

## SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 23—DECLARING THAT IT IS THE POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES TO SUPPORT AND FACILITATE ISRAEL IN MAINTAINING DEFENSIBLE BORDERS AND THAT IT IS CONTRARY TO UNITED STATES POLICY AND NATIONAL SECURITY TO HAVE THE BORDERS OF ISRAEL RETURN TO THE ARMISTICE LINES THAT EXISTED ON JUNE 4, 1967

Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Mr. JOHANNES, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. KIRK, Mr. BURR, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. KYL, Mr. THUNE, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. COATS, Mr. COBURN, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts, Mr. VITTER, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ENZI, Mr. ISAKSON, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. WICKER, Mr. LUGAR, and Mr. CHAMBLISS) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the committee on Foreign Relations:

## S. CON. RES. 23

Whereas, throughout its short history, Israel, a liberal democratic ally of the United States, has been repeatedly attacked by authoritarian regimes and terrorist organizations that denied its right to exist;

Whereas the United States Government remains steadfastly committed to the security of Israel, especially its ability to maintain secure, recognized, and defensible borders;

Whereas the United States Government is resolutely bound to its policy of preserving and strengthening the capability of Israel to deter enemies and defend itself against any threat;

Whereas United Nations Security Council Resolution 242 (1967) recognized Israel's "right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of force";

Whereas the United States has long recognized that a return to the 1967 lines would create a strategic military vulnerability for Israel and greatly impede its sovereign right to defend its borders; and

Whereas Prime Minister of Israel Benjamin Netanyahu correctly stated on May 20, 2011, that the 1967 lines were not "boundaries of peace. They are the boundaries of repeated war": Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That—*

(1) it is the policy of the United States to support and facilitate Israel in creating and maintaining secure, recognized, and defensible borders; and

(2) it is contrary to United States policy and our national security to have the borders of Israel return to the armistice lines that existed on June 4, 1967.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today I am pleased to rise and offer, with my good friend, the senior Senator from Connecticut, a concurrent resolution which reaffirms our Nation's steadfast and unshakable commitment to the security of Israel, specifically through the establishment of secure, recognized, and defensible borders.

It is unfortunate that I am compelled to offer such a resolution. For years, both Republican and Democratic ad-

ministrations have recognized that Israel's boundaries of June 4, 1967 are indefensible and if reestablished will create a strategic military vulnerability for our staunch ally.

That is why President Obama's recent comments were so dumbfounding. The President's prepared and thoroughly considered remarks called for the starting point of negotiations to be what we all know are the militarily indefensible 1967 lines.

Remember, if Israel returns to the 1967 lines its territory will, in some locations, be only 9 miles wide.

As Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu correctly stated in a friendly and appropriate correction to the President's remarks, the 1967 lines are not boundaries of peace. They are boundaries of repeated war.

Israel would have to give up the Golan Heights, the strategic elevated location which dominates northern Israel. Does the President not remember during the 1973 War the Syrians launched a massive armored attack on the Golan Heights which almost succeeded?

This raises the question of who President Obama was attempting to appease with his ill-advised statements, which unnecessarily drove a wedge between the United States and Israel?

The fact is the national security interests of the United States and Israel are linked. The threats Israel faces are the threats the United States faces. Whether it is Hezbollah in Lebanon, Hamas in the Gaza Strip or these groups' benefactor, Iran, we share a common foe.

Unfortunately, that foe, Iran, appears to be growing stronger and more capable. Iran has repeatedly stated it wishes to wipe the United States and Israel off the map. Iran's obvious aim is to establish strategic dominance over the entire region. Their relentless pursuit of nuclear weapons and ballistic missile technology is of grave concern.

Much has been said about Iran's nuclear program, but much less has been articulated about its ballistic missile program. In order to achieve its strategic objectives, Iran has embarked on a significant ballistic missile program. Iranian officials have boasted they have the ability to produce a ballistic missile with a 1,250 mile range. In 2009, the Iranians were able to launch a multistage space launch vehicle that the Air Force concluded "can serve as a test-bed for long-range ballistic missile technologies."

Even more troubling the Iranians appear to be developing a new long-range multistage solid rocket motor missile. Why is that important? If the Iranians successfully field this type of technology, they will be able to launch, almost instantaneously, missiles which carry warheads over great distances.

With these ominous developments emanating from Israel's and the United States common foe, do we really want to be seen as distancing ourselves from

one of our staunchest allies—especially on such a pivotal issue as Israel's borders. This issue of these borders is only underscored by the constant attacks on Israel's borders by Iran's surrogates, Hezbollah and Hamas.

That is why I believe this Concurrent Resolution is so important. It reaffirms the long-held, bipartisan policy of the United States, that we will "support and facilitate Israel in maintaining defensible borders and that it is contrary to United States policy and our national security to have the borders of Israel return to the armistice lines that existed on June 4, 1967."

The United States has no greater friend than Israel and Israel has no greater friend than the United States.

Israel too often finds herself alone in the world, unjustly singled out by the left as a nation uniquely without the moral authority to defend itself.

From my perspective, Israel does not need to apologize to anyone for defending itself against those who would do her harm, and I will always stand by Israel as she seeks to protect her citizens against terrorists and their state sponsors.

Having said that, I also believe many Iranians, especially the young people, know Iran is causing problems in the Middle East. We must support those people who are searchers for freedom.

The security of both our nations is irrevocably linked. This bipartisan concurrent resolution removes any harmful ambiguity the President's remarks last week might have caused.

The United States must stand by Israel. With his remarks last week, President Obama undermined her.

Israel faces consistent unprovoked aggression by longtime supporters of terrorism. But Israel is not a victim. All she asks is the ability to defend herself and for free people to support her right to self-defense.

This is no time for the United States to distance itself from Israel, and I will do everything I can to affirm Israel's territorial integrity and ability to protect her citizens against the unprovoked attacks of terrorist and state actors.

Because Israel is a true friend, I am not surprised that this resolution has strong bipartisan support. My colleague, Senator LIEBERMAN, and I will be joined by members of both parties who want to remind the world the United States is steadfastly committed to the security of Israel and especially our ally's ability to maintain secure, recognized and defensible borders.

## AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 434. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 782, to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to reauthorize that Act, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 435. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 782, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 436. Mr. COBURN (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 782, supra.

SA 437. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 782, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 438. Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. JOHANNIS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. COATS, and Mr. ROBERTS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 782, supra.

SA 439. Mr. JOHANNIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 782, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 440. Mr. MERKLEY proposed an amendment to the bill S. 782, supra.

SA 441. Mr. MCCAIN proposed an amendment to amendment SA 436 submitted by Mr. COBURN (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) to the bill S. 782, supra.

SA 442. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 782, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 443. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 782, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 444. Ms. SNOWE (for herself, Mrs. McCASKILL, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. HAGAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. ENZI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 782, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 445. Mr. COBURN (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 782, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 446. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 782, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 447. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 782, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 448. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 782, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 449. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 782, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 450. Mr. COBURN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, and Mrs. McCASKILL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 782, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 451. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 782, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 452. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 782, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 453. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 782, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 454. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 782, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 455. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 782, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 456. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 782, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 457. Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. BROWN of Ohio) submitted an amend-

ment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 782, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 458. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 782, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

## TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

**SA 434.** Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 782, to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to reauthorize that Act, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 29, after line 20, add the following:  
**SEC. 22. PERMANENT REAUTHORIZATION OF E-VERIFY.**

Section 401(b) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (division C of Public Law 104-208; 8 U.S.C. 1324a note) is amended by striking “Unless the Congress otherwise provides, the Secretary shall terminate a pilot program on September 30, 2012.”.

**SA 435.** Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 782, to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to reauthorize that Act, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows.

On page 29, after line 20, add the following:  
**SEC. 22. WATER QUALITY STANDARDS.**

None of the amounts made available by this Act, the amendments made by this Act, or any other provision of law may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the final rule of the Environmental Protection Agency entitled “Water Quality Standards for the State of Florida’s Lakes and Flowing Waters” (75 Fed. Reg. 75762 (December 6, 2010)).

**SA 436.** Mr. COBURN (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 782, to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to reauthorize that Act, and for other purposes; as follows.

Beginning on page 17, strike line 14 and all that follows through page 18, line 10, and insert the following:

(a) **BRIGHTFIELDS DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.**—Section 218 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3154d) is repealed.

(b) **TERMINATION OF GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE MITIGATION INCENTIVE FUND.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce shall terminate the Global Climate Change Mitigation Incentive Fund of the Department of Commerce.

**SA 437.** Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 782, to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to reauthorize that Act, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows.

Beginning on page 17, strike line 14 and all that follows through page 18, line 10, and insert the following:

(a) **BRIGHTFIELDS DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.**—Section 218 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3154d) is repealed.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—Section 701(a) of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3231(a)) (as amended by section 19) is amended by striking “\$500,000,000” and inserting “\$150,000,000”.

(c) **TERMINATION OF GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE MITIGATION INCENTIVE FUND.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce shall terminate the Global Climate Change Mitigation Incentive Fund of the Department of Commerce.

**SA 438.** Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. JOHANNIS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. COATS, and Mr. ROBERTS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 782, to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to reauthorize that Act, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

## TITLE II—REGULATORY ASSESSMENT

### SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Comprehensive Assessment of Regulations on the Economy Act of 2011”.

### SEC. 202. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **ADMINISTRATOR.**—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(2) **COMMITTEE.**—The term “Committee” means the Cumulative Regulatory Assessment Committee established by section 203(a).

(3) **FEDERAL REGULATORY MANDATE.**—The term “Federal regulatory mandate” means any regulation, rule, requirement, or interpretative guidance that—

(A) is promulgated or issued (or is expected to be initiated) by the Administrator or a State or local government during the period beginning on January 1, 2010, and ending on January 1, 2020;

(B) applies to 1 or more impacted units; and

(C) implements any provision or requirement relating to—

(i) interstate or international transport of air pollution under section 110(a)(2)(D), 115, or 126(b) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7410(a)(2)(D), 7415, 7426(b)) with respect to any national ambient air quality standard, including—

(I) any standard that has been promulgated or proposed before July 1, 2011; and

(II) any new or revised standard for ozone or fine particulate matter that, as of the date of enactment of this Act, is currently under review or development by the Administrator; and

(ii) the attainment, or maintenance of attainment, of any national ambient air quality standard, including—

(I) any new or revised standard for ozone or fine particulate matter that, as of the date of enactment of this Act, is currently under review or development by the Administrator; and

(II) any other standard that has been promulgated or proposed before July 1, 2011;

(iii) new source performance standards under section 111 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7411), including any standards under subsection (d) of that section;

(iv) hazardous air pollutants under section 112 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7412);

(v) greenhouse gas emissions under titles I, II, and V of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.), including the requirements for—

(I) new source performance standards under section 111 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7411), including any standards under subsection (d) of that section; and