number of Senators on the Judiciary Committee.

It described how the Border Patrol interviewed over 200 people who have come here illegally—adults and children—and asked them a simple question: Why did you come? Ninety five percent said: We came because we believe if we get here we will get amnesty. We believe we will get a permiso is what they said; that once they get here, once a child gets here, that little boy, that little girl is scot-free. I would suggest to my friend, this is what amnesty looks like.

I would suggest to my friends this is what amnesty looks like. Amnesty looks like dangerous drug cartels entering this country wantonly. Amnesty looks like thousands of young children being housed in military bases. Amnesty looks like hundreds of immigrants who came here illegally being transported to cities and towns amid opposition from the citizens who lived there. Amnesty looks like a complete and utter disregard of our rule of law. Amnesty is unfolding before our very eyes.

I would suggest that the only response that will stop this humanitarian disaster is for President Obama to start enforcing the law, to stop promising amnesty, to stop refusing to enforce Federal immigration law, and, finally, to secure the borders. Indeed, I would call upon our colleagues in this body in both parties to come together and secure the border once and for all and to stop holding border security hostage for amnesty.

Mr. CORNYN. If I could ask a question, really, of all three.

I think we have described the catastrophe that continues to unfold and indeed grow. I know, speaking for myself—and I venture to say, I bet, for all four of us—we are actually interested in trying to solve this problem.

The President sent over an appropriations request that is essentially a blank check. The junior Senator from Arizona appropriately acknowledged that the majority of the money is for health and human resources to continue to warehouse these kids with no actual solution.

The Senator from Arizona said we need to change that 2008 law. I agree with that. We need to make sure the children are detained and then get whatever process they are entitled to, perhaps even appear before an immigration judge—that is something we should talk about—before they are repatriated.

But I want to ask the senior Senator from Arizona, because of his long distinguished service on the Armed Services Committee, I was troubled to read and hear some of the testimony of General Kelly, the head of Southern Command, who is the combatant commander for the world south of the Texas border, Mexico and into Central and South America—or actually I guess Mexico is Northern Command. But he said they sit and watch 75 percent of the cartel activity involving illegal drugs and they simply don't have the assets to do anything about it.

I asked him: Do you think trying to figure out how to adequately fund and resource Southern Command, how to get our U.S. military to perhaps work more closely with the Central American military forces and the Mexican military forces, is that part of the solution to this problem?

Mr. MCCAIN. I would say to my colleague, yes. Also, the commander of Southern Command believes there is an increasing inflow of people entering our country illegally who are not from Mexico or from Central America. They are from other countries around the world, and there is a real and imminent threat of people coming to the United States of America not just to get a job with a better life but to commit acts of terror. We are seeing increasing numbers.

I say to my friend from Texas, it is my understanding—tell me if I am correct—that now 82 percent of the people coming across the border illegally are other than Mexican, a majority from Central America but then China, India, Africa—from all over the world they are coming.

Mr. CORNYN. I would say to the Senator I have been in Brooks County near Falfurrias, TX, to see some of the rescue beacons they have there with some of the language written in Chinese. This is in Brooks County near Falfurrias, TX, where I guarantee nobody who lives there speaks Chinese—or not many people.

So the Senator's point is well taken. Out of the 414,000 people detained coming across the southwestern border last year, they came from 100 different countries. Most of them were from Mexico and Central America, but the Senator is exactly right; we have seen a huge influx from Central America up through Mexico, and that is the primary source today.

Mr. MCCAIN. I just mentioned, and we all know—and I certainly would like my friend from Arizona to comment on this—we have a proposal that came over from the President of the United States to spend some $3.7 billion. I think all of us are for finding a way to pay for it but agree with measures that need to be taken, such as beefing up our consulate and embassy capabilities, such as increasing the number of refugee visas for citizens of El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala by 5,000 each next year, do what is necessary to try to address this from the humanitarian standpoint.

But the President of the United States failed, even though he had stated with the proposal that came over, there is not a request to amend the Trafficking Victims Prevention Act. In other words, we could be in an unending funding for treatment of people who came illegally unless we address the fundamental problem that is driving it.

I would ask my friend from Arizona—and, by the way, could I also point out that legislation he and I were part of and spent hundreds if not thousands of hours on called for 90-percent effective control of the border and 100-percent situational awareness, some $8 billion being spent. It was amended on the floor for an additional 20,000 Border Patrol, that a fundamental element of immigration reform, as we proposed it, was to get 90-percent effective control of the border, and, in addition to that, that we would have that funding come out of fees people would pay as they moved on a path to citizenship, not subject to appropriations.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the Senator for making that point with regard to the legislation. We propose to truly put border security first, and I continue to hope the House will take that up.

But one of the points that has been made is we have to stem this humanitarian crisis in a way that will actually solve the problem, and that will be solved when parents and relatives in these countries realize that sending their children, unaccompanied minors, is futile, that they will spend a lot of money and it won't work.

There is a good example of how we can give effect to this from a couple of years ago. In 2005, the country of Mexico allowed Brazilians to come in on kind of a visa waiver-type program. What happened is a lot of Brazilian nationals came through Mexico and used it as a conduit to come into this country. So we had a huge number of so-called OTMs or other-than-Mexicans coming up, Brazilians, and we were doing what can best be described as catch and release. We would take them back across the border and let them go.

That wasn't solving the problem, so the Bush administration decided we

needed to solve this problem. The way to actually solve it is to detain these individuals and then send them home to Brazil. We did that. It was an operation called Texas Hold 'Em. After that operation, within 30 days, the number of Brazilians coming through Mexico into this country dropped by 50 percent; within 60 days, that number dropped by 90 percent.

So we can do this, but it needs to involve us changing the law with regard to trafficking, to allow us to treat children in Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador the same way we treat children who come from Mexico or from Canada and allow us to repatriate and to take these children back. Once that happens, when we actually do that, then we have a chance to stem this tide. It is the best thing we could do on a humanitarian basis as well, to not have these children subject to the cartels and human smugglers who are preying on them right now.

Mr. CORNYN. I would ask the junior Senator from Texas, surely the President understands the facts as we have laid them out here, the problems with the 2008 law, really, the flaw in that law. They have created a business model out of it because they realized these immigrants who come across will not be detained, either the children or many adults, women traveling with minor children, because there are not adequate detention facilities.

I wonder if the Senator has an opinion why, if the President—surrounded as he is with some pretty smart policy people, people such as Secretary Jeh Johnson, the Secretary of Homeland Security, whom I have had a conversation with about this very topic—hasn't sent over a request to actually fix the problem, as opposed to continuing to warehouse people?

Mr. CRUZ. The senior Senator from Texas is exactly right that the President has effectively admitted he has no intention of stopping this problem. The supplemental request he has submitted, $3.7 billion, the majority of that goes to HHS's social services, providing care to these kids, rather than stopping and solving the problem.

The Senator and I have both spent a lot of time down on the border of Texas and all four of us have spent time down on the border of Texas or Arizona. The consistent answer from local leaders, from local law enforcement, from local elected officials about what is effective securing the border—the most consistent answer is boots on the ground; that if you want to effectively secure the border—boots on the ground, particularly combined with technology.

It is striking, out of $3.7 billion, a tiny percentage of that is directed toward boots on the ground. This is an HHS social services bill, and it is unfortunately a pattern we have seen with the Obama administration of bait-and-switch. They are calling this a border security bill. It is reminiscent of the 2009 stimulus, which we will all recall was sold to the American people. The 2009 stimulus was about building roads, infrastructure, and shovel-ready projects, all of which are good ideas. Then when over $800 billion was spent by the Obama administration, very little of it actually went to roads, infrastructure, or shovel-ready projects. Instead, it paid off liberal interest groups such as, in this case, the administration calls the $3.7 billion border security and yet almost none of the money goes to border security.

Indeed, I would note for all of the Democrats who are seeing this humanitarian crisis unfold, who are discovering suddenly the need for border security—and I would note my friend the senior Senator from New York stood on this floor as we were debating immigration last year and said: The border is secure today.

President Obama stood in El Paso in 2010 and said: The border is secure today.

I would note, for everyone who says now they are focused on border security that when the Senate Judiciary Committee was considering immigration reform, I introduced an amendment—the senior Senator from Texas supported it—that would have tripled our Border Patrol, that would have increased fourfold the fixed-wing assets, the technology that would have provided the tools to finally solve this problem, and every single Senate Democrat on the Senate Judiciary Committee voted against it. So we shouldn't be surprised the President's proposal that is labeled border security doesn't actually secure the border, doesn't do anything about the lawlessness or the amnesty, which means the Obama administration is effectively admitting they expect these children to continue coming—hundreds of thousands of them in years to come, hundreds of thousands of little boys and little girls being subjected to horrific physical abuse, sexual abuse, and they intend to do nothing to fix the problem, to stop it, to secure the borders, to uphold the law. That is heartbreaking, and that is not the responsibility of a Commander in Chief.

Mr. CORNYN. I would ask the senior Senator of Arizona, who is also a national well-known security expert but who also knows a little bit about this big world we live in, what is it we can do with some of the money slated to go to countries such as Honduras, Guatemala, and even Mexico?

Historically, we have had a successful partnership, for example, with the Colombian Government to help them build their capacity under Plan Colombia. Admittedly, that is a different scenario.

In Mexico we have the Merida Initiative, where we train and provide equipment to help build their police and law enforcement capability.

Are there things we ought to try to tie the money that goes to these countries to right now that would be productive programs and help solve the problem at its source?

Mr. MCCAIN. Absolutely. And I think, as we mentioned earlier, beefing up our embassy and consulate capabilities to hear these cases in the country of origin—particularly Central America—is very important.

I would also point out an article entitled ''Deportation data won't dispel rumors drawing migrant minors to U.S.'' It is a very interesting piece.

Organized crime groups in Central America have exploited the slow U.S. legal process and the compassion shown to children in apparent crisis, according to David Leopold, an immigration attorney in Cleveland.

He said smugglers, who may charge a family up to $12,000 to deliver a child to the border, often tell them exactly what to say to American officials.

''The cartels have figured out where the hole is,'' he said.

As it now stands, the 2008 law guarantees unaccompanied minors from those countries access to a federal asylum officer and a chance to tell a U.S. judge that they were victims of a crime or face abuse or sexual trafficking if they are sent home. If the claim is deemed credible, judges may grant a waiver from immediate deportation.

''Word of mouth gets back, and now people are calling and saying, 'This is what I said in court' '', said a senior U.S. law enforcement official, who was not authorized to speak on the record. ''Whether it is true or not, the perception is that they are successfully entering the United States. . . . That is what is driving up the landings.''

Of course, the numbers are staggering, as we have pointed out.

The President himself spoke in the Rose Garden last week.

Speaking in the Rose Garden last week, Obama said he was sending a ''clear message'' to parents in Central America not to send their children north in hopes of being allowed into America.

''The journey is unbelievably dangerous for these kids,'' Obama said. ''The children who are fortunate enough to survive it will be taken care of while they go through the legal process, but in most cases that process will lead to them being sent back home.''

Unfortunately, his statement is not backed up by the actual numbers. We are talking about one-tenth of these children actually being sent back, as they are being coached by these coyotes who are giving them the story to tell.

I wish to emphasize on the part of all of us on this side of the aisle and every American we represent that we have compassion for these people. We care about a humanitarian crisis. We care about these children. It is not a matter of fortressing America. We are all for legal immigration. We are from every part of the world. We will be portrayed by the open border people, very frankly, as those who want to stop these poor children from being able to come to our country. It is not that. We are trying to stop the human abuses, the terrible things being perpetrated on these children under the false pretenses—they should be false pretenses but now not so false—that they can come to this country and stay.

Mr. CORNYN. I think the senior Senator has accurately described how the cartels have figured out how to game the system.

Indeed, with all the advertising we do down in Central America saying ''don't come,'' as the junior Senator from Arizona indicated, as long as they get a call saying ''I made it'' and the cartels realize that for every migrant child they shuttle up through the smuggling corridors it is going to be another $5,000 or more in the bank, there is every incentive to continue.

But I ask the senior Senator and perhaps our other colleagues—the President has said that he has a pen and he has a phone, and he is going to do things without Congress. He said that because he is frustrated. I know we all have experienced a level of frustration during the immigration debates from time to time and over the years. But he says he is going to consider issuing another order relative to deportation policy, which strikes me as doubling down on his message that he is not going to enforce the law; he is going to try to circumvent the law and basically welcome more people here outside of legal avenues. So I ask my colleagues, doesn't that make things worse, not better?

Mr. MCCAIN. Well, the other aspect of this that makes things worse: Of course, the President on the one hand agrees with us that they can't stay. I don't know how many times I have quoted him here. But at the same time, as any objective observer would indicate, the proposal that came over for $3.7 billion has nothing that would dispel the incentive and the magnet creating this flood of young people whose trip we have been talking about, I ask my friend from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the Senator. I have to run to a hearing, but I wish to say yes. I, Senator MCCAIN, Senator FEINSTEIN on the other side of the aisle, and many others—I think everyone here—signed a letter to the President asking him to make a clear statement that children coming now will be deported. He did so, and so did the Secretary of Homeland Security. Our State Department has relayed that message. And you can say that until you are blue in the face, but if the reality is that unaccompanied minors who get here are then placed with guardians or families around the country and we appropriate $1.8 billion to do so, then the message being sent is exactly the opposite of what the President is saying.

I think that is what we are all here today to say—that we have to not just say the right thing, we have to do the right thing. And the right thing is to change the law that allows the loophole for people to stay here indefinitely and send the message by actually sending children—as we do with unaccompanied minors from Mexico and Canada—back because that will send the message clearer than any words we could say to those tight-knit communities who hear by word of mouth. And nobody is going to pay another $5,000 or $6,000 or $7,000 to send a child through those dangerous conditions to the border if they know they are going to be returned home.

Mr. MCCAIN. If I could finally add that this proposal that came over for $3.8 billion—and I can only speak for myself, but unless there are provisions in that legislation which would bring an end to this humanitarian crisis, then I cannot support it. I cannot vote for a provision which will then just perpetuate an unacceptable humanitarian crisis that is taking place on our southern border. I don't know if my colleague would agree.

Mr. CRUZ. I would note that the confirmation and message of amnesty received by the parents entrusting their children to these drug dealers is the Border Patrol report, which said that 95 percent of those coming believe they would get a permiso. They believe they would be allowed to go scot-free. That is the message being heard. It is why these children are being subjected to violence.

A Lackland Air Force Base senior official described a young Hispanic child who is a quadriplegic, who is paralyzed from the neck down, and the drug cartels abandoned him on the Texas side of the Rio Grande. They found him lying by the river, on the other side of the river. That is the sort of care and consideration they are providing for these children. What is happening to these children is horrific.

We are a compassionate nation. We have always been a compassionate nation. But any policy that continues children being abused by violent drug cartels is the opposite of compassion.

So I ask two questions to my friend the senior Senator from Arizona.

This afternoon I had lunch with the attorney general of Texas, Greg Abbott, who described that the attorney general of Texas and the U.S. Attorney's Office have recently arrested an alleged terrorist in Texas with ties to ISIS—with ties to the radical Islamic terrorists who are right now wreaking havoc across Iraq and Syria.

The first question I would ask the senior Senator from Arizona is, how significant does he see the threat of terrorists crossing our porous border and targeting the homeland?

Then, of the $3.7 billion President Obama has requested in the supplemental bill, just $160 million is directed to Border Patrol agents and immigration judges—both. So less than 5 percent of the total actually goes to boots on the ground.

The second question I would ask of the senior Senator from Arizona is, in his judgment, is devoting less than 5 percent of the resources from this bill to boots on the ground a serious effort at securing the border and solving the problem?

Mr. MCCAIN. I would say to my colleague, the answer to the second question is obviously no. It is my understanding that if you break this legislation into individual illegal immigrant, it is like $80,000 per individual—a remarkable sum. I will be glad to be corrected for the record if that is not true.

But concerning the Senator's first question, about a month ago, for the first time in Syria, an American citizen blew himself up as a suicide bomber in Syria.

There are now thousands and thousands of Europeans—we believe there are as many as 100 U.S. citizens, although that number varies—who are fighting in Syria on behalf of the most radical terrorist organization: ISIS. These many hundreds of Europeans who are fighting there have—guess what. As European citizens of these countries in Europe, they have a visa. They can go to a European country, get on a plane tomorrow, and fly to the United States of America because they are a citizen of one of the European countries with which we have a visa-free agreement.

Our Director of National Intelligence, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation have all said unequivocally that the events that are transpiring now in the largest, most wealthy, most influential, and largest center for terrorism, between Syria and Iraq, is breeding these people who have said they want to attack the United States of America.

Baghdadi, who is now the leader of ISIS, whom we saw on television apparently preaching at a mosque in Mosul the other day, despite the fact that there is $10 million on his head, when he left our prison camp Bucca in Iraq, he said: See you in New York. And I don't think he was joking.

So this also is clearly a national security issue over time as well, I say to my friend from Texas.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

REFUGEES

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, we are here today to address a refugee crisis in America. I never thought I would have to use those words on the floor of the Senate, but there is no other way to describe what is happening on our southern border.

What is happening in Central America—the violence, the kidnappings, the failure of the rule of law—is the root cause of the problem and it is threatening tens of thousands of families and thousands and thousands of children. It is causing a refugee crisis that is simply unacceptable in America and unacceptable in our hemisphere. Let's be clear. It is being caused in large measure by thousands in Central America who believe it is better to run for their lives and risk dying than stay and die for sure. It is nearly a 2,000-mile journey from these countries to the U.S. border. These families are not undertaking this journey lightly.

My Republican colleagues make it sound as though parents are willingly choosing to risk their children's lives, send them on a 2,000-mile journey fraught with smugglers, thieves, child abductors, and sex traffickers as if that is a choice. They are parents, just as we are parents. I, as a parent, cannot imagine having to make that choice—to send them on a perilous journey with no guarantees of survival except out of an absolute fear for their lives if they stay. To politicize the decision to send a child away as opportunistic, as a way to take advantage of American law, is as cynical a position as I have ever heard.

First of all, there is no deferred action. Nothing we did for DREAMers in this country would help any of these people. They don't qualify under any elements of that provision. The immigration reform that passed here in the Senate by a broad bipartisan vote—68 votes—would not help any one of these people because they would have had to have been in the country by December 31, 2011. Nothing in that law is an attraction—nothing.

Yet the Republicans in the House of Representatives will not even take a vote on immigration reform. Frankly, my Republican friends cannot have it both ways. They cannot criticize the President—in fact, sue the President—for abusing his Executive authority and at the same time come to this floor and criticize him for a lack of leadership when they will not even cast a vote. That is nothing if not totally and transparently political.

This is not about a welcome mat. It is a desperate effort on the part of thousands of parents to do what parents instinctively do, and that is to do what you must do to protect your child from the threats of violence and death at home even if it means sending them away.

Let's be clear. First and foremost, violence and crime are a pandemic that has sadly become part of life in Central America—in Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala. Honduras has the highest per capita murder rate in the world. El Salvador and Guatemala are in the top five in the world.

Second, more than 80 percent of the illicit drugs coming from South America to the United States travel through Central America. Drug traffickers and local gangs harass and extort local residents, and they are able to use their profits to corrupt the police, judicial system, and government institutions.

Third, the rates of poverty and inequality in these countries are sky high, while levels of economic growth and development lag far behind other countries in Latin America.

A recent report by the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees found the majority of the minors they interviewed here in the United States had left their home country out of fear. The bottom line is we must attack this problem from a foreign policy perspective, from a refugee perspective, and from a national security perspective. We need to do all we can to stabilize the situation in Central America and stop the flow of children and refugees to our border.

After a full year of squandering every conceivable opportunity to pass commonsense immigration reform, Speaker BOEHNER has admitted his party has killed any prospects for reform. Now we have to deal with the political consequences of the Republican leadership's obstructionism.

I fully support the President's efforts to fix some of the most urgent problems facing our Nation's broken immigration system, and I look forward to seeing those families who are here and eligible receive relief from deportation as we continue to advocate for a permanent legislative solution.

In the meantime, we need to provide emergency funding to deal with this refugee crisis. To begin with, the President's supplemental appropriation request is a very tough pro-enforcement legislation.

By the way, as we talk about more money for enforcement, we are actually doing a good job in enforcement of the border. Why do I say that? Because the reason we know of the size of the refugee challenge we are facing is because we are interdicting and apprehending these people at the border and then putting them in detention facilities. It is not that the Border Patrol is not doing their job. They are doing their job.

Yet we have a supplemental request on the appropriations bill that includes $3.7 billion for enforcement, Homeland Security, and other resources. It provides critical funding to prosecute traffickers who are bringing these kids here, and that is what my Republican colleagues have been asking for.

Let's be clear. We need to keep the supplemental clean and free of riders and authorizing language. If we don't keep it clean, it will never get passed. One person will want to add an item to immigration reform, and then another person will want to add an item to immigration reform. The bottom line is this body already passed—with over 68 votes—comprehensive immigration reform. We don't need to have a debate on a bill we have already passed. We need to deal with the emergency.

I love it when my Republican friends scream for action. This is emergency funding, and it is as conservative as it gets, focused almost entirely on enforcement. The bill is giving Republicans what they have always asked for—more money for border enforcement, especially in the border States.

We need to provide the President with the money so he can handle the refugee crisis. It is what we expect of nations around the world. It is what we tell other nations around the world. The history of America is to treat refugees appropriately and according to international standards.

Some of these children and families are refugees and some of them are not. The children who have claims should be able to pursue those claims with a day in court under existing U.S. law. If they lose, they will be deported. We have a legal system to address the crisis. Let's use it, and let's give the President the resources he needs to enforce it.

The President's supplemental appropriations request, in my mind, is an essential beginning, but I hope the administration will consider the 20-point plan I laid out that deals, in part, and I think importantly, with the root causes. Because if we spend $3.7 billion for enforcement and spend what we have been spending, which is about $110 million among five countries in Central America to create citizen security so people don't flee in the first place, it seems to me we have this equation a little wrong. We are going to spend $3.7 billion to deal with the consequences, but we are going to spend $110 million to deal with the cause. If we don't deal with the cause, guess what. There will never be enough money, and there will always be a continuing challenge of refugees fleeing the violence in their countries.

I hope we will increase aid for citizen security directed to help them with our law enforcement entities, to deal with the security of their country, to deal with the drug traffickers, to deal with the gangs. I hope we will increase aid to be able to create a sense of security in neighborhoods so people don't flee the country; so it isn't likely that your mother or father will be killed in front of you or your brother will be killed or your sister will be raped, which is increasingly the stories heard from these individuals, and that we will do it while implementing humane reforms that don't put innocent children in harm's way.

South of our border, we are seeing unprecedented violence, unprecedented suffering, unprecedented abuse. This is far more than an immigration issue, it is a refugee issue, much as we have seen in other parts of the world, and we must stop it. It will not be easy. There are no easy answers and no easy fixes, but I, for one, believe we should muster all the outrage we can to come up with a short-term fix and a long-term solution, as well as a strategy that does the following:

First, we have to identify the root causes of this far-reaching refugee problem. Second, we have to put pressure on governments in the hemisphere that are not handling crime and violence in their Nations in a way that prevents families from sending their children across the border in the first place. Third, we need to combat the smuggling and trafficking rings in Central America. That is in our own national security interests. Fourth, we have to effectively deal with the situation at hand and meet the humanitarian needs of these children—and I mean children, 8 years old, 7 years old—no matter what it takes, without placing them in jail in the process.

Fifth, we have to deal with the overriding issues and basic causes from a foreign policy point of view. Then, we can deal with the join-or-die gang recruitment and the gang threats against children and their families in the hemisphere—in Honduras and in Guatemala. Six, we have to do all we can to combat international crime, working with our neighbors to end the violence, threats, and crime activity that is destabilizing the region. Seventh, we need to crack down hard on the explosion of gangs and smugglers forcing families apart and preying on young children.

I can tell my colleagues, as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I am seeing day after day violence in so many countries spreading to so many countries, but I have never seen or thought I would see refugees from this hemisphere spilling over our borders. We need to act, and we have to deal with the immediate crisis at hand.

This is not just a challenge here. Asylum claims in the region, meaning to other countries in the Central American region, have skyrocketed by 700 percent in recent years. Current law protects the ability of those children under our system who apply for asylum and trafficking protection and other specialized forms of relief to have their day in court. Not every child will have a valid claim, and those who do not will ultimately be deported and reintegrated back to what is obviously a violent set of circumstances as it exists today, but that will be the case. But it is critically important that every child be given the chance to have due process under our existing law so we don't inadvertently return them to death and violence. There are better ways to deal with this population than through detention or expedited proceedings that don't undermine that due process.

I would like the administration to explore the use of alternatives to detention for families we want to monitor and make sure they show up at their court proceedings. This supplemental appropriations bill should also include the opportunity to make sure we look at those systems and that the representation of children in court is an adequate one.

While the short-term needs are very pressing, we must also not ignore the long-term importance of shoring up our regional security in Central America. Congress should increase funding for CARSI, the Central America Regional Security Initiative, to assist with narcotics interdiction, institutional capacity building, and violence prevention.

State and USAID must develop a long-term strategy that includes increased development budgets to support sustainable growth. The Millennium Challenge Corporation should accelerate engagement in the region. I also think the State Department should designate a high-level coordinator to establish an office to be the focal point for policy formulation and a response to humanitarian concerns facing children escaping this region. Lastly, State and USAID should work together to establish effective repatriation and reintegration programs for children who are returning to their home countries.

If we don't deal with the root causes, this is what is going to happen: We will expedite the process, we will deport, and when they go home and face the same violence we have done nothing to change, their option will still be the same, flee or die. And they will take the risk all over again, and we will have the challenge all over again.

There are no easy answers, but I truly believe, at the end of the day, immigration reform—which had very significant border protection provisions, very significant antitrafficking and smuggling of individuals—in terms of assistance to deal with those challenges, would have been and is still incredibly important.

Convincing our Republican colleagues in the House that if we continue to do nothing, then there will continue to be trouble on our borders and the refugee problem will only get worse seems to be a difficult proposition. The fact is the Senate-passed bill actually contains important border security measures. If it had been passed in the House 1 year ago when the Senate passed it and sent it over there, then maybe we would have preempted a good part of the challenge we have today. It contains antismuggling, antitrafficking measures. It contains provisions to address criminal activity. Yet the House Republican leadership cannot bring itself to marginalize the extreme rightwing and do what is right and just and fair.

The bottom line is that we have to attack this problem from a refugee perspective, a foreign policy perspective, and a national security perspective. We need to do all we can to maximize our effort to fight the criminals, increase development opportunities, and provide the type of economic statecraft that can provide relief. We have to give families a chance to fight back economically and politically against those who are causing the violence and the illicit trafficking, the gang and drug violence, and those running criminal networks in the region.

I am concerned and I am angry and it is time to fight back, but it is also time to deal with the crisis that is upon us, and we can only do that if we give the President the resources to meet the challenge. Failure to be willing to support the resources to do that will rest on those who cast a negative vote and, therefore, from my perspective, will risk the national security along the border of the United States, will risk the consequences of the humanitarian and refugee crisis that will continue to flow, and will risk the consequences of the drug traffickers in Central America, the gangs in Central America, all who use that as a route to come to the United States.

It is easy to say no. It is far more difficult to be constructive. So far what I have heard in response to this crisis is the negativity of no, the criticism of the President for using Executive powers when the Congress of the United States fails to act in its own right. You can't have it both ways. This is a moment to call for the greater interests of the Nation than to play partisan politics that I have seen so far.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the humanitarian situation on our southern border.

Over the last year, we have seen a flood of unaccompanied children come from Central American countries such as El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala. In fact, the number of children has more than doubled in the past year to nearly 60,000. This is a humanitarian crisis, and it is heartbreaking.

Sadly, there are some who believe they have found a simple solution to this problem—that we can somehow just round up these young children and send them back on a plane where they came from immediately. I disagree.

The United States has always been a leader in providing aid and assistance to those in danger and in need. These are values our country and Congress have overwhelmingly endorsed. In fact, the current procedures for dealing with children from these countries were set in a 2008 law. The law was signed by President Bush and unanimously passed by both the House and the Senate. These procedures are in place because our values as a nation dictate that we do what we can to protect children from violence and trafficking.

It saddens me that there are some who have even called for changing this underlying protective law, presumably so we can just ship these children back to where they came from without the due process protections this law affords. Of the thousands of children showing up at our doorstep, many of whom were at risk in the hands of criminal smugglers during their trip, 40 percent of them are young girls. Many are under the age of 12 and have been sent on their own without the protection of their parents or other family. These children aren't coming here because of President Obama or Democrats or Republicans. They are coming to our border because of the terrible violence and conditions they face in their home countries. In fact, there is a direct correlation between growing violence in these home countries and the increasing waves of children coming to the United States.

For example, many face join-or-die gang recruitment situations which amount to forced conscription such as we saw with the child soldiers in other countries. They are subjected to sexual violence and brutality. It is hard for someone from our country to imagine how severe this violence is, but data from the United Nations offers some perspective.

The U.N. estimates that the murder rate in Honduras in 2012 was 30 percent

higher than U.N. estimates of the civilian casualty rate at the height of the Iraq war. That is a staggering level of violence for any nation to endure. We all agree the current situation is unsustainable and needs to be addressed, but simply sending children back into harm's way is not the answer. We should be working together to address the root causes that are pushing these children to make these dangerous journeys.

I am proud to have worked with my colleague Senator MENENDEZ, from whom we just heard, to introduce a comprehensive plan to address this issue. That plan is a bit more complicated than simply rounding up children and shipping them out, but it is clear this crisis requires action on several fronts.

First, we should continue to crack down on human smuggling and criminal activity in concert with the children's home countries. Second, we have to honor our domestic and legal requirements related to the treatment of children, refugees, and asylum seekers. This means supporting the administration's efforts to provide humane treatment to these children. Third, we have to redouble our efforts to support peace, economic growth, and social development in Central America.

I look forward to discussing more of the details of our plan with any of my colleagues who want to work together constructively to solve this problem. Only by focusing on addressing the root cause of this crisis can we truly address it.

The President has been managing a coordinated response to handle this very difficult, heartbreaking situation. I hope we can work together to provide adequate resources to professionals on the ground. We must also continue pressing for comprehensive immigration reform so our system will not be so overwhelmed in times such as these.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HIRONO). The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Madam President, as you do now, I recently had the honor of presiding over this Chamber and had the opportunity in the hour I just finished presiding to listen to our colleagues as they have come to this floor, as you just have, Madam President, to speak to the humanitarian crisis unfolding on the southern border of our country. And sadly—I think truly sadly—I have listened to a whole series of our Republican colleagues use this opportunity to line up on the floor and to whale upon our President and claim that this humanitarian crisis is his fault, that it is solely the fault of the President that there are tens of thousands of children coming to the American border unaccompanied, seeking refuge in this country, that it is solely his fault. It is tough to even know where to begin in responding to these suggestions, but let me try. Let me start from my perspective as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

It is important first to remember that this is no ordinary issue of border security or of immigration enforcement. This is a humanitarian and a refugee crisis. The tens of thousands of children—young children—presenting themselves alone at the border of the United States are not dangerous criminals who threaten our national safety. They are so often children who have traveled thousands of miles from their home countries at enormous risk and expense, and they have come not because our border is wide open, not because it is unsecure. In fact, virtually all of them are being interdicted at the border by our effective border security. The challenge is that these children are being sent on these incredibly long and expensive and dangerous and difficult trips in the first place.

Our Republican colleagues have suggested that this is solely caused by our President's lawlessness, that somehow either a law that was proposed and passed here in the Senate, a comprehensive immigration reform bill, or the President's deferred action program with regard to those who are so-called DREAMers is what is causing this flood of child refugees to this country.

But as has been said by other of our colleagues just in the last hour, neither of those two things—neither the comprehensive immigration bill passed on a bipartisan basis by this Chamber nor the deferred action program of the administration—would create really any legal opportunity for these child refugees to stay in the United States. Neither of them applies. In order to get access to the benefit and the opportunity to be in the United States under those two provisions, you would have to have been here years ago. The problem is really instability, violence, the tragic collapse of governance and safety in three Central American countries.

If the magnet drawing thousands of refugees to this country were the actions or inactions of the President, would not we see a huge surge in refugees from elsewhere in Central America, from Panama or from Belize or from Costa Rica or everyone closer to us from Mexico as well? But we have not.

In the last 5 years child migrants from Mexico have stayed relatively flat, while children from the three countries that are the focus of current violence—El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala—have surged out of control. In 2009 child migrants from those three countries made up just 17 percent of all the children trying to come across the American border. This year, three-quarters are coming from El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala.

Why are they coming from these three countries? Why these three countries?

Well, if you ask them, they will tell you. The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees surveyed, last year, 404 child refugees and asked: Why have you made this long and dangerous and difficult trip to the American border? Only 9 of 404 surveyed said because they believed the U.S. would ''treat them well.'' More than half said they came out of fear because they were ''forcibly displaced.'' They are refugees, not criminals.

We need to deal with the source of the problem in these three countries, not make this a partisan game on the floor of this Chamber. I think the evidence is clear that these children are being sent on this difficult, long, and expensive trip by their parents in desperation—because they have no other choice. If they stay in their home countries, the levels of violence, of gang activity, of murder have skyrocketed off the charts. They are fleeing not just to America but to Mexico, to Nicaragua, to Costa Rica as well. Children are fleeing the violence in these three countries in every direction—not because they are drawn by the magnet of some failure of immigration policy here but because they are driven by the centrifugal force of violence in these three countries. In fact, asylum applications from children are up by more than 700 percent in the countries of Mexico, Panama, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and Belize—the countries immediately around these three that are at the very center of the violence.

It is my hope that with the emergency supplemental request submitted by the President, as we consider it and debate it in a hearing in the Appropriations Committee tomorrow and as we debate it here on the floor, we will see more and more ways in which this emergency supplemental provides resources needed to ensure that these children are given the fair hearing they are entitled to under the law—a law signed by President Bush, passed unanimously by this Chamber; that we will honor our international commitment and allow these children their day in court, and if they have no legitimate claim to refugee status, they will be deported, but if they have a legitimate claim, that they are treated fairly.

Families and children are fleeing these Central American countries because conditions have become unbearable. Gangs, narcotics groups, and corrupt officials have weakened security situations and created an environment where innocent civilians are targeted by gangs.

In Honduras, for example, as has been mentioned earlier today, in the city of San Pedro Sula, the murder rate is four times higher, the chance of dying through murder is four times higher than faced by American troops in the highest years of combat deaths in Iraq. It has one of the highest murder rates on the planet.

In Guatemala, a weak government lacks the capacity to address insecurity and poverty, and these forces continue to drive Guatemalans to flee and to send their children to seek some peace outside their country.

In El Salvador, after a failed truce, gangs have divided up territory and are

challenging control of the state, while bringing violence into every neighborhood.

Despite these significant issues, we can and we should contribute and invest more in partnership with these three countries to hold them accountable for delivering on stability for their citizens.

Visits by the Vice President, by the Secretary of State, and meetings with the leaders of these three countries have laid out a path forward and a plan, and funding in this emergency supplemental will help contribute to the prosecution of the coyotes and the criminal gangs who are profiting off of the trafficking of these children, to increasing the capacity of these countries to receive back those children and adults who are being repatriated, and to leading a media campaign to make sure parents understand that children sent to the United States are not automatically entitled to stay in the United States.

We have to strengthen our efforts to counter corruption, to hold these governments accountable, and to assist in building stronger security, judicial, and governing institutions in these three Central American countries.

I am also a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee and the Senate Appropriations Committee. From those seats, I know how important it is that we make sure resources are available to our badly overstretched immigration enforcement system. This provides additional resources for immigration judges, for the Legal Orientation Program, and for providing counsel to minors. As has been mentioned earlier today on this floor, we have an international obligation, when children fleeing violence present legitimate claims for refugee status, to make sure they have their day in court before either repatriating them to their country of origin or allowing them refugee status here.

This emergency supplemental would increase the funding so there would not be such an enormous backlog of cases, so there would be a Legal Orientation Program, which has a proven record of success. While it does not provide personal counsel to everyone awaiting trial, it gives out basic information so legitimate claims can be made and illegitimate claims do not waste the time of our immigration courts.

Last, providing counsel to minor children it is a small portion of this total supplemental, but if you have a child who is a victim of child trafficking, who has a valid asylum claim, they have to be given the opportunity to present a valid claim.

We already know funding in these areas is insufficient to meet this surge in refugee minors seeking the relief of the American country and court system, and I think we have to do both: invest in ensuring stability in the three countries in Central America from which tens of thousands of children are fleeing and invest in ensuring that our border security, our immigration courts, and the reasonable and appropriate process for separating out those who are legitimate refugees from those who are seeking access to our country illegally is done in a fair and an appropriate way.

A refugee crisis is not the time for us to abandon our laws or our values. It is the time for us to enforce and abide those laws—fairly and efficiently. To do so, I think, frankly, our best solution would be to have the House take up, consider, and pass the comprehensive immigration bill, the bipartisan immigration bill that was taken up and passed by this Chamber over a year ago. Frankly, I think this crisis is in no small part because of a critical opportunity that we missed a year ago to legislate in a responsible, bicameral, and bipartisan way to invest more in the border, to invest more in stabilizing the region, and to invest more in ensuring that we have the resources in our courts to deliver justice in this country appropriately.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). The Senator from Connecticut.

BIPARTISAN SPORTSMEN'S ACT

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, the matter before this Chamber is the sportsmen's bill. Most of us, including myself, support and encourage sportsmen and sportsmanship. This bill has many laudable provisions. Among other provisions, it expands opportunities for sportsmen to use guns on Federal property with the encouragement of Federal law.

I voted in favor of this bill, in effect, when the issue was clotured almost 2 years ago because I support sportsmen and think that Federal law should, in fact, encourage them. I voted against cloture just a few days ago and I oppose this bill now because since that first vote, this Nation has experienced the horrific and unspeakable horror of Sandy Hook, coming after decades of horror and unspeakable violence resulting from the illegal use of guns and the illegal purchase of guns in this Nation. There are too many guns illegally in the possession of criminals and other people dangerous to themselves or others.

I have worked on this issue for decades, first as attorney general and now as a Senator. I cannot vote for this bill expanding the use of guns on Federal property with the encouragement of Federal law, so long as this great institution has done nothing—absolutely nothing—to make America safer from the kind of carnage and killing that is epitomized by the terrible and unspeakable tragedy that occurred at Sandy Hook.

I have spoken often about that tragedy. I have continued to meet with the loved ones of those 20 wonderful and beautiful children and 6 great educators. They are with me, as is the terrible tragedy of that day when I went to the firehouse where they learned for the first time that their loved ones would not be coming home. But I have stood also with loved ones from urban areas of Hartford, New Haven, and elsewhere from all other the country—victims of gun violence who perished unnecessarily and avoidably.

They are the survivors of this continuing carnage that just this past weekend took tens of victims from around the country, including many in Chicago—as has been described so eloquently by Senator DURBIN—and two alone in the east side of Bridgeport, CT, just this past weekend.

I have stood with the family of Lori Jackson, her mom and dad. She was a young woman with two small children—twins—murdered by her estranged husband when he was under a restraining order, a temporary restraining order, literally the day before a permanent one would go into effect and he would have been barred under current law from possessing or buying a firearm of exactly the kind he used to kill her.

Lori Jackson's mom was almost killed. A bullet went through her jaw and part of her head. Another went through her arm. As she stood with me, she was still bandaged from that wound. They stood with me because they want to save others from the terrible tragic fate that befell her that early morning as she sought refuge in their home—her parent's home—knowing her estranged husband was treacherously, dangerously, perilously, searching for her.

But the law could not protect her. Federal law was powerless to do it because of a loophole that, in effect, exempted temporary restraining orders from the same protection that is provided to permanent restraining orders. Yet we know from her experience and from so many others that the initial period—those 10 days to 2 weeks when there is a temporary order—are the most dangerous and perilous times to women and others who are threatened by their intimate partners, spouses or former spouses. It is the most dangerous time because it is when the intimate partner, often the estranged husband, learns that she is leaving. It is over. She is seeking a divorce. She is taking the kids because it has become too dangerous. The threats have become too real and immediate.

That was Lori Jackson's situation. I have offered a bill to close the loophole that rendered Federal law useless to her. I called it the Lori Jackson bill. I am offering an amendment that is identical to that legislation I introduced with my great colleague and friend Senator MURPHY, who has been a teammate in this effort against gun violence.

The Lori Jackson bill has nine other cosponsors: Senators DURBIN, MURRAY, BOXER, HIRONO, WARREN, MARKEY, BALDWIN, MENENDEZ, and KAINE. The identical amendment that I propose today is supported by Senators MURPHY, DURBIN, MARKEY, WARREN, MARKEY, FEINSTEIN, HIRONO, and BOXER.

Lori Jackson was so brave. There is really no other word for it. She was brave, courageous, resolute, and strong—trying to escape the cycle of domestic violence which is a scourge across this country. We must continue the effort to fight domestic violence. But we know that a woman who is a victim of domestic violence is five times more likely to die if there is a gun in the house.

In her name and her memory, so that her legacy will be one of hope and courage, I offer this amendment to the sportsmen's bill. Let us do something to make the Lori Jacksons of America safer from gun violence, if we are going to expand the use and opportunity for guns on Federal property or under Federal law. Because it is Federal law that failed to protect them now—a simple loophole, that a modest change can close. Let's do it in her name and in the name of Jasmine Leonard, who also had a temporary protection order against her husband and who died at his hand; Chyna Joy Young, who celebrated her 18th birthday just days before she was shot and killed by her estranged boyfriend; Barbara Diane Dye, who was granted a temporary restraining order and then fled to safety in Texas, returning only for a hearing on the permanent restraining order when her husband cornered her in a parking lot, and shot her repeatedly with a .357 Magnum revolver, killing her—and in the name of all of the other victims of domestic violence whom we can protect with this sensible, commonsense, modest measure that offers them some protection. I know that this amendment and the others that I supported offered by my colleagues such as that of Senator DURBIN, who has been such a steadfast champion, and Senator FEINSTEIN, who likewise spearheaded this cause well before I came here, while I was attorney general working in the State of Connecticut on this cause.

I know that this measure will not alone solve the problems of gun violence in this country. But it is a step. It will save some women and men who may be victims of domestic violence. It is to be regarded as a companion to legislation proposed by Senator KLOBUCHAR—very important legislation that I support as well, to prevent stalkers from accessing firearms. These kinds of measures are steps in the right direction. We should take those steps, put them first, and give safety the priority it deserves before we create more opportunities, and expand more access to Federal land for the use of guns. Gun safety should come first. We can send that message but also very practically and really help save lives, injuries, and dollars.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. I know we have some other colleagues on the way down to the floor to speak, so I will be brief. I just want to join Senator BLUMENTHAL and thank him for his tremendous leadership, as he noted, going back to his days as Connecticut's attorney general and now as a member of the Judiciary Committee. There have been few people in this country, frankly, who have led more on taking on the fight against gun violence, especially when it comes to protecting victims of domestic violence, than Senator BLUMENTHAL. I am proud to join him in offering this amendment.

After being married for a number of years, Zina Daniel and her husband Radcliffe Haughton became estranged. In October of 2012 she got a restraining order against him, telling a court that he had slashed her tires and had threatened to throw acid in her face and burn her and her family with gas.

She told the court that his threats against her terrorized her every waking moment. She got a permanent restraining order, but even that permanent restraining order was not enough. He went on line—her estranged husband—went around our background check system, as is currently part of Federal law, and posted a ''want to buy'' ad on Armslist, one of the biggest online marketers of firearms. Within hours he found a seller. He bought a Glock handgun for $500 cash in a McDonald's parking lot. There was no background check. There were no questions asked by our seller. It was a simple transaction that was allowed because of our lax gun laws.

The next day he stormed into the Brookfield, WI, spa where his estranged wife worked and he murdered her and two other women. He injured four others and then he killed himself. This story is a caution both about our laws that protect victims of domestic violence but then also our unreasonable laws right now around how we conduct background checks in this country.

He was prevented from going into a store and buying a handgun only because Zina had gotten a permanent restraining order. But had she had a temporary restraining order, there would have been no such protection. That is what the amendment Senator BLUMENTHAL and I have will cure. It will give spouses, girlfriends, partners, protection during that moment of intense rage right when the husband is expelled from the house for violence, when that temporary restraining order is being taken out.

But this story also tells us that we have miles to go when it comes to the other protections that are necessary to reduce the incidents of gun violence. In this case she had one protection surrounding the permanent restraining order, but because we do not require background checks for online purchases, her husband was able to buy a gun within a day and go and murder her and two others.

If we had background checks required for online purchases, it is likely that Zina Daniel and her two coworkers would still be alive today. So that is why we are on the floor today. Senator BLUMENTHAL and I and many others of our colleagues believe that if we are going to have a weeklong debate about guns, we should be talking about what actions are actually going to reduce the epidemic rates of gun violence across this country, in particular the epidemic rates of gun violence when it comes to people who are victims of domestic abuse.

Senator BLUMENTHAL probably covered the landscape in terms of the statistics.

But it is pretty stunning the risks that women in particular are put in when their spouse has easy access to a firearm. Abused women are five times more likely to be killed by their abuser if their abuser owns a firearm, and one of the few moments we can prevent that abuser from obtaining that firearm is when the court gets involved at that moment of separation between the wife and the husband, between the abused and the abuser, that moment of the temporary restraining order.

Senator BLUMENTHAL and I think this is an amendment that could get broad bipartisan support. I wish we could get 60 votes for background checks, but I am realistic that it is not likely that five minds have changed since the last time we took this vote.

But just as we came together after a period of disagreement to pass the Violence Against Women Act, we can certainly make the decision that in those limited circumstances, during those limited days of a temporary restraining order, that abuser shouldn't be able to go out and buy a weapon.

Our amendment builds in protections so that this isn't a denial of due process; that the judge actually has to make a finding that there is a threat of violence. Those are fairly limited circumstances, but if this amendment is passed, we will save lives.

Senator BLUMENTHAL closed, and I will close in the same vein, by noting that while this amendment will save lives, it is not going to dramatically change the reality in this country, which is 80-plus people killed every day by guns. But everybody has a role to play in trying to reduce the rates of gun violence.

A young man in New Haven, CT, by the name of Doug Bethea, lost a close friend of his this summer, a 16-year-old boy named Torrence Gamble, whom he saw at a funeral for another friend of theirs who had been killed by gun violence. Torrence said he wanted to get off the streets and start setting his life straight.

He wanted to set up a time to meet with his friend Doug Bethea to try to find a way out. It was only a couple of days after saying, ''Doug, don't forget about me''—in fact, the very next day—that Torrance was shot in his head and died of his injuries at Yale-New Haven Hospital.

So Doug decided to do something about it, and he spent the summer going out bringing information to house-to-house to tell families and kids

in New Haven about their options to get off the streets, to do something productive with their time this summer, all of the rec leagues, arts programs, and dance programs that kids can invest positive energy in.

Target did their part a couple weeks ago by asking their customers to refrain from bringing guns onto their property, and we can do our part this week. If we are going to talk about guns this week, let's make sure we do something that reduces the rates of gun violence all across this country. This is a commonsense amendment, an amendment I am sure can gain broad bipartisan support. We hope we can do our part this week to try to stem the plague and scourge of gun violence on the streets of America.

BIPARTISAN SPORTSMEN'S ACT

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I support S. 2363, the Bipartisan Sportsmen's Act of 2014. I am pleased to join 45 of my colleagues—23 Republicans and 23 Democrats in total—as a cosponsor of this legislation.

This package of bills supports a variety of important conservation priorities while protecting access to public lands for hunters and anglers. It reauthorizes annual funding for the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation and the North American Wetlands Conservation Act, two public-private matching grant programs that have provided wildlife habitat, flood protection, and land and water conservation benefits across Virginia. For instance, National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Chesapeake Stewardship Grants leverage annual Federal support with private funds for projects that incur agricultural, stormwater, and habitation restoration benefits in the Chesapeake Bay watershed. In 2013, Virginia received $2.5 million for 12 projects throughout its portion of the watershed.

I have long supported measures to conserve open space in Virginia. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, 3.3 million people participate in hunting, fishing, and wildlife-watching in the Commonwealth. As Governor, one of my proudest environmental achievements was meeting an ambitious goal of preserving 400,000 acres for recreation and conservation by the end of my 4-year term.

While I am an avid hiker and outdoorsman, conservation is not just important to me for the intrinsic enjoyment of Virginia's beautiful lands and waters. Conservation is also good for business. According to the Outdoor Industry Association, outdoor recreation generates $13.6 billion in consumer spending, 138,000 jobs, $3.9 billion in wages and salaries, and $923 million in State and local tax revenue in Virginia every year.

It is no small feat to put together a bill supported by nearly half the U.S. Senate in equal partisan proportion. I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN). The Senator from Washington State is recognized.

THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Ms. CANTWELL. I appreciate the comments made by the Senator from Connecticut, and I come to the floor to talk about a very important issue, U.S. manufacturing jobs and what the Senate needs to do to make sure we are protecting U.S. manufacturing jobs.

I am speaking of the need to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank, a credit agency that helps U.S. manufacturers and small businesses sell their products to overseas markets.

Some of you may have read recently comments by some of our colleagues where they have shifted their position. The agency is set to expire on September 30 of this year, and it is so critical that we reauthorize this program because it is such an important tool for U.S. manufacturers.

Over the last few weeks, fringe organizations and activists have suddenly tried to turn this into a political casualty, saying we should kill the program, and I am here to advocate that it is a win-win situation for American manufacturers, for American taxpayers, and for the jobs it creates. That is because the Export-Import Bank supports about 1.2 million jobs, it returned $1 billion to the U.S. Treasury last year alone, and it supports between 35,000 suppliers of manufactured parts, and that was just in the year 2011. As this chart shows, the Export-Import Bank helps us generate export sales and supports 1.2 million jobs. That is between 2009 and 2013.

One would think a program that doesn't cost the taxpayers any money, actually helps us pay down the deficit, helps create that many export sales and that many jobs would be something we would want to reauthorize and give predictability to businesses all across the United States.

In fact, if the credit agency is not reauthorized, nearly 90 percent of the companies that would be harmed are small businesses. Sure, there are big companies such as Boeing or General Electric or Caterpillar that help sell products around the globe, and some of my colleagues want to criticize that somehow we should be apologizing for the fact that we actually make expensive products and sell them.

I am quite proud that we sell products from the United States to China and various parts all around the globe that are actually expensive products. We should be proud we are making something worth millions of dollars that people want to buy. So I am glad that ''Made In the USA'' is actually closing deals all across the globe.

Today we also want to highlight that all of these companies that are in the manufacturing sector are part of a manufacturing chain. We know this well, because in the State of Washington, when we look at who makes aerospace products, while we can say there is a company in Everett, WA, named Boeing, there are hundreds of companies, thousands of companies across the United States that are part of what is called the supply chain.

Behind every 777 or Caterpillar tractor there are thousands of workers who are working every day to refine their product, stay competitive, retrain, and refocus to make sure we build the very best products in the United States and that we are competing on a global basis.

When these larger companies and small businesses they work with try to win deals overseas, they run into lots of different challenges. That is why we are here today to say making sure we reauthorize this program is critically important to small business manufacturers and suppliers throughout the United States.

So with all of these small businesses and companies—30,000 to 35,000 companies across the United States—there is actually a supplier in every State in the United States, but let's look at some of the numbers.

In Georgia, there are over 833 different companies, such as United Seal and Rubber Company and other important companies, that make products just for aviation or for Caterpillar or for other products.

In the State of Florida, there are over 1,252 different small businesses and manufacturers that are helping to produce products that are sold on an international basis, and those companies want the Export-Import Bank reauthorized.

In the State of Wisconsin, there are over 1,397 different suppliers, such as Hentzen Coatings in Milwaukee, which provides primer, sealer, and wing coating. These are companies that also want to see the reauthorization of this important tool that helps products they help manufacture and build be sold in international markets.

Of course, there are places, such as Texas, which have a lot of people in the supply chain. Here are just some of the companies that are involved in manufacturing that take advantage of this important export-created agency by building products into final assembly. They are all over the State of Texas.

In fact, here is another continued list of these companies from Texas that are part of building products that are then using the Export-Import Bank to sell their products around the globe. But we can't go over all of those in Texas because there are actually 4,355 different companies in the State of Texas that are involved in the supply chain of companies that are selling products through the export credit agency and its assistance.

So we can see this is not a program that just affects one State or one region; it is an example of small business manufacturers working everywhere to stay competitive, to sell products, and win in the international marketplace.

Personally, having visited many of these companies in the State of Washington, I find it very frustrating, as

these people are working night and day to make the best airplanes, to make the best manufactured product, to take the risk to go and sell in overseas markets, to compete with international competitors, to retrain and reskill a workforce, that we have people in Congress who don't have the good common sense to understand what an important tool the Export-Import Bank is in helping U.S. manufacturers sell into new emerging markets.

I know there are other States—we are not going to show charts about them—but in Ohio—I know the Presiding Officer is from Ohio—there are over 1,700 suppliers.

These companies are companies such as Hartzell Propeller. They are a family-owned propeller manufacturer in Southwest Ohio. Hartzell is part of the Dayton aviation economy that dates back to the Wright brothers. In fact, it was Orville Wright who suggested that the Hartzell family build an airplane propeller.

Today the Wright brothers are gone, but this company is still here and they are still innovating. In fact, I think they are part of the spirit of innovation in America that makes it so great.

I am so frustrated that people here don't understand that innovative spirit, don't understand what it takes, don't understand that they are hampering—truly right now almost torturing—small businesses by not giving them the certainty and predictability for the export assistance program.

This company builds crop-dusting plane propellers. Hartzell has grown its company from about 13 to about 300 people in the last 3 years, and that is because these crop-dusting planes have been sold using the Export-Import Bank. The loans haven't come directly to Hartzell as part of the Ex-Im supply chain, but companies similar to them that make these propellers are important companies to making sure we win in the international marketplace.

The President of this company, Joe Hartzell, I thought said it best. He said:

> If you take Ex-Im away from my customers, you might as well bring unemployment checks to their offices, because you're going to put people on the street. If they're not building as many airplanes, then I'm going to have a jobs problem.

Here is a manufacturer—I heard the same thing in Seattle a few weeks ago when I was there—a company in Ohio saying if we don't get this program reauthorized, we are going to have bigger problems. So people such as Hartzell are trying to tell everyone here we need to keep working to make sure we get this reauthorized.

We need to make sure companies throughout the Midwest, such as in Wichita, KS, or people in the West, such as in Tempe, AZ, or companies in Irving, TX, everywhere where we are part of this huge supply chain, are doing the work we need to do.

Another area that is big on the supply chain is in the general area of aviation, and it supports over 200,000 jobs. So 200,000 jobs represents the number of people who are involved in aviation today, and those are individuals, businesses that are doing their best to stay competitive in aviation, even though we have incredible competition.

This incredible competition comes from the fact that there are so many different companies around the globe that also want to build airplanes. There is a demand for 35,000 new airplanes over the next 20 years. So we can imagine every country wants to try to build airplanes. China wants to build airplanes. Brazil is already in the business, Canada, the Europeans. Everybody wants to build airplanes.

The good news for us is we actually have a supply chain in the United States, and this chart represents that supply chain of 15,000 manufacturers and over 1.5 million jobs.

These are all companies throughout the United States of America who are involved in using the Export-Import Bank to make sure their products are sold on an international basis. There are actually jobs in companies in every State of the Union that take advantage of being part of this supply chain.

And why it is so important to keep the supply chain? Because if you keep the supply chain in your country, then you have the skill set it takes to keep innovating, because each of these companies is working on the individual parts and making them the best they can possibly be. That way we get the efficient airplane of today. This innovation is taking place all across the country, and we have to stay competitive.

Now, get rid of the Export-Import Bank and over time this supply chain will start to disappear. Why? Because in Europe they will still have an Export-Import Bank, and companies such as Airbus will continue to use that product and they will have a supply chain, and over time all these small businesses and all this expertise in aviation will move out of the United States of America to somewhere else. Then what manufacturing jobs will we have in the United States?

Aviation is one of the best sectors for manufacturing that we have today. With over 1.5 million employees, we need to keep aviation manufacturing competitive in the United States of America. That is why we need to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

There are other sectors of aviation, such as Gulfstream, which is another company, based in Savannah, GA, and has been one of the foremost makers of business jets. They have watched their international competition increase steadily over the last decade, and the Export-Import Bank has helped them be competitive. The Gulfstream supply chain has about 3,500 different businesses and about 13,000 employees, and all those employees are working hard to try to stay competitive. They are working to make sure we keep those jobs in the United States of America. But they also have to have the Export-Import Bank so they can then continue to win in the international marketplace. Gulfstream actually sells product to China. So jobs in Georgia and throughout the supply chain are helping us win in the international marketplace.

Whether they are composite companies or light industrial or fuselage skins, all of these things are helping people be competitive.

Right now, Gulfstream and the supply chain has sold 8,000 planes to China. That helped support 2,100 jobs, and most of those jobs were right in the Savannah, GA, area. So if we are going to cancel the Export-Import Bank, how are they going to get these products financed and how are they going to get them sold?

While we are very appreciative of both sectors of aviation—the commercial sector and general aviation sector, and we haven't even talked about the others, such as the defense sectors of aviation—these are two big components to our economy. Some people might think, well, there is a way to get these planes sold, or these are big companies, these are integral parts to our U.S. manufacturing base, and we need to keep it. The demand of the United States, as I said earlier, is for 35,000 new planes over the next 20 years, and 80 percent of those planes will be delivered outside of the United States. That means if we want to keep winning the race for airplane sales, we are going to have to work outside the United States.

Yesterday, Standard & Poor's reported that if the Export-Import Bank is not reauthorized, it would be a huge benefit to Airbus. In fact, they said:

> . . . Airbus would still be able to offer . . . financing, and this could be a deciding factor for some new aircraft contracts, especially in emerging markets and for sales to start-up or financially weak airlines.

In other words, we would be sending U.S. jobs overseas, and that is not what we want to do. Countries are building up their investment to try to compete with us, and the Export-Import Bank is a key tool for U.S. manufacturers to compete.

Trade is a critically important part of our economy. In 2013, U.S. exports reached $2.3 trillion worth of goods, and a key part of that export growth can be attributed to this program. The Export-Import Bank supported $37.4 billion worth of U.S. exports which supported over 200,000 jobs in the United States. That alone is enough information for me to say the Senate ought to act quickly to reauthorize this program.

There are many other aspects of the Export-Import Bank that help small businesses and manufacturing. In fact, there are about 12 million manufacturing jobs in the United States, and 1 in 4 jobs is tied to exports. That is why, when I think my colleagues try to portray the Export-Import Bank as an issue that maybe a few big companies

would benefit from, I think they have it totally wrong. This is an issue about the competitive nature of manufacturing and the supply chain of manufacturers all across the United States, and whether we want to keep manufacturing jobs—because they are high-wage, high-skilled jobs—in the United States.

While my colleagues would like to talk about other things in the economy, I think it is important to realize how manufacturing jobs are a higher wage. They are a higher wage than service-sector jobs, they help stabilize the middle class, they help the U.S. economy grow because of those large export numbers, and they help the United States continue to innovate and stay ahead in a global marketplace. All of these are reasons why the Export-Import Bank is such a viable tool.

Think about it from the perspective of being a critical part of manufacturing, and these are the high-wage jobs and it supports that supply chain I just went through. Then we can see why it is so important that this get done before the end of September.

Right now, what is happening is my colleagues not only want to threaten to not reauthorize this program, they actually want to kill it. My guess is they would like to say: OK, we will agree to a short-term extension of a few months, only in hopes of killing it later.

I want to make sure all my colleagues know how important it is not only that we reauthorize this, but we reauthorize it for several years so companies have the predictability and certainty to know the program is going to be there and they have the support.

The Export-Import Bank has four primary tools. It has loan guarantees that provide security to commercial lenders who make loans to foreign buyers of American products. For example, the loan helped Goss International in New Hampshire sell their printing presses in emerging markets in Brazil.

We have export credit insurance, and companies such as Manhasset in Yakima, in my State of Washington, used it to help get their music stands sold across the globe and make sure there was credit insurance to protect them.

There are loan programs, for example, to help foreign buyers of U.S. products such as FirmGreen in Newport Beach, CA, which is run by a disabled veteran who helped to sell their goods in Brazil.

It also provides working capital like in Morrison Technologies manufacturing in South Carolina which used the tools to purchase materials needed for a recent surge in business that couldn't have been met without that financing.

So here they are, all these companies throughout the country using the Export-Import Bank and staying competitive. I personally would make the Export-Import Bank bigger. When we look at what China is doing or what Europe is doing, they are making a bigger financial investment in helping their businesses become exporters.

In the United States, the Export-Import Bank finances less than 5 percent of U.S. exports. A significant portion of the capital of exports is done in the private sector, but this tool helps commercial banks and helps commercial manufacturers get their product when other avenues aren't available in the private sector.

Here is an example of one of the programs and how the Export-Import Bank works. We can see the U.S. exporter sells to the foreign buyer and that commercial financing is still part of the equation. The Export-Import Bank is only used as a safety net to make sure that financial commercial obligation is secure in this situation. So it is not as if we are replacing commercial banking, it is not as if we aren't even making market rates. We are for products such as aerospace.

The issue is, we need to make sure commercial banks are willing to guarantee these kinds of sales. We are providing a safety net with the Export-Import Bank. And what has the cost been to the U.S. Government? Well, we have had incredible success, because everybody pays fees into this system, and those fees and the success of the program has helped us pay down the Federal deficit. That is right; it has actually made money for U.S. taxpayers and helped us pay down the Federal deficit.

It supports 1.2 million export-related jobs, it has helped support $37 billion in exports from the United States, which helps our economy, and it has returned more than $1 billion to U.S. taxpayers. I would call that a win-win situation for American jobs and American taxpayers.

We have 73 days left until that program expires. I don't want to let that happen. So today we are announcing that over 200 different supply chain companies are sending a letter to the Senate and House of Representatives asking them to urgently support the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank.

We are also hearing from lots of businesses and business organizations that also support the immediate reauthorization: the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Business Roundtable, National Association of Businesses, the International Association of Machinists, National Grain and Feed Association, and many more organizations. All of them want to be able to say ''Made in the USA,'' and have their products sold overseas.

I hope my colleagues will be there to help ensure this program gets reauthorized in a short amount of time. I personally hope the Senate will take up this legislation in the next few weeks before we adjourn for the August recess. I would hate to see what happens to all the business deals these manufacturers have on the table if they go home in August and people are saying: Well, the bank only has a few days left to be reauthorized; I am not going to do business with you until I know. Or if somebody tries to stick a 5-month reauthorization on some bill, and then everybody still says: When is this program going to be reauthorized? Otherwise, I am not going to do a deal with U.S. manufacturers.

Of all the things we are doing in sending a message to the actual competitors of creating jobs in today's economy, why are we sending such a message of uncertainty in this situation? These are real jobs in a marketplace that is growing.

The middle class is going to grow from about 2.3 billion to about 5 billion people outside the United States over the next 15 years. We are going to see a doubling of the middle class. That is where products are going to be sold in emerging markets. Those emerging markets don't all have the financial tools to make those deals a reality, but the Export-Import Bank can help. They can help make sure a customer pays, that U.S. manufacturing wins, and that we keep our marketplace.

We hope all our colleagues will support this legislation. Time is running out. Know that this program has returned over $1 billion to the U.S. Treasury. That is a pretty good deal for us. If somebody on the other side has a better way of growing jobs and paying down the Federal deficit, I would like to hear it, because this is an important tool, and time is running out. I urge my colleagues to help support the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from companies asking to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank, and I yield the floor.

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

July 9, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. HARRY REID,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER, LEADER REID, LEADER PELOSI AND LEADER MCCONNELL: We are writing today to ask you to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank without further delay. The Export-Import Bank is absolutely essential to our companies. While many of us don't access the Bank's services directly, our customers do. We sell goods and services of all kinds to American businesses that rely on the Export-Import Bank to sell their products abroad.

Recent reports on the uncertainty of the Bank's future may have already impacted sales, which can negatively impact our bottom line. Our customers need the certainty of export credit to successfully pursue many of their commercial sales abroad. The ongoing defense budget uncertainty compounds this threat for many of our companies with commercial and defense customers.

Reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank should not be a partisan political game. Until recently, it never has been. In fact, the Bank has been reauthorized more than a dozen times, and recently it was reauthorized with broad bipartisan support. Reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank also helps reduce the deficit. The Bank earns money on its fees and interest, and last year returned over one billion dollars to the U.S. Treasury. It is time for Congress to schedule a vote, and reauthorize the bank.

More than 95 percent of the world's consumers live abroad. We need our customers to have the ability to sell to those consumers. If they do, many of our businesses will grow, allowing us to hire more employees and re-invest in our economy. If they no longer have the Bank's support, it is our foreign competitors who will reap the benefits of greater exports.

We urge you to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank immediately, helping to reduce our deficit, provide certainty to our economy, and invest in America's middle class.

Sincerely,

Advanced Welding Technologies, LLC, Wichita, KS; Aero-Flex Corp., Jupiter, FL; Aero-Plastics Inc., Renton, WA; Aerospace Fabrications of GA Dallas, GA; Aerospace Futures Alliance of Washington, Kent, WA; Air Industries Group; Aircraft Maintenance & Support; AIREPS INC., Anaheim, CA; Airready MRO Services Inc., Melbourne, AR; Alarin Aircraft Hinge, Inc.; Altek, Liberty Lake, WA; American Aerospace Controls, Inc., Farmingdale, NY; Amerisips of the Carolina's, Charleston, SC; Amphenol APCBT, Nashua, NH; Andrews Tool Co., Inc., Pantego, TX; Arizona Industrial Hardware, Chandler, AZ; Arthur J. Gallagher & Co., Cincinnati, OH; Aviation Partners Boeing; Aviation Technical Services, Everett, WA; B/E Aerospace, Inc. Consumables Management, Tulsa, OK; Bedard Machine Inc., Brea, CA; Boise Inc., Boise, ID; Bradham Consulting, LLC, Midlothian, VA; Brogdon Machine Inc., Blue Springs, MO; Buyken Metal Products, Inc.; Cascade Columbia Distribution, Seattle, WA; Central Sales & Service, Inc., Waverly, TN; Certified Inspection Service Co., Inc., Phoenix, AZ; CFAN, San Marcos, TX; Chapel Steel, Portland, OR; Clampco, Sedro Woolley, WA; Clark Manufacturing, Inc.; Wellington, KS; CMS2, LLC, North Las Vegas, NV; CO Maintenance, South Jordan, UT; Coalition Solutions Integrated (CSI); Columbus Jack Corporation, Columbus, OH; Commercial Aircraft Painting Services LLC, Portland, OR; Consolidated Truck & Caster Co., Saint Louis, MO; Council for U.S.-Russia Relations, Seattle, WA; CPI Aerostructures; Crace, Inc., Bellevue, WA; Cv International, Bend, OR; D&S Septic Tank and Sewer Service Inc., Pacific, MO; David Mann Lean Consulting, Grand Rapids, MI; Davis Door Service, Inc., Seattle, WA; Delva Tool and Machine Coiporation, Cinnaminson, NJ; Denezol Tool Co., Inc., Salem, OR; DESE Research Inc., Huntsville, AL; Deuro, The Woodlands, TX; Diamond Machine Works; Distribution International SW, Inc., Houston, TX; Diversified Industrial Services, Mukilteo, WA; Dyer Company, Lancaster, PA; E-SUV LLC/DBA E-Ride Industries, Princeton, MN; E.D. Powerco, Lake Elsinore, CA; East Coast Electronics & Data, Rockaway, NJ; EffectiveUI, Inc., Denver, CO; El-Co Machine Products, Inc., Inglewood, CA; Electroimpact, Mukilteo, WA; Elite Tool LLC, Moscow Mills, MO; Elk Creek Lumber Co., Wilkesboro, NC; Ellwood Group, Irvine, PA; Esterline Technologies, Bellevue, WA; Eustis Co., Inc., Mukilteo, WA; EWT-3DCNC, Inc., Rockford, IL.

Exelis Inc., McLean, VA; Exotic Metals, Kent, WA; Fabrisonic LLC, Columbus, OH; Farwest Aircraft Inc., Edgewood, WA; Ferguson Enterprises, Inc., Seattle, WA; Flanagan Industries, Glastonbury, CT; FlightSafety International, Broken Arrow, OK; Fluid Engineering Associates, Port Ludlow, WA; Fluid Mechanics Valve Company, Houston, TX; Frank V Radomski & Sons, Inc., Colmar, PA; Frontier Electronic Systems Corp., Stillwater, OK; Gary Jet Center, Inc., Gary, IN; Gasline Mechanical Inc., WA; Gastineau Log Homes, Inc., New Bloomfield, MO; Global Consulting & Investments, Inc., Issaquah, WA; Global Machine Works, Inc.; Global Trade Insurance; GM Nameplate, Seattle, WA; Growth Nation, Scottsdale, AZ; Hapeman Electronics Inc., Mercer, PA; Harris Group, Seattle, WA; Henkel Corporation, Bay Point, CA; Herndon Products, O'Fallon, MO; Hexagon Metrology, Inc., North Kingstown, RI; Hirschler Manufacturing Inc.; HITCO Carbon Composites, Gardena, CA; Hobart Machined Products, Inc., Hobart, WA; HOME INC., Hermann, MO; Horizon Distributing, Yakima, WA; Houston International Trade Development Council, Inc.; Hubbs Machine & Manufacturing, Inc., Cedar Hill, MO; Hughes Bros. Aircrafters, Inc., South Gate, CA; Hurricane Electronics, Inc., Pompano Beach, FL; HVAC R Services LLC, Auburn, WA; HySecurity, Kent, WA; IHS Inc., Englewood, CO; Illinois Chamber of Commerce, IL; IMS-CHAS, INC., North Charleston, SC; Independent Machine Company, Gladstone, MI; Industrial Sales & Mfg., Inc., Erie, PA; Industrial Supplies Company, Trevose, PA; Iridium Communications, Tempe, AZ; J. Maxime Roy, Inc., Lafayette, LA; Janicki Industries, Sedro Woolley, WA; Jet Systems, Inc., Wilbur, WA; JWD Machine, Fife, WA; Kaas Tailored; Kemeny Associates LLC dba Middleton Research, Middleton, WI; Kenmore Air, Kenmore, WA; Kratos Defense & Security Solutions, Inc., Lancaster, PA; Kubco Industrial Equipment, Inc., Houston, TX; Lamsco West Inc., Santa Clarita, CA; LKD Aerospace, Snoqualmie, WA; LMI Aerospace, St. Charles, MO; Lockheed Martin, Chelmsford, MA; LORD Corporation, Cary, NC; Luma Technologies, LLC, Bellevue, WA; Magna Tool Inc., Cypress, CA; Maney Aircraft, Inc., Ontario, CA; Marketech International, Inc., Port Townsend, WA; Master CNC, Inc., Washington Twp, MI; Maverick Enterprises, Monroe, NC; Meyer Tool Inc.; MFCP Inc—Fluid Connector Products, Portland, OR; MGL Energy, LLC, Destin, FL; Micro-Coax, Inc., Pottstown, PA; Microsemi Corporation; Millitech, Inc.

NaviTrade Structured Finance LLC, Barrington, IL; Neenah Enterprises, Inc., Neenah, WI; NewAgeSys, Inc., Princeton Junction, NJ; North Star Aerospace, Inc., Auburn, WA; NovaComp Engineering, Inc., Bothell, WA; Object Computing, Inc. (OCI), St. Louis, MO; Officemporium, Seattle, WA; Olympic Tool & Machine Corp., Aston, PA; Onboard Systems, Vancouver, WA; Orbit International Corp., Hauppauge, NY; Orion, Auburn, WA; Pacific Consolidated Industries LLC, Riverside, CA; Papé Material Handling, Seattle, WA; PAS MRO, Irvine, CA; Philips Screw Company; PhoenixMart LLC, Scottsdale, AZ; Pioneer Aerofab Corp.; Pioneer Human Services, WA; PM Testing, Fife, WA; ProTek Models, LLC, Rancho Cucamonga, CA; ProtoCAM, Allentown, PA; R & S Machining, Inc., St. Louis, MO; R&B Electronics, Inc., Sault Ste. Marie, MI; Robert Schneider & Associates, Inc., Kankakee, IL; Russell Investments, Seattle, WA; S & S Welding, Kent, WA; SEA Wire and Cable, Inc., AL; Service Steel Aerospace; Sigmatex High Technology Fabrics, Benicia, CA; Silicon Designs, Inc., Kirkland, WA; Silicon Forest Electronics, Vancouver, WA; SKF Aerospace, Indianapolis, IN, Skills Inc., Auburn, WA; Sound Machine Services, LLC., Suquamish, WA; Spirit AeroSystems, Wichita, KS; StandardAero, Tempe, AZ; SteelFab, Inc., Arlington, WA; Sunshine Metals Inc., Wichita, KS; System Heating and Air Conditioning Co Inc., Seattle, WA; System Integrators LLC. Glendale, AZ; Tech Manufacturing, LLC, Wright City, MO; Technical Aero, LLC, WA; Telephonics Corporation, Farmingdale, NY; Telepress, Inc., Kent, WA; The Complete Line LLC, Redmond, WA; The Entwistle Company, Hudson, MA; The Graeber Group Ltd, Kirkland, WA; The Industrial Controls Company, Sussex, WI; The Rockford Agency, Inc., Manhattan Beach, CA; Thick Film Technologies, Inc., Everett, WA; Titan Spring Inc., Hayden, ID; Toray Composites America, Inc., Tacoma, WA; Trade Acceptance Group, Ltd., Edina, MN; Transmet Corporation; TRICOR Systems Inc.; Triumph Actuation Systems—Valencia, Valencia, CA; Triumph Composite Systems, Spokane, WA; TSI Incorporated; TTF Aerospace, Auburn, WA; UEC Electronics, Hanahan, SC; Umbra Cuscinetti Inc., Everett, WA; United Risk Consultants, Dallas, TX; US Aluminum Casting, LLC, Entiat, WA; Valley Machine Shop Inc., Kent, WA; Ventower Industries; Verde Wood International, Carrboro, NC; Vosky Precision Machining Corp., Ronkonkoma, NY; Wallquest Inc., Wayne, PA; Welded Tubes, Inc., Orwell, OH; Wheeler Industries, Inc., North Charleston, SC; Will-Mor Manufacturing, Inc., Seabrook, NH; Wood Group Mustang Inc., Houston, TX; Wulbern-Koval Co., Charleston, SC; Zodiac Aerospace, WA; Zyxaxis Inc., Wichita, KS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

EPA RULE CHANGES

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I wish to speak for a few minutes about the EPA rules on water. EPA Administrator Gina McCarthy is in Missouri today to discuss the EPA's proposed rule which would significantly expand the authority of the United States under the Clean Water Act.

In a conference call with reporters yesterday, Administrator McCarthy called some of the questions about the rule ''silly'' and ''ludicrous'' and said that her trip to Missouri was part of a broader campaign to reassure the agricultural community and set the record straight. I hope she is spending at least as much time in my State listening as she is talking. If she does that she will find out that some of these concerns are very real but they have lots of impact and not just for the farm community across the country but for lots of people who are affected in lots of different ways by what happens if you expand the authority of the Federal Government as this rule would to deal with water almost everywhere and almost all water.

Not only did she say that these questions were silly and ludicrous, but the Missouri farm bureau expressed the concern that ''virtually every acre of private property potentially falls under the Clean Water Act jurisdiction. . . . Things that you normally do on a farm would be called into question.'' According to the Springfield News-Leader, ''McCarthy says that's hog wash.''

If the way to actually deal with the people we work for is to say your ideas are silly, they are ludicrous, and your comments are hog wash, I think once

again we are certainly seeing the Federal Government at its worst, not at its best.

This is a big organization. It is a well-run organization. It has represented Missouri's agricultural interests for a long time. There are folks who stand and say virtually every acre of private property potentially falls under the Clean Water Act jurisdiction if this rule is finalized, and at least 40 members of this body believe that to be the case. That is what they said, and she said it was hog wash. According to the paper, she rattled off what she said were ''some of the most dubious claims made by the rule's critics.''

This is a rule which has critics because it is a rule that deserves to have critics. It draws concerns from farmers. In fact, just today I said: Before I come over, let's be sure I know that we haven't had an epiphany of understanding here and suddenly Administrator McCarthy said: I have listened and you are right. These are problems to which we need to find the answers.

But what I found when I looked was that the farmers she met with today—there was no press in the meeting that included the farmers and there were no farmers in the meeting that included the press. So farm families were concerned that when you take the press out, away from everybody else, and you go out on this farm and talk about—I assume—all the great benefits that more Federal control of that farmland would produce, but then when you have a meeting with the farmers, no press is in that meeting where anybody can hear the concerns that these farmers have.

I think the Members of the Senate have been pretty clear as we cosponsored bills that would require the EPA to withdraw this rule and try again. It is clear that this is really a blatant overreach into the private lives and private property rights of the American people by the administration—and not just farmers but anybody who owns land anywhere. If I were just hearing from farmers, I would be concerned, but I am hearing from farmers, I am hearing from builders, I am hearing from realtors, I am hearing from local governments: What happens if the Federal Government has this most broad definition of waters of the United States?

The proposed rule would give the EPA, the Corps of Engineers, the most extreme of environmental groups a powerful tool to delay almost anything to prevent development, to prevent land use on property owned by municipalities, property owned by individuals, property owned by farming families and by small businesses, because all that property includes water in some way or another.

The law was clear when it was written that the EPA under the Clean Water Act would have authority ''over the navigable waters of the United States.'' This rule, in fact, makes the jurisdictional assertion that navigable waters now means ''any water that could go into navigable waters.'' Any water that could eventually flow into the Missouri River, the Mississippi River, the Ohio River, the Gulf of Mexico, the Atlantic Ocean, the Pacific Ocean and all water everywhere, eventually some of it heads to those places. So every drop of water everywhere is potentially under the jurisdiction of the EPA.

Navigable waters means what it means.

There was an editorial today in the Washington Post which actually supported the rule, but I thought the most interesting sentence in that editorial today that supports the rule was right in almost the exact middle of the editorial. It said: ''It's true that the agency's plan would expand the scope of the Clean Water Act regulation.'' Now, the way it expands the scope of the Clean Water Act regulation is it expands the scope of the Clean Water Act.

We actually have a procedure for that. It is the procedure that everybody who took a civics class learned when they took that civics class. The House passes a bill or the Senate passes a bill. The two come together. I know this doesn't happen as often as it needs to anymore, but that is not the way it has to happen. The two come together. They agree on a bill. It goes back to both Houses. They vote on that bill one final time. It goes to the President's desk and gets signed into law. That is how you expand the Clean Water Act.

You don't expand the Clean Water Act by somebody saying: You know, we just really think that the Congress should have done something here that they didn't do, and so we are going to do it. Then your friends who actually support the goal are so lulled into the idea that the government won't work that they even forget the constitutional process and say: Well, there is no question; the truth is this expands the regulations under the Clean Water Act.

If you ask anybody at the Washington Post or anybody else that uses words all the time to define navigable waters of the United States, nobody would say that is any water that flows into any water that might eventually flow into water that you can navigate. Nobody would say that. Nobody would say those are the navigable waters of the United States. But that is the authority that the EPA has.

Now we are talking about the authority the EPA would like to take. That is why I and a number of my colleagues—I think 29 of us—joined Senator BARRASSO in a bill that would say you can't do this. We are going to protect the water and property rights and stop the EPA from going beyond the wall.

Senator BARRASSO is also going to file that as an amendment that I intend to support on the bill before us now, the sportsmen's act. That has lots of water implications, many of which I have supported—the wetlands act. There are many things in there that I can be supportive of, but I am not supportive without any congressional authority of the EPA's deciding they are just going to take property rights from people who have those rights. I am particularly not supportive of that when the law was designed to define what the EPA could do.

If anybody wants to go out and do any kind of survey of the American people—let alone the legislators who voted for the Clean Water Act—and ask what ''navigable waters'' is, nobody thinks that is every drop of water that eventually flows to a source that could at some point in the distant distance be navigable.

We know what the law says. We know the authority the EPA has been given. I think we can have a legitimate debate about whether that authority has been properly used or not. But there is no legitimate debate about whether the EPA is trying to go way beyond what the Congress has authorized.

This idea the administration has that the pen and the phone will replace the Constitution of the United States is not worthy of this country. It not worthy of what we do. It is a disastrous course to set, to believe: OK, Congress, you deal with immigration for the next 60 days or I will just do it on my own. Congress, you change the Clean Water Act or we will just change the Clean Water Act with regulation. Congress, you change the Clean Air Act or we will change the Clean Air Act.

There is a reason for the constitutional process, and I hope Missourians in the next 24 hours are given the chance to remind Administrator McCarthy of what that reason is. And there are reasons that the Congress is looking for ways to remind the President of what that is. That is why I am supporting the Enforcement Law Act that has already passed the House of Representatives. What the Enforcement Law Act would do is give individual Members of Congress standing if a majority of either House of the Congress believes the President wasn't enforcing the law as written to go to a court and ask the court to decide if the President is enforcing the law as written.

In my view there is no way in the world that you could look at this proposed rule by the EPA and believe that the EPA and this administration is in any way complying with what is the clear intent of the law. If they don't like the law, there is a way to come to the Congress and ask it to change the law. That is their job. It is not their job to do the job of the Congress. That job the Constitution left to somebody besides the Executive, whose job it is to execute the law—not to improve on the law, not to write the law, not to make the law. And we see all those things being attempted by people who believe they know what is better for the United States of America than the people of the United States believe is good for the United States of America.

I would yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleagues in a very important discussion with regard to the waters of the United States and the proposed rule by the EPA.

The good Senator from Missouri, I, a Senator from Wyoming and—as has been already said on the floor—about 30 of us in total are proposing an amendment to the sportsmen's bill which is currently under consideration on the floor—an amendment that would address the regulatory overreach by the EPA and, specifically, their proposed waters of the U.S. regulation.

The amendment we have is very simple, very straightforward. It is relevant to the legislation that is currently on the floor and should be brought forward for a vote. It is amendment No. 3453, and as I said it deals with the waters of the United States.

I am going to take just a minute to read it because it is very simple and very straightforward and could be dealt with in a very expeditious way. Obviously with 29 Senators supporting it, it is an amendment that we should be voting on. This is a clear example of an amendment where this body needs to take a stand, and it is one that should receive a vote as part of this sportsmen's legislation.

So I will read from the amendment:

In General. Neither the Secretary of the Army nor the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall—

(1) finalize the proposed rule entitled ''Definition of 'Waters of the United States' Under the Clean Water Act'';

(2) use the proposed rule described in paragraph (1), or any substantially similar proposed rule or guidance, as a basis for any rulemaking or any decision regarding the scope of the enforcement of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

(b) RULES. The use of the proposed rule described in subsection (a)(1), or any substantially similar proposed rule or guidance, as the basis for any rulemaking or any decision regarding the scope or enforcement of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act shall be grounds for vacation of the final rule, decision, or enforcement action.

So very simply, what we provide is that the EPA cannot move forward with the proposed waters of the U.S. rule. It is appropriate because in essence, as my colleague from Missouri very accurately described, the EPA has gone way beyond its jurisdiction on this rule.

EPA alleges that it is responding to confusion in regard to the proposed Waters of the U.S. rule that it is getting from farmers and ranchers across our country. The fact is that is not the case. What EPA is doing is they are expanding their jurisdiction dramatically under an argument that the Supreme Court did not make, but an argument, rather, that the EPA is making that under what they call ''significant nexus'' they are empowered to regulate waters far beyond navigable bodies of water.

This is something I think affects almost every industry sector, but I am going to bring it back to a discussion of our farmers and ranchers and private property rights, which are, in fact, impacted by this proposed rule to talk about why it is so important that we have an opportunity to vote on this amendment and to defeat the proposed rule.

America's farmers and ranchers and entrepreneurs go to work every day to build a stronger Nation. Thanks to these hardworking men and women, we live in a country where there is affordable food at the grocery store and where a dynamic private sector offers Americans the opportunity to achieve a brighter future. In these difficult economic times the Federal Government should be doing all it can to empower those who grow our food and create jobs. Yet instead regulators are stifling growth with burdensome regulations which generate costs and uncertainty.

The proposed rule by the Army Corps of Engineers and the Environmental Protection Agency to regulate the waters of the United States is exactly the type of regulation that I am talking about. The waters of the United States rule greatly expands the scope of the Clean Water Act with regulations over America's streams and wetlands.

If we look at the chart I brought, we can see it is not just affecting our farmers and ranchers, it goes far beyond that. For example, it affects the power industry, the oil and gas industry, the construction industry, and the manufacturing industry. Almost anything you can think of is impacted by this regulatory overreach. It is clearly a power grab by the EPA, and it needs to be checked.

The Supreme Court has found that Federal jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act extends to navigable waters. We are not arguing with the EPA's ability to regulate something like the Missouri River or a lake that is a navigable body of water, but the Supreme Court has also made it clear that not all bodies of water are navigable or under the EPA's jurisdiction.

What has our farmers and ranchers so concerned is that the Corps and the EPA went far beyond lakes and rivers. This new proposed rule would bring EPA permitting, reporting, enforcement, mitigation, and citizen lawsuits to ephemeral streams. Ephemeral streams are really dry land most of the time. To a farmer, an ephemeral stream is simply a low area across the field. It brings tributaries into it—tributaries which are all ditches that carry any amount of water that eventually flows into a navigable body of water. Think about that. Ditches. All waters that are deemed adjacent to other jurisdictional waters, including dry ditches and ephemerals, plus any other waters that the EPA has determined to have a significant nexus. In real-world terms, these categories could bring burdensome regulations to a vast number of small, isolated wetlands and ponds. It is hard to see, but that is what we tried to depict on this chart. It is almost any type of water anywhere you find it.

For those of you who have not had the opportunity to visit with a farmer from my State of North Dakota, know that dealing with excess water is a common issue, to say the least, particularly in recent years. Most farmers could tell you that just because there is water in a ditch or a field one week doesn't mean there is going to be water in that field or ditch the next week. It certainly doesn't make that water worthy of being treated the same as a navigable river or lake. It defies common sense. A field with a low spot that has standing water during a rainy week and happens to be located near a ditch does not warrant Clean Water Act regulation from a legal or, as I have said, commonsense perspective.

The Corps and the EPA have responded to these concerns by saying they are going to exempt dozens of conservation practices, but these exemptions are extremely limited and they do not cover many Clean Water Act rights. For example, the farmer with a low spot in his field next to the ditch described above—as I just explained—may now be sued under the Clean Water Act's section 402 National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System. Think about that. Now the farmer faces the risk of litigation and litigation costs for using everyday weed control or fertilizer applications among other basic and essential farming activities.

Let me get this right. The EPA is saying: We are doing this because this is going to help farmers somehow understand what they have to do.

So the EPA goes beyond navigable bodies of water—let's take a State such as Ohio, for example. They are going to go beyond the Great Lakes and beyond the Ohio River, and the EPA is now going to extend their regulatory jurisdiction to water wherever they find it—in a ditch or on a farm—and they are going to regulate that, and they might give that farmer or rancher an exemption, and somehow they are helping and clarifying things for that farmer or rancher? It defies common sense.

Farmers and ranchers have to work through uncertain weather and markets to ensure that America is food secure, and they do an amazing job of it. They are the best in the world. Sixteen million people in this country are either directly involved in agriculture or indirectly involved in agriculture. We have a positive balance of payments in agriculture. We have the lowest cost, highest quality food supply in the world. Now the EPA by its own volition is going to go out and make it harder and more expensive and more difficult for our farmers and ranchers to do what they do better than anyone in the world. Farmers and ranchers have to work through uncertain weather and markets to ensure that we have food security. They don't need the burden of additional regulations and litigation,

and they certainly don't need that burden under the auspices of the EPA saying that somehow this is going to help. Well, that is not the case.

I offered a very similar amendment in the Appropriations Committee in the energy and water section. The night before we were to have our full Appropriations Committee meeting, at 7:30 that night, that bill, the Energy and Water bill, got pulled, so we didn't have our appropriations vote the next morning.

The amendment I had prepared simply would have defunded this proposed regulation, but because there was bipartisan support for this amendment, we are not going to get a chance to vote on it.

Twenty-eight other Senators and I have been here on the floor this afternoon. The Senator from Missouri was just here. The Senator from Wyoming was here earlier. Others have been here. I am here now. There will be more. So here we stand. We are on a sportsmen's bill, this is a relevant amendment, and the question is, Why aren't we voting on it? It has bipartisan support and 29 cosponsors. It is something that is clearly important not just to our farmers and ranchers but really to businesses and industry across this great country. So why aren't we voting on it? If somebody wants to come down and make an argument that they are for it, they can do so. But when all is said and done, the way this body works is by voting and determining where the majority falls.

I ask my colleagues, why in the world are we not voting on this amendment that is incredibly important to our farmers and ranchers and to businesses and to industry and to the people of this country? As I said, we didn't get a chance to vote on it in committee, and here we are on a bill where it is relevant. Are we going to get a chance to vote on it now? And if not now, when?

The majority rules, so let's have a vote. Let's give everybody a chance to stand and be counted. Let's have our vote, and let's stand up for the American people and make sure we strike down this proposed waters of the United States regulation.

With that, I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUMENTHAL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

VA HEALTH CARE

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I have received a number of calls in recent weeks, as we all have, about what is happening at the Veterans' Administration. Over the July 4th week, back in Ohio, I heard from lots of veterans at roundtables in communities all over the State, from Steubenville to Dayton, and lots of places in between: What are we going to do about the VA? I heard outrage. I heard disillusion over the VA. There is outrage about a system charged with caring for those who defend our Nation that falls short. There is frustration and disillusion because our veterans are waiting too long. We need to fix that.

But I also saw letters to the Cincinnati Enquirer and the Cleveland Plain Dealer and I had conversations with veterans who defended and bragged about the service they are getting, the care they are getting, whether it is the VA in Cincinnati or Dayton or Cleveland or Columbus or Chillicothe—the hospitals we have in my State—or whether it is the community-based clinics in places such as Mansfield and Zanesville and Lima and Springfield—those smaller community-based outpatient clinics, so-called CBOCs, that serve veterans who need less acute care but still need service from a doctor, from a nurse, from a physical therapist.

We can only conclude a couple of things. We can conclude there are, in fact, serious problems with the VA that need to be fixed. The Presiding Officer is a prominent member of the Veterans' Committee, and from his veterans hospitals in Connecticut he hears the same. We can also conclude that those who get in the system overwhelmingly are getting good care. There are 6.5 million veterans who are using VA health care with 85 million patient visits a year. That was in 2013. I assume there is a similar number this year. They are getting good care.

The problem is access to the system. The waiting times are simply unacceptable and outrageous and the disillusionment for those veterans is worse. We know what waiting times mean, especially in mental health treatment, where far too many veterans commit suicide.

With costs of war—and particularly this last round of wars over the last decade where we went to war as a nation, wrongly, in Iraq—we didn't pay for that war—and then the President and the Congress a decade ago made a fateful mistake, mostly out of arrogance, assuming that these two wars would be so short we didn't need to scale up the VA, we didn't need to increase funding, we didn't need to expand services, we didn't need to hire more doctors and nurses—two things happened. One, a whole bunch of new veterans, new soldiers and sailors and marines and air men and women, came home from Iraq and Afghanistan. A whole lot more were in the war than President Bush and the Congress thought would happen or cared to think would happen a decade ago.

The second thing is they came home in much worse shape than in previous wars. Soldiers who would have died on the battlefields—the Presiding Officer is a veteran himself and he knows and we all know that the illnesses and physical and mental injuries are much greater in this war because they survived the battlefield when they might not have survived these same kinds of explosions 20 or 30 years ago.

The third thing—I said two. The third thing that happened is because of a decision Congress made that was right a couple of decades ago—I believe it was President Clinton who signed that bill; it might have been President Bush 1—in passing a bill which included a provision called presumptive eligibility for Agent Orange. Before presumptive eligibility, when a veteran came home from Vietnam right after the war or developed an illness many years later, that veteran would have to fight with the VA to prove that Agent Orange was the reason he or she had that illness. After Agent Orange presumptive eligibility, what that meant is that these soldiers and these veterans, 20 years later, if they had 1 of the 20 or so illnesses defined by the law that were connected to Agent Orange, they automatically were eligible. That is called presumptive eligibility, meaning they were eligible for VA services and health care. That was a great thing.

However, what that meant is that as more and more veterans moved forward from Vietnam, as they aged into their fifties and sixties and some into their seventies, they have had a huge influx of patients into the VA. That is why this veterans conference report—the bill that passed the House and the bill that passed the Senate with almost no ''no'' votes—is so important, because our commitment to our veterans must match their commitment to our Nation.

I am the first Ohioan to serve a full term ever on the Senate Veterans' Committee. I have been lucky enough to be appointed to the joint House and Senate conference committee. We need to iron out the differences in these bills. We need to do three things. First, increase the accountability in the VA. VA employees, senior employees in particular, who don't do their jobs should lose their jobs; that if it is proven in fact they did not do their jobs, if they altered information, if they explained away delays incorrectly or dishonestly, that they be held accountable, period.

Although let's keep in mind the vast majority of VA employees, whether they are in Hartford or whether they are in Cleveland, are dedicated public servants to our Nation and to our veterans. These are men and women who chose to serve veterans, to work in Chillicothe, in Zanesville, and in Columbus, and so many of them are veterans themselves. They chose a career to serve veterans and they are veterans themselves. Whether it is a police officer at the Dayton VA, a claims processor at the Cleveland VARO, a nurse

at the Toledo CBOC, our veterans rely on them. We shouldn't condemn the VA at large for the wrongdoings of a relative few.

Second, the compromise bill will provide an option for veterans who are experiencing long wait times. In the Presiding Officer's State of Connecticut and in mine, few veterans are all that far from a CBOC or from a hospital, and this new proposal says that for veterans more than 40 miles away from a CBOC or hospital, they can go elsewhere to a local hospital or a local community-based health center instead of the VA because they are closer. We don't have too many places in my State—and I believe there are none in the Presiding Officer's State—where that is the case. But those veterans who have had to wait 30 years or 30 days should have that option because care for the veteran, our commitment to veterans must match their commitment to our Nation.

Third and last, the compromise bill will expand and enhance the VA's ability to provide veterans with the care they deserve. It will allow the VA to hire more doctors and nurses and physical therapists, to build more beds, to build more capacity at these VA centers and CBOCs to make sure they have the staff necessary. With the end of these two wars, thousands of our newest veterans will be joining the ranks of VA health care.

The shortage of care providers has been especially pressing for vets struggling with a brain injury—the so-called invisible injuries. That is when a soldier in the Army gets a head injury and it might be considered a minor head injury. A number of combatants have told me they get their ''bells rung'' is the term they use. It is an invisible injury, a minor concussion—often not reported but a minor concussion—and then another one and then another one. Look at what the stories have told us about the NFL players. The same holds true, only in a more serious way, for soldiers and for marines, what happens to them down the road. Thirty years later they go to the VA, their behavior has changed, their families are calling. The VA has no documentation of these injuries. They have to struggle to show these injuries, to prove these injuries to the VA, to the doctors for a diagnosis and to the VA for the coverage of the disability.

That is why my tracker bill, the Fairman Significant Event Tracker Act—or SET Act—is so important. Instead of the burden being on the veteran to show here were my concussions, here were my injuries, I should be eligible for disability; here is what happened to me, diagnose me with the right diagnosis, the Army itself should be keeping those records, and they should follow the health care of the veteran when they are in the military, when they are in the VA. The interface has to take place much more smoothly, so when a soldier turns in her gear and she comes back to Ravenna, OH, or she comes back to Wauseon, OH, or she comes back to Maple Heights or Garfield Heights, the VA locally will know what has happened to her.

These are the challenges. I will finish with a couple of troubling notes I received from a couple of people in Ohio. One came from Gary in Franklin County, which is the home of the State capital: My brother was a Vietnam vet and survivor of a major battle in Vietnam. He never discussed his experiences. He took his life in 1992. This bill will provide important mechanisms to help reduce the rate of suicides among our veterans. Every Member of Congress should support it. It is not a political issue, but a part of our sincere and legitimate commitment to our veterans.

I couldn't have said it better.

Christine from Miami County, the county just north of Dayton in southwest Ohio: This bill will remove the redtape that our veterans encounter at a time when they are least able to deal with it. My son died at his own hands after a tour in the Middle East. He sought help from the VA and was diagnosed with PTSD shortly before dying. I know his mental state at the time, and he would not have been able to handle providing proof that he experienced traumatic events or remember the duties he performed.

In other words, he had these injuries. The military didn't have the records of these injuries because he wasn't injured so badly that he was sent back to Germany or to Bethesda or to Walter Reed, but the military should have kept these records so he knew what, in fact, was wrong. He was not able, in his condition, to put together and find his old buddies that were with him 6 or 8 years earlier that could kind of recall the incidents of what happened.

Christine writes that this bill is a simple, effective solution.

We need to address the issues facing our veterans. Our commitment to our troops must match their commitment to our Nation.

I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am here for the 73rd ''time to wake up'' speech that I have done to urge my colleagues to wake up to the growing threat of climate change. The changes we are seeing, driven by carbon pollution, are far-reaching—from the coast lines of States such as Rhode Island and the Presiding Officer's State of Connecticut, to the great plateaus and mountain ranges out West; from pole to pole; from high up in the atmosphere to deep down in the oceans.

In Rhode Island, we know the oceans are ground zero for the effects of carbon pollution. Since the Industrial Revolution, the oceans have been absorbing our carbon dioxide emissions—roughly a quarter of the total excess emissions—which, by the laws of chemistry, has caused rapid changes in ocean acidity, the pH level of the oceans, changes not seen for a long time. When I say ''a long time,'' I mean at least 25 to 50 million years, potentially as many as 300 million years. To put 300 million years into perspective, we homo sapiens—the human species—have been on the Earth for about 200,000 years. So 300 million years goes way back into geologic time, back before the dinosaurs. So a change that is unprecedented in that much time is something we should pay attention to.

Recently, four Republican former EPA Administrators testified before my Environment and Public Works subcommittee on the dire need for congressional action to curb this carbon pollution that is causing these effects in our oceans.

Here is how the EPA's very first Administrator, William Ruckelshaus, put it. He said:

> Since the ocean absorbs 25–30 percent of the carbon from stationary or mobile sources we thought the ocean was our friend. It was keeping significant amounts of carbon from the atmosphere. But our friend is paying a penalty.

As carbon dissolves in water, it makes the water more acidic—a fundamental chemical proposition—and that can upset the delicate balance of ocean life. Again, that is just basic physics and chemistry.

Ronald Reagan's EPA chief Lee Thomas—Ronald Reagan's EPA chief—warned us that thanks to the profuse carbon pollution we have emitted, oceans are now acidifying at a rate 50 times greater than known historical change—50 times.

Of course, my colleagues in the minority did not seem inclined to listen to their fellow Republicans. Instead, they took a page out of the polluters' playbook, and as usual their routine was to call into question widely accepted science.

Well, I recently visited communities around the country. I will mention my trip recently along the southeast coast—the Atlantic coast—where researchers, elected officials, and business and home owners are seeing the effects of climate change firsthand.

It does not matter what somebody thinks on the Senate floor. They are seeing it firsthand. They know better than what the polluting special interests are trying to sell. Indeed, recently the United States Conference of Mayors unanimously adopted a resolution calling for natural solutions to fight the effects of climate change to ''protect fresh water supplies, defend the Nation's coastlines, maintain a healthy tree and green space cover, and protect air quality.'' Unanimously, by the U.S. Conference of Mayors, a bipartisan organization.

So there are a lot of people who know better than the nonsense the polluting special interests are trying to sell.

I flew out during this trip to where sea level rise is gnawing away at the Outer Banks. When you fly over the North Carolina coast, you see a lot of investment along the shoreline. You see houses, big houses, nice houses. You see hotels, you see restaurants, you see roads and infrastructure, you see an entire seafront economy.

I met down there with the North Carolina Coastal Federation at their Coastal Education Center in Wilmington. This is a bipartisan group. It has joined together in concern over the exposure of their coastal communities, their homes, to rising seas. What would my colleagues here in the Senate tell this bipartisan group in North Carolina about climate change? What would they tell the United States Conference of Mayors, a bipartisan group, about climate change? Do not worry, it is not real; run along now, do not concern yourself.

Good luck with that. People know better.

King Canute could not decree that the tide not come in. Republicans in Congress cannot legislate away the changes we are seeing in our oceans. When I was down in Florida, fishermen there told me about the northward migration of species they are used to catching in Florida, species such as redfish and snook, moving north because of warming ocean temperatures.

Fishermen in South Carolina told me snook are now being caught off the coast of Charleston. I have heard that redfish are being caught as far north as Cape Cod. I believe that because Rhode Islanders are catching tarpon and grouper off the shore of Rhode Island. I have had Rhode Island fishermen tell me they are catching fish their fathers and grandfathers never saw come up in their nets.

As one Rhode Island fisherman told me, ''Sheldon, it's getting weird out there.''

It is not just Rhode Island. The Maine legislature just established a bipartisan commission to study and address the harm from ocean acidification to ecosystems and to their shell fisheries—again, bipartisan.

Once you leave this building, people are taking bipartisan action. It is only here that the polluters hold such sway.

In Virginia, which is also a coal State, a bipartisan group, including Republican U.S. Representatives SCOTT RIGELL and Democratic Governor Terry McAuliffe, are working together to prepare communities such as Hampton Roads, VA, for several feet of sea level rise.

A State commission that was first assembled under the administration of our Virginia colleague TIM KAINE, back when he was Governor, has reconvened to address the threat of climate change in the oceans.

These Virginia leaders are not wasting time quarreling and denying basic science. They are working to protect commerce and homeowners in their communities threatened as the seas continue to rise. While our Republican colleagues in Congress try their best to ignore the problem of carbon pollution, there are very serious conversations going on outside these walls.

For example, former President George W. Bush's Treasury Secretary Hank Paulson invoked ocean warming and sea level rise in a recent editorial he wrote, calling for a fee on carbon pollution. Here is the cover of this week's Newsweek: ''Deep end. What rapid changes in oceans mean for Earth.''

This would not be the first one. Last year, National Geographic came out with this issue entitled ''Rising Seas.''

Now perhaps my colleagues on the other side who pretend that climate change is a hoax will agree that Newsweek is part of the hoax; National Geographic is part of the hoax; U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops is part of the hoax; the U.S. Navy is part of the hoax. We are bedeviled in this Chamber by preposterous ideas. What the Newsweek cover article highlights is the unprecedented effects of pumping all of that excess carbon into our oceans, ranging from coral bleaching to dissolving larval shellfish, to the disappearance of entire species.

BloombergView just published a recent editorial titled ''Climate Change Goes Underwater.''

I ask unanimous consent that this document be printed in the RECORD at the end of my comments.

This is not wild speculation. This is good old-fashioned reporting of things that are happening around us that people see. I have talked before about the humble pteropod, so let's talk a little about the pteropod, a funny type of snail which is about the size of a small pea.

The pteropod is known sometimes as the sea butterfly because its small foot has adapted into two little butterfly-like wings which propel it around in the ocean. These images show what can happen to the pteropod shell when the creature's underwater environment becomes more acidic and therefore lacks the compounds that are necessary for this little creature to make its delicate shell. It is not good for the pteropod. This is the pteropod in action with the little butterfly wings that help it to swim. Here is a clean shell from proper water. Here is a dissolving shell from exposure to acidified ocean water. This obviously is not good for the pteropod.

Recent research, which was led by NOAA scientists, has found that ocean acidification off our west coast, in what is called the California current ecosystem, is hitting the pteropod especially hard.

Let me take a minute and read from the publication of this report in the Proceedings of the Royal Society, a respected publication.

> The release of carbon dioxide (CO_2) into the atmosphere from fossil fuel burning, cement production and deforestation processes has resulted in atmospheric CO_2 concentrations that have increased about 40% since the beginning of the industrial era.

Now, the measure of that—we have always had atmospheric carbon concentrations between about 170 and 300 parts per million—we have broken 400. April was the first month when we were consistently, on average, above 400 parts per million.

When you think that the 170 to 300 parts per million range has lasted for thousands of years, for millennia, for longer than our species has been on the planet, the fact that we are suddenly outside of that range is a signal that ought to call our attention. That is what they are referring to.

Continuing:

> The oceans have taken up approximately 28% of the total amount of CO_2 produced by human activities over this time-frame, causing a variety of chemical changes known as ocean acidification (OA).

The rapid change in ocean chemistry is faster than at any time over the past 50 million years.

They go on to say, toward the end of the report, that one of the chokepoint areas, what they call the first bottleneck: ''The first bottleneck would primarily affect veligers and larvae''—which are early stages of the shell before its shell has hardened. The larvae is little, and the veliger is when it has kind of a shroud around it, but not yet a shell. It helps it to move and to consume food.

Continuing:

> The first bottleneck would primarily affect veligers and larvae, life stages where complete shell dissolution in the larvae can occur within two weeks upon exposure to undersaturation.

They also note that:

> Significant increases in vertical and spatial extent of conditions favouring pteropod shell dissolution are expected to make this habitat potentially unsuitable for pteropods.

So if the California current ecosystem habitat becomes unsuitable for pteropods, we have a little problem on our hands because pteropods are food for important fish like salmon, like mackerel, like herring. Pteropods are the base of the food chain. No pteropods means crashed salmon fisheries, crashed mackerel fisheries, crashed herring fisheries, crashes throughout polar and subpolar fisheries.

Dr. William Peterson is an oceanographer at NOAA's Northwest Fisheries Science Center. He is the coauthor of the study, and he said: ''We did not expect to see pteropods being affected to this extent in our coastal region for several decades.''

These ecosystems, these ocean ecosystems, are crumbling before our eyes and yet this Congress hides behind denial. In the face of inertia in Congress and in the face of the relentless truculence of the deniers, the Obama administration is trying to do what it can to push responsible policies.

Last month Secretary of State John Kerry held the State Department's ''Our Ocean'' Conference and I attended that conference for 2 days. One of the presenters there was Dr. Carol Turley

of the Plymouth Marine Laboratory. She described her research on ocean acidification, including using this graph of ocean acidity over the past 25 million years. That is today minus 25 million years, today minus 20 million years, minus 15 million years, minus 10 million years, minus 5 million years, and now.

Look at how little variation there has been in ocean pH across that 25-million-year time scale. Remember, we have been on the planet around 200,000 years. We go back to about here.

The rest of this is geologic time. That is a long span of time. If we put that against what is happening now, look how sudden that change is in ocean pH, the basic acidity of the oceans.

Why is this happening? We know that human activity releases gigatons of carbon every year. That is undeniable. We know that carbon dioxide acidifies seawater. That is basic chemistry. You can do that in a high school lab.

We know the ocean's pH is changing in unprecedented ways in human history. No one in their right mind can say this is natural variability.

This acidification of our seas will have devastating effects on ecosystems such as tropical coral reefs, which, as Dr. Turley pointed out, are home to one in every four species in the marine environment. If you wanted to drive a bulldozer through God's species on this planet, it would be hard to do much better than allowing this rampant ocean acidification.

My colleague and cochair of our Senate Oceans Caucus, Senator LISA MURKOWSKI, and I have had the chance to address the oceans conference together. She told the conference that the waters off her Alaskan shores are growing more acidic.

I agree with Senator MURKOWSKI that we need to understand what ocean acidification means for our fisheries and ocean ecosystems much better than we do now.

Secretary Kerry delivered a clear challenge. On this planet, with all of its many peoples, we share nothing so completely as we share the oceans. And if we are going to honor our duty to protect the oceans, to honor our duty to future generations, we are going to have to work together. These are painfully clear warnings. The facts speak volumes.

The denial propaganda has shown itself to be nonsense, to be a sham, which ought to come as no surprise because the machinery that produces the climate denial propaganda is the same machinery that denied tobacco was dangerous, the same machinery that denied there was an ozone hole, the same machinery that has always fought public health measures for industry, and has always been wrong. It has always been wrong because it is not its job to be right. It is its job to protect industry and allow them to continue to pollute and make money. That is its job. So it ought to come as no surprise that the argument it makes about climate change is nonsense and is a sham. It is time to unshackle ourselves from that machinery.

History is going to look back at this, and it will not be a shining moment for us. History will reflect that the polluters are polluting our democracy with their money and their influence just as badly as they are polluting our oceans and our atmosphere with their carbon.

We have to wake up. It will disserve our grandchildren and their grandchildren, and it will disgrace our generation to have allowed this democracy to miss this issue and to fail to act because of the propaganda machinery that has over and over again proven itself to be wrong. Our ocean economies, our ocean heritage, are all at stake.

As Secretary Kerry put it, it is our ocean, and it is our responsibility. Let us please wake up before we have completely disgraced ourselves.

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

[From the Bloomberg View, June 29, 2014]

CLIMATE CHANGE GOES UNDERWATER

(By The Editors)

When it comes to climate change, almost all the attention is on the air. What's happening to the water, however, is just as worrying—although for the moment it may be slightly more manageable.

Here's the problem in a seashell: As the oceans absorb about a quarter of the carbon dioxide released by fossil-fuel burning, the pH level in the underwater world is falling, creating the marine version of climate change. Ocean acidification is rising at its fastest pace in 300 million years, according to scientists.

The most obvious effects have been on oysters, clams, coral and other sea-dwelling creatures with hard parts, because more acidic water contains less of the calcium carbonate essential for shell- and skeleton-building. But there are also implications for the land-based creatures known as humans.

It's not just the Pacific oyster farmers who are finding high pH levels make it hard for larvae to form, or the clam fishermen in Maine who discover that the clams on the bottom of their buckets can be crushed by the weight of a full load, or even the 123.3 million Americans who live near or on the coasts. Oceans cover more than two-thirds of the earth, and changes to the marine ecosystem will have profound effects on the planet.

Stopping acidification, like stopping climate change, requires first and foremost a worldwide reduction in greenhouse-gas emissions. That's the bad news. Coming to an international agreement about the best way to do that is hard.

Unlike with climate change, however, local action can make a real difference against acidification. This is because in many coastal regions where shellfish and coral reefs are at risk, an already bad situation is being made worse by localized air and water pollution, such as acid rain from coal-burning; effluent from big farms, pulp mills and sewage systems; and storm runoff from urban pavement. This means that existing anti-pollution laws can address some of the problem.

States have the authority under the U.S. Clean Water Act, for instance, to set standards for water quality, and they can use that authority to strengthen local limits on the kinds of pollution that most contribute to acidification hot spots. Coastal states and cities can also maximize the amount of land covered in vegetation (rather than asphalt or concrete), so that when it rains the water filters through soil and doesn't easily wash urban pollution into the sea. States can also qualify for federal funding for acidification research in their estuaries.

Such research can hardly happen fast enough. It's still not known, for instance, exactly to what extent acidification is to blame for the decline of coral reefs. And if the chemical change in the ocean makes it harder for sea snails and other pteropods to survive, will that also threaten the wild salmon and other big fish that eat them?

Better monitoring of acidification would help scientists learn how much it varies from place to place and what makes the difference. This calls for continuous readings, because pH levels shift throughout the day and from season to season. Engineers are designing new measuring devices that can be left in the water, and it looks like monitoring will eventually be done in a standardized way throughout the world.

In the meantime, researchers are finding small ways to give local populations of shellfish their best chance to survive—depositing crushed shells in the mudflats where clams live, for instance, to neutralize the sediment, or planting sea grass in shellfish habitats to absorb CO2. Such strategies, like pollution control, are worthwhile if only to help keep shellfish populations as robust as possible in the short term, perhaps giving natural selection the opportunity to breed strains better suited to a lower-pH world.

These efforts also give humans more time to learn about ocean acidification. And maybe they will help their political leaders better understand the urgency of international cooperation on limiting greenhouse gas emissions.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. 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.

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

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF NORMAN C. BAY TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 839.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Norman C. Bay, of New Mexico, to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there is a cloture motion at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented

under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to report the motion.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Norman C. Bay, of New Mexico, to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

Harry Reid, Tom Udall, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Jack Reed, Tim Kaine, Patrick J. Leahy, Barbara Boxer, Bill Nelson, Christopher A. Coons, Richard Blumenthal, Richard J. Durbin, Christopher Murphy, Patty Murray, Martin Heinrich, Tom Harkin, Tammy Baldwin, Cory A. Booker.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call under rule XXII be waived.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF CHERYL A. LAFLEUR TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 842.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Cheryl A. LaFleur, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there is a cloture motion at the desk, and I ask that it be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to report the motion.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Cheryl A. LaFleur, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

Harry Reid, Tom Udall, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Cory A. Booker, Jack Reed, Tim Kaine, Patrick J. Leahy, Barbara Boxer, Bill Nelson, Christopher A. Coons, Angus S. King, Jr., Richard Blumenthal, Richard J. Durbin, Christopher Murphy, Patty Murray, Tom Harkin, Tammy Baldwin.

Mr. REID. I ask that the mandatory quorum call under rule XXII be waived.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at noon tomorrow, July 10, the Senate proceed to executive session and consider Calendar Nos. 903, 695, and 895; that the time until 2 p.m. be equally divided in the usual form on the Donovan nomination; that upon the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate proceed to vote, with no intervening action or debate, on the nominations in the order listed; that there be 2 minutes for debate, equally divided in the usual form, prior to the votes on the Silliman and Smith nominations; that all rollcall votes after the first be 10 minutes in length; further, that if any nomination is confirmed, the motion will be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate resume legislative session.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, on Tuesday, July 15, 2014, at noon the Senate proceed to executive session and vote on the motions to invoke cloture on Executive Calendar Nos. 839 and 842 in the order listed; further, that if cloture is invoked on either of these nominations, on Tuesday, July 15, 2014, at 3 p.m. all postcloture time be expired and the Senate proceed to vote on the confirmation of the nominations in the order upon which cloture was invoked; further, that there be 2 minutes for debate prior to each vote; that if any nomination is confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate resume legislative session.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

THE FUTURE OF LEISURE

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, my daughter Alicia works for the Motion Picture Association of America and sent me a report from the Wall Street Journal written by Robert Iger.

My wife Marcelle and I, as well as Alicia, have been to Mr. Iger's home and spent time with him, his highly talented wife Willow Bay, and their children. We have all been impressed with the enthusiasm and direction he brings to the Walt Disney Company, and some of my most interesting times have been with him talking about it.

Mr. President, I wanted to share with others his report, and I ask consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 7, 2014]

DISNEY'S IGER ON THE FUTURE OF LEISURE: TECHNOLOGY BUILT ON STORYTELLING

(By Robert A. Iger)

In 1956, the year after Disneyland opened, Walt Disney was asked to imagine what entertainment would be like a half-century into the future.

As one of the world's great innovators, Walt had just introduced people to a new form of leisure entertainment—the theme park. But when it came to predicting the future, Walt said that was beyond his powers, given the rapid pace of change in the entertainment industry.

One thing was certain, Walt said: The centuries-old human need for great storytelling would endure for generations to come, enhanced by new technologies that would bring these tales to life in extraordinary ways.

Walt was better at predicting the future than he realized. Six decades later, technology is lifting the limits of creativity and transforming the possibilities for entertainment and leisure. Today's digital era has unleashed unprecedented innovation, giving rise to an array of new entertainment options competing for our time and attention.

As Walt also predicted, people's need to be entertained with storytelling has endured: We gravitate to the universal stories that bind us—tales of adventure, heroism and love, tales that provide comfort and escape. Great storytelling still remains the bedrock of great entertainment.

In the years ahead, this fusion of technology and creativity will allow us to deliver experiences once unimaginable. What will that future look like? Like Walt, I'm hesitant to make predictions. But a few things seem certain to me.

To start, the 20th-century concept of ''one size fits all'' no longer applies, as innovators around the world create tools that allow us to customize entertainment and leisure experiences to fit our own tastes and schedules and share them instantly with friends, family and an ever-growing digitally connected global community. In short, we are creating what I like to call technology-enabled leisure.

Mobile storytelling, and mobile entertainment, will dominate our lives, and offer rich, compelling experiences well beyond what is available today. Where someone is will no longer be a barrier to being entertained; the geography of leisure will be limitless. One of the most exciting developments I see on the

horizon is technology that will immerse us into entertaining worlds, or project those worlds and experiences into our lives. In essence, entertainment will be immeasurably enhanced with both virtual-reality experiences and augmented-reality experiences. Bringing us into created worlds and bringing created worlds into our world will fundamentally explode the boundaries of storytelling, unburdening the storyteller in ways we can't yet imagine.

The challenges? Technology can be an invasive force, competing for our attention and eroding the time we have for ourselves and our families. Few of us would give up the tech tools that keep us productive and informed; even fewer can remember the last time we completely unplugged on vacation. The more ubiquitous technology becomes in our lives, the more diligent we must be to ensure it doesn't overwhelm or diminish our leisure time.

Ultimately, technology is about connecting, not cocooning; it's a tool that should empower us to reach more people and bind us closer together, rather than encourage us to disengage from one another. Even as we use technology to create more individualized experiences, social interaction is still a basic need, a fundamental part of our humanity.

That's why we value entertainment ''events'' that create treasured memories, strengthen personal connections and deliver shared experiences, whether at the movies, in a theme park, or at a sports stadium. This is entertainment that cannot be time-shifted or duplicated; you have to be there, immersed in the moment.

An experience is enhanced when shared with others, becoming something to be savored and remembered long after it's over. These social events enrich our lives, and our need for them will never change.

The human love of storytelling, whether individualized or shared, will also be a constant. Although I can't predict the precise future of entertainment, I share Walt Disney's optimism and his belief that whatever lies ahead, it will be defined by great storytelling. Just like it always has been.

FINANCIAL AID SIMPLIFICATION AND TRANSPARENCY ACT

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I recently spoke to Senate interns regarding the Financial Aid Simplification and Transparency Act. I ask unanimous consent that my full speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

FINANCIAL AID SIMPLIFICATION AND TRANSPARENCY ACT

Thank you for coming. We know it's the pizza more than anything else that brought you here, but to some extent it may be the dreaded federal student application form. What we would like to do today is tell you a story. We will call this a ''teaching moment.'' I think that may have been Senator Bennet's phrase, but it is a teaching moment for you as to how legislation is supposed to work in the United States Senate. And I think it may be a teaching moment for senators, about how to do our jobs.

We are going to tell you a story of how we got to where we are and tell you what our proposal is. And then we are going to invite the experts to tell us what kind of students we senators have been in terms of listening to them and then coming up with something. Then we will ask you what you think. Then we are going to put this out for our committee on which we serve, which Senator Harkin is the chairman of, which is working on the reauthorization of Higher Education with our colleagues to see if we can get cosponsors and make a difference in something. So what I will do is begin the story, and I will just take a few minutes. Then I will turn it over to Senator Bennet, and he will tell you more about exactly what the proposal is. First, let me introduce the three experts: Ms. Kim Cook, executive director of the National College Access Network, Dr. Judith Scott-Clayton, assistant professor of economics and education at Teachers College at Columbia University, and Ms. Kristin Conklin, founding partner at HCM Strategists, LLC.

Here's why they are here. Several months ago at one of the hearings of the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee, those three, and one other, who is from Harvard Graduate School of Education, testified before us. I am down on the Republican side and Michael is on the Democratic side. It looked to me like we had the same reaction, because they were talking about this federal student application form, which is 106 questions, with 68 pages of explanations that you have to fill out every year you apply for a grant or a loan.

It gets audited during the year, and, of course, you would probably make a mistake on one of those questions, so you might not get your money. It is so discouraging to people who apply for it that many who should do not. One of the community college representatives said that a quarter of the community college students do not even fill out the form, and they are probably the ones who we most want to have the opportunity to do that.

So what we heard the four say was you could eliminate all those questions except two and get 90 or 95 percent of all of the information that you need.

Of course I am the first one to wonder, ''Is that just a bizarre outlier? Is that just one witness with a weird proposal?'' But every single one of the four said that. Then they went on to make some other very common sense recommendations about being able to fill it out earlier in your high school year, suggestions about over-borrowing, about simplifying the loan and student repayment process—all of which made a lot of sense.

So, at the end of the hearing, I said, ''Would four of you please write a letter to us on the things that you agree with?'' By the time I got down to see them, they said, ''We won't write you four letters, we'll write you one.'' So they did.

Michael and I began working together to see if we could take their recommendations and put it in a piece of legislation. In doing that, we wanted to show the proper respect to our colleagues, so we let our chairman, Senator Harkin, know about it. We mentioned it to Arne Duncan, so he would know what we are doing, because we would like in the end to have Republican support, and the president's support, and the House of Representatives' support. We are not here to make a political point. We are here to get a result. And then we thought about what would be the best way to introduce it. Senator Bennet said, ''Why don't we invite the interns to come over for lunch? Why don't we lay it out to them? Why don't we ask the experts who suggested it to us what they think?''

Next week, then, we will introduce it and see what is going on and how we can improve it over the next few weeks. And then maybe when you fill out the form in your next year of college, it will be the size of a postcard instead of the size of that. That thing takes, if you add it up, 20 million students filling that out every year, and the form itself says it takes at least three hours. If you add up the amount of money and time spent on that, you get into billions of hours wasted, you get into hundreds of millions of dollars that might be spent on construction, instead of hiring staff people at the college to help you fill these things out. You might encourage a lot more people, who are eligible and who need the money, to get the surest step toward improving their lives.

Of course, the College Board says that a college four-year degree is worth a million dollars in increased earnings over your lifetime. It is one sure ticket to a better life that we know about. Finally, I want to say that it has been a great pleasure to work with Michael. I am a pretty good Republican, he's a pretty good Democrat, but that does not make any difference. The reason we are here is that the Senate is a place where you are supposed to have extended debate about important subjects until you come to a consensus, and then you get a result. That is the way you govern a complex country. So what we hope is that this is just a small example of one part of the Higher Education reauthorization process that will help make life simpler.

Michael, there is one other thing that I should say. You may ask, how did this happen? How did this long thing happen? It wasn't any evil-doer who did it. What happened was the Higher Education Act was authorized in 1965. In my opinion, what happened was it got reauthorized eight times by different groups of senators and congressman, different group of regulators wrote things. People had good, well-intentioned ideas and after that [process], you get that. So what we are doing is starting from scratch to try to turn 106 questions into a postcard and get the money where it should go, to the eligible students who want to go to college.

CONGRATULATING THE VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY COMMODORES

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, as a fellow Commodore, I would like to congratulate the Vanderbilt University baseball team on winning the College World Series and bringing home Vanderbilt's first men's national championship.

Tim Corbin, Vanderbilt's outstanding coach who has been named National Coach of the Year by Collegiate Baseball, is to be commended for his exceptional leadership and determination throughout the entire season.

This was a hard-fought win, and I am so proud of the perseverance and tenacity of Coach Corbin and these young men.

Vanderbilt is a very special university, one that produces student-athletes of exceptional character, integrity, and pride in themselves and their school.

It is a privilege to be a home-State alumnus of a university that continues to embrace these values while also encouraging its students to excel in both academics and athletics.

I am filled with pride today for my alma mater, and I wish the baseball team and all of Vanderbilt University the best.

This achievement would not have been possible without the skill, determination and teamwork of the following outstanding student-athletes:

Tyler Beede, Ben Bowden, Walker Buehler, Tyler Campbell, Ro Coleman, Vince Conde, Will Cooper, Jason Delay, Karl Ellison, Tyler Ferguson, Carson Fulmer, Tyler Green, Chris Harvey, Ryan Johnson, John Kilichowski, Aubrey McCarty, Brian Miller, Jared Miller, Penn Murfee, John Norwood, Drake Parker, T.J. Pecorano, Adam Ravenelle, Bryan Reynolds, Steven Rice, Nolan Rogers, Jordan Sheffield, Kyle Smith, Luke Stephenson, Hayden Stone, Dansby Swanson, Xavier Turner, Zander Wiel, and Rhett Wiseman.

Go Dores!

AWARDING CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO RAOUL WALLENBERG

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I wish to honor the memory of one of the world's most courageous humanitarians: Raoul Wallenberg. Seventy years ago today, Raoul Wallenberg arrived in Budapest, risking his own life to save the lives of tens of thousands of Hungarian Jews from the atrocities of the Holocaust.

Raoul Wallenberg emerged as a champion of those who were persecuted during one of the darkest chapters of human history. Mr. Wallenberg served on the War Refugee Board, an independent government agency established in 1944 by President Franklin D. Roosevelt and tasked with the ''immediate rescue and relief of the Jews of Europe and other victims of enemy persecution.'' Through his courageous work on the War Refugee Board, Mr. Wallenberg prevented the deportation of tens of thousands of Hungarian Jews to Auschwitz-Birkenau. Wallenberg risked his own life and livelihood in order to save Jewish people through a variety of means by issuing thousands of protective documents for them; by securing their release from deportation trains, death march convoys, and labor service brigades; and by establishing the International Ghetto of protected houses.

While the Holocaust showed us that human beings are capable of committing unspeakably evil acts, heroes like Raoul Wallenberg proved that we are also capable of bravery, selflessness, and goodness.

It is only fitting that we passed legislation in 2012 bestowing one of America's highest civilian awards, the Congressional Gold Medal, to one of the greatest heroes this world has known. That actual medal is being awarded to Raoul Wallenberg's family in a ceremony today to honor his legacy.

American citizenship is not a requirement for receiving the Congressional Gold Medal; but if it were required, Wallenberg would be eligible. He received honorary U.S. citizenship in 1981 thanks to the efforts of former Congressman Tom Lantos (D-CA, 12th) who, as a 16-year-old in 1944, escaped from a Nazi forced labor camp outside of Budapest and hid with his aunt in a safe house Wallenberg had established.

Throughout the world, streets have been named after Raoul Wallenberg including one here in Washington, where the U.S. Holocaust Museum is located. Monuments bearing his name are testaments to Raoul Wallenberg's heroism and to the thousands of lives he saved during the Holocaust. Awards are given in his name to honor humanitarians around the world. The most important reminders of all that he accomplished are the human ones the descendants of those who survived the Holocaust, thanks to Raoul Wallenberg's heroism. Raoul Wallenberg left this earth too soon but he accomplished more in his short life than most of us could ever hope to.

We can honor Mr. Wallenberg by trying to live with the courage and conviction that he demonstrated in his short time. By doing so, we can do right by him, and we can do right by all those whose lives were lost or forever changed by the Holocaust.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

SECOND LIEUTENANT TOBIAS C. ALEXANDER

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I wish to remember the life and sacrifice of a remarkable young man, Army 2LT Tobias C. Alexander. Along with one other soldier, Toby died May 20, 2012 of injuries he sustained when his unit was attacked with improvised explosive devices in Tarin Kowt, Afghanistan, in support of Operation Enduring Freedom.

Toby was born June 8, 1981 in Wesel, Germany and graduated from Eglin High School in 1999.

Toby entered the Active Duty Army in August 2002 as a signal intel analyst. He deployed to Afghanistan in 2007 in support of Operation Enduring Freedom with the Combined Joint Special Operations Task Force—Afghanistan (3rd Special Forces Group, Airborne). He obtained the rank of sergeant first class.

In 2011 he earned a bachelors' degree in interdisciplinary studies from Cameron University where he was a part of the Reserve Officer Training Corps. After receiving his commission, he attended the Field Artillery Basic Officer Leader Course B at Fort Sill, OK and was then assigned to the 1st Battalion, 14th Field Artillery, 214th Fires Brigade. He served as a platoon leader for Alpha Battery before being selected for the Security Forces Advisory Team, SFAT, which was responsible for the training of Afghanistan's national security forces. He deployed for his second tour to Afghanistan in June 2011.

His friend, Myles Mendez, said ''He was the guy you went to if you needed to know something, so a lot of people were always going to him with 'What's this? What's that? Can you help me?' He was the go-to guy.''

''I honestly don't think that he would have had it any other way. I think if he had to choose to go out, I think he would have wanted to have it serving his country. He was a patriot.''

On May 30, 2012, the family held funeral services at Cameron Baptist Church in Lawton, OK.

He is survived by his wife Amanda, his children: Angelicia, Kevin and Lexie, and his parents Bill and Heike Alexander.

Today we remember Army 2LT Tobias C. Alexander, a young man who loved his family and country, and gave his life as a sacrifice for freedom.

ARMY PRIVATE FIRST CLASS JON R. TOWNSEND

Mr. President, I also wish to remember Army PFC Jon R. Townsend. Along with three other soldiers, Jon died September 16, 2012 in Zabul province, Afghanistan, in support of Operation Enduring Freedom due to injuries sustained due to enemy small arms fire.

Jon was born October 28, 1992 and was raised in Claremore, OK. Two days after he graduated from Claremore-Sequoyah High School in 2011 he left for Army basic training at 17. His friends and family watched as he transformed—downing 5 dozen eggs a week—from an average kid into a bulked-up recruit.

After completing initial training, Jon was assigned to the 1st Battalion, 23rd Infantry Regiment, 3rd Stryker Brigade Combat Team, 2nd Infantry Division, based at Joint Base Lewis-McChord, WA. He deployed to Afghanistan in December 2011.

His mother said that Jon believed in the mission and was particularly fond of the children he encountered. He asked her to send him care packages with treats that he could give his ''babies,'' and he'd use his wet wipes to clean the children. ''Jon loved life and wanted to share it with everybody,'' she said. ''He wanted to make everybody happy.''

In February 2012, he went home on leave from Afghanistan and married his high school sweetheart, Brittany Carden. They had 3 days together as a married couple before he departed back to Afghanistan.

''I'm not mad. . .Jon did this because he loved his country,'' his mother said. ''He wanted to make it safe, and (joining the military) was the only way he knew how.''

On September 28, 2012, the family held a service at First Baptist Church and Jon was laid to rest in Lone Chapel Cemetery in Claremore, OK.

Jon is survived by his wife Brittany Townsend; Lois Harrison, granny; Karen (Katy Harrison) Nelson, mother; Aunt Honee Sue (Harrison) Grumbein and spouse Keith Grumbien and their children: Kobe, Kalvin, and Katelyn of Foyil; respected father-like figure Roland Long of Foyil; Jeremy Nelson, brother, and spouse, Courtney and their children: Austin, Jeremiah, Keegan and Xelia Nelson; Andrew Bingham; and Caleb and Myah Smith; Jennifer (Nelson) Tucker and spouse Paul Tucker and children: Tanner and Addison; Nancy (Roberts) Carden, mother-in-law; James L. Carden, Jr., father; Cherish (Carden) Moye, sister, and husband Brent Moye; and James Larry Carden, III, brother; and faithful four-legged friend, Teddy. He was preceded in death by his father Robert

Wayne Townsend, cousin Shawn Mersa, maternal grandfather (Bud) or Carroll Harrison, Jr., Sharon Rice (Harrison) aunt.

Today we remember Army PFC Jon R. Townsend, a young man who loved his family and country, and gave his life as a sacrifice for freedom.

HOSPITALMAN ERIC D. WARREN

Mr. President, as well I would like to pay tribute to the life and sacrifice of Navy HM Eric D. ''Doc'' Warren. Eric died May 26, 2012 of injuries he sustained from an improvised explosive device in Sangin district, Helmand Province, Afghanistan, in support of Operation Enduring Freedom.

Eric was born November 22, 1988 and was a resident of Shawnee, OK. As a child, he was active in Cub Scouts, little league sports, and earned a black belt in Tae Kwon Do. Eric was also active in his church youth group, football, wrestling, and drama.

After graduating from McLoud High School, he enlisted in the Navy, graduated from Corpsman School and completed Fleet Marine Force training as a combat corpsman. He was then assigned to 1st Battalion, 8th Marine Regiment, 2nd Marine Division, II Marine Expeditionary Force, Camp Lejeune, NC.

He was deployed to Afghanistan in January 2012 for his third tour of duty.

''When he was home last time, I shook his hand and he hugged my neck and whispered in my ear ''pray for me,'' Reverend Ron Baldridge said. ''I prayed for him every day.''

Eric was a skinny kid with a mischievous streak who took pleasure in challenging his pastor and youth minister, Reverend Baldridge explained. Kevin Spurgin, youth minister at Eric's church said Hospitalman Warren knew the possible consequences of being in one of the most dangerous areas of Afghanistan, but any fears he may have had were overcome by pride for the job he was doing there.

His father, Marvin, said his son never put himself first and the only enemy he knew was at war. ''He was real passionate about being with his guys over there,'' said Marvin, pausing to wipe away his tears. ''He wanted to make sure they were safe.''

On June 5, 2012, the family held a funeral service at Downtown Pentecostal Holiness Church in Shawnee, OK. There was a 60-second standing ovation for Eric during his funeral service to commemorate Hospitalman Warren's service to his country, and the ultimate sacrifice he and his family made.

Eric is the son of Donna Beth and Marvin Warren Jr., who adopted 11-year-old Eric Warren after marrying his mother. His birth father is William Burris, according to his obituary.

Today we remember Navy HM Eric D. ''Doc'' Warren, a young man who loved his family and country, and gave his life as a sacrifice for freedom.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

CHICKASAW COUNTY, IOWA

• Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, the strength of my State of Iowa lies in its vibrant local communities, where citizens come together to foster economic development, make smart investments to expand opportunity, and take the initiative to improve the health and well-being of residents. Over the decades, I have witnessed the growth and revitalization of so many communities across my State. It has been deeply gratifying to see how my work in Congress has supported these local efforts.

I have always believed in accountability for public officials, and this, my final year in the Senate, is an appropriate time to give an accounting of my work across four decades representing Iowa in Congress. I take pride in accomplishments that have been national in scope—for instance, passing the Americans with Disabilities Act and spearheading successful farm bills. But I take a very special pride in projects that have made a big difference in local communities across my State.

Today, I would like to give an accounting of my work with leaders and residents of Chickasaw County to build a legacy of a stronger local economy, better schools and educational opportunities, and a healthier, safer community.

Between 2001 and 2013, the creative leadership in your community has worked with me to successfully acquire financial assistance from programs I have fought hard to support, which have provided more than $4.2 million to the local economy.

Of course, one of my favorite memories of working together is the success Alta Vista has had in accessing farm bill funds for important projects such as obtaining a fire truck, wastewater treatment, and conservation activities.

Among the highlights:

School grants: Every child in Iowa deserves to be educated in a classroom that is safe, accessible, and modern. That is why, for the past decade and a half, I have secured funding for the innovative Iowa Demonstration Construction Grant Program—better known among educators in Iowa as Harkin grants for public schools construction and renovation. Across 15 years, Harkin grants worth more than $132 million have helped school districts to fund a range of renovation and repair efforts—everything from updating fire safety systems to building new schools. In many cases, these Federal dollars have served as the needed incentive to leverage local public and private dollars, so it often has a tremendous multiplier effect within a school district. Over the years, Chickasaw County has received $980,307 in Harkin grants.

Agricultural and rural development: Because I grew up in a small town in rural Iowa, I have always been a loyal friend and fierce advocate for family farmers and rural communities. I have been a member of the House or Senate Agriculture Committee for 40 years—including more than 10 years as chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee. Across the decades, I have championed farm policies for Iowans that include effective farm income protection and commodity programs; strong, progressive conservation assistance for agricultural producers; renewable energy opportunities; and robust economic development in our rural communities. Since 1991, through various programs authorized through the farm bill, Chickasaw County has received more than $2 million from a variety of farm bill programs.

Keeping Iowa communities safe: I also firmly believe that our first responders need to be appropriately trained and equipped, able to respond to both local emergencies and to statewide challenges such as, for instance, the methamphetamine epidemic. Since 2001, Chickasaw County's fire departments have received over $1 million for firefighter safety and operations equipment.

Disability rights: Growing up, I loved and admired my brother Frank, who was deaf. But I was deeply disturbed by the discrimination and obstacles he faced every day. That is why I have always been a passionate advocate for full equality for people with disabilities. As the primary author of the Americans with Disabilities Act and the ADA Amendments Act, I have had four guiding goals for our fellow citizens with disabilities: equal opportunity, full participation, independent living and economic self-sufficiency. Nearly a quarter century since passage of the ADA, I see remarkable changes in communities everywhere I go in Iowa—not just in curb cuts or closed-captioned television, but in the full participation of people with disabilities in our society and economy, folks who at long last have the opportunity to contribute their talents and to be fully included. These changes have increased economic opportunities for all citizens of Chickasaw County, both those with and without disabilities. And they make us proud to be a part of a community and country that respects the worth and civil rights of all of our citizens.

This is at least a partial accounting of my work on behalf of Iowa, and specifically Chickasaw County, during my time in Congress. In every case, this work has been about partnerships, cooperation, and empowering folks at the State and local level, including in Chickasaw County, to fulfill their own dreams and initiatives. And, of course, this work is never complete. Even after I retire from the Senate, I have no intention of retiring from the fight for a better, fairer, richer Iowa. I will always be profoundly grateful for the opportunity to serve the people of Iowa as their Senator.•

DALLAS COUNTY, IOWA

● Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, the strength of my State of Iowa lies in its vibrant local communities, where citizens come together to foster economic development, make smart investments to expand opportunity, and take the initiative to improve the health and well-being of residents. Over the decades, I have witnessed the growth and revitalization of so many communities across my State, and it has been deeply gratifying to see how my work in Congress has supported these local efforts.

I have always believed in accountability for public officials, and this, my final year in the Senate, is an appropriate time to give an accounting of my work across four decades representing Iowa in Congress. I take pride in accomplishments that have been national in scope—for instance, passing the Americans with Disabilities Act and spearheading successful farm bills. But I take a very special pride in projects that have made a big difference in local communities across my State.

Today, I would like to give an accounting of my work with leaders and residents of Dallas County to build a legacy of a stronger local economy, better schools and educational opportunities, and a healthier, safer community.

Between 2001 and 2013, the creative leadership in your community has worked with me to secure funding in Dallas County worth over $2 million and successfully acquired financial assistance from programs I have fought hard to support, which have provided more than $28 million to the local economy.

Of course, one of my favorite memories of working together is their terrific work to improve wellness both at worksites and to provide opportunities for physical activity in the community, under the terrific leadership of Shelley Horak.

Among the highlights:

Wellness and health care: Improving the health and wellness of all Americans has been something I have been passionate about for decades. That is why I fought to dramatically increase funding for disease prevention, innovative medical research, and a whole range of initiatives to improve the health of individuals and families not only at the doctor's office but also in our communities, schools, and workplaces. I am so proud that Americans have better access to clinical preventive services, nutritious food, smoke-free environments, safe places to engage in physical activity, and information to make healthy decisions for themselves and their families. These efforts not only save lives, they will also save money for generations to come thanks to the prevention of costly chronic diseases, which account for a whopping 75 percent of annual health care costs. I am pleased that Dallas County has recognized this important issue by securing more than $150,000 for community wellness activities.

Main Street Iowa: One of the greatest challenges we face—in Iowa and all across America—is preserving the character and vitality of our small towns and rural communities. This isn't just about economics. It is also about maintaining our identity as Iowans. Main Street Iowa helps preserve Iowa's heart and soul by providing funds to revitalize downtown business districts. This program has allowed towns like Adel to use that money to leverage other investments to jumpstart change and renewal. I am so pleased that Dallas County has earned $45,000 through this program. These grants build much more than buildings. They build up the spirit and morale of people in our small towns and local communities.

School grants: Every child in Iowa deserves to be educated in a classroom that is safe, accessible, and modern. That is why, for the past decade and a half, I have secured funding for the innovative Iowa Demonstration Construction Grant Program—better known among educators in Iowa as Harkin grants for public schools construction and renovation. Across 15 years, Harkin grants worth more than $132 million have helped school districts to fund a range of renovation and repair efforts—everything from updating fire safety systems to building new schools. In many cases, these Federal dollars have served as the needed incentive to leverage local public and private dollars, so it often has a tremendous multiplier effect within a school district. Over the years, Dallas County has received $1,283,316 in Harkin grants. Similarly, schools in Dallas County have received funds that I designated for Iowa Star Schools for technology totaling $244,341.

Disaster mitigation and prevention: In 1993, when historic floods ripped through Iowa, it became clear to me that the national emergency-response infrastructure was woefully inadequate to meet the needs of Iowans in flood-ravaged communities. I went to work dramatically expanding the Federal Emergency Management Agency's hazard mitigation program, which helps communities reduce the loss of life and property due to natural disasters and enables mitigation measures to be implemented during the immediate recovery period. Disaster relief means more than helping people and businesses get back on their feet after a disaster, it means doing our best to prevent the same predictable flood or other catastrophe from recurring in the future. The hazard mitigation program that I helped create in 1993 provided critical support to Iowa communities impacted by the devastating floods of 2008. Dallas County has received over $1.6 million to remediate and prevent widespread destruction from natural disasters.

Agricultural and rural development: Because I grew up in a small town in rural Iowa, I have always been a loyal friend and fierce advocate for family farmers and rural communities. I have been a member of the House or Senate Agriculture Committee for 40 years—including more than 10 years as chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee. Across the decades, I have championed farm policies for Iowans that include effective farm income protection and commodity programs; strong, progressive conservation assistance for agricultural producers; renewable energy opportunities; and robust economic development in our rural communities. Since 1991, through various programs authorized through the farm bill, Dallas County has received more than $4 million from a variety of farm bill programs.

Keeping Iowa communities safe: I also firmly believe that our first responders need to be appropriately trained and equipped, able to respond to both local emergencies and to statewide challenges such as, for instance, the methamphetamine epidemic. Since 2001, Dallas County's fire departments have received over $1.5 million for firefighter safety and operations equipment.

Disability rights: Growing up, I loved and admired my brother Frank, who was deaf. But I was deeply disturbed by the discrimination and obstacles he faced every day. That is why I have always been a passionate advocate for full equality for people with disabilities. As the primary author of the Americans with Disabilities Act and the ADA Amendments Act, I have had four guiding goals for our fellow citizens with disabilities: equal opportunity, full participation, independent living and economic self-sufficiency. Nearly a quarter century since passage of the ADA, I see remarkable changes in communities everywhere I go in Iowa—not just in curb cuts or closed captioned television, but in the full participation of people with disabilities in our society and economy, folks who at long last have the opportunity to contribute their talents and to be fully included. These changes have increased economic opportunities for all citizens of Dallas County, both those with and without disabilities. And they make us proud to be a part of a community and country that respects the worth and civil rights of all of our citizens.

This is at least a partial accounting of my work on behalf of Iowa, and specifically Dallas County, during my time in Congress. In every case, this work has been about partnerships, cooperation, and empowering folks at the State and local level, including in Dallas County, to fulfill their own dreams and initiatives. And, of course, this work is never complete. Even after I retire from the Senate, I have no intention of retiring from the fight for a better, fairer, richer Iowa. I will always be profoundly grateful for the opportunity to serve the people of Iowa as their Senator.●

GRUNDY COUNTY, IOWA

● Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, the strength of my State of Iowa lies in its

vibrant local communities, where citizens come together to foster economic development, make smart investments to expand opportunity, and take the initiative to improve the health and well-being of residents. Over the decades, I have witnessed the growth and revitalization of so many communities across my State. It has been deeply gratifying to see how my work in Congress has supported these local efforts.

I have always believed in accountability for public officials, and this, my final year in the Senate, is an appropriate time to give an accounting of my work across four decades representing Iowa in Congress. I take pride in accomplishments that have been national in scope—for instance, passing the Americans with Disabilities Act and spearheading successful farm bills. But I take a very special pride in projects that have made a big difference in local communities across my State.

Today, I would like to give an accounting of my work with leaders and residents of Grundy County to build a legacy of a stronger local economy, better schools and educational opportunities, and a healthier, safer community.

Between 2001 and 2013, the creative leadership in your community has worked with me to successfully acquire financial assistance from programs I have fought hard to support, which have provided more than $7 million to the local economy.

Of course, one of my favorite memories of working together is the community's success in obtaining more than $294,000 in funds from the Department of Justice for public safety efforts to promote drug free communities, provide transitional housing for victims of domestic violence, and purchase safety equipment for law enforcement personnel.

Among the highlights:

School grants: Every child in Iowa deserves to be educated in a classroom that is safe, accessible, and modern. That is why, for the past decade and a half, I have secured funding for the innovative Iowa Demonstration Construction Grant Program—better known among educators in Iowa as Harkin grants for public schools construction and renovation. Across 15 years, Harkin grants worth more than $132 million have helped school districts to fund a range of renovation and repair efforts—everything from updating fire safety systems to building new schools. In many cases, these Federal dollars have served as the needed incentive to leverage local public and private dollars, so it often has a tremendous multiplier effect within a school district. Over the years, Grundy County has received $95,000 in Harkin grants. Similarly, schools in Grundy County have received funds that I designated for Iowa Star Schools for technology totaling $85,475.

Disaster mitigation and prevention: In 1993, when historic floods ripped through Iowa, it became clear to me that the national emergency-response infrastructure was woefully inadequate to meet the needs of Iowans in flood-ravaged communities. I went to work dramatically expanding the Federal Emergency Management Agency's hazard mitigation program, which helps communities reduce the loss of life and property due to natural disasters and enables mitigation measures to be implemented during the immediate recovery period. Disaster relief means more than helping people and businesses get back on their feet after a disaster, it means doing our best to prevent the same predictable flood or other catastrophe from recurring in the future. The hazard mitigation program that I helped create in 1993 provided critical support to Iowa communities impacted by the devastating floods of 2008. Grundy County has received over $2 million to remediate and prevent widespread destruction from natural disasters.

Agricultural and rural development: Because I grew up in a small town in rural Iowa, I have always been a loyal friend and fierce advocate for family farmers and rural communities. I have been a member of the House or Senate Agriculture Committee for 40 years—including more than 10 years as chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee. Across the decades, I have championed farm policies for Iowans that include effective farm income protection and commodity programs; strong, progressive conservation assistance for agricultural producers; renewable energy opportunities; and robust economic development in our rural communities. Since 1991, through various programs authorized through the farm bill, Grundy County has received more than $2.8 million from a variety of farm bill programs.

Keeping Iowa communities safe: I also firmly believe that our first responders need to be appropriately trained and equipped, able to respond to both local emergencies and to statewide challenges such as, for instance, the methamphetamine epidemic. Since 2001, Grundy County's fire departments have received over $382,000 for firefighter safety and operations equipment.

Disability rights: Growing up, I loved and admired my brother Frank, who was deaf. But I was deeply disturbed by the discrimination and obstacles he faced every day. That is why I have always been a passionate advocate for full equality for people with disabilities. As the primary author of the Americans with Disabilities Act, ADA, and the ADA Amendments Act, I have had four guiding goals for our fellow citizens with disabilities: equal opportunity, full participation, independent living and economic self-sufficiency. Nearly a quarter century since passage of the ADA, I see remarkable changes in communities everywhere I go in Iowa—not just in curb cuts or closed captioned television, but in the full participation of people with disabilities in our society and economy, folks who at long last have the opportunity to contribute their talents and to be fully included. These changes have increased economic opportunities for all citizens of Grundy County, both those with and without disabilities. And they make us proud to be a part of a community and country that respects the worth and civil rights of all of our citizens.

This is at least a partial accounting of my work on behalf of Iowa, and specifically Grundy County, during my time in Congress. In every case, this work has been about partnerships, cooperation, and empowering folks at the State and local level, including in Grundy County, to fulfill their own dreams and initiatives. And, of course, this work is never complete. Even after I retire from the Senate, I have no intention of retiring from the fight for a better, fairer, richer Iowa. I will always be profoundly grateful for the opportunity to serve the people of Iowa as their Senator.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

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

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

2014 NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL STRATEGY—PM 49

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

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit the 2014 *National Drug Control Strategy*, a 21st century approach to drug policy that is built on decades of research demonstrating that addiction is a disease of the brain—one that can be prevented, treated, and from which people can recover. The pages that follow lay out an evidence-based plan for real drug policy reform, spanning the spectrum of effective prevention, early intervention, treatment, recovery support, criminal justice, law enforcement, and international cooperation.

Illicit drug use and its consequences challenge our shared dream of building for our children a country that is healthier, safer, and more prosperous. Illicit drug use is associated with addiction, disease, and lower academic

performance among our young people. It contributes to crime, injury, and serious dangers on the Nation's roadways. And drug use and its consequences jeopardize the progress we have made in strengthening our economy—contributing to unemployment, impeding re-employment, and costing our economy billions of dollars in lost productivity.

These facts, combined with the latest research about addiction as a disease of the brain, helped shape the approach laid out in my Administration's first *National Drug Control Strategy*—and they continue to guide our efforts to reform drug policy in a way that is more efficient, effective, and equitable. Through the Affordable Care Act, millions of Americans will be able to obtain health insurance, including coverage for substance use disorder treatment services. We have worked to reform our criminal justice system, addressing unfair sentencing disparities, providing alternatives to incarceration for nonviolent, substance-involved offenders, and improving prevention and re-entry programs to protect public safety and improve outcomes for people returning to communities from prisons and jails. And we have built stronger partnerships with our international allies, working with them in a global effort against drug trafficking and transnational organized crime, while also assisting them in their efforts to address substance use disorders and related public health problems.

This progress gives us good reason to move forward with confidence. However, we cannot effectively build on this progress without collaboration across all sectors of our society. I look forward to joining with community coalitions, faith-based groups, tribal communities, health care providers, law enforcement agencies, state and local governments, and our international partners to continue this important work in 2014. And I thank the Congress for its continued support of our efforts to build a healthier, safer, and more prosperous country.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 9, 2014*.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:49 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1528. An act to amend the Controlled Substances Act to allow a veterinarian to transport and dispense controlled substances in the usual course of veterinary practice outside of the registered location.

H.R. 3488. An act to establish the conditions under which the Secretary of Homeland Security may establish preclearance facilities, conduct preclearance operations, and provide customs services outside the United States, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4007. An act to recodify and reauthorize the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program.

H.R. 4263. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize the Department of Homeland Security to establish a social media working group, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4289. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Under Secretary for Management of the Department of Homeland Security to take administrative action to achieve and maintain interoperable communications capabilities among the components of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4653. An act to reauthorize the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 3488. An act to establish the conditions under which the Secretary of Homeland Security may establish preclearance facilities, conduct preclearance operations, and provide customs services outside the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4007. An act to recodify and reauthorize the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4263. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize the Department of Homeland Security to establish a social media working group, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4289. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Under Secretary for Management of the Department of Homeland Security to take administrative action to achieve and maintain interoperable communications capabilities among the components of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4653. An act to reauthorize the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 2569. A bill to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 1528. An act to amend the Controlled Substances Act to allow a veterinarian to transport and dispense controlled substances in the usual course of veterinary practice outside of the registered location.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bills were read the first time:

S. 2578. A bill to ensure that employers cannot interfere in their employees' birth control and other health care decisions.

S. 2579. A bill to require the Secretary of State to offer rewards totaling up to $5,000,000 for information on the kidnapping and murder of Naftali Fraenkel, a dual United States-Israeli citizen, that began on June 12, 2014.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM–284. A joint resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Vermont applying to the United States Congress to call a convention of the states under Article V of the United States Constitution for the sole purpose of proposing amendments to the United States Constitution that would limit the influence of money in the electoral process; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

JOINT SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 27

Whereas, it was the stated intention of the framers of the Constitution of the United States of America that the Congress of the United States of America should be ''dependent on the people alone'' (James Madison or Alexander Hamilton, Federalist 52), and

Whereas, that dependency has evolved from a dependency on the people alone to a dependency on those who spend excessively in elections through campaigns or third-party groups, and

Whereas, the U.S. Supreme Court ruling in Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission, 130 S.Ct. 876 (2010), removed restrictions on amounts of independent political spending, and

Whereas, the removal of those restrictions has resulted in the corrupting influence of powerful economic forces, which have supplanted the will of the people by undermining our ability to choose our political leadership, write our own laws, and determine the fate of our State, and

Whereas, the State of Vermont believes that a convention called pursuant to Article V of the U.S. Constitution should be convened to consider amendments to that Constitution to limit the corrupting influence of money in our political system and desires that said convention should be so limited, and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States has failed to propose, pursuant to Article V of the Constitution, amendments that would adequately address the concerns of Vermont: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives, That the General Assembly, pursuant to Article V of the U.S. Constitution, hereby petitions the U.S. Congress to call a convention for the sole purpose of proposing amendments to the Constitution of the United States of America that would limit the corrupting influence of money in our electoral process, including, inter alia, by overturning the Citizens United decision, and be it further

Resolved, That this petition shall not be considered by the U.S. Congress until 33 other states submit petitions for the same purpose as proposed by Vermont in this resolution and unless the Congress determines that the scope of amendments to the Constitution of the United States considered by the convention shall be limited to the same purpose requested by Vermont, and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be directed to send a copy of this resolution to the Vice President of the United States; the President Pro Tempore and the Secretary of the Senate of the United States; the Speaker and Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States; the Archivist of the United States; and the Vermont Congressional Delegation.

POM–285. A resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Georgia applying to the United States Congress to call a convention of the states under Article V of the United States Constitution for the purpose of proposing amendments to the United States Constitution related to fiscal restraints on the federal government, limiting the power and jurisdiction of the federal government, and limiting the terms of office for its officials and for members of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 736

Whereas, the founders of the Constitution of the United States empowered state legislators to be guardians of liberty against future abuses of power by the federal government; and

Whereas, the federal government has created a crushing national debt through improper and imprudent spending; and

Whereas, the federal government has invaded the legitimate roles of the states through the manipulative process of federal mandates, most of which are unfunded to a great extent; and

Whereas, the federal government has ceased to live under a proper interpretation of the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas, it is the solemn duty of the states to protect the liberty of our people, particularly for the generations to come, by proposing amendments to the Constitution of the United States through a convention of the states under Article V of the United States Constitution to place clear restraints on these and related abuses of power: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of Georgia, That the General Assembly of the State of Georgia hereby applies to Congress, under the provisions of Article V of the Constitution of the United States, for the calling of a convention of the states limited to proposing amendments to the United States Constitution that impose fiscal restraints on the federal government, limit the power and jurisdiction of the federal government, and limit the terms of office for its officials and for members of Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That this application shall be deemed an application for a convention to address each or all of the subjects herein stated. For the purposes of determining whether two-thirds of the states have applied for a convention addressing any of the subjects stated herein, this application is to be aggregated with the applications of any other state legislatures for the single subjects of balancing the federal budget, limiting the power and jurisdiction of the federal government, or limiting the terms of federal officials; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby directed to transmit copies of this application to the President and Secretary of the United States Senate and to the Speaker and Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, to transmit copies to the members of the United States Senate and United States House of Representatives from this state, and to transmit copies hereof to the presiding officers of each of the legislative houses in the several states, requesting their cooperation; and be it further

Resolved, That this application constitutes a continuing application in accordance with Article V of the Constitution of the United States until the legislatures of at least two-thirds of the several states have made applications on the same subject.

POM–286. A memorial adopted by the Legislature of the State of Florida applying to the United States Congress to call a convention of the states under Article V of the United States Constitution for the sole purpose of proposing amendments to the United States Constitution, which impose fiscal restraints on the federal government, limit the power and jurisdiction of the federal government, and limit the terms of office for federal officials and members of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE MEMORIAL 476

Whereas, the Founders of the United States of America provided in the Constitution of the United States for a limited Federal Government of express enumerated powers, and

Whereas, the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution specifically provides that all powers not delegated to the Federal Government nor prohibited by the Constitution to the states are reserved to the states, respectively, or to the people, and

Whereas, for many decades, this balance of power was generally respected and followed by those occupying positions of authority in the Federal Government, and

Whereas, as federal power has expanded over the past decades, federal spending has exponentially increased to the extent that it is now decidedly out of balance in relation to actual revenues or when comparing the ratio of accumulated public debt to the nation's gross domestic product, and

Whereas, in 2013, the Federal Government's accumulated public debt exceeded $17 trillion, which is more than double that in 2006, and

Whereas, projections of federal deficit spending in the coming decades demonstrate that this power shift and its fiscal impacts are continuing and pose serious threats to the freedom and financial security of the American people and future generations, and

Whereas, the Founders of the United States of America provided a procedure in Article V of the Constitution to amend the Constitution on application of two-thirds of the several states, calling a convention for proposing amendments that will be valid to all intents and purposes if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several states, or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, as one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by Congress, and

Whereas, it is a fundamental duty of state legislatures to support, protect, and defend the liberty of the American people, including generations yet to come, by asserting their solemn duty and responsibility under the Constitution to call for a convention under Article V for proposing amendments to the Constitution to reverse and correct the ominous path that the country is now on and to restrain future expansions and abuses of federal power: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida:

(1) That the Legislature of the State of Florida does hereby make application to Congress pursuant to Article V of the Constitution of the United States to call an Article V convention for the sole purpose of proposing amendments to the Constitution of the United States which:

(a) Impose fiscal restraints on the Federal Government.

(b) Limit the power and jurisdiction of the Federal Government.

(c) Limit the terms of office for federal officials and members of Congress.

(2) That these three proposed amendment categories are severable from one another and may be counted individually toward the required two-thirds number of applications made by the state legislatures for the calling of an Article V convention.

(3) That this memorial is revoked and withdrawn, nullified, and superseded to the same effect as if it had never been passed, and retroactive to the date of passage, if it is used for the purpose of calling a convention or used in support of conducting a convention to amend the Constitution of the United States for any purpose other than imposing fiscal restraints on the Federal Government, limiting the power and jurisdiction of the Federal Government, or limiting the terms of office for federal officials and members of Congress.

(4) That this application constitutes a continuing application in accordance with Article V of the Constitution of the United States until the legislatures of at least two-thirds of the several states have made applications on one or more of the three proposed amendment categories listed above.

Be it further resolved That copies of this memorial be dispatched to the President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and to each member of the Florida delegation to the United States Congress.

POM–287. A resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Georgia making renewed application to the United States Congress calling a convention of the states under Article V of the United States Constitution for the purpose of proposing a balanced budget amendment to the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 371

Whereas, in 1976, by House Resolution 469–1267, Resolution Act No. 93 (Ga. L. 1976, p. 184), the Georgia General Assembly applied to the Congress to call a convention for the specific and exclusive purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to require a balanced federal budget and to make certain exceptions with respect thereto; and

Whereas, in 2004, by House Resolution No. 1343, Act No. 802 (Ga. L. 2004, p. 1081), the Georgia General Assembly rescinded and repealed all prior applications for constitutional conventions, including but not limited to said 1976 application; and

Whereas, the need for such a balanced budget amendment remains and has become far more apparent and urgent: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of Georgia, That this body hereby applies again to Congress, under the provisions of Article V of the Constitution of the United States, for the calling of a convention for proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States and recommends that the convention be limited to consideration and proposal of an amendment requiring that in the absence of a national emergency the total of all federal appropriations made by the Congress for any fiscal year may not exceed the total of all estimated federal revenues for that fiscal year; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to transmit appropriate copies of this application to the President and Secretary of the United States Senate, the Speaker and Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, and members of the Georgia congressional delegation and to transmit appropriate copies also to the presiding officers of each of the legislative houses of the several states, requesting their cooperation; and be it further

Resolved, That this application is to be considered as covering the same subject matter as the presently-outstanding balanced budget applications from other states, including but not limited to previously adopted applications from Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, and Texas, and this application should be aggregated with same for

the purpose of reaching the two-thirds of states necessary to require the calling of a convention, but should not be aggregated with any applications on any other subject; and be it further

Resolved, That this application shall constitute a continuing application in accordance with Article V of the Constitution of the United States until:

(1) The legislatures of at least two-thirds of the several states have made applications on the same subject and Congress has called for a convention for proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States;

(2) The Congress of the United States has in accordance with Article V of the Constitution of the United States proposed an amendment to said Constitution which is consistent with the balanced budget amendment referenced in this application; or

(3) January 1, 2020, whichever first occurs.

POM–288. A memorial adopted by the Legislature of the State of Florida applying to the United States Congress to call a convention of the states under Article V of the United States Constitution for the sole purpose of proposing an amendment to the United States Constitution which requires a balanced federal budget; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE MEMORIAL 658

Whereas, the Legislature of the State of Florida passed Senate Concurrent Resolution 10 on April 21, 2010, and

Whereas, Senate Concurrent Resolution 10 made application to Congress to call a convention for proposing amendments pursuant to Article V of the Constitution of the United States for two purposes: to achieve and maintain a balanced federal budget and to control the ability of Congress and federal executive agencies to dictate to states requirements for the expenditure of federal funds, and

Whereas, the Legislature of the State of Florida desires to conform to the single subject applications from Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, Colorado, Delaware, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Texas and limit its application to Congress for the sole purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to require a balanced federal budget: Now, Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida:

(1) That the Legislature of the State of Florida hereby applies to Congress, under Article V of the Constitution of the United States, to call a convention limited to proposing an amendment to the Constitution requiring that, in the absence of a national emergency, the total of all federal appropriations made by the Congress for any fiscal year may not exceed the total of all estimated federal revenues for that fiscal year, together with any related and appropriate fiscal restraints.

(2) That this application is to be considered as covering the same subject matter as the presently outstanding balanced budget applications from other states and is to be aggregated with the applications from those states for the purpose of attaining the two-thirds number of states necessary to require the calling of a convention, but may not be aggregated with applications on any other subject calling for a constitutional convention under Article V of the United States Constitution.

(3) That this application constitutes a continuing application in accordance with Article V until the legislatures of at least two-thirds of the states have made applications on the same subject and supersedes all previous applications by this Legislature on the same subject; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be dispatched to the President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and to each member of the Florida delegation to the United States Congress.

POM–289. A memorial adopted by the Legislature of the State of Florida applying to the United States Congress to call a convention of the states under Article V of the United States Constitution for the sole purpose of proposing an amendment to the United States Constitution to provide that every law enacted by Congress shall embrace only one subject, which shall be clearly expressed in its title; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE MEMORIAL 261

Whereas, each measure before a legislative body should pass on its own merits without depending on legislative support for other unrelated measures to achieve the required number of votes for passage, and

Whereas, a single-subject constitutional provision addresses this concern by prohibiting a legislative body from enacting a law that embraces more than one subject, and

Whereas, 41 of the 50 states, including Florida, have a single-subject provision in their respective state constitutions, and the legislatures and citizens of these states have benefited from a single-subject requirement, and

Whereas, the Constitution of the United States is the supreme law of the United States of America, touching the lives of every citizen in the several states, but is missing this important provision, and

Whereas, our great country is deep in debt and Congress is currently searching for a solution, and

Whereas, a federal single-subject amendment would provide the means to limit pork barrel spending, control the phenomenon of legislating through riders, limit omnibus legislation produced by logrolling, prevent public surprise, and increase the institutional accountability of Congress and its members, and

Whereas, it is Florida's hope and desire that Congress will be able to conduct its business in a more productive, efficient, transparent, and less acrimonious way with a single-subject requirement, and

Whereas, Article V of the Constitution of the United States makes provision for amending the Constitution on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several states, calling a convention for proposing amendments that shall be valid to all intents and purposes if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several states or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by Congress: Now, Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida:

(1) That the Legislature of the State of Florida, with all due respect, does hereby make application to the Congress of the United States pursuant to Article V of the Constitution of the United States to call a convention for the sole purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that Congress shall pass no bill, and no bill shall become law, which embraces more than one subject, that subject to be clearly expressed in the bill's title.

(2) That this memorial is revoked and withdrawn, nullified, and superseded to the same effect as if it had never been passed, and be retroactive to the date of passage, if it is used for the purpose of calling a convention or used in support of conducting a convention to amend the Constitution of the United States for any purpose other than requiring that every law enacted by Congress embrace only one subject, which shall be clearly expressed in the title.

(3) That this application constitutes a continuing application in accordance with Article V of the Constitution of the United States until the legislatures of at least two-thirds of the states have made applications on the same subject; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be dispatched to the President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and to each member of the Florida delegation to the United States Congress.

POM–290. A memorial adopted by the Legislature of the State of Florida urging the Congress of the United States to direct the United States Environmental Protection Agency in developing guidelines for regulating carbon dioxide emissions from existing fossil-fueled electric generating units; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SENATE MEMORIAL 1174

Whereas, a reliable and affordable energy supply is vital to Florida's economy and job growth, as well as the overall interests of its citizens, and

Whereas, Florida supports an all-inclusive energy strategy because it is in the best interest of the state and the nation, and

Whereas, the United States has an abundant supply of coal that provides economic and energy security benefits, including affordable and reliable electricity, and

Whereas, carbon regulations for existing coal-fueled electric generating units could threaten the affordability and reliability of Florida's electricity supplies, and

Whereas, such regulations impose additional financial burdens on electric generating units that have invested in pollution controls to meet the recent mercury regulations of the United States Environmental Protection Agency, and

Whereas, such burdens risk the closure of electric generating units resulting in substantial job loss, and

Whereas, carbon dioxide emissions from coal-fueled electric generating units in the United States represent only 3 percent of global anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions, and

Whereas, the United States Energy Information Administration projects that carbon dioxide emissions from the nation's electric sector will be 14 percent below 2005 levels in 2020, and

Whereas, the United States Energy Information Administration projects that carbon dioxide emissions from the nation's coal-fueled electric generating units will be 19 percent below 2005 levels in 2020, and

Whereas, on June 25, 2013, the President of the United States directed the United States Environmental Protection Agency to issue standards, regulations, and guidelines to address carbon dioxide emissions from new, existing, modified, and reconstructed fossil-fueled electric generating units, and

Whereas, the President of the United States has recognized that states will play a central role in establishing and implementing carbon standards for existing electric generating units, and

Whereas, the Clean Air Act requires the United States Environmental Protection Agency to establish a procedure under which

each state must develop a plan for establishing and implementing standards of performance for existing fossil-fueled electric generating units within the state, and

Whereas, the Clean Air Act expressly allows states, in developing and applying such standards of performance, to take into consideration, among other factors, the remaining useful life of an existing fossil-fueled electric generating unit to which such standards apply, and

Whereas, the existing regulations of the United States Environmental Protection Agency provide that states may adopt less stringent emissions standards or longer compliance schedules than the agency's guidelines based on factors such as unreasonable cost of control, physical impossibility of installing necessary control equipment, or other factors that make less stringent standards or longer compliance times significantly more reasonable, and

Whereas, it is in the best interest of electricity consumers in Florida to continue to benefit from reliable, affordable electricity provided by coal-based electric generating units: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida: That the Congress of the United States is urged to direct the United States Environmental Protection Agency, in developing guidelines for regulating carbon dioxide emissions from existing fossil-fueled electric generating units, to:

(1) Respect the primacy of Florida and rely on state regulators to develop performance standards for carbon dioxide emissions which take into account the unique policies, energy needs, resource mix, and economic priorities of the state.

(2) Issue guidelines and approve state-established performance standards that are based on reductions of carbon dioxide emissions determined to be achievable by measures undertaken at fossil-fueled electric generating units.

(3) Allow Florida to set less stringent performance standards or longer compliance schedules for fossil-fueled electric generating units.

(4) Give Florida maximum flexibility to implement carbon dioxide performance standards for fossil-fueled electric generating units; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be dispatched to the President of the United States, to the Administrator of the United States Environmental Protection Agency, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and to each member of the Florida delegation to the United States Congress.

POM-291. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Colorado urging the United States Congress to pass comprehensive federal legislation authorizing banks and credit unions to serve legal marijuana and hemp businesses; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 14–003

Whereas, All one hundred members of the Colorado General Assembly took an oath to uphold the United States constitution and the Colorado constitution; and

Whereas, Colorado voters recently approved Amendment 64, a constitutional amendment to legalize the sale and consumption of recreational marijuana in Colorado, with 55.23 percent of the vote, or approximately 1.38 million votes, in favor of legalization; and

Whereas, Hemp has long been recognized for its varied industrial uses, was sold and used commercially in the earliest days of our country's history, and was recognized as a valuable cash crop by George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and Benjamin Franklin; and

Whereas, Federal laws, including the ''Controlled Substances Act'', the ''Bank Secrecy Act'', and the ''Annunzio-Wylie Anti-Money Laundering Act'', prohibit banks from providing financial services to marijuana and hemp businesses; and

Whereas, Directives from federal regulatory agencies such as the Federal Reserve, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the National Credit Union Administration, and the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency also prohibit bankers from accepting deposits from marijuana or hemp businesses; and

Whereas, The ''USA PATRIOT Act'' directs financial institutions to establish Enhanced Due Diligence policies, procedures, and controls where necessary to detect and report instances of suspected money laundering, which has led to the adoption of Know Your Customer procedures; and

Whereas, Know Your Customer procedures require banks and credit unions to verify the identity of their customers and determine that the source of their funds is legitimate by obtaining information about the nature of an account holder's business, customers, and sources of funds; and

Whereas, Banks and credit unions that comply with the Know Your Customer rules will be required by anti-money laundering laws and regulations to file recurring suspicious activity reports documenting the financial activities of a legal marijuana business, including filing a currency transaction report each time a marijuana business makes a deposit of more than $10,000 and reporting cash that smells like marijuana; and

Whereas, Marijuana remains classified as a schedule I controlled substance at the federal level, the strictest classification under the ''Controlled Substances Act'', and the production of industrial hemp remains highly restricted at the federal level; and

Whereas, The United States attorney general recently announced guidance for financial institutions that wish to provide banking services to legal marijuana businesses in what has become known as the Cole Memo; and

Whereas, This guidance greatly adds to the reporting and compliance requirements already demanded of banks and credit unions, including ensuring that the marijuana businesses to which they provide services do not sell to minors, transfer marijuana to a state where its sale is illegal, involve themselves with organized crime, sell illegal drugs, encourage the use of marijuana on federal property, or encourage drugged driving; and

Whereas, The United States Treasury's Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, or FinCEN, in coordination with the United States Department of Justice, also issued a memo outlining expectations for compliance with the ''Bank Secrecy Act'', including verifying the legitimacy of a marijuana business's license and registration, developing an understanding of the norm for marijuana business transactions and monitoring each business for deviation from the norm, monitoring publicly available sources for adverse information on the business and any related parties, and monitoring for suspicious activity on an ongoing basis; and

Whereas, In April 2014, United States Senators Chuck Grassley and Dianne Feinstein sent a letter to the director of FinCEN, questioning FinCEN's legal authority to provide banks guidance on violations of federal law and noting the possibility that a financial institution might complete a suspicious activity report regarding a marijuana business customer, and then that specific report could be used against the financial institution as evidence of the institution being complicit in the act of money laundering; and

Whereas, Financial institutions face a significant challenge in verifying that a marijuana business is in compliance with all of the guidelines issued by the Department of Justice and FinCEN and face uncertainty about whether they would be reasonably protected from prosecution or actions by regulatory agencies, now or in the future, on the basis of guidance in non-binding memoranda; and

Whereas, The above-mentioned guidance is a directive to federal prosecutors to avoid prosecuting financial institutions that comply with the Cole Memo and FinCEN guidance but does not limit punitive actions from federal regulatory agencies, including several that operate outside of the executive branch, such as the FDIC and the Federal Reserve, whose regulatory actions could be just as damaging to a financial institution's operations as prosecution; and

Whereas, The guidance is not enforceable in court, provides neither a safe harbor from prosecution nor legal defense in court, and can only be considered temporary, short-lived guidance as it could be reversed by a future administration; and

Whereas, The guidance from the United States Department of Justice cannot override federal laws or regulations, which still characterize acceptance of a deposit from a marijuana business as money laundering; and

Whereas, Neither the United States Department of Justice guidance nor the FinCEN memo provide adequate regulatory and legal certainty for financial institutions to provide banking services to the legal marijuana industry; and

Whereas, Under federal law, banks and credit unions that conduct business with legal marijuana businesses will still be in violation of the ''Bank Secrecy Act'', the ''Annunzio-Wylie Anti-Money Laundering Act'', and the ''USA PATRIOT Act'', and any bank or credit union that chooses to serve marijuana businesses effectively puts its regulatory status at risk; and

Whereas, Colorado and Washington have already legalized retail marijuana shops, and several other states will be considering full legalization at the ballot in the 2014 elections; and

Whereas, Twenty states have already legalized the sale and consumption of medical marijuana for limited medical uses; and

Whereas, The medical, retail, and hemp agricultural businesses that are legally permitted to operate under state laws in dozens of states are forced to operate as all-cash businesses, including paying for capital investments such as hydration and lighting equipment in cash, compensating employees in cash, and renting or purchasing warehouses and other real estate with large down payments in cash; and

Whereas, The medical, retail, and hemp agricultural businesses can accept neither credit nor debit cards from customers because electronic payments are handled through the banking system; and

Whereas, Both the state of Colorado and its local municipalities use bank accounts to audit sales tax collections, and a lack of accounting information that is typically available for such audits could mean that Colorado governments are under-collecting tax revenue; and

Whereas, The storage and transfer of large amounts of cash necessary for the legal operation of marijuana businesses has already made these businesses a target for crime and could attract the involvement of organized criminal enterprises; and

Whereas, Colorado is unable to address this problem by chartering a state bank or credit

union because all financial institutions are interconnected through federal banking laws and regulations that govern national and international commerce: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Sixty-ninth General Assembly of the State of Colorado:

(1) That the ability of the federal executive branch to facilitate a reasonable regulatory structure for the marijuana industry is limited as long as federal law categorizes marijuana as an illegal substance.

(2) That the best solution to the problem of a lack of financial services for the legal marijuana industry will be comprehensive federal legislation authorizing banks and credit unions to serve legal marijuana and hemp businesses; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this Resolution be sent to all members of the Colorado delegation to the United States Congress, the speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the United States Senate majority leader, the United States Senate majority leader pro tempore, and the president of the United States.

POM–292. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of North Carolina urging the United States Congress and the President of the United States to reauthorize the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 1261

Whereas, insurance helps protect the United States economy from the adverse effects of the risks inherent in economic and development while also providing the resources necessary to rebuild physical and economic infrastructure, offer indemnification for business disruption, and provide coverage for medical and liability costs from injuries and loss of life in the event of catastrophic losses to persons or property; and

Whereas, the terrorist attack of September 11, 2001, produced insured losses larger than any natural or manmade event in history, with claims paid by insurers to their policy holders eventually totaling some $32.5 billion, making this the second most costly insurance event in United States history; and

Whereas, the sheer enormity of the loss, combined with the possibility of future attacks, produced financial shockwaves that shook insurance markets causing insurers and reinsurers to exclude coverage arising from acts of terrorism from virtually all commercial property and liability policies; and

Whereas, the lack of terrorism risk insurance contributed to a paralysis in the economy, especially in construction, tourism, business travel, and real estate finance; and

Whereas, the United States Congress originally passed the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002, Pub. L. 107–297 (TRIA), in which the federal government agreed to provide terrorism reinsurance to insurers and reauthorized this arrangement via the Terrorism Risk Insurance Extension Act of 2005, Pub. L. 109–144, and the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2007, Pub. L. 110–160 (TRIPRA); and

Whereas, under TRIPRA the federal government provides such reinsurance after industry-wide losses attributable to annual certified terrorism events exceed $100 million; and

Whereas, coverage under TRIPRA is provided to individual insurers after the insurer has incurred losses related to terrorism equal to 20% of the insurer's previous year earned premium for property-casualty lines; and

Whereas, after an individual insurer has reached such a threshold, the insurer pays 15% of residual losses and the federal government pay the remaining 85%; and

Whereas, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program has an annual cap of $100 billion of aggregate insured losses, beyond which the federal program does not provide coverage; and

Whereas, TRIPRA requires the federal government to recoup 100% of the benefits provided under the program via policyholder surcharges to the extent the aggregate insured losses are less than $27.5 billion and enables the government to recoup expenditures beyond that mandatory recoupment amount; and

Whereas, without question, TRIA and its successors are the principal reason for the continued stability in the insurance and reinsurance market for terrorism insurance to the benefit of our overall economy; and

Whereas, the presence of a robust private-public partnership has provided stability and predictability and has allowed insurers to actively participate in the market in a meaningful way; and

Whereas, without a program such as TRIPRA, many of our citizens who want and need terrorism coverage to operate their businesses all across the nation would be either unable to get insurance or unable to afford the limited coverage that would be available; and

Whereas, without federally provided reinsurance, property and casualty insurers will face less availability of terrorism reinsurance and will therefore be severely restricted in their ability to provide sufficient coverage for acts of terrorism to support our economy; and

Whereas, unfortunately, despite the hard work and dedication of this nations's counterterrorism agencies and the bravery of the men and women in uniform who fought and continue to fight battles abroad to keep us safe here at home, the threat from terrorist attacks in the United States is both real and substantial and will remain as such for the foreseeable future: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives:

Section 1. The members of the House of Representatives of the State of North Carolina urge the United States Congress and the President of the United States to reauthorize the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program.

Section 2. The Principal Clerk shall transmit certified copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Speaker and clerk of the United States House of Representative, the President Pro Tempore and the Secretary of the United States Senate, the members of the North Carolina Congressional delegation, and the news media of North Carolina.

Section 3. This resolution is effective upon adoption.

POM–293. A substitute concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Missouri memorializing the need to preserve natural resources and provide recreational development and other improvements for the public use; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SENATE SUBSTITUTE FOR HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 9

Whereas, in 1959, Senate Resolution No. 33 and House Resolution No. 19, recognizing the importance of the extraordinary manifestations of nature and recreational attributes of the Current and Jacks Fork Riverways , requested Congress to enact legislation to preserve the natural resources and provide recreational development and other improvements for the public use; and

Whereas, in 1964, Congress answered Missouri's request by enacting legislation to establish the Ozark National Scenic Riverways; and

Whereas, the riverways within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways are, and remain, public highways of the State of Missouri, subject to concurrent jurisdiction between the State of Missouri and the United States under Missouri Senate Bill No. .362 enacted in 1971; and

Whereas, in 2005, the National Park Service began researching for the purpose of drafting a new general management plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways; and

Whereas, the National Park Service is advocating the ''Preferred Alternative'' option of the general management plan; and

Whereas, the goal of the ''Preferred Alternative'' option of the general management plan is to shut down public access points to riverways, eliminate motorized boat traffic from certain areas, further restrict boat motor horsepower in other areas, close several gravel bars, and propose that additional areas be designated as federal wilderness; and

Whereas, the ''No-Action Alternative'' option of the general management plan is an appropriate balance between resource preservation and opportunities for recreational use; and

Whereas, the general management plan will guide decisions related to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways for the next 15 to 20 years; and

Whereas, tourism is one of the most critical components of our rural economy; and

Whereas, thousands of hikers, campers, boaters, hunters, fishermen, and horseback riders visit these areas annually generating irreplaceable tax revenue; and

Whereas, any further limitations on the access to these riverways would severely impact this local economy;

Whereas, the Missouri Conservation Commission is charged with the control, management, restoration, conservation, and regulation of bird, fish, game, forestry, and all wildlife resources of the state, including hatcheries, sanctuaries, refuges, reservations, and all other property owned, acquired, or used for such purposes; and

Whereas, in September of 2009, the Missouri Department of Conservation recommended that ''hunting, fishing, and trapping continue to be allowed through the Ozark National Scenic Riverways except in highly developed areas where a reasonable safety zone for public protection may be required: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Missouri Senate, Ninety-seventh General Assembly, Second Regular Session, the House of Representatives concurring therein, hereby strongly urge the United States Department of the Interior National Park Service to pursue one of the following three options in regard to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways:

1. Choose the ''No-Action Alternative'' option of the general management plan;

2. Enter into negotiations with the State of Missouri, Department of Conservation for the return of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways to the State of Missouri so that the land will continued to be used for its original and intended purpose; or

3. Enter into a contract with the State of Missouri, Department of Conservation for the management, operation, and maintenance of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways; and be it further

Resolved That the Chief Clerk of the Missouri House of Representatives be instructed to prepare properly inscribed copies of this resolution for the President Pro Tempore of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the Secretary of the United States Department

of the Interior, each member of the Missouri Congressional Delegation, the Director of the National Park Service, the Superintendent of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, the Director of the Missouri Department of Conservation, and Governor Jay Nixon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CARPER, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 1376. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 369 Martin Luther King Jr. Drive in Jersey City, New Jersey, as the ''Judge Shirley A. Tolentino Post Office Building''.

H.R. 1813. A bill to redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 162 Northeast Avenue in Tallmadge, Ohio, as the ''Lance Corporal Daniel Nathan Deyarmin, Jr., Post Office Building''.

S. 2056. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 13127 Broadway Street in Alden, New York, as the ''Sergeant Brett E. Gornewicz Memorial Post Office''.

S. 2057. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 198 Baker Street in Corning, New York, as the ''Specialist Ryan P. Jayne Post Office Building''.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, Ms. HEITKAMP, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 2570. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to recognize Indian tribal governments for purposes of determining under the adoption credit whether a child has special needs; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ISAKSON (for himself and Mr. CHAMBLISS):

S. 2571. A bill to adjust the boundary of the Kennesaw Mountain National Battlefield Park to include the Wallis House and Harriston Hill, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 2572. A bill to ban the use of bisphenol A in food containers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL:

S. 2573. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase, expand, and extend the credit for hydrogen-related alternative fuel vehicle refueling property and to increase the investment credit for more efficient fuel cells; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. FISCHER:

S. 2574. A bill to make the United States Preventive Services Task Force subject to the Federal Advisory Committee Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WALSH (for himself, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado):

S. 2575. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to prepare a report on the status of greater sage-grouse conservation efforts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 2576. A bill to establish the Maritime Washington National Heritage Area in the State of Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CRUZ:

S. 2577. A bill to require the Secretary of State to offer rewards totaling up to $5,000,000 for information on the kidnapping and murder of Naftali Fraenkel, a dual United States-Israeli citizen, that began on June 12, 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KAINE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. REID, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. WALSH, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 2578. A bill to ensure that employers cannot interfere in their employees' birth control and other health care decisions; read the first time.

By Mr. CRUZ:

S. 2579. A bill to require the Secretary of State to offer rewards totaling up to $5,000,000 for information on the kidnapping and murder of Naftali Fraenkel, a dual United States-Israeli citizen, that began on June 12, 2014; read the first time.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. CASEY):

S. Res. 497. A resolution honoring the life and career of Charles ''Chuck'' Noll; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 170

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 170, a bill to recognize the heritage of recreational fishing, hunting, and recreational shooting on Federal public land and ensure continued opportunities for those activities.

S. 236

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 236, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish a Medicare payment option for patients and physicians or practitioners to freely contract, without penalty, for Medicare fee-for-service items and services, while allowing Medicare beneficiaries to use their Medicare benefits.

S. 517

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 517, a bill to promote consumer choice and wireless competition by permitting consumers to unlock mobile wireless devices, and for other purposes.

S. 987

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 987, a bill to maintain the free flow of information to the public by providing conditions for the federally compelled disclosure of information by certain persons connected with the news media.

S. 1029

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1029, a bill to reform the process by which Federal agencies analyze and formulate new regulations and guidance documents.

S. 1033

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1033, a bill to authorize a grant program to promote physical education, activity, and fitness and nutrition, and to ensure healthy students, and for other purposes.

S. 1064

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1064, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for treatment of clinical psychologists as physicians for purposes of furnishing clinical psychologist services under the Medicare program.

S. 1261

At the request of Mr. UDALL of Colorado, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1261, a bill to amend the National Energy Conservation Policy Act and the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 to promote energy efficiency via information and computing technologies, and for other purposes.

S. 1431

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1431, a bill to permanently extend the Internet Tax Freedom Act.

S. 1463

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1463, a bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to prohibit importation, exportation, transportation, sale, receipt, acquisition, and purchase in interstate or foreign commerce, or in a manner substantially affecting interstate or foreign commerce, of any live animal of any prohibited wildlife species.

S. 1495

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Maryland

(Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1495, a bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to issue an order with respect to secondary cockpit barriers, and for other purposes.

S. 1738

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1738, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

S. 1875

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1875, a bill to provide for wildfire suppression operations, and for other purposes.

S. 2023

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2023, a bill to reform the financing of Senate elections, and for other purposes.

S. 2192

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2192, a bill to amend the National Alzheimer's Project Act to require the Director of the National Institutes of Health to prepare and submit, directly to the President for review and transmittal to Congress, an annual budget estimate (including an estimate of the number and type of personnel needs for the Institutes) for the initiatives of the National Institutes of Health pursuant to such an Act.

S. 2231

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2231, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide an individual with a mental health assessment before the individual enlists in the Armed Forces or is commissioned as an officer in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 2250

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) were added as cosponsors of S. 2250, a bill to extend the Travel Promotion Act of 2009, and for other purposes.

S. 2298

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2298, a bill to provide for a lifetime National Recreational Pass for any veteran with a service-connected disability, and for other purposes.

S. 2360

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2360, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the rules relating to inverted corporations.

S. 2500

At the request of Mr. WALSH, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2500, a bill to restrict the ability of the Federal Government to undermine privacy and encryption technology in commercial products and in NIST computer security and encryption standards.

S. 2501

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2501, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make improvements to the Medicare hospital readmissions reduction program.

S. RES. 482

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 482, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the area between the intersections of International Drive, Northwest Van Ness Street, Northwest International Drive, Northwest and International Place, Northwest in Washington, District of Columbia, should be designated as ''Liu Xiaobo Plaza''.

AMENDMENT NO. 3451

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the names of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3451 intended to be proposed to S. 2363, a bill to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3453

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3453 intended to be proposed to S. 2363, a bill to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3455

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3455 intended to be proposed to S. 2363, a bill to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3457

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3457 intended to be proposed to S. 2363, a bill to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3458

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3458 intended to be proposed to S. 2363, a bill to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3464

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3464 intended to be proposed to S. 2363, a bill to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3467

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3467 intended to be proposed to S. 2363, a bill to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3470

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3470 intended to be proposed to S. 2363, a bill to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3478

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3478 intended to be proposed to S. 2363, a bill to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 497—HONORING THE LIFE AND CAREER OF CHARLES ''CHUCK'' NOLL

Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. CASEY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 497

Whereas Chuck Noll was born on January 5, 1932, in Cleveland, Ohio;

Whereas Chuck Noll excelled at multiple positions on the football field during a preparatory career at Benedictine High School in Cleveland, Ohio and during a college career at the University of Dayton;

Whereas, after being drafted in the 20th round of the 1953 National Football League Draft by his hometown team, the Cleveland Browns, Chuck Noll enjoyed a 7-year career as a linebacker and offensive lineman;

Whereas, after his playing career ended, Chuck Noll joined coaching staffs headed by 2 future Hall-of-Famers, including Sid Gillman of the San Diego Chargers;

Whereas, after serving as an assistant coach for nearly a decade, Chuck Noll was selected by the Rooney family to serve as 14th head coach of the Pittsburgh Steelers football team on January 27, 1969;

Whereas the current owner of the Pittsburgh Steelers is quoted as saying ''hiring

Chuck Noll was the best decision we ever made for the Steelers'';

Whereas, in 1972, in Chuck Noll's fourth season as head coach of the Pittsburgh Steelers, the Pittsburgh Steelers won 11 games and made the playoffs for the first time since 1947;

Whereas, on January 12, 1975, the Pittsburgh Steelers dynasty was born when Chuck Noll led the Pittsburgh Steelers to a victory over the Minnesota Vikings to win Super Bowl IX—the first of the Pittsburgh Steelers' now 6 Super Bowl titles;

Whereas, over the 5 football seasons after winning Super Bowl IX, Chuck Noll's Pittsburgh Steelers went on to capture an additional 3 Super Bowl titles—Super Bowl X and XIII, both by defeating the Dallas Cowboys, and Super Bowl XIV, by defeating the Los Angeles Rams;

Whereas Chuck Noll is best known for masterminding the ''Steel Curtain'', one of the most stout and prolific defensive units in National Football League history;

Whereas both Chuck Noll's ability to identify talent and his hands-on coaching technique led to Hall of Fame careers for more than 10 of Chuck Noll's players;

Whereas, following 23 football seasons and 193 football game wins, including a record 4 Super Bowl titles as a head coach of the Pittsburgh Steelers, Chuck Noll was enshrined in the Pro Football Hall of Fame in Canton, Ohio as part of the Class of 1993; and

Whereas, on June 13, 2014, Chuck Noll passed away surrounded by loved ones at his home in Sewickley, Pennsylvania at the age of 82: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the life and career of Chuck Noll and his contributions to the city of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania and the National Football League; and

(2) expresses its sympathies to Chuck Noll's family and friends, the Pittsburgh Steelers, Steelers fans, and football fans all around the world.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3480. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MURPHY, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3481. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 4660, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3482. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3483. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3484. Mr. BURR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3485. Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. ALEXANDER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3486. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3487. Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. CRUZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3488. Mr. HEINRICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3489. Mr. HEINRICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3490. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3469 proposed by Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. RISCH) to the bill S. 2363, supra.

SA 3491. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2363, supra.

SA 3492. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3491 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 2363, supra.

SA 3493. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3492 proposed by Mr. REID to the amendment SA 3491 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 2363, supra.

SA 3494. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3495. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3496. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3497. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3498. Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3499. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3500. Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. MURPHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3501. Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Ms. HIRONO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3502. Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3503. Mrs. FISCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3504. Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. WALSH, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. RISCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3505. Mr. HEINRICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3506. Mr. HEINRICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3507. Mr. HEINRICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3508. Mr. HEINRICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3509. Mr. HEINRICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3510. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3511. Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. REED) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3512. Mr. HARKIN (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3513. Mr. WALSH (for himself and Mr. TESTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3514. Mr. WALSH (for himself and Mr. TESTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3515. Mr. WALSH (for himself, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3516. Mr. COCHRAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3517. Mr. COCHRAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3518. Mr. COCHRAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3519. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3520. Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CRAPO, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. LEE, and Mr. HATCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3521. Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. LEE, and Mr. THUNE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3522. Mr. BARRASSO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3523. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3524. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3525. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3526. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3527. Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. VITTER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. KIRK, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. BURR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3528. Mr. REID (for Mr. COBURN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 311, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating sites in the Lower Mississippi River Area in the State of Louisiana as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes.

SA 3529. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3530. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3529 submitted by Mr. REID and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3480. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MURPHY, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. STRAW PURCHASERS AND TRAFFICKERS OF FIREARMS.

Section 924 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', except that any person who commits a violation described in subparagraph (A) by making a false statement or representation with respect to a firearm or ammunition with knowledge or reasonable cause to believe that the firearm or ammunition is to be used to commit a crime of violence, as defined in subsection (c)(3), shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 15 years or both''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', except that any person who knowingly violates section 922(a)(6) with knowledge or reasonable cause to believe that the firearm or ammunition is to be used to commit a crime of violence, as defined in subsection (c)(3), shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 15 years or both''; and

(2) by striking subsection (h) and inserting the following:

''(h) Whoever knowingly receives or transfers a firearm or ammunition, or attempts or conspires to do so, knowing or having reasonable cause to believe that such firearm or ammunition will be used to commit a crime of violence (as defined in subsection (c)(3)), a drug trafficking crime (as defined in subsection (c)(2)), or a crime under the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.), the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), the Foreign Narcotics Kingpin Designation Act (21 U.S.C. 1901 et seq.), or section 212(a)(2)(C) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(2)(C)) shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 15 years, or both.''.

SA 3481. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 4660, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 157, line 24, strike ''$1,390,000,000'' and insert ''$1,620,000,000''.

SA 3482. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II, add the following:

SEC. 2_____. AVAILABILITY OF INTEREST IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION FUND.

Section 3(b)(2)(C) of the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669b(b)(2)(C)) is amended by striking ''2016'' and inserting ''2026''.

SA 3483. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 53, after line 11, add the following:

SEC. 2_____. STATE CONTROL OF HUNTING, FISHING, OUTDOOR RECREATION, AND ENERGY DEVELOPMENT AND PRODUCTION ON CERTAIN FEDERAL LAND.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AVAILABLE FEDERAL LAND.—The term ''available Federal land'' means any Federal land that, as of May 31, 2013—

(A) is located within the boundaries of a State;

(B) is not held by the United States in trust for the benefit of a federally recognized Indian tribe;

(C) is not a unit of the National Park System;

(D) is not a unit of the National Wildlife Refuge System; and

(E) is not a Congressionally designated wilderness area.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(3) STATE.—The term ''State'' means—

(A) a State; and

(B) the District of Columbia.

(b) STATE PROGRAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A State—

(A) may establish a program covering the leasing and permitting processes, regulatory requirements, and any other provisions by which the State would exercise its rights to develop all forms of energy resources on available Federal land in the State;

(B) may establish a program covering the allowance of hunting, fishing, and any other outdoor recreation activities (as determined by the State) on available Federal land in the State; and

(C) as a condition of certification under subsection (c)(2) shall submit a declaration to the Departments of the Interior, Agriculture, and Energy that a program under subparagraph (A) or (B) has been established or amended.

(2) AMENDMENT OF PROGRAMS.—A State may amend a program developed and certified under this section at any time.

(3) CERTIFICATION OF AMENDED PROGRAMS.—Any program amended under paragraph (2) shall be certified under subsection (c)(2).

(c) LEASING, PERMITTING, AND REGULATORY PROGRAMS.—

(1) SATISFACTION OF FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS.—Each program certified under this section shall be considered to satisfy all applicable requirements of Federal law (including regulations), including—

(A) the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.);

(B) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.); and

(C) the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.).

(2) FEDERAL CERTIFICATION AND TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS.—Upon submission of a declaration by a State under subsection (b)(1)(C)—

(A) the program under subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b)(1), as applicable, shall be certified; and

(B) the State shall receive all rights from the Federal Government to carry out the certified program.

(3) ISSUANCE OF PERMITS AND LEASES.—If a State elects to issue a permit or lease for the development of any form of energy resource on any available Federal land within the borders of the State in accordance with a program certified under paragraph (2), the permit or lease shall be considered to meet all applicable requirements of Federal law (including regulations).

(d) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Activities carried out in accordance with this section shall not be subject to judicial review.

(e) ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT.—Activities carried out in accordance with this section shall not be subject to subchapter II of chapter 5, and chapter 7, of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Administrative Procedure Act'').

SA 3484. Mr. BURR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

SEC. 1_____. WILD HORSES IN AND AROUND THE CURRITUCK NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE.

(a) AGREEMENT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior shall enter into an agreement with the Corolla Wild Horse Fund (a nonprofit corporation established under the laws of the State of North Carolina), the County of Currituck, North Carolina, and the State of North Carolina within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act to provide for management of free-roaming wild horses in and around the Currituck National Wildlife Refuge.

(2) TERMS.—The agreement shall—

(A) allow a herd of not less than 110 and not more than 130 free-roaming wild horses in and around such refuge, with a target population of between 120 and 130 free-roaming wild horses;

(B) provide for cost-effective management of the horses while ensuring that natural resources within the refuge are not adversely impacted;

(C) provide for introduction of a small number of free-roaming wild horses from the herd at Cape Lookout National Seashore as is necessary to maintain the genetic viability of the herd in and around the Currituck National Wildlife Refuge; and

(D) specify that the Corolla Wild Horse Fund shall pay the costs associated with—

(i) coordinating a periodic census and inspecting the health of the horses;

(ii) maintaining records of the horses living in the wild and in confinement;

(iii) coordinating the removal and placement of horses and monitoring of any horses removed from the Currituck County Outer Banks; and

(iv) administering a viable population control plan for the horses including auctions, adoptions, contraceptive fertility methods, and other viable options.

(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR INTRODUCTION OF HORSES FROM CAPE LOOKOUT NATIONAL SEASHORE.—During the effective period of the memorandum of understanding between the National Park Service and the Foundation for Shackleford Horses, Inc. (a non-profit corporation organized under the laws of and doing business in the State of North Carolina) signed in 2007, no horse may be removed from Cape Lookout National Seashore for introduction at Currituck National Wildlife Refuge except—

(1) with the approval of the Foundation; and

(2) consistent with the terms of such memorandum (or any successor agreement) and the Management Plan for the Shackleford Banks Horse Herd signed in January 2006 (or any successor management plan).

(c) NO LIABILITY CREATED.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as creating liability for the United States for any damages caused by the free-roaming wild horses to any person or property located inside or outside the boundaries of the refuge.

SA 3485. Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. ALEXANDER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

SEC. 1___. REFUND OF FUNDS USED BY STATES TO OPERATE NATIONAL PARKS DURING SHUTDOWN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the National Park Service shall refund to each State all funds of the State that were used to reopen and temporarily operate a unit of the National Park System during the period in October 2013 in which there was a lapse in appropriations for the unit.

(b) FUNDING.—Funds of the National Park Service that are appropriated after the date of enactment of this Act shall be used to carry out this section.

SA 3486. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 53, after line 11, add the following:

SEC. 2___. OFF-INSTALLATION DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE NATURAL RESOURCES PROJECTS COMPLIANCE WITH INTEGRATED NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANS.

Section 103a of the Sikes Act (16 U.S.C. 670c–1) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) COMPLIANCE WITH INTEGRATED NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN.—In the case of a cooperative agreement or interagency agreement entered into under subsection (a) for the maintenance and improvement of natural resources located off of a military installation or State-owned National Guard installation, funds referred to in subsection (b) may be used only pursuant to an approved integrated natural resources management plan.''.

SA 3487. Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. CRUZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II, add the following:

SEC. 2___. PROHIBITION ON LAND MANAGEMENT MODIFICATIONS RELATING TO LESSER PRAIRIE CHICKEN.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including regulations), the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior shall not implement or limit any modification to a public or private land-related policy or subsurface mineral right-related policy or practice that is in effect on the date of enactment of this Act relating to the listing of the Lesser Prairie Chicken as a threatened species or endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

SA 3488. Mr. HEINRICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II, add the following:

SEC. 2_____. WILDLIFE AND HUNTING HERITAGE CONSERVATION COUNCIL ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

The Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. 661 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 10. WILDLIFE AND HUNTING HERITAGE CONSERVATION COUNCIL ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established the Wildlife and Hunting Heritage Conservation Council Advisory Committee (referred to in this section as the 'Advisory Committee') to advise the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture (referred to in this section as the 'Secretaries') on wildlife and habitat conservation, hunting, and recreational shooting.

''(b) DUTIES OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—The Advisory Committee shall advise the Secretaries with regard to—

''(1) implementation of Executive Order No. 13443 (72 Fed. Reg. 46537 (Aug. 16, 2007)) (relating to facilitation of hunting heritage and wildlife conservation), which directs Federal agencies 'to facilitate the expansion and enhancement of hunting opportunities and the management of game species and their habitat';

''(2) policies and programs to conserve and restore wetland, agricultural land, grassland, and forest and rangeland habitats;

''(3) policies and programs to promote opportunities and access to hunting and shooting sports on Federal land;

''(4) policies and programs to recruit and retain new hunters and shooters;

''(5) policies and programs that increase public awareness of the importance of wildlife conservation and the social and economic benefits of recreational hunting and shooting; and

''(6) policies and programs that encourage coordination among the public, the hunting and shooting sports community, wildlife conservation groups, and States, Indian tribes, and the Federal Government.

''(c) MEMBERSHIP.—

''(1) APPOINTMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Advisory Committee shall consist of not more than 16 discretionary members and 7 ex officio members.

''(B) EX OFFICIO MEMBERS.—The ex officio members of the Advisory Committee shall be—

''(i) the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service or a designated representative of the Director;

''(ii) the Director of the Bureau of Land Management or a designated representative of the Director;

''(iii) the Director of the National Park Service or a designated representative of the Director;

''(iv) the Chief of the Forest Service or a designated representative of the Chief;

''(v) the Chief of the Natural Resources Conservation Service or a designated representative of the Chief;

''(vi) the Administrator of the Farm Service Agency or a designated representative of the Administrator; and

''(vii) the Executive Director of the Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies.

''(C) DISCRETIONARY MEMBERS.—The discretionary members shall be appointed jointly by the Secretaries from at least 1 of each of the following:

''(i) State fish and wildlife agencies.

''(ii) Game bird hunting organizations.

''(iii) Wildlife conservation organizations.

''(iv) Big game hunting organizations.

''(v) Waterfowl hunting organizations.

''(vi) The tourism, outfitter, and guiding industry.

''(vii) The firearms and ammunition manufacturing industry.

''(viii) The hunting and shooting equipment retail industry.

''(ix) Tribal resource management organizations.

''(x) Women's hunting and fishing advocacy, outreach, or education organizations.

''(xi) Minority hunting and fishing advocacy, outreach, or education organizations.

''(xii) Veterans service organizations.

''(D) ELIGIBILITY.—Prior to the appointment of the discretionary members, the Secretaries shall determine that each individual nominated for appointment to the Advisory Committee, and the organization each individual represents, actively supports and promotes sustainable-use hunting, wildlife conservation, and recreational shooting.

''(2) TERMS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), members of the Advisory Committee—

''(i) shall be appointed for a term of 4 years; and

''(ii) shall not be appointed for more than 3 terms, regardless of whether the terms are consecutive or nonconsecutive.

''(B) INITIAL APPOINTMENTS.—As designated by the Secretaries at the time of appointment, of the members first appointed—

''(i) 6 members shall be appointed for a term of 4 years;

''(ii) 5 members shall be appointed for a term of 3 years; and

''(iii) 5 members shall be appointed for a term of 2 years.

''(3) PRESERVATION OF PUBLIC ADVISORY STATUS.—No individual may be appointed as a discretionary member of the Advisory Committee while serving as an officer or employee of the Federal Government.

''(4) VACANCY AND REMOVAL.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Any vacancy on the Advisory Committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

''(B) REMOVAL.—Advisory Committee members shall serve at the discretion of the Secretaries and may be removed at any time for good cause.

''(5) CONTINUATION OF SERVICE.—Each appointed member may continue to serve after the expiration of the term of office to which that member was appointed until a successor has been appointed.

''(6) CHAIRPERSON.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Chairperson of the Advisory Committee shall be jointly appointed for a 3-year term by the Secretaries from among the members of the Advisory Committee.

''(B) TERM.—An individual may not be appointed as Chairperson for more than 2 terms, regardless of whether the terms are consecutive or nonconsecutive.

''(7) PAY AND EXPENSES.—Members of the Advisory Committee shall serve without pay for such service, but each member of the Advisory Committee may be reimbursed for travel and lodging incurred through attending meetings of the Advisory Committee-approved subgroup meetings in the same amounts and under the same conditions as Federal employees (in accordance with section 5703 of title 5, United States Code).

''(8) MEETINGS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Advisory Committee shall meet at the call of the Secretaries, the Chairperson, or a majority of the members, but not less frequently than twice annually.

''(B) OPEN MEETINGS.—Each meeting of the Advisory Committee shall be open to the public.

''(C) PRIOR NOTICE OF MEETINGS.—Timely notice of each meeting of the Advisory Committee shall be published in the Federal Register and be submitted to trade publications and publications of general circulation.

''(D) SUBGROUPS.—The Advisory Committee may establish such workgroups or subgroups as the Advisory Committee determines necessary for the purpose of compiling information or conducting research, subject to the conditions that any workgroup or subgroup of the Advisory Committee—

''(i) may not conduct business without the direction of the Advisory Committee; and

''(ii) shall report in full to the Advisory Committee.

''(9) QUORUM.—9 members of the Advisory Committee shall constitute a quorum.

''(d) EXPENSES.—The expenses of the Advisory Committee that the Secretaries determine to be reasonable and appropriate shall be paid by the Secretaries.

''(e) ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT, TECHNICAL SERVICES, AND ADVICE.—A designated Federal Officer shall be jointly appointed by the Secretaries to provide to the Advisory Committee the administrative support, technical services, and advice that the Secretaries determine to be reasonable and appropriate.

''(f) ANNUAL REPORT.—

''(1) REQUIRED.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than September 30 of each year, the Advisory Committee shall submit a report to the Secretaries, the Committee on Natural Resources and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate.

''(B) EXTENSION.—If the Advisory Committee cannot meet the September 30 deadline in any year, the Secretaries shall advise the Chairpersons of each of the Committees described in subparagraph (A) of the reasons for the delay and the date on which the submission of the report is anticipated.

''(2) CONTENTS.—The report under paragraph (1) shall include—

''(A) a description of the activities of the Advisory Committee during the preceding year;

''(B) a description of the reports and recommendations made by the Advisory Committee to the Secretaries during the preceding year; and

''(C) an accounting of actions taken by the Secretaries as a result of the recommendations.

''(g) FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the Advisory Committee.

''(h) ABOLISHMENT OF THE EXISTING WILDLIFE AND HUNTING HERITAGE CONSERVATION COUNCIL ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—On publication of the first notice of the Advisory Committee under subsection (c)(8), the Wildlife and Hunting Heritage Conservation Council formed in furtherance of section 441 of the Revised Statutes (43 U.S.C. 1457), the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 (16 U.S.C. 742a et seq.), and other Acts applicable to specific bureaus of the Department of the Interior is abolished.''.

SA 3489. Mr. HEINRICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 42, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

(c) REPORT ON PUBLIC ACCESS AND EGRESS TO FEDERAL PUBLIC LAND.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) FEDERAL PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT AGENCY.—The term ''Federal public land management agency'' means any of the National Park Service, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the Forest Service, and the Bureau of Land Management.

(B) TRAVEL MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The term ''travel management plan'' means a plan for the management of travel—

(i) with respect to land under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service, on park roads and designated routes under section 4.10 of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations);

(ii) with respect to land under the jurisdiction of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, on the land under a comprehensive conservation plan prepared under section 4(e) of the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 668dd(e));

(iii) with respect to land under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service, on National Forest System land under part 212 of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations); and

(iv) with respect to land under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, under a resource management plan developed under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

(2) REPORT ON PUBLIC ACCESS AND EGRESS TO FEDERAL PUBLIC LAND.—

(A) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, each head of a Federal public land management agency shall make available to the public on the website of the Federal public land management agency a report that includes—

(i) a list of the location and acreage of land more than 640 acres in size under the jurisdiction of the Federal public land management agency on which the public is allowed, under Federal or State law, to hunt, fish, or use the land for other recreational purposes—

(I) to which there is no public access or egress; or

(II) to which public access or egress to the legal boundaries of the land is significantly restricted (as determined by the head of the Federal public land management agency);

(ii) with respect to land described in clause (i), a list of the locations and acreage on the land that the head of the Federal public land management agency determines have significant potential for use for hunting, fishing, and other recreational purposes; and

(iii) with respect to land described in clause (ii), a plan developed by the Federal public land management agency that—

(I) identifies how public access and egress could reasonably be provided to the legal boundaries of the land in a manner that minimizes the impact on wildlife habitat and water quality;

(II) specifies the actions recommended to secure the access and egress, including acquiring an easement, right-of-way, or fee title from a willing owner of any land that abuts the land or the need to coordinate with State land management agencies or other Federal or State governmental entities to allow for such access and egress; and

(III) is consistent with the travel management plan in effect on the land.

(B) LIST OF PUBLIC ACCESS ROUTES FOR CERTAIN LAND.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, each head of a Federal public land management agency shall make available to the public on the website of the Federal public land management agency, and thereafter revise as the head of the Federal public land management agency determines appropriate, a list of roads or trails that provide the primary public access and egress to the legal boundaries of contiguous parcels of land equal to more than 640 acres in size under the jurisdiction of the Federal public land management agency on which the public is allowed, under Federal or State law, to hunt, fish, or use the land for other recreational purposes.

(C) MEANS OF PUBLIC ACCESS AND EGRESS INCLUDED.—In considering public access and egress under subparagraphs (A) and (B), the head of the applicable Federal public land management agency shall consider public access and egress to the legal boundaries of the land described in those subsections, including access and egress—

(i) by motorized or non-motorized vehicles; and

(ii) on foot or horseback.

(D) EFFECT.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—This subsection shall have no effect on whether a particular recreational use shall be allowed on the land described in clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (A).

(ii) EFFECT OF ALLOWABLE USES ON AGENCY CONSIDERATION.—In preparing the plan under subparagraph (A)(iii), the head of the applicable Federal public land management agency shall only consider recreational uses that are allowed on the land at the time that the plan is prepared.

SA 3490. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3469 proposed by Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. RISCH) to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; as follows:

In the amendment, on line 1, strike the word ''the''.

SA 3491. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

This Act shall become effective 3 days after enactment.

SA 3492. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3491 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; as follows:

In the amendment, strike ''3 days'' and insert ''4 days''.

SA 3493. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3492 proposed by Mr. REID to the amendment SA 3491 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; as follows:

In the amendment, strike ''4'' and insert ''5''.

SA 3494. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II, add the following:

SEC. 2_____. EMERGENCY FOREST REHABILITATION AND RESTORATION AND WILDFIRE CONTROL.

Title VI of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6591) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 602. EMERGENCY FOREST REHABILITATION AND RESTORATION AND WILDFIRE CONTROL.

''(a) DEFINITION.—In this section:

''(1) CATASTROPHIC EVENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'catastrophic event' means any natural disaster or any fire, flood, or explosion, regardless of cause, that the Secretary determines has caused or has the potential to cause damage of significant severity and magnitude to Federal land.

''(B) NATURAL DISASTER.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), a natural disaster, as determined by the Secretary, may include a fire, hurricane, tornado, windstorm, snow or ice storm, rain storm, high water, wind-driven water, tidal wave, earthquake, volcanic eruption, landslide, mudslide, drought, or insect or disease outbreak.

''(2) SECRETARY.—The term 'Secretary' has the meaning given term in section 101.

''(b) MECHANICAL FOREST TREATMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall implement such procedures as are necessary to ensure that not less than 400,000 acres of Federal land each fiscal year are treated with mechanical treatments intended to produce merchantable wood.

''(2) FUNDING.—The Secretary shall use to carry out paragraph (1)—

''(A) funds described in subsection (f)(3); and

''(B) any other funds made available for the purposes described in paragraph (1).

''(c) EMERGENCY CIRCUMSTANCES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall—

''(A) declare that emergency circumstances exist for all Federal land subject to the effects of a catastrophic event, including on Federal land outside urban interface areas; and

''(B) as soon as practicable, take all actions necessary for the rehabilitation or restoration of the Federal land, with highest priority given to Federal land impacted by large-scale beetle infestations.

''(2) EMERGENCY ALTERNATIVE ARRANGEMENTS.—In accordance with section 220.4 of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations and section 1506.11 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations), for any Federal land for which the Secretary declares the existence of emergency circumstances under paragraph (1), the Secretary may use emergency alternative arrangements to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

''(3) LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no administrative appeal shall be allowed for any action classified as an emergency alternative arrangement under paragraph (2) or a categorical exclusion under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) due to emergency circumstances declared under paragraph (1).

''(d) CATASTROPHIC EVENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable during but not later than 30 days after the conclusion of a catastrophic event, the Secretary shall initiate timely salvage activities on the Federal land affected by the catastrophic event so as to prevent significant deterioration of timber values, development of significant fire hazard, or other forest mortality that would prevent the Federal land from regenerating to forest within 5 years.

''(2) FUNDING.—The Secretary shall use to carry out paragraph (1)—

''(A) funds described in subsection (f)(3); and

''(B) any other funds made available for the purposes described in paragraph (1).

''(e) EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LAND.—This section shall not apply to—

''(1) a component of the National Wilderness Preservation System;

''(2) Federal land on which the removal of vegetation is prohibited or restricted by Act of Congress, Presidential proclamation, or the applicable land management plan; or

''(3) a wilderness study area.

''(f) LIMITATION ON ACQUISITION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, except as provided in paragraph (2), beginning on the date of enactment of this section and during each of the subsequent 5 full fiscal years, none of the funds made available to the Secretary under any law may be used—

''(A) to survey land for future acquisition as Federal land; or

''(B) to enter into discussions with non-Federal landowners to identify land for acquisition as Federal land.

''(2) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) does not apply to the use of funds—

''(A) to complete land transactions underway on the date of enactment of this section;

''(B) to exchange Federal land for non-Federal land; or

''(C) to accept donations of non-Federal land as Federal land.

''(3) USE OF FUNDS.—Of the funds that would otherwise have been used for purchase of non-Federal land by the Forest Service—

''(A) ¼ shall be transferred to the Wildland Fire Management account of the Department of Agriculture; and

''(B) ¾ shall be used by Secretary to carry out—

''(i) mechanical forest treatments described in subsection (b); and

''(ii) salvage activities described in subsection (d).''.

SA 3495. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 30, strike line 21 and all that follows through page 31, line 21, and insert the following:

(4) BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT, NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM, AND FOREST SERVICE LAND.—

(A) LAND OPEN.—

(i) BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT LAND AND FOREST SERVICE LAND.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—Land under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management or the Forest Service (including a component of the National Wilderness Preservation System, land designated as a wilderness study area or administratively classified as wilderness eligible or suitable, and primitive or semiprimitive areas, but excluding land on the outer Continental Shelf) shall be open to recreational fishing, hunting, and recreational shooting unless the managing Federal public land agency acts to close the land to the activity.

(II) MOTORIZED ACCESS.—Nothing in subclause (I) authorizes or requires motorized access or the use of motorized vehicles for recreational fishing, hunting, or recreational shooting purposes within land designated as a wilderness study area or administratively classified as wilderness eligible or suitable.

(ii) NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM LAND.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—Any unit of the National Park System described in subclause (II) shall be open to the recreational hunting of elk unless the Director of the National Park Service closes the unit to the recreational hunting of elk after a 60-day public comment period.

(II) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—A unit of the National Park System referred to in subclause (I) is a unit—

(aa) comprised of more than 2,000 contiguous acres of land; and

(bb) that utilizes a management planning process to examine alternatives to translocation to maintain elk populations at a size at which vegetation, other ungulates and wildlife, neighbors of the unit of the National Park System, and other resources of the unit of the National Park System would not experience adverse effects.

(B) CLOSURE OR RESTRICTION.—Land described in subparagraph (A)(i)(I) may be subject

---

SA 3496. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

SEC. 1___. HAYING AND GRAZING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1233 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3833) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) HAYING AND GRAZING.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subchapter, the Secretary shall permit the owner or operator of eligible land subject to a contract under the conservation reserve program to make certain approved use of forage removed from the eligible land if the forage removal is a mid-contract management requirement of 1 or more conservation practices subject to the program contract for the eligible land.

''(2) REQUIREMENTS.—To be eligible to use removed forage in accordance with this subsection, the owner or operator of the eligible land shall agree—

''(A) to implement a haying or grazing plan established by the Natural Resources Conservation Service;

''(B) to limit the frequency of forage removal to the schedule established in the mid-contract management requirements; and

''(C) not to conduct forage removal during the primary nesting season.

''(3) APPROVED USES.—

''(A) PERSONAL OR COMMERCIAL USE.—An owner or operator described in paragraph (2) may elect to use removed forage under this subsection for personal or commercial haying or grazing use in exchange for agreeing—

''(i) to forgo the mid-contract cost-share payment for the eligible land; and

''(ii) to a 25-percent reduction in the annual rental rate for the eligible land.

''(B) DONATION.—An owner or operator described in paragraph (2) may elect to donate, to an entity approved by the State department of agriculture, removed forage under this subsection for haying or grazing, without any reduction in the mid-contract cost-share payment or the rental rate.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1232(a)(8) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3832(a)(8)) is amended by striking ''or (c)'' and inserting '', (c), or (e)''.

SA 3497. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 44, lines 19 and 20, strike ''each of fiscal years 2015 through 2024'' and insert ''each fiscal year beginning with fiscal year 2015''.

SA 3498. Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

SEC. 1_____. AGREEMENT TO KEEP PUBLIC LAND OPEN DURING A GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COVERED UNIT.—The term ''covered unit'' means—

(A) public land;

(B) units of the National Park System;

(C) units of the National Wildlife Refuge System; or

(D) units of the National Forest System.

(2) PUBLIC LAND.—The term ''public land'' has the meaning given the term ''public lands'' in section 103 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1702).

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means—

(A) the Secretary of the Interior, with respect to land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior; or

(B) the Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture.

(b) AUTHORITY TO ENTER INTO AGREEMENT.—Subject to subsection (c), if a State or political subdivision of the State offers, the Secretary shall enter into an agreement with the State or political subdivision of the State under which the United States may accept funds from the State or political subdivision of the State to reopen, in whole or in part, any covered unit within the State or political subdivision of the State during any period in which there is a lapse in appropriations for the covered unit.

(c) APPLICABILITY.—The authority under subsection (b) shall only be in effect during any period in which the Secretary is unable to operate and manage covered units at normal levels, as determined in accordance with the terms of agreement entered into under subsection (b).

(d) REFUND.—The Secretary shall refund to the State or political subdivision of the State all amounts provided to the United States under an agreement entered into under subsection (b)—

(1) on the date of enactment of an Act retroactively appropriating amounts sufficient to maintain normal operating levels at the covered unit reopened under an agreement entered into under subsection (b); or

(2) on the date on which the State or political subdivision establishes, in accordance with the terms of the agreement, that, during the period in which the agreement was in effect, fees for entrance to, or use of, the covered units were collected by the Secretary.

(e) VOLUNTARY REIMBURSEMENT.—If the requirements for a refund under subsection (d) are not met, the Secretary may, subject to the availability of appropriations, reimburse the State and political subdivision of the State for any amounts provided to the United States by the State or political subdivision under an agreement entered into under subsection (b).

SA 3499. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

SEC. 1_____. RECREATIONAL SHOOTING PROTECTION.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CHIEF.—The term ''Chief'' means the Chief of the Forest Service.

(2) DIRECTOR.—The term ''Director'' means the Director of the Bureau of Land Management.

(3) NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM.—The term ''National Forest System'' has the meaning given the term in section 11(a) of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1609(a)).

(4) NATIONAL MONUMENT LAND.—The term ''National Monument land'' has the meaning given that term in the Act of June 8, 1908 (commonly known as the ''Antiquities Act of 1906'') (16 U.S.C. 431 et seq.).

(5) RECREATIONAL SHOOTING.—The term ''recreational shooting'' includes any form of sport, training, competition, or pastime, whether formal or informal, that involves the discharge of a rifle, handgun, or shotgun, or the use of a bow and arrow.

(b) RECREATIONAL SHOOTING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, National Monument land under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management and land of the National Forest System under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service shall be open to access and use for recreational shooting, except those closures and restrictions determined by the Director or Chief, as applicable, to be necessary and reasonable and supported by facts and evidence for 1 or more of the following:

(A) Reasons of national security.

(B) Reasons of public safety.

(C) To comply with an applicable Federal law (including regulations).

(2) NOTICE; REPORT.—

(A) REQUIREMENT.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B)(ii), before a restriction or closure under paragraph (1) is made effective, the Director or Chief, as applicable, shall—

(i) publish public notice of the closure or restriction in a newspaper of general circulation in the area where the closure or restriction will be carried out; and

(ii) submit to Congress a report detailing the location and extent of, and evidence justifying, the closure or restriction.

(B) TIMING.—The Director or Chief, as applicable, shall issue the notice and report required under subparagraph (A)—

(i) before the closure, if practicable without risking national security or public safety; and

(ii) in cases where such issuance is not practicable for reasons of national security or public safety, not later than 30 days after the closure.

(3) CESSATION OF CLOSURE OR RESTRICTION.—A closure or restriction under subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (1) shall cease to be effective, as applicable—

(A) on the day after the last day of the 180-day period beginning on the date on which the Director or Chief, as applicable, submits the report to Congress under paragraph (2)(B) regarding the closure or restriction, unless the closure or restriction has been approved by Federal law; and

(B) on the date that is 30 days after the date of enactment of a Federal law disapproving the closure or restriction.

(4) MANAGEMENT.—Consistent with paragraph (1), the Director shall manage National Monument land under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management and the Chief shall manage land of the National Forest System under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service—

(A) in a manner that supports, promotes, and enhances recreational shooting opportunities;

(B) to the extent authorized under State law (including regulations); and

(C) in accordance with applicable Federal law (including regulations).

(5) LIMITATION ON DUPLICATIVE CLOSURES OR RESTRICTIONS.—The Director or Chief, as applicable, may not issue a closure or restriction under paragraph (1) that is substantially similar to a previously issued closure or restriction that was not approved by Federal law.

(6) EFFECTIVE DATE FOR PRIOR CLOSURES AND RESTRICTIONS.—On the date that is 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, this section shall apply to closures and restrictions in place on the date of enactment of this Act that relate to access and use for recreational shooting on—

(A) National Monument land under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management; and

(B) land of the National Forest System under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service.

(7) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than October 1 of each year, the Director and Chief, as applicable, shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report that describes any National Monument land under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management any land of the National Forest System under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service—

(A) that was closed to recreational shooting or on which recreational shooting was restricted at any time during the preceding year; and

(B) the reason for the closure.

(8) NO PRIORITY.—Nothing in this section requires the Director of Chief, as applicable,

to give preference to recreational shooting over other uses of Federal public land or over land or water management priorities established by Federal law.

(9) AUTHORITY OF THE STATES.—

(A) SAVINGS.—Nothing in this section affects the authority, jurisdiction, or responsibility of a State to manage, control, or regulate fish and wildlife under State law (including regulations) on land or water in the State, including Federal public land.

(B) FEDERAL LICENSES.—Nothing in this section authorizes the Director to require a license for recreational shooting on land or water in a State, including on Federal public land in the State.

(10) AUTHORITY OF DIRECTOR AND CHIEF.—Nothing in this section affects the ability of the Director or Chief, as applicable—

(A) to prohibit the use of tannerite, binary explosive targets, or other explosive devices pursuant to Federal law (including regulations); and

(B) temporarily close all or a portion of an area during periods of high fire danger.

SA 3500. Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. MURPHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE III—PAUSE FOR SAFETY ACT

SECTION 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Pause for Safety Act of 2014''.

SEC. 302. DEFINITIONS.

In this title—

(1) the term ''close associate'' means, with respect to an individual—

(A) a dating partner, friend, co-worker, or neighbor of the individual; or

(B) any other person who has a relationship with the individual so as to be concerned about the safety and well-being of the individual, as determined by a State;

(2) the term ''family member'' means, with respect to an individual, a spouse, child, parent, sibling, grandchild, or grandparent of the individual;

(3) the term ''firearm'' has the meaning given the term in section 921 of title 18, United States Code;

(4) the term ''gun violence prevention order'' means a written order, issued by a State court or signed by a magistrate (or other comparable judicial officer), prohibiting a named individual from having under the custody or control of the individual, owning, purchasing, possessing, or receiving any firearms;

(5) the term ''gun violence prevention warrant'' means a written order, issued by a State court or signed by a magistrate (or other comparable judicial officer), regarding an individual who is subject to a gun violence prevention order and who is known to own or possess 1 or more firearms, that directs a law enforcement officer to temporarily seize and retain any firearm in the possession of the individual;

(6) the term ''law enforcement officer'' means a public servant authorized by State law or by a State government agency to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, investigation, or prosecution of an offense; and

(7) the term ''wellness check'' means a visit conducted by a law enforcement officer to the residence of an individual for the purpose of assessing whether the individual poses a danger to the individual or others due to a mental, behavioral, or physical condition.

SEC. 303. NATIONAL GUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION ORDER AND WARRANT LAW.

(a) ENACTMENT OF GUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION ORDER LAW.—In order to receive a grant under section 304, on the date that is 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, each State shall have in effect legislation that—

(1) authorizes a gun violence prevention order and gun violence prevention warrant in accordance with subsection (b); and

(2) requires each law enforcement agency of the State to comply with subsection (c).

(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR GUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION ORDERS AND WARRANTS.—Legislation required under subsection (a) shall be subject to the following requirements:

(1) APPLICATION FOR GUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION ORDER.—A family member or close associate of an individual may submit an application to a State court, on a form designed by the court, that—

(A) describes the facts and circumstances necessitating that a gun violence prevention order be issued against the named individual;

(B) is signed by the applicant, under oath; and

(C) includes any additional information required by the State court or magistrate (or other comparable judicial officer) to demonstrate that possession of a firearm by the named individual poses a significant risk of personal injury to the named individual or others.

(2) EXAMINATION OF APPLICANT AND WITNESSES.—A State court or magistrate (or other comparable judicial officer) may, before issuing a gun violence prevention order—

(A) examine under oath, the individual who applied for the order under paragraph (1) and any witnesses the individual produces; and

(B)(i) require that the individual or any witness submit a signed affidavit, which describes the facts the applicant or witness believes establish the grounds of the application; or

(ii) take an oral statement from the individual or witness under oath.

(3) STANDARD FOR ISSUANCE OF ORDER.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A State court or magistrate (or other comparable judicial officer) may issue a gun violence prevention order only upon a finding of probable cause that possession of a firearm by the named individual poses a significant risk of personal injury to the named individual or others.

(B) NOTIFICATION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The court shall notify the Department of Justice and comparable State agency of the gun violence prevention order not later than 2 court days after issuing the order. The court shall also notify the Department of Justice and comparable State agency of any order restoring the ability of the individual to own or possess firearms not later than 2 court days after issuing the order to restore the individual's right to own or possess any type of firearms that may be lawfully owned and possessed. Such notice shall be submitted in an electronic format, in a manner prescribed by the Department of Justice and the comparable State agency.

(ii) UPDATE OF DATABASES.—As soon as practicable after receiving a notification under clause (i), the Department of Justice and comparable State agency shall update the background check databases of the Department and agency, respectively, to reflect the prohibitions articulated in the gun violence prevention order.

(4) ISSUANCE OF GUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION WARRANT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—After issuing a gun violence prevention order, a State court or magistrate (or other comparable judicial officer) shall, upon a finding of probable cause to believe that the named individual subject to the order has a firearm in his custody or control, issue a gun violence prevention warrant ordering the temporary seizure of all firearms specified in the warrant.

(B) REQUIREMENT.—Subject to paragraph (6), a gun violence prevention warrant issued under subparagraph (A) shall require that any firearm described in the warrant be taken from any place, or from any individual in whose possession, the firearm may be.

(5) SERVICE OF GUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION ORDER.—When serving a gun violence prevention order, a law enforcement officer shall provide the individual with a form to request a hearing in accordance with paragraph (6)(F).

(6) TEMPORARY SEIZURE OF FIREARMS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—When a law enforcement officer takes property under a gun violence prevention warrant, the law enforcement officer shall give a receipt for the property taken, specifying the property in detail, to the individual from whom it was taken. In the absence of a person, the law enforcement officer shall leave the receipt in the place where the law enforcement officer found the property.

(B) TEMPORARY CUSTODY OF SEIZED FIREARMS.—All firearms seized pursuant to a gun violence prevention warrant shall be retained by the law enforcement officer or the law enforcement agency in custody, subject to the order of the court that issued the warrant or to any other court in which an offense with respect to the firearm is triable.

(C) LIMITATION ON SEIZURE OF FIREARMS.—If the location to be searched during the execution of a gun violence prevention warrant is jointly occupied by multiple parties and a firearm is located during the execution of the seizure warrant, and it is determined that the firearm is owned by an individual other than the individual named in the gun violence prevention warrant, the firearm may not be seized if—

(i) the firearm is stored in a manner that the individual named in the gun violence prevention warrant does not have access to or control of the firearm; and

(ii) there is no evidence of unlawful possession of the firearm by the owner.

(D) GUN SAFE.—If the location to be searched during the execution of a gun violence prevention warrant is jointly occupied by multiple parties and a gun safe is located, and it is determined that the gun safe is owned by an individual other than the individual named in the gun violence prevention warrant, the contents of the gun safe shall not be searched except in the owner's presence, or with the owner's consent, or unless a valid search warrant has been obtained.

(E) RETURN OF FIREARM TO RIGHTFUL OWNER.—If any individual who is not a named individual in a gun violence prevention warrant claims title to a firearm seized pursuant to a gun violence prevention warrant, the firearm shall be returned to the lawful owner not later than 30 days after the date on which the title is claimed.

(F) RIGHT TO REQUEST A HEARING.—A named individual may submit 1 written request at any time during the effective period of a gun violence prevention order issued against the individual for a hearing for an order allowing the individual to own, possess, purchase, or receive a firearm.

(7) HEARING ON GUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION ORDER AND GUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION WARRANT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (E), not later than 14 days after the date on which a gun violence prevention order and, when applicable, a gun violence prevention warrant, is issued, the court that issued the order and, when applicable, the warrant, or another court in that

same jurisdiction, shall hold a hearing to determine whether the individual who is the subject of the order may have under the custody or control of the individual, own, purchase, possess, or receive firearms and, when applicable, whether any seized firearms should be returned to the individual named in the warrant.

(B) NOTICE.—The individual named in a gun violence prevention order requested to be renewed under subparagraph (A) shall be given written notice and an opportunity to be heard on the matter.

(C) BURDEN OF PROOF.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), at any hearing conducted under subparagraph (A), the State or petitioner shall have the burden of establishing probable cause that the individual poses a significant risk of personal injury to the individual or others by owning or possessing the firearm.

(ii) HIGHER BURDEN OF PROOF.—A State may establish a burden of proof for hearings conducted under subparagraph (A) that is higher than the burden of proof required under clause (i).

(D) REQUIREMENTS UPON FINDING OF SIGNIFICANT RISK.—If the named individual is found at the hearing to pose a significant risk of personal injury to the named individual or others by owning or possessing a firearm, the following shall apply:

(i) The firearm or firearms seized pursuant to the warrant shall be retained by the law enforcement agency for a period not to exceed 1 year.

(ii) The named individual shall be prohibited from owning or possessing, purchasing or receiving, or attempting to purchase or receive a firearm for a period not to exceed 1 year, a violation of which shall be considered a misdemeanor offense.

(iii) The court shall notify the Department of Justice and comparable State agency of the gun violence prevention order not later than 2 court days after issuing the order. The court shall also notify the Department of Justice and comparable State agency of any order restoring the ability of the individual to own or possess firearms not later than 2 court days after issuing the order to restore the individual's right to own or possess any type of firearms that may be lawfully owned and possessed. Such notice shall be submitted in an electronic format, in a manner prescribed by the Department of Justice and the comparable State agency.

(iv) As soon as practicable after receiving a notification under clause (iii), the Department of Justice and comparable State agency shall update the background check databases of the Department and agency, respectively, to reflect—

(I) the prohibitions articulated in the gun violence prevention order; or

(II) an order issued to restore an individual's right to own or possess a firearm.

(E) RETURN OF FIREARMS.—If the court finds that the State has not met the required standard of proof, any firearm seized pursuant to the warrant shall be returned to the named individual not later than 30 days after the hearing.

(F) LIMITATION ON HEARING REQUIREMENT.—If an individual named in a gun violence prevention warrant is prohibited from owning or possessing a firearm for a period of 1 year or more by another provision of State or Federal law, a hearing pursuant to subparagraph (A) is not required and the court shall issue an order to hold the firearm until either the individual is no longer prohibited from owning a firearm or the individual sells or transfers ownership of the firearm to a licensed firearm dealer.

(8) RENEWING GUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION ORDER AND GUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION WARRANT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (E), if a law enforcement agency has probable cause to believe that an individual who is subject to a gun violence prevention order continues to pose a significant risk of personal injury to the named individual or others by possessing a firearm, the agency may initiate a request for a renewal of the order, on a form designed by the court, describing the facts and circumstances necessitating the request.

(B) NOTICE.—The individual named in the gun violence prevention order requested to be renewed under subparagraph (A) shall be given written notice and an opportunity to be heard on the matter.

(C) HEARING.—After notice is given under subparagraph (B), a hearing shall be held to determine if a request for renewal of the order shall be issued.

(D) ISSUANCE OF RENEWAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (E), a State court may issue a renewal of a gun violence prevention order if there is probable cause to believe that the individual who is subject to the order continues to pose a significant risk of personal injury to the named individual or others by possessing a firearm.

(E) HIGHER BURDEN OF PROOF.—A State may establish a burden of proof for initiating a request for or issuing a renewal of a gun violence prevention order that is higher than the burden of proof required under subparagraph (A) or (D).

(F) NOTIFICATION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The court shall notify the Department of Justice and comparable State agency of a renewal of the gun violence prevention order not later than 2 court days after renewing the order. The court shall also notify the Department of Justice and comparable State agency of any order restoring the ability of the individual to own or possess firearms not later than 2 court days after issuing the order to restore the individual's right to own or possess any type of firearms that may be lawfully owned and possessed. Such notice shall be submitted in an electronic format, in a manner prescribed by the Department of Justice and the comparable State agency.

(ii) UPDATE OF DATABASES.—As soon as practicable after receiving a notification under clause (i), the Department of Justice and comparable State agency shall update the background check databases of the Department and agency, respectively, to reflect—

(I) the prohibitions articulated in the renewal of the gun violence prevention order; or

(II) an order issued to restore an individual's right to own or possess a firearm.

(c) LAW ENFORCEMENT CHECK OF STATE FIREARM DATABASE.—Each law enforcement agency of the State shall establish a procedure that requires a law enforcement officer to, in conjunction with performing a wellness check on an individual, check whether the individual is listed on any of the firearm and ammunition databases of the State or jurisdiction in which the individual resides.

(d) CONFIDENTIALITY PROTECTIONS.—All information provided to the Department of Justice and comparable State agency pursuant to legislation required under subsection (a) shall be kept confidential, separate, and apart from all other records maintained by the Department of Justice and comparable State agency.

SEC. 304. PAUSE FOR SAFETY GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services of the Department of Justice may make grants to an eligible State to assist the State in carrying out the provisions of the State legislation described in section 303.

(b) ELIGIBLE STATE.—A State shall be eligible to receive grants under this section on and after the date on which—

(1) the State enacts legislation described in section 303; and

(2) the Attorney General determines that the legislation of the State described in paragraph (1) complies with the requirements of section 303.

(c) USE OF FUNDS.—Funds awarded under this section may be used by a State to assist law enforcement agencies or the courts of the State in carrying out the provisions of the State legislation described in section 303.

(d) APPLICATION.—An eligible State desiring a grant under this section shall submit to the Director of the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services an application at such time, in such manner, and containing or accompanied by such information, as the Director may reasonably require.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this section.

SEC. 305. FEDERAL FIREARMS PROHIBITION.

Section 922 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (8)(B)(ii), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (9), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (9) the following:

''(10) is subject to a court order that prohibits such person from having under the custody or control of the person, owning, purchasing, possessing, or receiving any firearms.''; and

(2) in subsection (g)—

(A) in paragraph (8)(C)(ii), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (9), by striking the comma at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (9) the following:

''(10) who is subject to a court order that prohibits such person from having under the custody or control of the person, owning, purchasing, possessing, or receiving any firearms,''.

SEC. 306. FULL FAITH AND CREDIT.

Any gun violence prevention order issued under a State law enacted in accordance with this title shall have the same full faith and credit in every court within the United States as they have by law or usage in the courts of such State from which they are issued.

SEC. 307. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this title, or an amendment made by this title, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance, is held to be invalid, the remainder of this title, or an amendment made by this title, or the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected.

SA 3501. Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Ms. HIRONO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE III—LORI JACKSON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE SURVIVOR PROTECTION ACT

SECTION 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Lori Jackson Domestic Violence Survivor Protection Act''.

SEC. 302. DEFINITIONS OF "INTIMATE PARTNER" AND "MISDEMEANOR CRIME OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE" EXPANDED.

Section 921(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (32)—

(A) by striking ''and an individual'' and inserting ''an individual''; and

(B) by inserting '', or a dating partner (as defined in section 2266) or former dating partner'' before the period at the end; and

(2) in paragraph (33)(A)(ii)—

(A) by striking ''or by'' and inserting ''by''; and

(B) by inserting '', or by a dating partner (as defined in section 2266) or former dating partner of the victim'' before the period at the end.

SEC. 303. UNLAWFUL SALE OF FIREARM TO A PERSON SUBJECT TO COURT ORDER.

Section 922(d)(8) of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(8) is subject to a court order described in subsection (g)(8); or''.

SEC. 304. LIST OF PERSONS SUBJECT TO A RESTRAINING OR SIMILAR ORDER PROHIBITED FROM POSSESSING OR RECEIVING A FIREARM EXPANDED.

Section 922(g)(8) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''that'';

(2) by striking subparagraphs (A) and (B) and inserting the following:

''(A)(i) that was issued after a hearing of which such person received actual notice, and at which such person had an opportunity to participate; or

''(ii) in the case of an ex parte order, relating to which notice and opportunity to be heard are provided—

''(I) within the time required by State, tribal, or territorial law; and

''(II) in any event within a reasonable time after the order is issued, sufficient to protect the person's right to due process;

''(B) that restrains such person from—

''(i) harassing, stalking, threatening, or engaging in other conduct that would put an individual in reasonable fear of bodily injury to such individual, including an order that was issued at the request of an employer on behalf of its employee or at the request of an institution of higher education on behalf of its student; or

''(ii) intimidating or dissuading a witness from testifying in court; and''; and

(3) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) by striking ''intimate partner or child'' each place it appears and inserting ''individual described in subparagraph (B)'';

(B) in clause (i), by inserting ''that'' before ''includes''; and

(C) in clause (ii), by inserting ''that'' before ''by its''.

SA 3502. Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON IMPLEMENTATION OF UNITED NATIONS ARMS TRADE TREATY.

It is the sense of the Senate—

(1) that the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty must be transmitted to, and receive the advice and consent of, the Senate, and the commitments in the Treaty must be embodied in implementing legislation properly enacted into law, before any changes are made to existing programs or activities in furtherance of, or pursuant to, or otherwise to implement the Treaty; and

(2) to condemn the public statement made by Assistant Secretary of State Thomas M. Countryman on April 23, 2014, that before any of these steps have been taken, the Department of State is at present implementing the Arms Trade Treaty.

SA 3503. Mrs. FISCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

SEC. 1_____. LIMITATION ON DESIGNATION OF NEW FEDERALLY PROTECTED LAND.

(a) DEFINITION OF FEDERALLY PROTECTED LAND.—In this section, the term ''federally protected land'' means—

(1) any land managed by the National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, or Forest Service; or

(2) any other area designated or acquired by the Federal Government for the purpose of conserving historic, cultural, environmental, scenic, recreational, developmental, or biological resources.

(b) FINDINGS REQUIRED.—New federally protected land shall not be designated unless the Secretary, prior to the designation, publishes in the Federal Register—

(1) a finding that the addition of the new federally protected land would not have a negative impact on the administration of existing federally protected land; and

(2) a finding that, as of the date of the finding, sufficient resources are available to effectively implement management plans for existing units of federally protected land.

SA 3504. Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. WALSH, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. RISCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

TITLE III—CABIN USER FEES

SECTION 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Cabin Fee Act of 2014''.

SEC. 302. CABIN USER FEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Agriculture (referred to in this title as the ''Secretary'') shall establish a fee in accordance with this section for the issuance of a special use permit for the use and occupancy of National Forest System land for recreational residence purposes.

(b) INTERIM FEE.—During the period beginning on January 1, 2014, and ending on the last day of the calendar year during which the current appraisal cycle is completed under subsection (c), the Secretary shall assess an interim annual fee for recreational residences on National Forest System land that is an amount equal to the lesser of—

(1) the fee determined under the Cabin User Fees Fairness Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 6201 et seq.), subject to the requirement that any increase over the fee assessed during the previous year shall be limited to not more than 25 percent; or

(2) $5,600.

(c) COMPLETION OF CURRENT APPRAISAL CYCLE.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete the current appraisal cycle, including receipt of timely second appraisals, for recreational residences on National Forest System land in accordance with the Cabin User Fees Fairness Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 6201 et seq.) (referred to in this Act as the ''current appraisal cycle'').

(d) LOT VALUE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—To establish the base value assigned to a lot under this section, the Secretary shall use only appraisals conducted and approved by the Secretary in accordance with the Cabin User Fee Fairness Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 6201 et seq.) during the current appraisal cycle.

(2) SECOND APPRAISAL.—If a second appraisal—

(A) is approved by the Secretary, the value established by the second appraisal shall be the base value assigned to the lot; or

(B) is not approved by the Secretary, the value established by the initial appraisal shall be the base value assigned to the lot.

(e) ADJUSTMENT.—On the date of completion of the current appraisal cycle and before assessing a fee under subsection (f), the Secretary shall make a 1-time adjustment to the value of each appraised lot on which a recreational residence is located to reflect any change in value occurring after the date of the most recent appraisal for the lot, in accordance with the 4th quarter of 2012 National Association of Homebuilders/Wells Fargo Housing Opportunity Index.

(f) ANNUAL FEE.—

(1) BASE.—After the date on which appraised lot values have been adjusted in accordance with subsection (e), the annual fee assessed prospectively by the Secretary for recreational residences on National Forest System land shall be in accordance with the following tiered fee structure:

Fee Tier	Approximate Percent of Permits Nationally	Fee Amount
Tier 1	6 percent	$600
Tier 2	16 percent	$1,100
Tier 3	26 percent	$1,600
Tier 4	22 percent	$2,100
Tier 5	10 percent	$2,600
Tier 6	5 percent	$3,100
Tier 7	5 percent	$3,600
Tier 8	3 percent	$4,100
Tier 9	3 percent	$4,600
Tier 10	3 percent	$5,100
Tier 11	1 percent	$5,600.

(2) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—The Secretary shall increase or decrease the annual fees set forth in the table under paragraph (1) to reflect changes in the Implicit Price Deflator for the Gross Domestic Product published by the Bureau of Economic Analysis of the Department of Commerce, applied on a 5-year rolling average.

(3) ACCESS AND OCCUPANCY ADJUSTMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall by regulation establish criteria pursuant to which the annual fee determined in accordance with this section may be suspended or reduced temporarily if access to, or the occupancy of, the recreational residence is significantly restricted.

(B) APPEAL.—The Secretary shall by regulation grant the cabin owner the right of an administrative appeal of the determination made in accordance with subparagraph (A) with respect to whether to suspend or reduce temporarily the annual fee.

(g) PERIODIC REVIEW.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning on the date that is 10 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report that—

(A) analyzes the annual fees set forth in the table under subsection (f)(1) to ensure that the fees reflect fair value for the use of the land for recreational residence purposes, taking into account all use limitations and restrictions (including any limitations and restrictions imposed by the Secretary); and

(B) includes any recommendations of the Secretary with respect to modifying the fee system.

(2) LIMITATION.—The use of appraisals shall not be required for any modifications to the fee system based on the recommendations under paragraph (1)(B).

SEC. 303. CABIN TRANSFER FEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a fee in the amount of $1,200 for the issuance of a new recreational residence permit due to a change of ownership of the recreational residence.

(b) ADJUSTMENTS.—The Secretary shall annually increase or decrease the transfer fee established under subsection (a) to reflect changes in the Implicit Price Deflator for the Gross Domestic Product published by the Bureau of Economic Analysis of the Department of Commerce, applied on a 5-year rolling average.

SEC. 304. EFFECT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this title limits or restricts any right, title, or interest of the United States in or to any land or resource in the National Forest System.

(b) ALASKA.—The Secretary shall not establish or impose a fee or condition under this Act for permits in the State of Alaska that is inconsistent with section 1303(d) of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 3193(d)).

SEC. 305. RETENTION OF FEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Beginning 10 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary may retain, and expend, for the purposes described in subsection (b), any fees collected under this title without further appropriation.

(b) USE.—Amounts made available under subsection (a) shall be used to administer the recreational residence program and other recreation programs carried out on National Forest System land.

SEC. 306. REPEAL OF CABIN USER FEES FAIRNESS ACT OF 2000.

Effective on the date of the assessment of annual permit fees in accordance with section 302(f) (as certified to Congress by the Secretary), the Cabin User Fees Fairness Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 6201 et seq.) is repealed.

SA 3505. Mr. HEINRICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title III, add the following:

SEC. 317. LEVERAGING OF THERMAL TECHNOLOGIES TO IMPROVE ENERGY EFFICIENCY OF AIR FORCE INSULATION SYSTEMS AND MEDIUM SHELTER SYSTEMS THROUGH BASIC EXPEDITIONARY AIRFIELD RESOURCES PROGRAM.

The Secretary of the Air Force shall leverage currently available thermal technologies in order to pursue energy efficient insulation systems and more energy efficient medium shelter systems through the Basic Expeditionary Airfield Resources (BEAR) program.

SA 3506. Mr. HEINRICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle H of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1087. WHITE SANDS MISSILE RANGE AND FORT BLISS.

(a) WITHDRAWAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to valid existing rights and paragraph (3), the Federal land described in paragraph (2) is withdrawn from—

(A) entry, appropriation, and disposal under the public land laws, except for the issuance of oil and gas pipeline rights-of-way;

(B) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(C) operation of the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.

(2) DESCRIPTION OF FEDERAL LAND.—The Federal land referred to in paragraph (1) consists of—

(A) the approximately 6,500 acres of land depicted as ''Parcel 1'' on the map entitled ''Fort Bliss/BLM Land Transfer and Withdrawal'' and dated June 18, 2014 (referred to in this section as the ''map''); and

(B) any land or interest in land that is acquired by the United States within the boundaries of ''Parcel 1'', as depicted on the map.

(b) ADMINISTRATION.—Effective beginning on the date of enactment of this Act—

(1) Public Land Order 833, dated May 21, 1952 (17 Fed. Reg. 4822) shall not apply to the approximately 2,050 acres of land generally depicted as ''Parcel 2'' on the map; and

(2) the land described in paragraph (1) shall be—

(A) added to the Organ Mountains—Desert Peaks National Monument; and

(B) managed in accordance with—

(i) the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.); and

(ii) any other applicable laws.

(c) LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall publish in the Federal Register a legal description of the Federal land withdrawn by subsection (a).

(2) FORCE OF LAW.—The legal description published under paragraph (1) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act, except that the Secretary of the Interior may correct errors in the legal description.

(3) REIMBURSEMENT OF COSTS.—The Secretary of the Army shall reimburse the Secretary of the Interior for any costs incurred by the Secretary of the Interior in implementing this subsection with regard to the Federal land described in subsection (a)(2)(A).

SA 3507. Mr. HEINRICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title XV, add the following:

SEC. 1526. INVESTIGATION OF TECHNICAL QUESTIONS RAISED DURING RECENT OPERATIONAL TESTING OF DIRECTED ENERGY TECHNOLOGIES.

The Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization (JIEDDO) shall use existing resources (including funds) for operational evaluations on directed energy technologies of the Air Force Research Laboratory (AFRL) in order to investigate technical questions on directed energy technologies that arose during a recent operational evaluation of directed energy technology conducted by the 260th Engineer Company in Afghanistan.

SA 3508. Mr. HEINRICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title II, add the following:

SEC. 234. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON SUPPORT FOR DEVELOPMENT OF ADVANCED PHOTONICS INSTITUTE FOR MANUFACTURING INNOVATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Many applications of light-based technologies are revolutionizing advanced manufacturing, communications, defense, energy, health, and other sectors.

(2) Further research and manufacturing will enable greater advances in defense technologies improving intelligence capabilities for the warfighter such as the capture of spectral signals from space which are vital for information gathering, the development of adaptive optics and optical communications for data transfer, and non-kinetic military solutions to minimize civilian casualties.

(3) The photonic technology developed for defense purposes will also serve a dual commercial purpose, enabling advances in image processing, non-invasive health screenings, robotics, and improved space situational awareness for both the defense and commercial sectors.

(4) Photonics is a key enabling technology, and further Federal and private investment in advanced photonics manufacturing has the potential to create high quality, long-term job growth while furthering national security objectives.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense should support the development of an advanced photonics institute for manufacturing innovation to improve economic competitiveness and national security.

SA 3509. Mr. HEINRICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle H of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1087. DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS NOTICE OF AVERAGE TIMES FOR PROCESSING BENEFITS CLAIMS.

(a) PUBLIC NOTICE.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall, to the extent practicable, post the information described in subsection (b)—

(1) in physical locations, such as regional offices of the Department of Veterans Affairs or other claims in-take facilities of the Department, that the Secretary considers appropriate;

(2) on the Internet website of the Department; and

(3) through other mediums or using such other methods, including collaboration with veterans service organizations, as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(b) INFORMATION DESCRIBED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The information described in this subsection is the average processing time of the claims described in paragraph (2).

(2) CLAIMS DESCRIBED.—The claims described in this paragraph are each of the following types of claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs:

(A) A fully developed claim.

(B) A claim that is not fully developed.

(3) UPDATE OF INFORMATION.—The information described in this subsection shall be updated not less frequently than once each fiscal quarter.

(c) EXPIRATION OF REQUIREMENTS.—The requirements of subsection (a) shall expire on December 31, 2015.

(d) VETERANS SERVICE ORGANIZATION DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''veterans service organization'' means an organization recognized by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for the representation of veterans under section 5902 of title 38, United States Code.

SA 3510. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle H of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1087. TECHNOLOGY COMMERCIALIZATION FUND.

Section 1001(e) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16391(e)) is amended by inserting ''based on future planned activities and the amount of the appropriations for the fiscal year'' after ''fiscal year''.

SA 3511. Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. REED) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 102.

SA 3512. Mr. HARKIN (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II, add the following:

SEC. 2___. USE OF FUNDS TO ACQUIRE WATERFOWL PRODUCTION AREAS IN PRAIRIE POTHOLE REGION.

Section 4(b)(3) of the Act of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 451, chapter 71; 16 U.S.C. 718d(b)(3)) is amended in the first sentence by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', except that not less than 6 percent, and not more than 40 percent, of funds made available to carry out this paragraph for each fiscal year shall be used to acquire Waterfowl Production Areas in each State of the Prairie Pothole Region (as defined in section 1467.3 of title 7, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of the Waterfowl Protection Act of 2014))''.

SA 3513. Mr. WALSH (for himself and Mr. TESTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II, add the following:

SEC. 2___. NORTH FORK WATERSHED PROTECTION.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ELIGIBLE FEDERAL LAND.—The term ''eligible Federal land'' means—

(A) any federally owned land or interest in land depicted on the Map as within the North Fork Federal Lands Withdrawal Area; or

(B) any land or interest in land located within the North Fork Federal Lands Withdrawal Area that is acquired by the Federal Government after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) MAP.—The term ''Map'' means the Bureau of Land Management map entitled ''North Fork Federal Lands Withdrawal Area'' and dated June 9, 2010.

(b) WITHDRAWAL.—

(1) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, the eligible Federal land is withdrawn from—

(A) all forms of location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(B) disposition under all laws relating to mineral leasing and geothermal leasing.

(2) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Map shall be made available to the public at each appropriate office of the Bureau of Land Management.

(3) EFFECT OF SECTION.—Nothing in this subsection prohibits the Secretary of the Interior from taking any action necessary to complete any requirement under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) or the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) required for permitting surface-disturbing activity to occur on any lease issued before the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 3514. Mr. WALSH (for himself and Mr. TESTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE III—ROCKY MOUNTAIN FRONT HERITAGE ACT OF 2014

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Rocky Mountain Front Heritage Act of 2014''.

SEC. 302. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) CONSERVATION MANAGEMENT AREA.—The term ''Conservation Management Area'' means the Rocky Mountain Front Conservation Management Area established by section 303(a)(1).

(2) DECOMMISSION.—The term ''decommission'' means—

(A) to reestablish vegetation on a road; and

(B) to restore any natural drainage, watershed function, or other ecological processes that are disrupted or adversely impacted by the road by removing or hydrologically disconnecting the road prism.

(3) DISTRICT.—The term ''district'' means the Rocky Mountain Ranger District of the Lewis and Clark National Forest.

(4) MAP.—The term ''map'' means the map entitled ''Rocky Mountain Front Heritage Act'' and dated October 27, 2011.

(5) NONMOTORIZED RECREATION TRAIL.—The term ''nonmotorized recreation trail'' means a trail designed for hiking, bicycling, or equestrian use.

(6) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means—

(A) with respect to land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Agriculture; and

(B) with respect to land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of the Interior.

(7) STATE.—The term ''State'' means the State of Montana.

SEC. 303. ROCKY MOUNTAIN FRONT CONSERVATION MANAGEMENT AREA.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established the Rocky Mountain Front Conservation Management Area in the State.

(2) AREA INCLUDED.—The Conservation Management Area shall consist of approximately 195,073 acres of Federal land managed by the Forest Service and 13,087 acres of Federal land managed by the Bureau of Land Management in the State, as generally depicted on the map.

(3) INCORPORATION OF ACQUIRED LAND AND INTERESTS.—Any land or interest in land that is located in the Conservation Management Area and is acquired by the United States from a willing seller shall—

(A) become part of the Conservation Management Area; and

(B) be managed in accordance with—

(i) in the case of land managed by the Forest Service—

(I) the Act of March 1, 1911 (commonly known as the ''Weeks Law'') (16 U.S.C. 552 et seq.); and

(II) any laws (including regulations) applicable to the National Forest System;

(ii) in the case of land managed, by the Bureau of Land Management, the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.);

(iii) this section; and

(iv) any other applicable law (including regulations).

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of the Conservation Management Area are to conserve, protect, and enhance for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations the recreational, scenic, historical, cultural, fish, wildlife, roadless, and ecological values of the Conservation Management Area.

(c) MANAGEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall manage the Conservation Management Area—

(A) in a manner that conserves, protects, and enhances the resources of the Conservation Management Area; and

(B) in accordance with—

(i) the laws (including regulations) and rules applicable to the National Forest System for land managed by the Forest Service;

(ii) the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) for land managed by the Bureau of Land Management;

(iii) this section; and

(iv) any other applicable law (including regulations).

(2) USES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall only allow such uses of the Conservation Management Area that the Secretary determines would further the purposes described in subsection (b).

(B) MOTORIZED VEHICLES.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The use of motorized vehicles in the Conservation Management Area shall be permitted only on existing roads, trails, and areas designated for use by such vehicles as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(ii) NEW OR TEMPORARY ROADS.—Except as provided in clause (iii), no new or temporary roads shall be constructed within the Conservation Management Area.

(iii) EXCEPTIONS.—Nothing in clause (i) or (ii) prevents the Secretary from—

(I) rerouting or closing an existing road or trail to protect natural resources from degradation, as determined to be appropriate by the Secretary;

(II) constructing a temporary road on which motorized vehicles are permitted as part of a vegetation management project in any portion of the Conservation Management Area located not more than ¼ mile from the Teton Road, South Teton Road, Sun River Road, Beaver Willow Road, or Benchmark Road;

(III) authorizing the use of motorized vehicles for administrative purposes (including noxious weed eradication or grazing management); or

(IV) responding to an emergency.

(iv) DECOMMISSIONING OF TEMPORARY ROADS.—The Secretary shall decommission any temporary road constructed under clause (iii)(II) not later than 3 years after the date on which the applicable vegetation management project is completed.

(C) GRAZING.—The Secretary shall permit grazing within the Conservation Management Area, if established on the date of enactment of this Act—

(i) subject to—

(I) such reasonable regulations, policies, and practices as the Secretary determines appropriate; and

(II) all applicable laws; and

(ii) in a manner consistent with—

(I) the purposes described in subsection (b); and

(II) the guidelines set forth in the report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives accompanying H.R. 5487 of the 96th Congress (H. Rept. 96–617).

(D) VEGETATION MANAGEMENT.—Nothing in this title prevents the Secretary from conducting vegetation management projects within the Conservation Management Area—

(i) subject to—

(I) such reasonable regulations, policies, and practices as the Secretary determines appropriate; and

(II) all applicable laws (including regulations); and

(ii) in a manner consistent with the purposes described in subsection (b).

SEC. 304. DESIGNATION OF WILDERNESS ADDITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the following Federal land in the State is designated as wilderness and as additions to existing components of the National Wilderness Preservation System:

(1) BOB MARSHALL WILDERNESS.—Certain land in the Lewis and Clark National Forest, comprising approximately 50,401 acres, as generally depicted on the map, which shall be added to and administered as part of the Bob Marshall Wilderness designated under section 3 of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1132).

(2) SCAPEGOAT WILDERNESS.—Certain land in the Lewis and Clark National Forest, comprising approximately 16,711 acres, as generally depicted on the map, which shall be added to and administered as part of the Scapegoat Wilderness designated by the first section of Public Law 92–395 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note).

(b) MANAGEMENT OF WILDERNESS ADDITIONS.—Subject to valid existing rights, the land designated as wilderness additions by subsection (a) shall be administered by the Secretary in accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), except that any reference in that Act to the effective date of that Act shall be deemed to be a reference to the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) LIVESTOCK.—The grazing of livestock and the maintenance of existing facilities relating to grazing in the wilderness additions designated by this section, if established before the date of enactment of this Act, shall be permitted to continue in accordance with—

(1) section 4(d)(4) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(4)); and

(2) the guidelines set forth in the report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives accompanying H.R. 5487 of the 96th Congress (H. Rept. 96–617).

(d) WILDFIRE, INSECT, AND DISEASE MANAGEMENT.—In accordance with section 4(d)(1) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(1)), within the wilderness additions designated by this section, the Secretary may take any measures that the Secretary determines to be necessary to control fire, insects, and diseases, including, as the Secretary determines appropriate, the coordination of those activities with a State or local agency.

(e) ADJACENT MANAGEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The designation of a wilderness addition by this section shall not create any protective perimeter or buffer zone around the wilderness area.

(2) NONWILDERNESS ACTIVITIES.—The fact that nonwilderness activities or uses can be seen or heard from areas within a wilderness addition designated by this section shall not preclude the conduct of those activities or uses outside the boundary of the wilderness area.

SEC. 305. MAPS AND LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall prepare maps and legal descriptions of the Conservation Management Area and the wilderness additions designated by sections 303 and 304, respectively.

(b) FORCE OF LAW.—The maps and legal descriptions prepared under subsection (a) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this title, except that the Secretary may correct typographical errors in the map and legal descriptions.

(c) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The maps and legal descriptions prepared under subsection (a) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management.

SEC. 306. NOXIOUS WEED MANAGEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall prepare a comprehensive management strategy for preventing, controlling, and eradicating noxious weeds in the district.

(b) CONTENTS.—The management strategy shall—

(1) include recommendations to protect wildlife, forage, and other natural resources in the district from noxious weeds;

(2) identify opportunities to coordinate noxious weed prevention, control, and eradication efforts in the district with State and local agencies, Indian tribes, nonprofit organizations, and others;

(3) identify existing resources for preventing, controlling, and eradicating noxious weeds in the district;

(4) identify additional resources that are appropriate to effectively prevent, control, or eradicate noxious weeds in the district; and

(5) identify opportunities to coordinate with county weed districts in Glacier, Pondera, Teton, and Lewis and Clark Counties in the State to apply for grants and enter into agreements for noxious weed control and eradication projects under the Noxious Weed Control and Eradication Act of 2004 (7 U.S.C. 7781 et seq.).

(c) CONSULTATION.—In developing the management strategy required under subsection (a), the Secretary shall consult with—

(1) the Secretary of the Interior;

(2) appropriate State, tribal, and local governmental entities; and

(3) members of the public.

SEC. 307. NONMOTORIZED RECREATION OPPORTUNITIES.

Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture, in consultation with interested parties, shall conduct a study to improve nonmotorized recreation trail opportunities (including mountain bicycling) on land not designated as wilderness within the district.

SEC. 308. MANAGEMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE; HUNTING AND FISHING.

Nothing in this title affects the jurisdiction of the State with respect to fish and wildlife management (including the regulation of hunting and fishing) on public land in the State.

SEC. 309. OVERFLIGHTS.

(a) JURISDICTION OF THE FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION.—Nothing in this title affects the jurisdiction of the Federal Aviation Administration with respect to the airspace above the wilderness or the Conservation Management Area.

(b) BENCHMARK AIRSTRIP.—Nothing in this title affects the continued use, maintenance, and repair of the Benchmark (3U7) airstrip.

SEC. 310. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this title.

SA 3515. Mr. WALSH (for himself, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II, add the following:

SEC. 2___. SAGE-GROUSE CONSERVATION EFFORTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) pursuant to the court-approved work schedule described in the Joint Motion for Approval of Settlement Agreement and Order of Dismissal of Guardians Claims entitled ''In Re Endangered Species Act Section 4 Deadline Litigation'' (D.D.C. 2011), not later than September 30, 2015, the Secretary is scheduled to issue a decision on whether

to proceed with listing the greater sage-grouse as a threatened or endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.);

(2) the Federal Government, through programs of the Department of Interior and the Department of Agriculture, has invested substantial funds on greater and Gunnison sage-grouse conservation efforts to avoid the greater and Gunnison sage-grouse being listed as threatened or endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.);

(3) State wildlife management agencies have prepared, and as of the date of enactment of this Act are in the process of implementing, greater and Gunnison sage-grouse conservation plans to complement the conservation efforts of the Federal Government;

(4) private investment in conservation efforts, independently and in conjunction with Federal cost-share conservation easement programs, has been significant;

(5) through a combination of Federal, State, and private efforts, significant conservation progress is being made, and further progress will be made following full implementation of State management plans and new Federal conservation programs; and

(6) farmers, ranchers, developers, and small businesses need certainty, and further clarity on the likelihood of a listing decision will provide that certainty.

(b) DEFINITION OF SECRETARY.—In this section, the term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(c) GREATER SAGE-GROUSE REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than December 15, 2014, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the status of greater sage-grouse conservation efforts.

(2) CONTENTS.—In the report required under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall include—

(A) a description of public and private programs and expenditures, including State and Federal Government agencies, relating to greater sage-grouse conservation;

(B) a description of State management plans, including plans that have been announced but not yet implemented;

(C) a description of Bureau of Land Management plans, or plans by any other land management agencies, relating to greater sage-grouse conservation;

(D) in accordance with paragraph (3), a description of the metrics that, at the discretion of the Secretary, will be used to make a determination of whether the greater sage-grouse should be listed as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.);

(E) any outcome under the programs, expenditures, or plans referred to in subparagraphs (A) through (C) that can be measured by the metrics described in paragraph (3); and

(F) any recommendations to Congress for legislative actions that could provide certainty to farmers, ranchers, developers, and small businesses and could assist in the conservation of the greater sage-grouse.

(3) REPORTED METRICS.—The metrics described in paragraph (2)(D) may include—

(A) the quantity of acres enrolled in sagebrush and habitat protection in conservation programs established under title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3801 et seq.) or other conservation programs of the Department of Agriculture, including conservation easements, land purchases or swaps, vegetation management or habitat enhancement programs, and fuels management programs;

(B) data on nonfire related habitat restoration efforts, including native, nonnative, and mixed seeding efforts;

(C) data on mine reclamation and subsequent restoration efforts intended to restore greater sage-grouse habitat;

(D) data on conifer removal;

(E) data on presuppression fire efforts, including—

(i) the number of acres associated with fuels management programs; and

(ii) the number of miles associated with fire breaks;

(F) data on habitat restoration, including postfire restoration efforts involving native, nonnative, and mixed seeding;

(G) data on structure removal, power line burial, power line retrofitting or modification, fence modification, fence marking, and fence removal;

(H) for livestock and rangeland management, data on allotment closure and road closure;

(I) for travel management, data on road and trail closure and trail rerouting;

(J) data on greater sage-grouse translocation efforts, including the number of greater sage-grouse translocated, the age of each translocated greater sage-grouse, and the sex of each translocated greater sage-grouse; and

(K) any other data or metric the Secretary may examine in making the decision on whether to list the greater sage-grouse as a threatened or endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.)

(d) AGRICULTURAL LAND EASEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1265B(b)(2)(C)(i) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3865b(b)(2)(C)(i))) is amended—

(A) by striking ''GRASSLANDS'' and inserting ''IN GENERAL''; and

(B) by inserting ''and land with greater or Gunnison sage-grouse habitat of special environmental significance'' after ''significance''.

(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—Section 1265B(b)(3)(B) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3865b(b)(3)(B)) is amended—

(A) in clause (i), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon at the end;

(B) in clause (ii), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(iii) maximizing the protection of greater or Gunnison sage-grouse habitat.''.

SA 3516. Mr. COCHRAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. PROHIBITION ON FEDERAL FUNDING OF FIREARMS OWNERSHIP DATABASE.

No department or agency of the United States shall support, by funding or other means, the establishment or maintenance, by a State or political subdivision of a State, of any comprehensive or partial listing of firearms lawfully possessed or lawfully owned by private persons, or of persons who lawfully possess or own firearms, except in the case of firearms that have been reported to the State or political subdivision as lost or stolen.

SA 3517. Mr. COCHRAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. EXTENSION OF THE SEAWARD BOUNDARY OF MISSISSIPPI FOR RECREATIONAL FISHERY MANAGEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4 of the Submerged Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1312) is amended—

(1) by striking ''The seaward boundary'' and inserting the following:

''(a) The seaward boundary''; and

(2) by inserting at the end the following:

''(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the State of Mississippi may extend its seaward boundary to a line nine geographical miles distant from its coast line into the Gulf of Mexico for the purpose of managing, administering, leasing, developing, and using the recreational fisheries found in such lands and waters.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) SUBMERGED LANDS ACT.—Section 2(b) of the Submerged Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1301(b)) is amended by inserting '', except as provided in section 4(b),'' after ''in no event''.

(2) MAGNUSON–STEVENS FISHERY CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT ACT.—

(A) AUTHORITY OF THE GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL.—Section 302(a) of the Magnuson–Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1852(a)) is amended—

(i) in paragraph (1)(E), by striking ''paragraph (3))'' and inserting ''paragraphs (3) and (4))''; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) The State of Mississippi shall have authority over the recreational fisheries in the land and waters to the line 9 geographical miles distant from the coast line of the State of Mississippi into the Gulf of Mexico.''.

(B) STATE JURISDICTION.—Section 306(a)(2) of the Magnuson–Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1856(a)(2)) is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (C)(ii), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon and ''and''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) to the line 9 geographical miles distant from the coast line of the State of Mississippi into the Gulf of Mexico for the purpose of managing, administering, leasing, developing, and using recreational fishing found in such lands and waters.''.

SA 3518. Mr. COCHRAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II, add the following:

SEC. 2___. MIGRATORY BIRD TREATY ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3 of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 704) is amended—

(1) by striking the section designation and all that follows through ''That subject to the provisions and in order to carry out the purposes of the conventions, the Secretary of Agriculture'' and inserting the following:

''SEC. 3. DETERMINATION REGARDING WHEN AND HOW MIGRATORY BIRDS MAY BE TAKEN, KILLED, OR POSSESSED.

''(a) REGULATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the requirements of the conventions, to carry out the purposes of the conventions, the Secretary of the Interior''; and

(2) in subsection (a) (as amended by paragraph (1)), by adding at the end the following:

''(2) ADDITIONAL HUNTING DAYS FOR MEMBERS AND VETERANS OF ARMED FORCES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including regulations), the Secretary of the Interior may allow any State to promulgate and implement regulations under which members and veterans of the Armed Forces in the State may take migratory birds that are waterfowl during an additional 2-day period outside of the open season established at the Federal level for such migratory birds, subject to subparagraph (B).

''(B) REQUIREMENT.—The additional 2-day period allowed under subparagraph (A) may not occur more than 7 days before, or 7 days after, the open season established at the Federal level for the applicable migratory birds.''.

(b) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—The Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703 et seq.) is amended by striking ''Secretary of Agriculture'' each place it appears and inserting ''Secretary of the Interior''.

SA 3519. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. REPATRIATION OF UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 235(a) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''CHILDREN FROM CONTIGUOUS COUNTRIES'' and inserting ''UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN'';

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''a country that is contiguous with the United States'' and inserting ''Belize, Canada, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, or Panama''; and

(C) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) by striking the subparagraph heading and inserting ''AGREEMENTS WITH FOREIGN COUNTRIES''; and

(ii) by striking ''countries contiguous to the United States'' and inserting ''Belize, Canada, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, and Panama''; and

(2) in paragraph (5)(D), by striking ''from a contiguous country subject to the exceptions under subsection (a),'' and inserting ''from Belize, Canada, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, or Panama who meets the criteria set forth in clauses (i) through (iii) of paragraph (2)(A),''.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to unaccompanied alien children who are in the custody of the Federal Government on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. ___. ORGANIZED HUMAN SMUGGLING.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) EFFORT OR SCHEME.—The term ''effort or scheme to assist or cause 5 or more persons'' does not require that the 5 or more persons enter, attempt to enter, prepare to enter, or travel at the same time if such acts are completed during a 1-year period.

(2) LAWFUL AUTHORITY.—The term ''lawful authority''—

(A) means permission, authorization, or license that is expressly provided for under the immigration laws of the United States; and

(B) does not include—

(i) any authority described in subparagraph (A) that was secured by fraud or otherwise unlawfully obtained; or

(ii) any authority that was sought, but not approved.

(b) PROHIBITED ACTIVITIES.—It shall be unlawful for any person, while acting for profit or other financial gain, to knowingly direct or participate in an effort or scheme to assist or cause 5 or more persons (other than a parent, spouse, or child of the offender)—

(1) to enter, attempt to enter, or prepare to enter the United States—

(A) by fraud, falsehood, or other corrupt means;

(B) at any place other than a port or place of entry designated by the Secretary of Homeland Security; or

(C) in a manner not prescribed by the immigration laws and regulations of the United States;

(2) to travel by air, land, or sea toward the United States (whether directly or indirectly)—

(A) knowing that the persons seek to enter or attempt to enter the United States without lawful authority; and

(B) with the intent to aid or further such entry or attempted entry; or

(3) to be transported or moved outside of the United States—

(A) knowing that such persons are aliens in unlawful transit from 1 country to another or on the high seas; and

(B) under circumstances in which the persons are seeking to enter the United States without official permission or legal authority.

(c) CONSPIRACY AND ATTEMPT.—Any person who attempts or conspires to violate subsection (b) shall be punished in the same manner as a person who completes a violation of such subsection.

(d) BASE PENALTY.—Except as provided in subsection (e), any person who violates subsection (b) or (c) shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned for not more than 20 years, or both.

(e) ENHANCED PENALTIES.—Any person who violates subsection (b) or (c)—

(1) in the case of a violation during and in relation to which a serious bodily injury (as defined in section 1365 of title 18, United States Code) occurs to any person, shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned for not more than 30 years, or both;

(2) in the case of a violation during and in relation to which the life of any person is placed in jeopardy, shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned for not more than 30 years, or both;

(3) in the case of a violation involving 10 or more persons, shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned for not more than 30 years, or both;

(4) in the case of a violation involving the bribery or corruption of a United States or foreign government official, shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned for not more than 30 years, or both;

(5) in the case of a violation involving robbery or extortion (as such terms are defined in paragraph (1) or (2), respectively, of section 1951(b) of title 18, United States Code), shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned for not more than 30 years, or both;

(6) in the case of a violation during and in relation to which any person is subjected to an involuntary sexual act (as defined in section 2246(2) of title 18, United States Code), shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned for not more than 30 years, or both;

(7) in the case of a violation resulting in the death of any person, shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned for any term of years or for life, or both;

(8) in the case of a violation in which any alien is confined or restrained, including by the taking of clothing, goods, or personal identification documents, shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned not fewer than 5 years and not more than 10 years, or both;

(9) in the case of smuggling an unaccompanied alien child (as defined in section 462(g)(2) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 279(g)(2)), shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, or imprisoned not more than 20 years.

SA 3520. Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CRAPO, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. LEE, and Mr. HATCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II, add the following:

SEC. 2_____. GREATER SAGE-GROUSE PROTECTION AND CONSERVATION MEASURES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COVERED WESTERN STATE.—The term ''covered western State'' means each of the States of California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming.

(2) NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM LAND.—The term ''National Forest System land'' means the Federal land within the National Forest System, as described in section 11(a) of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1609(a)).

(3) PUBLIC LAND.—The term ''public land'' has the meaning given the term ''public lands'' in section 103 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1702).

(4) SAGE GROUSE SPECIES.—The term ''sage grouse species'' means the greater sage-grouse (Centrocercus urophasianus) and the Gunnison sage-grouse (Centrocercus minimus).

(5) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means—

(A) the Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to National Forest System land; and

(B) the Secretary of the Interior, with respect to public land.

(6) STATEWIDE PLAN.—The term ''statewide plan'' means a statewide conservation and management plan for the protection and recovery of sage grouse species within a covered western State.

(b) SECRETARIAL PARTICIPATION IN STATE PLANNING PROCESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after receipt of notice from a covered western State that the State is initiating or has initiated development of a statewide conservation and management plan for the protection and recovery of the sage grouse species within the State, the Secretary shall provide to the Governor of that covered western State—

(A) a commitment of the willingness of the Secretary to participate in the development;

(B) a list of designees from the Department of the Interior or Department of Agriculture, as applicable, who shall represent the Secretary as a participant in the development; and

(C) a list of other Federal departments that could be invited by the covered western State to participate.

(2) ACCESS TO INFORMATION.—Not later than 60 days after receipt of a notice described in paragraph (1) from the covered western State, the Secretary shall provide to the

State all relevant scientific data, research, or information regarding sage grouse species and habitat within the State to appropriate State personnel to assist the State in the development.

(3) AVAILABILITY OF DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL.—The Secretary shall make personnel from Department of the Interior agencies or Department of Agriculture agencies, respectively, available, on at least a monthly basis, to meet with officials of the State to develop or implement a statewide plan.

(c) CONTENTS OF NOTICE.—A notice under subsection (b) shall—

(1) be submitted by a Governor of any covered western State; and

(2) include—

(A) an invitation for the Secretary to participate in development of the statewide plan; and

(B) a commitment that, not later than 2 years after the submission of a notice under this section, the State shall present to the Secretary for review a 10-year (or longer) sage grouse species conservation and management plan for the entire State.

(d) REVIEW OF STATE PLAN.—If the Secretary receives a statewide plan from a covered western State not later than 2 years after receiving a notice under subsection (b) from the State, the Secretary shall—

(1) review the statewide plan using the best available science and data to determine if the statewide plan is likely—

(A) to conserve the sage grouse species to the point at which the measures provided pursuant to the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) are no longer necessary in the State; and

(B) to conserve the habitat essential to conserve the sage grouse species within the State; and

(2) approve or endorse, or make comments regarding, the statewide plan not later than 120 days after the date of submission.

(e) ACTIONS AFTER STATEWIDE PLAN IS SUBMITTED.—

(1) HOLD ON CERTAIN ACTIONS.—Not later than 30 days after receipt of a statewide plan from a covered western State, the Secretary shall—

(A) take necessary steps to place on hold—

(i) for a period of not less than 10 years, all actions with respect to listing any sage grouse species in that State under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.);

(ii) enforcement of any current listing of sage grouse species within that State under that Act; and

(iii) designation of any critical habitat for any sage grouse species within that State under that Act; and

(B) withdraw any land use planning activities related to Federal management of sage grouse on Federal land within that State and take immediate steps to amend all Federal land use plans to comply with the statewide plan with respect to that State, if—

(i) the State presents to the Secretary the conservation and management plan of the State not later than 2 years after the State submits notice to the Secretary under subsection (b); and

(ii) the State is implementing the plan.

(2) ACTIONS PURSUANT TO NEPA.—Any proposed action pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) that occurs within a covered western State may not be denied or restricted solely on the basis of a sage grouse species if the action is consistent with a statewide plan that has been submitted by the State to the Secretary.

(f) EXISTING STATE PLANS.—The Secretary shall—

(1) except as provided in paragraph (2), give effect to a statewide plan that is submitted by a covered western State and approved or endorsed by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service before the date of the enactment of this Act, in accordance with the terms of approval or endorsement of the plan by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service; and

(2) for purposes of subsections (b)(3) and (e), treat a statewide plan described in paragraph (1) as a plan referred to in those subsections.

SA 3521. Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. LEE, and Mr. THUNE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

SEC. 1_____. INTERSTATE TRANSPORT OF KNIVES.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''transport''—

(1) includes staying in temporary lodging overnight, common carrier misrouting or delays, stops for food, fuel, vehicle maintenance, emergencies, medical treatment, and any other activity related to the journey of an individual; and

(2) does not include transport of a knife with the intent to commit an offense punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding 1 year involving the use or threatened use of force against another person, or with knowledge, or reasonable cause to believe, that such an offense is to be committed in the course of, or arising from, the journey.

(b) TRANSPORT OF KNIVES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, rule, or regulation of the United States, or of a State or political subdivision of a State, an individual who is not otherwise prohibited by Federal law from possessing, transporting, shipping, or receiving a knife may transport a knife from any State or place where the individual may lawfully possess, carry, or transport the knife to any other State or place where the individual may lawfully possess, carry, or transport the knife if—

(A) in the case of transport by motor vehicle, the knife is not directly accessible from the passenger compartment of the motor vehicle, or, in the case of a motor vehicle without a compartment separate from the passenger compartment, the knife is contained in a locked container, glove compartment, or console; or

(B) in the case of transport by means other than a motor vehicle, including any transport over land, on or through water, or through the air, the knife is contained in a locked container.

(2) TEMPORARY LODGING.—An individual transporting a knife in accordance with paragraph (1) may have a knife accessible while staying in any form of temporary lodging.

(c) EMERGENCY KNIVES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An individual—

(A) may carry in the passenger compartment of a motor vehicle a knife or tool designed for enabling escape in an emergency that incorporates a blunt tipped safety blade or a guarded blade or both for cutting safety belts; and

(B) shall not be required to secure a knife or tool described in subparagraph (A) in a locked container, glove compartment, or console.

(2) LIMITATION.—This subsection shall not apply to the transport of a knife or tool in the passenger cabin of an aircraft whose passengers are subject to airport screening procedures of the Transportation Security Administration.

(d) NO ARREST OR DETENTION.—An individual who is transporting a knife in compliance with this section may not be arrested or otherwise detained for violation of any law, rule, or regulation of a State or political subdivision of a State related to the possession, transport, or carrying of a knife, unless there is probable cause to believe that the individual is not in compliance with subsection (b).

(e) CLAIM OR DEFENSE.—An individual may assert this section as a claim or defense in any civil or criminal action or proceeding. When an individual asserts this section as a claim or defense in a criminal proceeding, the State or political subdivision has the burden of proving, beyond a reasonable doubt, that the individual was not in compliance with subsection (b).

(f) RIGHT OF ACTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any individual who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or political subdivision of a State, subjects, or causes to be subjected, any individual to the deprivation of the rights, privileges, or immunities provided for in this section, shall be liable to the individual so deprived in an action at law or equity, or other proper proceeding for redress.

(2) ATTORNEY'S FEES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If an individual asserts this section as a claim or defense, the court shall award to the prevailing party, as described in subparagraph (B), reasonable attorney's fees.

(B) PREVAILING PARTY.—A prevailing party described in this subparagraph—

(i) includes a party who receives a favorable resolution through a decision by a court, settlement of a claim, withdrawal of criminal charges, or change of a statute or regulation; and

(ii) does not include a State or political subdivision of a State, or an employee or representative of a State or political subdivision of a State.

(g) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit any right to possess, carry, or transport a knife under applicable State law.

SA 3522. Mr. BARRASSO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II, add the following:

SEC. 2_____. ALLOCATION OF LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND FOR STATE AND FEDERAL PURPOSES.

Section 5 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 460*l*-7) is amended by striking the second sentence and inserting the following: ''Of the appropriations from the fund, not less than 40 percent shall be for State purposes and not less than 40 percent shall be for Federal purposes.''.

SA 3523. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II, add the following:

SEC. 2____. ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT OF 1973.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 3 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1532) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), (10), (12), (13), (14), (15), (16), (17), (18), (19), (20), and (21) as paragraphs (2), (3), (4), (5), (7), (8), (9), (10), (11), (12), (13), (14), (15), (16), (17), (18), (19), (20), (21), and (22), respectively;

(2) by inserting before paragraph (2) (as so redesignated) the following:

''(1) AFFECTED PARTY.—The term 'affected party' means any person, including a business entity, or any State, tribal government, or local subdivision the rights of which may be affected by a determination made under section 4(a) in a suit brought under section 11(g)(1)(C).''; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (5) (as so redesignated) the following:

''(6) COVERED SETTLEMENT.—The term 'covered settlement' means a consent decree or a settlement agreement in an action brought under section 11(g)(1)(C).''.

(b) INTERVENTION; APPROVAL OF COVERED SETTLEMENT.—Section 11(g) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1540(g)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by adding at the end the following:

''(C) PUBLISHING COMPLAINT; INTERVENTION.—

''(i) PUBLISHING COMPLAINT.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the plaintiff serves the defendant with the complaint in an action brought under paragraph (1)(C) in accordance with Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Secretary of the Interior shall publish the complaint in a readily accessible manner, including electronically.

''(II) FAILURE TO MEET DEADLINE.—The failure of the Secretary to meet the 30-day deadline described in subclause (I) shall not be the basis for an action under paragraph (1)(C).

''(ii) INTERVENTION.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—After the end of the 30-day period described in clause (i), each affected party shall be given a reasonable opportunity to move to intervene in the action described in clause (i), until the end of which a party may not file a motion for a consent decree or to dismiss the case pursuant to a settlement agreement.

''(II) REBUTTABLE PRESUMPTION.—In considering a motion to intervene by any affected party, the court shall presume, subject to rebuttal, that the interests of that affected party would not be represented adequately by the parties to the action described in clause (i).

''(III) REFERRAL TO ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION.—

''(aa) IN GENERAL.—If the court grants a motion to intervene in the action, the court shall refer the action to facilitate settlement discussions to—

''(AA) the mediation program of the court; or

''(BB) a magistrate judge.

''(bb) PARTIES INCLUDED IN SETTLEMENT DISCUSSIONS.—The settlement discussions described in item (aa) shall include each—

''(AA) plaintiff;

''(BB) defendant agency; and

''(CC) intervenor.'';

(2) by striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following:

''(4) LITIGATION COSTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the court, in issuing any final order in any suit brought under paragraph (1), may award costs of litigation (including reasonable attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, whenever the court determines such award is appropriate.

''(B) COVERED SETTLEMENT.—

''(i) CONSENT DECREES.—The court shall not award costs of litigation in any proposed covered settlement that is a consent decree.

''(ii) OTHER COVERED SETTLEMENTS.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—For a proposed covered settlement other than a consent decree, the court shall ensure that the covered settlement does not include payment to any plaintiff for the costs of litigation.

''(II) MOTIONS.—The court shall not grant any motion, including a motion to dismiss, based on the proposed covered settlement described in subclause (I) if the covered settlement includes payment to any plaintiff for the costs of litigation.''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(6) APPROVAL OF COVERED SETTLEMENT.—

''(A) DEFINITION OF SPECIES.—In this paragraph, the term 'species' means a species that is the subject of an action brought under paragraph (1)(C).

''(B) APPROVAL.—

''(i) CONSENT DECREES.—The court shall not approve a proposed covered settlement that is a consent decree unless each State and county in which the Secretary of the Interior believes a species occurs approves the covered settlement.

''(ii) OTHER COVERED SETTLEMENTS.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—For a proposed covered settlement other than a consent decree, the court shall ensure that the covered settlement is approved by each State and county in which the Secretary of the Interior believes a species occurs.

''(II) MOTIONS.—The court shall not grant any motion, including a motion to dismiss, based on the proposed covered settlement described in subclause (I) unless the covered settlement is approved by each State and county in which the Secretary of the Interior believes a species occurs.

''(C) NOTICE.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior shall provide each State and county in which the Secretary of the Interior believes a species occurs notice of a proposed covered settlement.

''(ii) DETERMINATION OF RELEVANT STATES AND COUNTIES.—The defendant in a covered settlement shall consult with each State described in clause (i) to determine each county in which the Secretary of the Interior believes a species occurs.

''(D) FAILURE TO RESPOND.—The court may approve a covered settlement or grant a motion described in subparagraph (B)(ii)(II) if, not later than 45 days after the date on which a State or county is notified under subparagraph (C)—

''(i)(I) a State or county fails to respond; and

''(II) of the States or counties that respond, each State or county approves the covered settlement; or

''(ii) all of the States and counties fail to respond.

''(E) PROOF OF APPROVAL.—The defendant in a covered settlement shall prove any State or county approval described in this paragraph in a form—

''(i) acceptable to the State or county, as applicable; and

''(ii) signed by the State or county official authorized to approve the covered settlement.''.

SA 3524. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 301. CLARIFYING CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIPTIONS IN PROVO RIVER PROJECT TRANSFER ACT.

(a) PLEASANT GROVE PROPERTY.—Section 2(4)(A) of the Provo River Project Transfer Act (Public Law 108–382; 118 Stat. 2212) is amended by striking ''of enactment of this Act'' and inserting ''on which the parcel is conveyed under section 3(a)(2)''.

(b) PROVO RESERVOIR CANAL.—Section 2(5) of the Provo River Project Transfer Act (Public Law 108–382; 118 Stat. 2212) is amended—

(1) by striking ''canal, and any associated land, rights-of-way, and facilities'' and inserting ''water conveyance facility historically known as the Provo Reservoir Canal and all associated bridges, fixtures, structures, facilities, lands, interests in land, and rights-of-way held,'';

(2) by inserting ''and forebay'' after ''Diversion Dam'';

(3) by inserting ''near the Jordan Narrows to the point where water is discharged to the Welby-Jacob Canal and the Utah Lake Distributing Canal'' after ''Penstock''; and

(4) by striking ''of enactment of this Act'' and inserting ''on which the Provo Reservoir Canal is conveyed under section 3(a)(1)''.

SA 3525. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE III—LAND CONVEYANCES

SEC. 301. LAND CONVEYANCE, UINTA-WASATCH-CACHE NATIONAL FOREST, UTAH.

(a) CONVEYANCE REQUIRED.—On the request of Brigham Young University submitted to the Secretary of Agriculture not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall convey, not later than one year after receiving the request, to Brigham Young University all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to an approximately 80-acre parcel of National Forest System land in the Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest in the State of Utah, as generally depicted on the map entitled ''Upper Y Mountain Trail and Y Conveyance Act'' and dated June 6, 2013, subject to valid existing rights and by quitclaim deed.

(b) CONSIDERATION.—

(1) CONSIDERATION REQUIRED.—As consideration for the land conveyed under subsection (a), Brigham Young University shall pay to the Secretary an amount equal to the fair market value of the land, as determined by an appraisal approved by the Secretary and conducted in conformity with the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions and section 206 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1716).

(2) DEPOSIT.—The consideration received by the Secretary under paragraph (1) shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury to reduce the Federal deficit.

(c) PUBLIC ACCESS TO Y MOUNTAIN TRAIL.—After the conveyance under subsection (a), Brigham Young University will—

(1) continue to allow the same reasonable public access to the trailhead and portion of the Y Mountain Trail already owned by Brigham Young University as of the date of the enactment of this Act that Brigham Young University has historically allowed; and

(2) allow that same reasonable public access to the portion of the Y Mountain Trail

and the ''Y'' symbol located on the land described in subsection (a).

(d) SURVEY AND ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—The exact acreage and legal description of the land to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary. Brigham Young University shall pay the reasonable costs of survey, appraisal, and any administrative analyses required by law.

SA 3526. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE III—MINERAL LEASING

SEC. 301. RELINQUISHMENT OF CERTAIN LAND IN UTAH.

The Act entitled ''An Act to define the exterior boundary of the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation in the State of Utah, and for other purposes'', approved March 11, 1948 (62 Stat. 72), as amended by the Act entitled ''An Act to amend the Act extending the exterior boundary of the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation in the State of Utah so as to authorize such State to exchange certain mineral lands for other lands mineral in character'' approved August 9, 1955, (69 Stat. 544), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 5. In order to further clarify authorizations under this Act, the State of Utah is hereby authorized to relinquish to the United States, for the benefit of the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation, State school trust or other State-owned subsurface mineral lands located beneath the surface estate delineated in Public Law 440 (approved March 11, 1948) and south of the border between Grand County, Utah, and Uintah County, Utah, and select in lieu of such relinquished lands, on an acre-for-acre basis, any subsurface mineral lands of the United States located beneath the surface estate delineated in Public Law 440 (approved March 11, 1948) and north of the border between Grand County, Utah, and Uintah County, Utah, subject to the following conditions:

''(1) RESERVATION BY UNITED STATES.—The Secretary of the Interior shall reserve an overriding interest in that portion of the mineral estate comprised of minerals subject to leasing under the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 171 et seq.) in any mineral lands conveyed to the State.

''(2) EXTENT OF OVERRIDING INTEREST.—The overriding interest reserved by the United States under paragraph (1) shall consist of—

''(A) 50 percent of any bonus bid or other payment received by the State as consideration for securing any lease or authorization to develop such mineral resources;

''(B) 50 percent of any rental or other payments received by the State as consideration for the lease or authorization to develop such mineral resources;

''(C) a 6.25 percent overriding royalty on the gross proceeds of oil and gas production under any lease or authorization to develop such oil and gas resources; and

''(D) an overriding royalty on the gross proceeds of production of such minerals other than oil and gas, equal to 50 percent of the royalty rate established by the Secretary of the Interior by regulation as of October 1, 2011.

''(3) RESERVATION BY STATE OF UTAH.—The State of Utah shall reserve, for the benefit of its State school trust, an overriding interest in that portion of the mineral estate comprised of minerals subject to leasing under the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) in any mineral lands relinquished by the State to the United States.

''(4) EXTENT OF OVERRIDING INTEREST.—The overriding interest reserved by the State under paragraph (3) shall consist of—

''(A) 50 percent of any bonus bid or other payment received by the United States as consideration for securing any lease or authorization to develop such mineral resources on the relinquished lands;

''(B) 50 percent of any rental or other payments received by the United States as consideration for the lease or authorization to develop such mineral resources;

''(C) a 6.25 percent overriding royalty on the gross proceeds of oil and gas production under any lease or authorization to develop such oil and gas resources; and

''(D) an overriding royalty on the gross proceeds of production of such minerals other than oil and gas, equal to 50 percent of the royalty rate established by the Secretary of the Interior by regulation as of October 1, 2011.

''(5) NO OBLIGATION TO LEASE.—Neither the United States nor the State shall be obligated to lease or otherwise develop oil and gas resources in which the other party retains an overriding interest under this section.

''(6) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to enter into cooperative agreements with the State and the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation to facilitate the relinquishment and selection of lands to be conveyed under this section, and the administration of the overriding interests reserved hereunder.''.

SA 3527. Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. VITTER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. KIRK, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. BURR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. _____. REPATRIATION OF UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 235(a) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking the paragraph heading and inserting ''RULES FOR UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN'';

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''a country that is contiguous with the United States'' and inserting ''Belize, Canada, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, or any other foreign country that the Secretary determines appropriate''; and

(C) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) by striking the subparagraph heading and inserting ''AGREEMENTS WITH FOREIGN COUNTRIES''; and

(ii) by striking ''countries contiguous to the United States'' and inserting ''Belize, Canada, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, and any other foreign country that the Secretary determines appropriate''; and

(2) in paragraph (5)(D), by striking '', except for an unaccompanied alien child from a contiguous country subject to the exceptions under subsection (a),'' and inserting ''who does not meet the criteria listed in paragraph (2)(A)''.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to any unaccompanied alien child who was apprehended on or after October 1, 2013.

SA 3528. Mr. REID (for Mr. COBURN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 311, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating sites in the Lower Mississippi River Area in the State of Louisiana as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 3, strike lines 10 through 12 and insert the following:

SEC. 4. AGREEMENT; DONATIONS.

The study described in section 3 shall not be conducted until the date on which—

(1) the Secretary enters into an agreement with a State, unit of local government, or other entity to conduct the study using non-Federal funds; or

(2) the Secretary receives a donation of an amount of non-Federal funds sufficient to pay the cost of conducting the study.

SA 3529. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

This Act shall become effective 1 day after enactment.

SA 3530. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3529 submitted by Mr. REID and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In the amendment, strike ''1 day'' and insert ''2 days''.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 9, 2014, at 2:20 p.m. in room SR–253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled, ''Promoting the Well-Being and Academic Success of College Athletes.''

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 9, 2014, at 9:45 a.m., to hold a hearing entitled ''Russia and Developments in Ukraine.''

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

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. LEVIN. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 9, 2014, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled ''Challenges at the Border: Examining the Causes, Consequences, and the Response to the Rise in Apprehensions at the Southern Border.''

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

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 9, 2014, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD–628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

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

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would request that floor privileges for the balance of the month be afforded to my interns: Annika Graham, Nathan Sidell, Amber Vernon, Rebecca Carney-Braveman, Samuel Ortiz, Evyn Ysais, Marcus Gamble, Diane Murph, Izabella Powers, Sarah Pherson, Kendall Eilo, and Ben Gilman.

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

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Briggs Noun and Margaret Chelsvig, interns in my office, be granted privileges of the floor for today's session.

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

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my intern, Audrey Mechling, be granted privileges of the floor for the remainder of the day.

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

THE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the energy committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 291 and H.R. 356; that the Senate proceed to their consideration and the consideration of the following calendar number items en bloc: Calendar No. 256, H.R. 255; Calendar No. 226, H.R. 330; Calendar No. 359, H.R. 507; Calendar No. 353, H.R. 697; Calendar No. 361, H.R. 876; Calendar No. 362, H.R. 1158; Calendar No. 399, H.R. 2337; Calendar No. 369, H.R. 3110; Calendar No. 54, S. 247; Calendar No. 57, S. 311; Calendar No. 60, S. 354; Calendar No. 129, S. 363; Calendar No. 118, S. 476; and Calendar No. 120, S. 609.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bills en bloc.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN CEMETERIES LOCATED ON NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM LAND

The bill (H.R. 291) to provide for the conveyance of certain cemeteries that are located on National Forest System land in Black Hills National Forest, South Dakota, was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

UINTAH AND OURAY INDIAN RESERVATION IN THE STATE OF UTAH

The bill (H.R. 356) to clarify authority granted under the Act entitled ''An Act to define the exterior boundary of the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation in the State of Utah, and for other purposes,'' was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

PROVO RIVER PROJECT CLARIFYING ACT

The bill (H.R. 255) to amend certain definitions contained in the Provo River Project Transfer Act for purposes of clarifying certain property descriptions, and for other purposes, was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

H.R. 255

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

SECTION 1. CLARIFYING CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIPTIONS IN PROVO RIVER PROJECT TRANSFER ACT.

(a) PLEASANT GROVE PROPERTY.—Section 2(4)(A) of the Provo River Project Transfer Act (Public Law 108–382; 118 Stat. 2212) is amended by striking ''of enactment of this Act'' and inserting ''on which the parcel is conveyed under section 3(a)(2)''.

(b) PROVO RESERVOIR CANAL.—Section 2(5) of the Provo River Project Transfer Act (Public Law 108–382; 118 Stat. 2212) is amended—

(1) by striking ''canal, and any associated land, rights-of-way, and facilities'' and inserting ''water conveyance facility historically known as the Provo Reservoir Canal and all associated bridges, fixtures, structures, facilities, lands, interests in land, and rights-of-way held,'';

(2) by inserting ''and forebay'' after ''Diversion Dam'';

(3) by inserting ''near the Jordan Narrows to the point where water is discharged to the Welby-Jacob Canal and the Utah Lake Distributing Canal'' after ''Penstock''; and

(4) by striking ''of enactment of this Act'' and inserting ''on which the Provo Reservoir Canal is conveyed under section 3(a)(1)''.

DISTINGUISHED FLYING CROSS NATIONAL MEMORIAL ACT

The bill (H.R. 330) to designate a Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial at the March Field Air Museum in Riverside, California, was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

H.R. 330

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial Act''.

SEC. 2. DESIGNATION OF DISTINGUISHED FLYING CROSS NATIONAL MEMORIAL IN RIVERSIDE, CALIFORNIA.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The most reliable statistics regarding the number of members of the Armed Forces who have been awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross indicate that 126,318 members of the Armed Forces received the medal during World War II, approximately 21,000 members received the medal during the Korean conflict, and 21,647 members received the medal during the Vietnam War. Since the end of the Vietnam War, more than 203 Armed Forces members have received the medal in times of conflict.

(2) The National Personnel Records Center in St. Louis, Missouri, burned down in 1973, and thus many more recipients of the Distinguished Flying Cross may be undocumented. Currently, the Department of Defense continues to locate and identify members of the Armed Forces who have received the medal and are undocumented.

(3) The United States currently lacks a national memorial dedicated to the bravery and sacrifice of those members of the Armed Forces who have distinguished themselves by heroic deeds performed in aerial flight.

(4) An appropriate memorial to current and former members of the Armed Forces is under construction at March Field Air Museum in Riverside, California.

(5) This memorial will honor all those members of the Armed Forces who have distinguished themselves in aerial flight, whether documentation of such members who earned the Distinguished Flying Cross exists or not.

(b) DESIGNATION.—The memorial to members of the Armed Forces who have been awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross, located at March Field Air Museum in Riverside, California, is hereby designated as the Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial.

(c) EFFECT OF DESIGNATION.—The national memorial designated by this section is not a unit of the National Park System, and the designation of the national memorial shall not be construed to require or permit Federal funds to be expended for any purpose related to the national memorial.

PASCUA YAQUI TRIBE TRUST LAND ACT

The bill (H.R. 507) to provide for the conveyance of certain land inholdings owned by the United States to the Pascua Yaqui of Arizona, and for other purposes, was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

H.R. 507

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Pascua Yaqui Tribe Trust Land Act''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

For the purposes of this Act, the following definitions apply:

(1) DISTRICT.—The term ''District'' means the Tucson Unified School District, a school district recognized as such under the laws of the State of Arizona.

(2) MAP.—The term ''map'' means the map titled ''PYT Land Department'' and dated January 15, 2013.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(4) TRIBE.—The term ''Tribe'' means the Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona, a federally recognized Indian tribe.

SEC. 3. LANDS TO BE HELD IN TRUST.

(a) PARCEL A.—Subject to subsection (c) and to valid existing rights, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the approximately 10 acres of Federal lands generally depicted on the map as Parcel A are declared to be held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Tribe.

(b) PARCEL B.—Subject to subsection (c) and valid existing rights, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the approximately 10 acres of Federal lands generally depicted on the map as Parcel B are declared to be held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Tribe.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsections (a) and (b) shall take effect on the day after the date on which—

(1) the District relinquishes all right, title, and interest of the District in and to the land described in subsection (b); and

(2) the Secretary (or a delegate of the Secretary) approves and records the lease agreement between the Tribe and the District for the construction and operation of a regional transportation facility located on the restricted Indian land of the Tribe in accordance with the requirements of the first section of the Act entitled ''An Act to authorize the leasing of restricted Indian lands for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, business, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases'', approved August 9, 1955 (25 U.S.C. 415), and part 162 of title 25, Code of Federal Regulations (including successor regulations).

SEC. 4. GAMING PROHIBITION.

The Tribe may not conduct gaming activities on the lands held in trust under this Act, as a matter of claimed inherent authority, or under the authority of any Federal law, including the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.) or under any regulations thereunder promulgated by the Secretary or the National Indian Gaming Commission.

SEC. 5. WATER RIGHTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There shall not be Federal reserved rights to surface water or groundwater for any land taken into trust by the United States for the benefit of the Tribe under this Act.

(b) STATE WATER RIGHTS.—The Tribe retains any right or claim to water under State law for any land taken into trust by the United States for the benefit of the Tribe under this Act.

(c) FORFEITURE OR ABANDONMENT.—Any water rights that are appurtenant to land taken into trust by the United States for the benefit of the Tribe under this Act may not be forfeited or abandoned.

(d) ADMINISTRATION.—Nothing in this Act affects or modifies any right of the Tribe or any obligation of the United States under Public Law 95–375 (25 U.S.C. 1300f et seq.).

THREE KIDS MINE REMEDIATION AND RECLAMATION ACT

The bill (H.R. 697) to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in Clark County, Nevada, for the environmental remediation and reclamation of the Three Kids Mine Project Site, and for other purposes, was ordered to a third reading, and was read the third time.

IDAHO WILDERNESS WATER RESOURCES PROTECTION ACT

The bill (H.R. 876) to authorize the continued use of certain water diversions located on National Forest System land in the Frank Church-River of No Return Wilderness and the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes, was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

H.R. 876

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Idaho Wilderness Water Resources Protection Act''.

SEC. 2. TREATMENT OF EXISTING WATER DIVERSIONS IN FRANK CHURCH-RIVER OF NO RETURN WILDERNESS AND SELWAY-BITTERROOT WILDERNESS, IDAHO.

(a) AUTHORIZATION FOR CONTINUED USE.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall issue a special use authorization to the owners of a water storage, transport, or diversion facility (in this section referred to as a ''facility'') located on National Forest System land in the Frank Church-River of No Return Wilderness and the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness for the continued operation, maintenance, and reconstruction of the facility if the Secretary determines that—

(1) the facility was in existence on the date on which the land upon which the facility is located was designated as part of the National Wilderness Preservation System (in this section referred to as ''the date of designation'');

(2) the facility has been in substantially continuous use to deliver water for the beneficial use on the owner's non-Federal land since the date of designation;

(3) the owner of the facility holds a valid water right for use of the water on the owner's non-Federal land under Idaho State law, with a priority date that predates the date of designation; and

(4) it is not practicable or feasible to relocate the facility to land outside of the wilderness and continue the beneficial use of water on the non-Federal land recognized under State law.

(b) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—

(1) REQUIRED TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—In a special use authorization issued under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(A) allow use of motorized equipment and mechanized transport for operation, maintenance, or reconstruction of a facility, if the Secretary determines that—

(i) the use is necessary to allow the facility to continue delivery of water to the non-Federal land for the beneficial uses recognized by the water right held under Idaho State law; and

(ii) the use of nonmotorized equipment and nonmechanized transport is impracticable or infeasible; and

(B) preclude use of the facility for the storage, diversion, or transport of water in excess of the water right recognized by the State of Idaho on the date of designation.

(2) DISCRETIONARY TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—In a special use authorization issued under subsection (a), the Secretary may—

(A) require or allow modification or relocation of the facility in the wilderness, as the Secretary determines necessary, to reduce impacts to wilderness values set forth in section 2 of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131) if the beneficial use of water on the non-Federal land is not diminished; and

(B) require that the owner provide a reciprocal right of access across the non-Federal property, in which case, the owner shall receive market value for any right-of-way or other interest in real property conveyed to the United States, and market value may be paid by the Secretary, in whole or in part, by the grant of a reciprocal right-of-way, or by reduction of fees or other costs that may accrue to the owner to obtain the authorization for water facilities.

NORTH CASCADES NATIONAL PARK SERVICE COMPLEX FISH STOCKING ACT

The bill (H.R. 1158) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to continue stocking fish in certain lakes in the North Cascades National Park, Ross Lake National Recreation Area, and Lake Chelan National Recreation Area, was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

H.R. 1158

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''North Cascades National Park Service Complex Fish Stocking Act''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) NORTH CASCADES NATIONAL PARK SERVICE COMPLEX.—The term ''North Cascades National Park Service Complex'' means collectively the North Cascades National Park, Ross Lake National Recreation Area, and Lake Chelan National Recreation Area.

(2) PLAN.—The term ''plan'' means the document entitled ''North Cascades National Park Service Complex Mountain Lakes Fishery Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement'' and dated June 2008.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. STOCKING OF CERTAIN LAKES IN THE NORTH CASCADES NATIONAL PARK SERVICE COMPLEX.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), the Secretary shall authorize the stocking of fish in lakes in the North Cascades National Park Service Complex.

(b) CONDITIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to allow stocking of fish in not more than 42 of the 91 lakes in the North Cascades National Park Service Complex that have historically been stocked with fish.

(2) NATIVE NONREPRODUCING FISH.—The Secretary shall only stock fish that are—

(A) native to the slope of the Cascade Range on which the lake to be stocked is located; and

(B) nonreproducing, as identified in management alternative B of the plan.

(3) CONSIDERATIONS.—In making fish stocking decisions under this Act, the Secretary shall consider relevant scientific information, including the plan and information gathered under subsection (c).

(4) REQUIRED COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall coordinate the stocking of fish under this Act with the State of Washington.

(c) RESEARCH AND MONITORING.—The Secretary shall—

(1) continue a program of research and monitoring of the impacts of fish stocking on the resources of the applicable unit of the North Cascades National Park Service Complex; and

(2) beginning on the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act and every 5 years thereafter, submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report that describes the results of the research and monitoring under paragraph (1).

LAKE HILL ADMINISTRATIVE SITE AFFORDABLE HOUSING ACT

The bill (H.R. 2337) to provide for the conveyance of the Forest Service Lake Hill Administrative Site in Summit County, Colorado, was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

H.R. 2337

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Lake Hill Administrative Site Affordable Housing Act''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) COUNTY.—The term ''County'' means Summit County, Colorado.

(2) LAKE HILL ADMINISTRATIVE SITE.—The term ''Lake Hill Administrative Site'' means the parcel of approximately 40 acres of National Forest System land in the County, as depicted on the map entitled ''Lake Hill Administrative Site'' and dated June 2012.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 3. CONVEYANCE OF FOREST SERVICE LAKE HILL ADMINISTRATIVE SITE, SUMMIT COUNTY, COLORADO.

(a) CONVEYANCE AUTHORITY.—Upon receipt of an offer from the County in which the County agrees to the condition imposed by subsection (c), the Secretary shall use the authority provided by the Forest Service Facility Realignment and Enhancement Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–54; 16 U.S.C. 580d note) to convey to the County all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Forest Service Lake Hill Administrative Site.

(b) APPLICATION OF LAW.—

(1) TREATMENT AS ADMINISTRATIVE SITE.—The Lake Hill Administrative Site is considered to be an administrative site under section 502(1)(A) of the Forest Service Facility Realignment and Enhancement Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–54; 16 U.S.C. 580d note).

(2) EXCEPTION.—Section 502(1)(C) of that Act does not apply to the conveyance of the Lake Hill Administrative Site.

(c) COSTS.—The County shall be responsible for processing and transaction costs related to the direct sale under subsection (a).

(d) PROCEEDS.—Proceeds received from the conveyance pursuant to subsection (a) shall be available, without further appropriation and until expended, for capital improvement and maintenance of Forest Service facilities in Region 2 of the United States Forest Service.

HUNA TLINGIT TRADITIONAL GULL EGG USE ACT

The bill (H.R. 3110) to allow for the harvest of gull eggs by the Huna Tlingit people within Glacier Bay National Park in the State of Alaska, was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

H.R. 3110

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Huna Tlingit Traditional Gull Egg Use Act''.

SEC. 2. LIMITED AUTHORIZATION FOR COLLECTION OF GULL EGGS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior (referred to in this Act as the ''Secretary'') may allow the collection by members of the Hoonah Indian Association of the eggs of glaucous-winged gulls (Laurus glaucescens) within Glacier Bay National Park (referred to in this Act as the ''Park'') not more frequently than twice each calendar year at up to 5 locations within the Park, subject to any terms and conditions that the Secretary determines to be necessary.

(b) APPLICABLE LAW.—For the purposes of sections 203 and 816 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 410hh–2, 3126), the collection of eggs of glaucous-winged gulls within the Park in accordance with subsection (a) shall be considered to be a use specifically permitted by that Act.

(c) HARVEST PLAN.—The Secretary shall establish schedules, locations, and any additional terms and conditions that the Secretary determines to be necessary for the harvesting of eggs of glaucous-winged gulls in the Park, based on an annual harvest plan to be prepared by the Secretary and the Hoonah Indian Association.

HARRIET TUBMAN NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARKS ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 247) to establish the Harriet Tubman National Historical Park in Auburn, New York, and the Harriet Tubman Underground Railroad National Historical Park in Caroline, Dorchester, and Talbot Counties, Maryland, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment; as follows:

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The bill, as amended, is as follows:

[Insert the part printed in italic]

S. 247

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Harriet Tubman National Historical Parks Act''.

SEC. 2. HARRIET TUBMAN UNDERGROUND RAILROAD NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK, MARYLAND.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) HISTORICAL PARK.—The term ''historical park'' means the Harriet Tubman Underground Railroad National Historical Park established by subsection (b)(1)(A).

(2) MAP.—The term ''map'' means the map entitled ''Authorized Acquisition Area for the Proposed Harriet Tubman Underground Railroad National Historical Park'', numbered T20/80,001, and dated July 2010.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(4) STATE.—The term ''State'' means the State of Maryland.

(b) HARRIET TUBMAN UNDERGROUND RAILROAD NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), there is established the Harriet Tubman Underground Railroad National Historical Park in Caroline, Dorchester, and Talbot Counties, Maryland, as a unit of the National Park System.

(B) DETERMINATION BY SECRETARY.—The historical park shall not be established until the date on which the Secretary determines that a sufficient quantity of land, or interests in land, has been acquired to constitute a manageable park unit.

(C) NOTICE.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Secretary makes a determination under subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register notice of the establishment of the historical park, including an official boundary map for the historical park.

(D) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The official boundary map published under subparagraph (C) shall be on file and available for public inspection in appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

(2) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the historical park is to preserve and interpret for the benefit of present and future generations the historical, cultural, and natural resources associated with the life of Harriet Tubman and the Underground Railroad.

(3) LAND ACQUISITION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may acquire land and interests in land within the areas depicted on the map as ''Authorized Acquisition Areas'' by purchase from willing sellers, donation, or exchange.

(B) BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.—On acquisition of land or an interest in land under subparagraph (A), the boundary of the historical park shall be adjusted to reflect the acquisition.

(c) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall administer the historical park in accordance with this section and the laws generally applicable to units of the National Park System, including—

(A) the National Park System Organic Act (16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.); and

(B) the Act of August 21, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 461 et seq.).

(2) INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the historical park is established, the Director of the National Park Service and the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service shall enter into an agreement to allow the National Park Service to provide for public interpretation of historic resources located within the boundary of the Blackwater National Wildlife Refuge that are associated with the life of Harriet Tubman, consistent with the management requirements of the Refuge.

(3) INTERPRETIVE TOURS.—The Secretary may provide interpretive tours to sites and resources located outside the boundary of the historical park in Caroline, Dorchester, and Talbot Counties, Maryland, relating to the life of Harriet Tubman and the Underground Railroad.

(4) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may enter into a cooperative agreement with the State, political subdivisions of the State, colleges and universities, non-profit organizations, and individuals—

(i) to mark, interpret, and restore nationally significant historic or cultural resources relating to the life of Harriet Tubman or the Underground Railroad within the boundaries of the historical park, if the agreement provides for reasonable public access; or

(ii) to conduct research relating to the life of Harriet Tubman and the Underground Railroad.

(B) VISITOR CENTER.—The Secretary may enter into a cooperative agreement with the State to design, construct, operate, and maintain a joint visitor center on land owned by the State—

(i) to provide for National Park Service visitor and interpretive facilities for the historical park; and

(ii) to provide to the Secretary, at no additional cost, sufficient office space to administer the historical park.

(C) COST-SHARING REQUIREMENT.—

(i) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the total cost of any activity carried out under this paragraph shall not exceed 50 percent.

(ii) FORM OF NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal share of the cost of carrying out an activity under this paragraph may be in the form of in-kind contributions or goods or services fairly valued.

(d) GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are made available to carry out this section, the Secretary shall prepare a general management plan for the historical park in accordance with section 12(b) of the National Park Service General Authorities Act (16 U.S.C. 1a–7(b)).

(2) CONSULTATION.—The general management plan shall be prepared in consultation with the State (including political subdivisions of the State).

(3) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall coordinate the preparation and implementation of the management plan with—

(A) the Blackwater National Wildlife Refuge;

(B) the Harriet Tubman National Historical Park established by section 3(b)(1)(A); and

(C) the National Underground Railroad Network to Freedom.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this section.

SEC. 3. HARRIET TUBMAN NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK, AUBURN, NEW YORK.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) HISTORICAL PARK.—The term ''historical park'' means the Harriet Tubman National Historical Park established by subsection (b)(1)(A).

(2) HOME.—The term ''Home'' means The Harriet Tubman Home, Inc., located in Auburn, New York.

(3) MAP.—The term ''map'' means the map entitled ''Harriet Tubman National Historical Park'', numbered T18/80,000, and dated March 2009.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(5) STATE.—The term ''State'' means the State of New York.

(b) HARRIET TUBMAN NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), there is established the Harriet Tubman National Historical Park in Auburn, New York, as a unit of the National Park System.

(B) DETERMINATION BY SECRETARY.—The historical park shall not be established until the date on which the Secretary determines that a sufficient quantity of land, or interests in land, has been acquired to constitute a manageable park unit.

(C) NOTICE.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Secretary makes a determination under subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register notice of the establishment of the historical park.

(D) MAP.—The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

(2) BOUNDARY.—The historical park shall include the Harriet Tubman Home, the Tubman Home for the Aged, the Thompson Memorial AME Zion Church and Rectory, and associated land, as identified in the area entitled ''National Historical Park Proposed Boundary'' on the map.

(3) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the historical park is to preserve and interpret for the benefit of present and future generations the historical, cultural, and natural resources associated with the life of Harriet Tubman.

(4) LAND ACQUISITION.—The Secretary may acquire land and interests in land within the areas depicted on the map by purchase from a willing seller, donation, or exchange.

(c) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall administer the historical park in accordance with this section and the laws generally applicable to units of the National Park System, including—

(A) the National Park System Organic Act (16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.); and

(B) the Act of August 21, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 461 et seq.).

(2) INTERPRETIVE TOURS.—The Secretary may provide interpretive tours to sites and resources located outside the boundary of the historical park in Auburn, New York, relating to the life of Harriet Tubman.

(3) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may enter into a cooperative agreement with the owner of any land within the historical park to mark, interpret, or restore nationally significant historic or cultural resources relating to the life of Harriet Tubman, if the agreement provides that—

(i) the Secretary shall have the right of access to any public portions of the land covered by the agreement to allow for—

(I) access at reasonable times by historical park visitors to the land; and

(II) interpretation of the land for the public; and

(ii) no changes or alterations shall be made to the land except by mutual agreement of the Secretary and the owner of the land.

(B) RESEARCH.—The Secretary may enter into a cooperative agreement with the State, political subdivisions of the State, institutions of higher education, the Home and other nonprofit organizations, and individuals to conduct research relating to the life of Harriet Tubman.

(C) COST-SHARING REQUIREMENT.—

(i) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the total cost of any activity carried out under this paragraph shall not exceed 50 percent.

(ii) FORM OF NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal share may be in the form of in-kind contributions or goods or services fairly valued.

(D) ATTORNEY GENERAL.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall submit to the Attorney General for review any cooperative agreement under this paragraph involving religious property or property owned by a religious institution.

(ii) FINDING.—No cooperative agreement subject to review under this subparagraph shall take effect until the date on which the Attorney General issues a finding that the proposed agreement does not violate the Establishment Clause of the first amendment to the Constitution.

(d) GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are made available to carry out this section, the Secretary shall prepare a general management plan for the historical park in accordance with section 12(b) of the National Park Service General Authorities Act (16 U.S.C. 1a–7(b)).

(2) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall coordinate the preparation and implementation of the management plan with—

(A) the Harriet Tubman Underground Railroad National Historical Park established by section 2(b)(1); and

(B) the National Underground Railroad Network to Freedom.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this Act, except that not more than $7,500,000 shall be available to provide financial assistance under subsection (c)(3).

SEC. 4. OFFSET.

Section 101(b)(12) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–303; 110 Stat. 3667) is amended by striking ''$53,852,000'' and inserting ''$29,852,000''.

LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER AREA STUDY ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 311) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating sites in the Lower Mississippi River Area in the State of Louisiana as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment, as follows:

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The bill, as amended, is as follows:

[The parts of the bill intended to be stricken are shown in boldface brackets and the parts of the bill intended to be inserted are shown in italics]

S. 311

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Lower Mississippi River Area Study Act''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) STUDY AREA.—The term ''study area'' includes Fort St. Philip, Fort Jackson, the Head of Passes, and any related and supporting historical, cultural, and recreational resources located in Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana.

SEC. 3. STUDY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are made available to carry out this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the State of Louisiana and other interested organizations, shall complete a special resource study that evaluates—

(1) the national significance of the study area; and

(2) the suitability and feasibility of designating the study area as a unit of the National Park System.

(b) CRITERIA.—In conducting the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall use the criteria for the study of areas for potential inclusion in the National Park System in section 8(c) of National Park System General Authorities Act (16 U.S.C. 1a–5(c)).

(c) CONTENT.—The study described in subsection (a) shall—

(1) include cost estimates for the potential acquisition, development, operation, and maintenance of the study area; and

(2) identify alternatives for the management, administration, and protection of the study area.

SEC. 4. DONATIONS.

The Secretary may accept the donation of funds to carry out this Act.

[SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this Act.]

The amendment (No. 3528) was agreed to, as follows:

On page 3, strike lines 10 through 12 and insert the following:

SEC. 4. AGREEMENT; DONATIONS.

The study described in section 3 shall not be conducted until the date on which—

(1) the Secretary enters into an agreement with a State, unit of local government, or other entity to conduct the study using non-Federal funds; or

(2) the Secretary receives a donation of an amount of non-Federal funds sufficient to pay the cost of conducting the study.

OREGON CAVES REVITALIZATION ACT OF 2013

The bill (S. 354) to modify the boundary of the Oregon Caves National Monument, and for other purposes, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

S. 354

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Oregon Caves Revitalization Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) MAP.—The term ''map'' means the map entitled ''Oregon Caves National Monument and Preserve'', numbered 150/80,023, and dated May 2010.

(2) MONUMENT.—The term ''Monument'' means the Oregon Caves National Monument established by Presidential Proclamation Number 876 (36 Stat. 2497), dated July 12, 1909.

(3) NATIONAL MONUMENT AND PRESERVE.—The term ''National Monument and Preserve'' means the Oregon Caves National Monument and Preserve designated by section 3(a)(1).

(4) NATIONAL PRESERVE.—The term ''National Preserve'' means the National Preserve designated by section 3(a)(2).

(5) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(6) SECRETARY CONCERNED.—The term ''Secretary concerned'' means—

(A) the Secretary of Agriculture (acting through the Chief of the Forest Service), with respect to National Forest System land; and

(B) the Secretary of the Interior, with respect to land managed by the Bureau of Land Management.

(7) STATE.—The term ''State'' means the State of Oregon.

SEC. 3. DESIGNATIONS; LAND TRANSFER; BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.

(a) DESIGNATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Monument and the National Preserve shall be administered as a single unit of the National Park System and collectively known and designated as the ''Oregon Caves National Monument and Preserve''.

(2) NATIONAL PRESERVE.—The approximately 4,070 acres of land identified on the map as ''Proposed Addition Lands'' shall be designated as a National Preserve.

(b) TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Administrative jurisdiction over the land designated as a National Preserve under subsection (a)(2) is transferred from the Secretary of Agriculture to the Secretary, to be administered as part of the National Monument and Preserve.

(2) EXCLUSION OF LAND.—The boundaries of the Rogue River-Siskiyou National Forest are adjusted to exclude the land transferred under paragraph (1).

(c) BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.—The boundary of the National Monument and Preserve is modified to exclude approximately 4 acres of land—

(1) located in the City of Cave Junction; and

(2) identified on the map as the ''Cave Junction Unit''.

(d) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

(e) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Monument shall be considered to be a reference to the ''Oregon Caves National Monument and Preserve''.

SEC. 4. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall administer the National Monument and Preserve in accordance with—

(1) this Act;

(2) Presidential Proclamation Number 876 (36 Stat. 2497), dated July 12, 1909; and

(3) any law (including regulations) generally applicable to units of the National Park System, including the National Park Service Organic Act (16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.).

(b) FIRE MANAGEMENT.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, in accordance with subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) revise the fire management plan for the Monument to include the land transferred under section 3(b)(1); and

(2) in accordance with the revised plan, carry out hazardous fuel management activities within the boundaries of the National Monument and Preserve.

(c) EXISTING FOREST SERVICE CONTRACTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall—

(A) allow for the completion of any Forest Service stewardship or service contract executed as of the date of enactment of this Act with respect to the National Preserve; and

(B) recognize the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture for the purpose of administering a contract described in subparagraph (A) through the completion of the contract.

(2) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—All terms and conditions of a contract described in paragraph (1)(A) shall remain in place for the duration of the contract.

(3) LIABILITY.—The Forest Service shall be responsible for any liabilities relating to a contract described in paragraph (1)(A).

(d) GRAZING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary may allow the grazing of livestock within the National Preserve to continue as authorized under permits or leases in existence as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) APPLICABLE LAW.—Grazing under paragraph (1) shall be—

(A) at a level not greater than the level at which the grazing exists as of the date of enactment of this Act, as measured in Animal Unit Months; and

(B) in accordance with each applicable law (including National Park Service regulations).

(e) FISH AND WILDLIFE.—The Secretary shall permit hunting and fishing on land and waters within the National Preserve in accordance with applicable Federal and State laws, except that the Secretary may, in consultation with the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, designate zones in which, and establish periods during which, no hunting or fishing shall be permitted for reasons of public safety, administration, or compliance by the Secretary with any applicable law (including regulations).

SEC. 5. VOLUNTARY GRAZING LEASE OR PERMIT DONATION PROGRAM.

(a) DONATION OF LEASE OR PERMIT.—

(1) ACCEPTANCE BY SECRETARY CONCERNED.—The Secretary concerned shall accept a grazing lease or permit that is donated by a lessee or permittee for—

(A) the Big Grayback Grazing Allotment located in the Rogue River-Siskiyou National Forest; and

(B) the Billy Mountain Grazing Allotment located on a parcel of land that is managed by the Secretary (acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management).

(2) TERMINATION.—With respect to each grazing permit or lease donated under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

(A) terminate the grazing permit or lease; and

(B) ensure a permanent end to grazing on the land covered by the grazing permit or lease.

(b) EFFECT OF DONATION.—A lessee or permittee that donates a grazing lease or grazing permit (or a portion of a grazing lease or grazing permit) under this section shall be considered to have waived any claim to any range improvement on the associated grazing allotment or portion of the associated grazing allotment, as applicable.

SEC. 6. WILD AND SCENIC RIVER DESIGNATIONS.

(a) DESIGNATION.—Section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(208) RIVER STYX, OREGON.—The subterranean segment of Cave Creek, known as the River Styx, to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior as a scenic river.''.

(b) POTENTIAL ADDITIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 5(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1276(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(141) OREGON CAVES NATIONAL MONUMENT AND PRESERVE, OREGON.—

''(A) CAVE CREEK, OREGON.—The 2.6-mile segment of Cave Creek from the headwaters at the River Styx to the boundary of the Rogue River Siskiyou National Forest.

''(B) LAKE CREEK, OREGON.—The 3.6-mile segment of Lake Creek from the headwaters at Bigelow Lakes to the confluence with Cave Creek.

''(C) NO NAME CREEK, OREGON.—The 0.6-mile segment of No Name Creek from the headwaters to the confluence with Cave Creek.

''(D) PANTHER CREEK.—The 0.8-mile segment of Panther Creek from the headwaters to the confluence with Lake Creek.

''(E) UPPER CAVE CREEK.—The segment of Upper Cave Creek from the headwaters to the confluence with River Styx.''.

(2) STUDY; REPORT.—Section 5(b) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1276(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(20) OREGON CAVES NATIONAL MONUMENT AND PRESERVE, OREGON.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are made available to carry out this paragraph, the Secretary shall—

''(A) complete the study of the Oregon Caves National Monument and Preserve segments described in subsection (a)(141); and

''(B) submit to Congress a report containing the results of the study.''.

GEOTHERMAL PRODUCTION EXPANSION ACT OF 2013

The bill (S. 363) to expand geothermal production, and for other purposes, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

S. 363

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Geothermal Production Expansion Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. NONCOMPETITIVE LEASING OF ADJOINING AREAS FOR DEVELOPMENT OF GEOTHERMAL RESOURCES.

Section 4(b) of the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 (30 U.S.C. 1003(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(4) ADJOINING LAND.—

''(A) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

''(i) FAIR MARKET VALUE PER ACRE.—The term 'fair market value per acre' means a dollar amount per acre that—

''(I) except as provided in this clause, shall be equal to the market value per acre (taking into account the determination under subparagraph (B)(iii) regarding a valid discovery on the adjoining land) as determined by the Secretary under regulations issued under this paragraph;

''(II) shall be determined by the Secretary with respect to a lease under this paragraph, by not later than the end of the 180-day period beginning on the date the Secretary receives an application for the lease; and

''(III) shall be not less than the greater of—

''(aa) 4 times the median amount paid per acre for all land leased under this Act during the preceding year; or

''(bb) $50.

''(ii) INDUSTRY STANDARDS.—The term 'industry standards' means the standards by which a qualified geothermal professional assesses whether downhole or flowing temperature measurements with indications of permeability are sufficient to produce energy from geothermal resources, as determined through flow or injection testing or measurement of lost circulation while drilling.

''(iii) QUALIFIED FEDERAL LAND.—The term 'qualified Federal land' means land that is otherwise available for leasing under this Act.

''(iv) QUALIFIED GEOTHERMAL PROFESSIONAL.—The term 'qualified geothermal professional' means an individual who is an engineer or geoscientist in good professional standing with at least 5 years of experience in geothermal exploration, development, or project assessment.

''(v) QUALIFIED LESSEE.—The term 'qualified lessee' means a person that may hold a geothermal lease under this Act (including applicable regulations).

''(vi) VALID DISCOVERY.—The term 'valid discovery' means a discovery of a geothermal resource by a new or existing slim hole or production well, that exhibits downhole or flowing temperature measurements with indications of permeability that are sufficient to meet industry standards.

''(B) AUTHORITY.—An area of qualified Federal land that adjoins other land for which a qualified lessee holds a legal right to develop geothermal resources may be available for a noncompetitive lease under this section to the qualified lessee at the fair market value per acre, if—

''(i) the area of qualified Federal land—

''(I) consists of not less than 1 acre and not more than 640 acres; and

''(II) is not already leased under this Act or nominated to be leased under subsection (a);

''(ii) the qualified lessee has not previously received a noncompetitive lease under this paragraph in connection with the valid discovery for which data has been submitted under clause (iii)(I); and

''(iii) sufficient geological and other technical data prepared by a qualified geothermal professional has been submitted by the qualified lessee to the applicable Federal land management agency that would lead individuals who are experienced in the subject matter to believe that—

''(I) there is a valid discovery of geothermal resources on the land for which the qualified lessee holds the legal right to develop geothermal resources; and

''(II) that thermal feature extends into the adjoining areas.

''(C) DETERMINATION OF FAIR MARKET VALUE.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall—

''(I) publish a notice of any request to lease land under this paragraph;

''(II) determine fair market value for purposes of this paragraph in accordance with procedures for making those determinations that are established by regulations issued by the Secretary;

''(III) provide to a qualified lessee and publish, with an opportunity for public comment for a period of 30 days, any proposed determination under this subparagraph of the fair market value of an area that the qualified lessee seeks to lease under this paragraph; and

''(IV) provide to the qualified lessee and any adversely affected party the opportunity to appeal the final determination of fair market value in an administrative proceeding before the applicable Federal land management agency, in accordance with applicable law (including regulations).

''(ii) LIMITATION ON NOMINATION.—After publication of a notice of request to lease land under this paragraph, the Secretary may not accept under subsection (a) any nomination of the land for leasing unless the request has been denied or withdrawn.

''(iii) ANNUAL RENTAL.—For purposes of section 5(a)(3), a lease awarded under this paragraph shall be considered a lease awarded in a competitive lease sale.

''(D) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of the Geothermal Production Expansion Act of 2013, the Secretary shall issue regulations to carry out this paragraph.''.

THE CHESAPEAKE AND OHIO CANAL NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK COMMISSION EXTENSION ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 476) to amend the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Development Act to extend to the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park Commission, which had been reported from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

The committee substitute was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The bill, as amended, is as follows:

[Insert the part printed in italic]

S. 476

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

SECTION 1. CHESAPEAKE AND OHIO CANAL NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK COMMISSION.

The Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park Commission (referred to in this Act as the ''Commission'') is authorized in accordance with the provisions of section 6 of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Development Act (16 U.S.C. 410y–4), except that the Commission shall terminate 10 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

SAN JUAN COUNTY FEDERAL LAND CONVEYANCE ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 609) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land in San Juan County, New Mexico, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with amendments; as follows:

(The parts of the bill intended to be stricken are shown in boldface brackets and the parts of the bill intended to be inserted are shown in italics.)

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The bill, as amended, is as follows:

[Insert the part printed in italic]

S. 609

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''San Juan County Federal Land Conveyance Act''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) FEDERAL LAND.—The term ''Federal land'' means the approximately 19 acres of [Federal land] *Federal surface estate* generally depicted as ''Lands Authorized for Conveyance'' on the map.

(2) LANDOWNER.—The term ''landowner'' means the plaintiffs in the case styled Blancett v. United States Department of the Interior, et al., No. 10–cv–00254–JAP–KBM, United States District Court for the District of New Mexico.

(3) MAP.—The term ''map'' means the map entitled ''San Juan County Land Conveyance'' and dated June 20, 2012.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(5) STATE.—The term ''State'' means the State of New Mexico.

SEC. 3. CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LAND IN SAN JUAN COUNTY, NEW MEXICO.

(a) IN GENERAL.—On request of the landowner, the Secretary shall, under such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe *and subject to valid existing rights*, convey to the landowner all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to any portion of the Federal land (including any improvements or appurtenances to the Federal land) by sale.

(b) SURVEY; ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—

(1) SURVEY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the Federal land to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey approved by the Secretary.

(2) COSTS.—The administrative costs associated with the conveyance shall be paid by the landowner.

(c) CONSIDERATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As consideration for the conveyance of the Federal land under subsection (a), the landowner shall pay to the Secretary an amount equal to the fair market value of the Federal land conveyed, as determined under paragraph (2).

(2) APPRAISAL.—The fair market value of any Federal land that is conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined by an appraisal acceptable to the Secretary that is performed in accordance with—

(A) the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions;

(B) the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice; and

(C) any other applicable law (including regulations).

(d) DISPOSITION AND USE OF PROCEEDS.—

(1) DISPOSITION OF PROCEEDS.—The Secretary shall deposit the proceeds of any conveyance of Federal land under subsection (a) in a special account in the Treasury for use in accordance with paragraph (2).

(2) USE OF PROCEEDS.—Amounts deposited under paragraph (1) shall be available to the Secretary, without further appropriation and until expended, for the acquisition of land or interests in land from willing sellers in the State for resource protection that is consistent with the purposes for which the Bald Eagle Area of Critical Environmental Concern in the State was established.

(e) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions for a conveyance under subsection (a) as the Secretary determines to be appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(f) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, the Federal land is withdrawn from—

(1) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(2) disposition under all laws relating to mineral and geothermal leasing or mineral materials.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendments to S. 247, S. 311, S. 476, and S. 609 be agreed to; the Coburn amendment to S. 311 be agreed to; that the bills be read three times and passed en bloc; and the motions to reconsider be considered made, with no intervening action or debate.

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

The bills (H.R. 255, H.R. 291, H.R. 330, H.R. 356, H.R. 507, H.R. 697, H.R. 876, H.R. 1158, H.R. 2337 and H.R. 3119) were read the third time and passed.

The bills (S. 354 and S. 363) were passed, as follows:

S. 354

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Oregon Caves Revitalization Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) MAP.—The term ''map'' means the map entitled ''Oregon Caves National Monument and Preserve'', numbered 150/80,023, and dated May 2010.

(2) MONUMENT.—The term ''Monument'' means the Oregon Caves National Monument established by Presidential Proclamation Number 876 (36 Stat. 2497), dated July 12, 1909.

(3) NATIONAL MONUMENT AND PRESERVE.—The term ''National Monument and Preserve'' means the Oregon Caves National Monument and Preserve designated by section 3(a)(1).

(4) NATIONAL PRESERVE.—The term ''National Preserve'' means the National Preserve designated by section 3(a)(2).

(5) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(6) SECRETARY CONCERNED.—The term ''Secretary concerned'' means—

(A) the Secretary of Agriculture (acting through the Chief of the Forest Service), with respect to National Forest System land; and

(B) the Secretary of the Interior, with respect to land managed by the Bureau of Land Management.

(7) STATE.—The term ''State'' means the State of Oregon.

SEC. 3. DESIGNATIONS; LAND TRANSFER; BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.

(a) DESIGNATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Monument and the National Preserve shall be administered as a single unit of the National Park System and collectively known and designated as the ''Oregon Caves National Monument and Preserve''.

(2) NATIONAL PRESERVE.—The approximately 4,070 acres of land identified on the map as ''Proposed Addition Lands'' shall be designated as a National Preserve.

(b) TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Administrative jurisdiction over the land designated as a National Preserve under subsection (a)(2) is transferred from the Secretary of Agriculture to the Secretary, to be administered as part of the National Monument and Preserve.

(2) EXCLUSION OF LAND.—The boundaries of the Rogue River-Siskiyou National Forest are adjusted to exclude the land transferred under paragraph (1).

(c) BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.—The boundary of the National Monument and Preserve is modified to exclude approximately 4 acres of land—

(1) located in the City of Cave Junction; and

(2) identified on the map as the ''Cave Junction Unit''.

(d) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

(e) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Monument shall be considered to be a reference to the ''Oregon Caves National Monument and Preserve''.

SEC. 4. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall administer the National Monument and Preserve in accordance with—

(1) this Act;

(2) Presidential Proclamation Number 876 (36 Stat. 2497), dated July 12, 1909; and

(3) any law (including regulations) generally applicable to units of the National Park System, including the National Park Service Organic Act (16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.).

(b) FIRE MANAGEMENT.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, in accordance with subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) revise the fire management plan for the Monument to include the land transferred under section 3(b)(1); and

(2) in accordance with the revised plan, carry out hazardous fuel management activities within the boundaries of the National Monument and Preserve.

(c) EXISTING FOREST SERVICE CONTRACTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall—

(A) allow for the completion of any Forest Service stewardship or service contract executed as of the date of enactment of this Act with respect to the National Preserve; and

(B) recognize the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture for the purpose of administering a contract described in subparagraph (A) through the completion of the contract.

(2) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—All terms and conditions of a contract described in paragraph (1)(A) shall remain in place for the duration of the contract.

(3) LIABILITY.—The Forest Service shall be responsible for any liabilities relating to a contract described in paragraph (1)(A).

(d) GRAZING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary may allow the grazing of livestock within the National Preserve to continue as authorized under permits or leases in existence as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) APPLICABLE LAW.—Grazing under paragraph (1) shall be—

(A) at a level not greater than the level at which the grazing exists as of the date of enactment of this Act, as measured in Animal Unit Months; and

(B) in accordance with each applicable law (including National Park Service regulations).

(e) FISH AND WILDLIFE.—The Secretary shall permit hunting and fishing on land and waters within the National Preserve in accordance with applicable Federal and State laws, except that the Secretary may, in consultation with the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, designate zones in which, and establish periods during which, no hunting or fishing shall be permitted for reasons of public safety, administration, or compliance by the Secretary with any applicable law (including regulations).

SEC. 5. VOLUNTARY GRAZING LEASE OR PERMIT DONATION PROGRAM.

(a) DONATION OF LEASE OR PERMIT.—

(1) ACCEPTANCE BY SECRETARY CONCERNED.—The Secretary concerned shall accept a grazing lease or permit that is donated by a lessee or permittee for—

(A) the Big Grayback Grazing Allotment located in the Rogue River-Siskiyou National Forest; and

(B) the Billy Mountain Grazing Allotment located on a parcel of land that is managed by the Secretary (acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management).

(2) TERMINATION.—With respect to each grazing permit or lease donated under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

(A) terminate the grazing permit or lease; and

(B) ensure a permanent end to grazing on the land covered by the grazing permit or lease.

(b) EFFECT OF DONATION.—A lessee or permittee that donates a grazing lease or grazing permit (or a portion of a grazing lease or grazing permit) under this section shall be considered to have waived any claim to any range improvement on the associated grazing allotment or portion of the associated grazing allotment, as applicable.

SEC. 6. WILD AND SCENIC RIVER DESIGNATIONS.

(a) DESIGNATION.—Section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(208) RIVER STYX, OREGON.—The subterranean segment of Cave Creek, known as the River Styx, to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior as a scenic river.''.

(b) POTENTIAL ADDITIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 5(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1276(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(141) OREGON CAVES NATIONAL MONUMENT AND PRESERVE, OREGON.—

''(A) CAVE CREEK, OREGON.—The 2.6-mile segment of Cave Creek from the headwaters at the River Styx to the boundary of the Rogue River Siskiyou National Forest.

''(B) LAKE CREEK, OREGON.—The 3.6-mile segment of Lake Creek from the headwaters at Bigelow Lakes to the confluence with Cave Creek.

''(C) NO NAME CREEK, OREGON.—The 0.6-mile segment of No Name Creek from the headwaters to the confluence with Cave Creek.

''(D) PANTHER CREEK.—The 0.8-mile segment of Panther Creek from the headwaters to the confluence with Lake Creek.

''(E) UPPER CAVE CREEK.—The segment of Upper Cave Creek from the headwaters to the confluence with River Styx.''.

(2) STUDY; REPORT.—Section 5(b) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1276(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(20) OREGON CAVES NATIONAL MONUMENT AND PRESERVE, OREGON.—Not later than 3

years after the date on which funds are made available to carry out this paragraph, the Secretary shall—

''(A) complete the study of the Oregon Caves National Monument and Preserve segments described in subsection (a)(141); and

''(B) submit to Congress a report containing the results of the study.''.

S. 363

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Geothermal Production Expansion Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. NONCOMPETITIVE LEASING OF ADJOINING AREAS FOR DEVELOPMENT OF GEOTHERMAL RESOURCES.

Section 4(b) of the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 (30 U.S.C. 1003(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(4) ADJOINING LAND.—

''(A) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

''(i) FAIR MARKET VALUE PER ACRE.—The term 'fair market value per acre' means a dollar amount per acre that—

''(I) except as provided in this clause, shall be equal to the market value per acre (taking into account the determination under subparagraph (B)(iii) regarding a valid discovery on the adjoining land) as determined by the Secretary under regulations issued under this paragraph;

''(II) shall be determined by the Secretary with respect to a lease under this paragraph, by not later than the end of the 180-day period beginning on the date the Secretary receives an application for the lease; and

''(III) shall be not less than the greater of—

''(aa) 4 times the median amount paid per acre for all land leased under this Act during the preceding year; or

''(bb) $50.

''(ii) INDUSTRY STANDARDS.—The term 'industry standards' means the standards by which a qualified geothermal professional assesses whether downhole or flowing temperature measurements with indications of permeability are sufficient to produce energy from geothermal resources, as determined through flow or injection testing or measurement of lost circulation while drilling.

''(iii) QUALIFIED FEDERAL LAND.—The term 'qualified Federal land' means land that is otherwise available for leasing under this Act.

''(iv) QUALIFIED GEOTHERMAL PROFESSIONAL.—The term 'qualified geothermal professional' means an individual who is an engineer or geoscientist in good professional standing with at least 5 years of experience in geothermal exploration, development, or project assessment.

''(v) QUALIFIED LESSEE.—The term 'qualified lessee' means a person that may hold a geothermal lease under this Act (including applicable regulations).

''(vi) VALID DISCOVERY.—The term 'valid discovery' means a discovery of a geothermal resource by a new or existing slim hole or production well, that exhibits downhole or flowing temperature measurements with indications of permeability that are sufficient to meet industry standards.

''(B) AUTHORITY.—An area of qualified Federal land that adjoins other land for which a qualified lessee holds a legal right to develop geothermal resources may be available for a noncompetitive lease under this section to the qualified lessee at the fair market value per acre, if—

''(i) the area of qualified Federal land—

''(I) consists of not less than 1 acre and not more than 640 acres; and

''(II) is not already leased under this Act or nominated to be leased under subsection (a);

''(ii) the qualified lessee has not previously received a noncompetitive lease under this paragraph in connection with the valid discovery for which data has been submitted under clause (iii)(I); and

''(iii) sufficient geological and other technical data prepared by a qualified geothermal professional has been submitted by the qualified lessee to the applicable Federal land management agency that would lead individuals who are experienced in the subject matter to believe that—

''(I) there is a valid discovery of geothermal resources on the land for which the qualified lessee holds the legal right to develop geothermal resources; and

''(II) that thermal feature extends into the adjoining areas.

''(C) DETERMINATION OF FAIR MARKET VALUE.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall—

''(I) publish a notice of any request to lease land under this paragraph;

''(II) determine fair market value for purposes of this paragraph in accordance with procedures for making those determinations that are established by regulations issued by the Secretary;

''(III) provide to a qualified lessee and publish, with an opportunity for public comment for a period of 30 days, any proposed determination under this subparagraph of the fair market value of an area that the qualified lessee seeks to lease under this paragraph; and

''(IV) provide to the qualified lessee and any adversely affected party the opportunity to appeal the final determination of fair market value in an administrative proceeding before the applicable Federal land management agency, in accordance with applicable law (including regulations).

''(ii) LIMITATION ON NOMINATION.—After publication of a notice of request to lease land under this paragraph, the Secretary may not accept under subsection (a) any nomination of the land for leasing unless the request has been denied or withdrawn.

''(iii) ANNUAL RENTAL.—For purposes of section 5(a)(3), a lease awarded under this paragraph shall be considered a lease awarded in a competitive lease sale.

''(D) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of the Geothermal Production Expansion Act of 2013, the Secretary shall issue regulations to carry out this paragraph.''.

The bills (S. 247, S. 311, S. 476 and S. 609, as amended, were ordered to be engrossed for the third reading, were read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 247

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Harriet Tubman National Historical Parks Act''.

SEC. 2. HARRIET TUBMAN UNDERGROUND RAILROAD NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK, MARYLAND.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) HISTORICAL PARK.—The term ''historical park'' means the Harriet Tubman Underground Railroad National Historical Park established by subsection (b)(1)(A).

(2) MAP.—The term ''map'' means the map entitled ''Authorized Acquisition Area for the Proposed Harriet Tubman Underground Railroad National Historical Park'', numbered T20/80,001, and dated July 2010.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(4) STATE.—The term ''State'' means the State of Maryland.

(b) HARRIET TUBMAN UNDERGROUND RAILROAD NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), there is established the Harriet Tubman Underground Railroad National Historical Park in Caroline, Dorchester, and Talbot Counties, Maryland, as a unit of the National Park System.

(B) DETERMINATION BY SECRETARY.—The historical park shall not be established until the date on which the Secretary determines that a sufficient quantity of land, or interests in land, has been acquired to constitute a manageable park unit.

(C) NOTICE.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Secretary makes a determination under subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register notice of the establishment of the historical park, including an official boundary map for the historical park.

(D) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The official boundary map published under subparagraph (C) shall be on file and available for public inspection in appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

(2) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the historical park is to preserve and interpret for the benefit of present and future generations the historical, cultural, and natural resources associated with the life of Harriet Tubman and the Underground Railroad.

(3) LAND ACQUISITION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may acquire land and interests in land within the areas depicted on the map as ''Authorized Acquisition Areas'' by purchase from willing sellers, donation, or exchange.

(B) BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.—On acquisition of land or an interest in land under subparagraph (A), the boundary of the historical park shall be adjusted to reflect the acquisition.

(c) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall administer the historical park in accordance with this section and the laws generally applicable to units of the National Park System, including—

(A) the National Park System Organic Act (16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.); and

(B) the Act of August 21, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 461 et seq.).

(2) INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the historical park is established, the Director of the National Park Service and the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service shall enter into an agreement to allow the National Park Service to provide for public interpretation of historic resources located within the boundary of the Blackwater National Wildlife Refuge that are associated with the life of Harriet Tubman, consistent with the management requirements of the Refuge.

(3) INTERPRETIVE TOURS.—The Secretary may provide interpretive tours to sites and resources located outside the boundary of the historical park in Caroline, Dorchester, and Talbot Counties, Maryland, relating to the life of Harriet Tubman and the Underground Railroad.

(4) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may enter into a cooperative agreement with the State, political subdivisions of the State, colleges and universities, non-profit organizations, and individuals—

(i) to mark, interpret, and restore nationally significant historic or cultural resources relating to the life of Harriet Tubman or the Underground Railroad within the boundaries of the historical park, if the agreement provides for reasonable public access; or

(ii) to conduct research relating to the life of Harriet Tubman and the Underground Railroad.

(B) VISITOR CENTER.—The Secretary may enter into a cooperative agreement with the State to design, construct, operate, and maintain a joint visitor center on land owned by the State—

(i) to provide for National Park Service visitor and interpretive facilities for the historical park; and

(ii) to provide to the Secretary, at no additional cost, sufficient office space to administer the historical park.

(C) COST-SHARING REQUIREMENT.—

(i) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the total cost of any activity carried out under this paragraph shall not exceed 50 percent.

(ii) FORM OF NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal share of the cost of carrying out an activity under this paragraph may be in the form of in-kind contributions or goods or services fairly valued.

(d) GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are made available to carry out this section, the Secretary shall prepare a general management plan for the historical park in accordance with section 12(b) of the National Park Service General Authorities Act (16 U.S.C. 1a–7(b)).

(2) CONSULTATION.—The general management plan shall be prepared in consultation with the State (including political subdivisions of the State).

(3) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall coordinate the preparation and implementation of the management plan with—

(A) the Blackwater National Wildlife Refuge;

(B) the Harriet Tubman National Historical Park established by section 3(b)(1)(A); and

(C) the National Underground Railroad Network to Freedom.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this section.

SEC. 3. HARRIET TUBMAN NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK, AUBURN, NEW YORK.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) HISTORICAL PARK.—The term ''historical park'' means the Harriet Tubman National Historical Park established by subsection (b)(1)(A).

(2) HOME.—The term ''Home'' means The Harriet Tubman Home, Inc., located in Auburn, New York.

(3) MAP.—The term ''map'' means the map entitled ''Harriet Tubman National Historical Park'', numbered T18/80,000, and dated March 2009.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(5) STATE.—The term ''State'' means the State of New York.

(b) HARRIET TUBMAN NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), there is established the Harriet Tubman National Historical Park in Auburn, New York, as a unit of the National Park System.

(B) DETERMINATION BY SECRETARY.—The historical park shall not be established until the date on which the Secretary determines that a sufficient quantity of land, or interests in land, has been acquired to constitute a manageable park unit.

(C) NOTICE.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Secretary makes a determination under subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register notice of the establishment of the historical park.

(D) MAP.—The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

(2) BOUNDARY.—The historical park shall include the Harriet Tubman Home, the Tubman Home for the Aged, the Thompson Memorial AME Zion Church and Rectory, and associated land, as identified in the area entitled ''National Historical Park Proposed Boundary'' on the map.

(3) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the historical park is to preserve and interpret for the benefit of present and future generations the historical, cultural, and natural resources associated with the life of Harriet Tubman.

(4) LAND ACQUISITION.—The Secretary may acquire land and interests in land within the areas depicted on the map by purchase from a willing seller, donation, or exchange.

(c) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall administer the historical park in accordance with this section and the laws generally applicable to units of the National Park System, including—

(A) the National Park System Organic Act (16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.); and

(B) the Act of August 21, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 461 et seq.).

(2) INTERPRETIVE TOURS.—The Secretary may provide interpretive tours to sites and resources located outside the boundary of the historical park in Auburn, New York, relating to the life of Harriet Tubman.

(3) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may enter into a cooperative agreement with the owner of any land within the historical park to mark, interpret, or restore nationally significant historic or cultural resources relating to the life of Harriet Tubman, if the agreement provides that—

(i) the Secretary shall have the right of access to any public portions of the land covered by the agreement to allow for—

(I) access at reasonable times by historical park visitors to the land; and

(II) interpretation of the land for the public; and

(ii) no changes or alterations shall be made to the land except by mutual agreement of the Secretary and the owner of the land.

(B) RESEARCH.—The Secretary may enter into a cooperative agreement with the State, political subdivisions of the State, institutions of higher education, the Home and other nonprofit organizations, and individuals to conduct research relating to the life of Harriet Tubman.

(C) COST-SHARING REQUIREMENT.—

(i) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the total cost of any activity carried out under this paragraph shall not exceed 50 percent.

(ii) FORM OF NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal share may be in the form of in-kind contributions or goods or services fairly valued.

(D) ATTORNEY GENERAL.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall submit to the Attorney General for review any cooperative agreement under this paragraph involving religious property or property owned by a religious institution.

(ii) FINDING.—No cooperative agreement subject to review under this subparagraph shall take effect until the date on which the Attorney General issues a finding that the proposed agreement does not violate the Establishment Clause of the first amendment to the Constitution.

(d) GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are made available to carry out this section, the Secretary shall prepare a general management plan for the historical park in accordance with section 12(b) of the National Park Service General Authorities Act (16 U.S.C. 1a–7(b)).

(2) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall coordinate the preparation and implementation of the management plan with—

(A) the Harriet Tubman Underground Railroad National Historical Park established by section 2(b)(1); and

(B) the National Underground Railroad Network to Freedom.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this Act, except that not more than $7,500,000 shall be available to provide financial assistance under subsection (c)(3).

SEC. 4. OFFSET.

Section 101(b)(12) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–303; 110 Stat. 3667) is amended by striking ''$53,852,000'' and inserting ''$29,852,000''.

S. 311

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Lower Mississippi River Area Study Act''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) STUDY AREA.—The term ''study area'' includes Fort St. Philip, Fort Jackson, the Head of Passes, and any related and supporting historical, cultural, and recreational resources located in Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana.

SEC. 3. STUDY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are made available to carry out this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the State of Louisiana and other interested organizations, shall complete a special resource study that evaluates—

(1) the national significance of the study area; and

(2) the suitability and feasibility of designating the study area as a unit of the National Park System.

(b) CRITERIA.—In conducting the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall use the criteria for the study of areas for potential inclusion in the National Park System in section 8(c) of National Park System General Authorities Act (16 U.S.C. 1a–5(c)).

(c) CONTENT.—The study described in subsection (a) shall—

(1) include cost estimates for the potential acquisition, development, operation, and maintenance of the study area; and

(2) identify alternatives for the management, administration, and protection of the study area.

SEC. 4. AGREEMENT; DONATIONS.

The study described in section 3 shall not be conducted until the date on which—

(1) the Secretary enters into an agreement with a State, unit of local government, or other entity to conduct the study using non-Federal funds; or

(2) the Secretary receives a donation of an amount of non-Federal funds sufficient to pay the cost of conducting the study.

S. 476

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

SECTION 1. CHESAPEAKE AND OHIO CANAL NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK COMMISSION.

The Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park Commission (referred to in this Act as the ''Commission'') is authorized in accordance with the provisions of section

6 of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Development Act (16 U.S.C. 410y–4), except that the Commission shall terminate 10 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

S. 609

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''San Juan County Federal Land Conveyance Act''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) FEDERAL LAND.—The term ''Federal land'' means the approximately 19 acres of Federal surface estate generally depicted as ''Lands Authorized for Conveyance'' on the map.

(2) LANDOWNER.—The term ''landowner'' means the plaintiffs in the case styled Blancett v. United States Department of the Interior, et al., No. 10–cv–00254–JAP–KBM, United States District Court for the District of New Mexico.

(3) MAP.—The term ''map'' means the map entitled ''San Juan County Land Conveyance'' and dated June 20, 2012.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(5) STATE.—The term ''State'' means the State of New Mexico.

SEC. 3. CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LAND IN SAN JUAN COUNTY, NEW MEXICO.

(a) IN GENERAL.—On request of the landowner, the Secretary shall, under such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe and subject to valid existing rights, convey to the landowner all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to any portion of the Federal land (including any improvements or appurtenances to the Federal land) by sale.

(b) SURVEY; ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—

(1) SURVEY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the Federal land to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey approved by the Secretary.

(2) COSTS.—The administrative costs associated with the conveyance shall be paid by the landowner.

(c) CONSIDERATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As consideration for the conveyance of the Federal land under subsection (a), the landowner shall pay to the Secretary an amount equal to the fair market value of the Federal land conveyed, as determined under paragraph (2).

(2) APPRAISAL.—The fair market value of any Federal land that is conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined by an appraisal acceptable to the Secretary that is performed in accordance with—

(A) the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions;

(B) the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice; and

(C) any other applicable law (including regulations).

(d) DISPOSITION AND USE OF PROCEEDS.—

(1) DISPOSITION OF PROCEEDS.—The Secretary shall deposit the proceeds of any conveyance of Federal land under subsection (a) in a special account in the Treasury for use in accordance with paragraph (2).

(2) USE OF PROCEEDS.—Amounts deposited under paragraph (1) shall be available to the Secretary, without further appropriation and until expended, for the acquisition of land or interests in land from willing sellers in the State for resource protection that is consistent with the purposes for which the Bald Eagle Area of Critical Environmental Concern in the State was established.

(e) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions for a conveyance under subsection (a) as the Secretary determines to be appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(f) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, the Federal land is withdrawn from—

(1) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(2) disposition under all laws relating to mineral and geothermal leasing or mineral materials.

MAJOR GENERAL WILLIAM H. GOURLEY VA-DOD OUTPATIENT CLINIC

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 272.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 272) to designate the Department of Veterans Affairs and Department of Defense joint outpatient clinic to be constructed in Marina, California, as the ''Major General William H. Gourley VA-DOD Outpatient Clinic.''

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read three times and passed, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

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

The bill (H.R. 272) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

DR. CAMERON McKINLEY DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS VETERANS CENTER

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1216.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1216) to designate the Department of Veterans Affairs Vet Center in Prescott, Arizona, as the ''Dr. Cameron McKinley Department of Veterans Affairs Veterans Center.''

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (H.R. 1216) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

DESIGNATING OCTOBER 30, 2014, AS A NATIONAL DAY OF REMEMBRANCE FOR NUCLEAR WEAPONS PROGRAM WORKERS

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 417.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 417) designating October 30, 2014, as national day of remembrance for nuclear weapons program workers.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 417) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of Tuesday, April 8, 2014, under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

Mr. REID. Mr. President, this a very important piece of legislation. Most of the nuclear weapons program workers are in Nevada, at the Nevada test site. At one time we had 12,000 people working there on a weapons program and many of them got sick because we didn't know the dangers of nuclear weapons. We had many of them sitting above ground and soldiers and workers would be out there with stuff floating around. People can drive out there, if they can get through all the security checkpoints, but they have bleachers still there that were set up to watch the nuclear weapons go off. Then we had about 1,000 nuclear devices at the Nevada test site that were detonated above ground, in tunnels, in shafts. So there truly does need to be a day of remembrance, and I congratulate those Senators who have moved this forward.

HONORING THE LIFE AND CAREER OF CHARLES ''CHUCK'' NOLL

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 497.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant bill clerk read as follow:

A resolution (S. Res. 497) honoring the life and career of Charles ''Chuck'' Noll.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 497) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 2578 AND S. 2579

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am told that there are two bills at the desk, and I ask for their first reading en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bills by title for the first time en bloc.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2578) to ensure that employers cannot interfere in their employees' birth control and other health care decisions.

A bill (S. 2579) to require the Secretary of State to offer rewards totaling up to $5,000,000 for information on the kidnapping and murder of Naftali Fraenkel, a dual United States-Israeli citizen, that began on June 12, 2014.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now ask for a second reading on these two bills but object to my own request en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bills will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I had a conversation with the Republican leader on Monday, and we went over the things we have to do this work period. We have a lot to do. One of the things we are trying to do—because we have so much going on around the country; namely, in our States—is we want to try to balance what we do and, frankly, we have some people running for office. But we have made great progress this week so far. We have been able to reach agreement on a number of things that we believe are important.

So having said that—and I have gone over what we are going to do in the next few days—I think it would be appropriate to announce to everyone that we are going to not have any votes on Monday. We have work we are going to have to do here Monday, but we are not going to have any votes. I think it is important Senators know that. We were planning on having a number of votes on Monday. I think that is not necessary now.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JULY 10, 2014

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. on Thursday, July 10, 2014; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business until 12:00 noon, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each and the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees; that following morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session as provided under the previous order; finally, that the filing deadline for first-degree amendments to S. 2363 be at 10:30 a.m. and the filing deadline for second-degree amendments be at 11:30 a.m.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we hope to reach agreement to have the cloture vote around noon tomorrow on the Bipartisan Sportsmen's Act. Under a previous order, there will be a rollcall vote at 2 p.m. There will be a couple of voice votes after that.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the proves order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:46 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, July 10, 2014, at 10 a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

JESS LIPPINCOTT BAILY, OF OHIO, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA.

JUDITH BETH CEFKIN, OF COLORADO, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF FIJI, AND TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AND WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF KIRIBATI, THE REPUBLIC OF NAURU, THE KINGDOM OF TONGA, AND TUVALU.

ROBERT FRANCIS CEKUTA, OF NEW YORK, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF AZERBAIJAN.

STAFFORD FITZGERALD HANEY, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF COSTA RICA.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

ELIZABETH SHERWOOD-RANDALL, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF ENERGY, VICE DANIEL B. PONEMAN.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MICHELE JEANNE SISON, OF MARYLAND, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE THE DEPUTY REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED NATIONS, WITH THE RANK AND STATUS OF AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY, AND THE DEPUTY REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN THE SECURITY COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

MICHELE JEANNE SISON, OF MARYLAND, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SESSIONS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS, DURING HER TENURE OF SERVICE AS DEPUTY REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED NATIONS.

MARGARET ANN UYEHARA, OF OHIO, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO MONTENEGRO.

JAMES PETER ZUMWALT, OF CALIFORNIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF SENEGAL AND TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AND WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF GUINEA-BISSAU.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 9, 2014:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

DARCI L. VETTER, OF NEBRASKA, TO BE CHIEF AGRICULTURAL NEGOTIATOR, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

WILLIAM D. ADAMS, OF MAINE, TO BE CHAIRPERSON OF THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

JULIAN CASTRO, OF TEXAS, TO BE SECRETARY OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive Message transmitted by the President to the Senate on July 9, 2014 withdrawing from further Senate consideration the following nomination:

ELIZABETH M. ROBINSON, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF ENERGY, VICE KRISTINA M. JOHNSON, RESIGNED, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON JANUARY 6, 2014.