(Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1204, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to protect rights of conscience with regard to requirements for coverage of specific items and services, to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit certain abortion-related discrimination in governmental activities, and for other purposes.

S. 1226

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1226, a bill to promote industry growth and competitiveness and to improve worker training, retention, and advancement, and for other purposes.

S. 1229

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as cosponsors of S. 1229, a bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to empower the States to set the maximum annual percentage rates applicable to consumer credit transactions, and for other purposes.

S. 1234

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1234, a bill to clarify that a State has the sole authority to regulate hydraulic fracturing on Federal land within the boundaries of the State.

S. 1235

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 1235, a bill to restrict any State or local jurisdiction from imposing a new discriminatory tax on cell phone services, providers, or property.

S. 1236

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1236, a bill to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage.

S.J. RES. 19

At the request of Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 19, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections.

S. RES. 75

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 75, a resolution condemning the Government of Iran for its state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights.

S. RES. 153

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 153, a resolution recognizing the 200th anniversary of the Battle of Lake Erie.

AMENDMENT NO. 1312

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1312 intended to be proposed to S. 744, a bill to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1317

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1317 intended to be proposed to S. 744, a bill to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1397

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1397 intended to be proposed to S. 744, a bill to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1453

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1453 intended to be proposed to S. 744, a bill to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1636

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1636 intended to be proposed to S. 744, a bill to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1714

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1714 intended to be proposed to S. 744, a bill to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1718

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1718 intended to be proposed to S. 744, a bill to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. ALEXANDER):

S. 1240. A bill to establish a new organization to manage nuclear waste, provide a consensual process for siting nuclear waste facilities, ensure adequate funding for managing nuclear waste, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleagues in introducing the Nuclear Waste Administration Act.

This bipartisan legislation, which has been years in the making, is also cosponsored by Senators RON WYDEN, LISA MURKOWSKI, and LAMAR ALEXANDER.

This legislation represents our best attempt to establish a workable, long term nuclear waste policy for the United States, something our Nation lacks today, by implementing the unanimous recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future.

First, the bill would create an independent entity, the Nuclear Waste Administration, with the sole purpose of managing nuclear waste.

Second, the bill would authorize the siting and construction of three types of waste facilities: a ''pilot'' waste storage facility for waste from shut down reactors, additional storage facilities for waste from other facilities, and permanent repositories to dispose of nuclear waste.

Third, the bill creates a consent-based siting process for both storage facilities and repositories, based on the successful efforts to build waste facilities in other countries.

The legislation requires that local, tribal, and State governments must consent to host waste facilities by signing incentive agreements, assuring that waste is only stored in the States and communities that want and welcome it.

Fourth, the bill would direct the fees currently collected from nuclear power ratepayers to fund nuclear waste management, currently about $750 M annually, into a new Working Capital Fund available to the Nuclear Waste Administration to fund construction of waste facilities.

Finally, the legislation ensures that the new Nuclear Waste Administration will be held accountable for meeting Federal responsibilities and stewarding Federal dollars.

The Nuclear Waste Administrator will be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The Administration will be overseen by a five-member Nuclear Waste Oversight Board, modeled on the Defense Nuclear Facilities Board. The administration will have an Inspector General. The administration will not be able to access the corpus of the Nuclear Waste Trust Fund until it reaches agreement with a host community. Appropriators may limit the administration's spending, if necessary. Finally, if the agency fails to open a nuclear waste facility by 2025, additional funding will cease.

The United States has 104 operating commercial nuclear power reactors that supply ⅕ of our electricity and nearly 75 percent of our emissions-free power.

However, production of this nuclear power has a significant downside: it produces nuclear waste that will take hundreds of thousands of years to decay. Unlike most nuclear nations, the United States has no program to consolidate waste in centralized facilities.

Instead, we leave the waste next to operating and shut down reactors sitting in pools of water or in cement and steel dry casks. Today, approximately 70,000 metric tons of nuclear waste is stored at commercial reactor sites. This total grows by 2,000 metric tons each year.

In addition to commercial nuclear waste, we must also address waste generated from creating our nuclear weapons stockpile and powering our Navy.

The byproducts of nuclear energy represent some of the nation's most hazardous materials, but for decades we have failed to find a solution for their safe storage and permanent disposal. Most experts agree that this failure is not a scientific problem or an engineering impossibility; it is a failure of government.

Although the Federal Government signed contracts committing to pick up commercial waste beginning in 1998, the Federal government's waste program has failed to take possession of a single fuel assembly.

Our government has not honored its contractual obligations. We have been sued, and we have lost. So today, the Federal taxpayer is paying power plants to store the waste at reactor sites all over the nation. The cost of this liability is forecast to reach $20 billion by 2020.

As we try to manage our growing national debt, we simply cannot tolerate continued inaction.

In January 2012, the Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future completed a two-year comprehensive study and published unanimous recommendations for fixing our Nation's broken nuclear waste management program.

The commission found that the only long-term, technically feasible solution for this waste is to dispose of it in a permanent underground repository. Until such a facility is opened, which will take many decades, spent nuclear fuel will continue to be an expensive, dangerous burden.

That is why the commission also recommended that we establish an interim storage facility program to begin consolidating this dangerous waste, in addition to working on a permanent repository.

Finally, after studying the experience of all nuclear nations, the commission found that siting these facilities is most likely to succeed if the host states and communities are welcome and willing partners, not adversaries. The commission recommended that we adopt a consent based nuclear facility siting process.

Senators WYDEN, MURKOWSKI, ALEXANDER, and I introduce this legislation in order to begin implementing those recommendations, putting us on a dual track toward interim and permanent storage facilities. The bill also reflects much work by former Senator Bingaman, who put forward a similar proposal as one of the last bills he wrote.

In my view, one of the most important provisions in this legislation is the pilot program to begin consolidating nuclear waste at safer, more cost-efficient centralized facilities on an interim basis. The legislation will facilitate interim storage of nuclear waste in above-ground canisters called dry casks. These facilities would be located in willing communities, away from population centers, and on thoroughly assessed sites.

Some members of Congress argue that we should ignore the need to interim storage sites and instead push forward with a plan to open Yucca Mountain as a permanent storage site.

Others argue that we should push forward only with repository plans in new locations.

But the debate over Yucca Mountain, a controversial waste repository proposed in the Nevada desert, which lacks State approval, is unlikely to be settled any time soon.

I believe the debate over a permanent repository does not need to be settled in order to recognize the need for interim storage. Even if Congress and a future president reverse course and move forward with Yucca Mountain, interim storage facilities would still be an essential component of a badly needed national nuclear waste strategy.

By creating interim storage sites, a top recommendation of the Blue Ribbon Commission, we would begin reducing Federal liability while providing breathing room to site and build a permanent repository.

Interim storage facilities could also provide alternative storage locations in emergency situations requiring spent nuclear fuel to be moved quickly from a reactor site.

Both short- and long-term storage programs are vital. Permanently disposing of our current inventory of nuclear waste will take several decades.

Because of that long timeline, interim storage facilities allow us to achieve significant cost savings for taxpayers and utility ratepayers by shuttering a number of nuclear plants.

One thing is certain: inaction is the most costly and least safe option.

Our longstanding stalemate is costly to taxpayers, utility ratepayers and communities that are involuntarily saddled with waste after local nuclear power plants have shut down.

It leaves nuclear waste all over the country, stored in all different ways.

It is long overdue for the government to honor its obligation to safely dispose of the Nation's nuclear waste.

This will be a long journey, but we must take the first step.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CASEY, Mr. FRANKEN, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1251. A bill to establish programs with respect to childhood, adolescent, and young adult cancer; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am pleased to be joined by Senators FISCHER, MENENDEZ, CASEY, KLOBUCHAR and FRANKEN in the introduction of the Caroline Pryce Walker Conquer Childhood Cancer Reauthorization Act. This legislation is an extension of ongoing bipartisan efforts in the Senate over the past decade to hopefully one day cure cancers in children, adolescents, and young adults.

I first started working on this issue after meeting the Haight family from Warwick, Rhode Island in June of 2004. Nancy and Vincent lost their son, Ben, when he was just 9 years old to neuroblastoma, a very aggressive tumor in the brain. With the strong support of families like the Haights for increased research into the causes of childhood cancers and improved treatment options, I introduced legislation that eventually was signed into law in 2008 as the Caroline Pryce Walker Conquer Childhood Cancer Act.

Since then, I have worked to secure funding for these efforts, including $6 million for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, CDC, to improve the ability of state cancer registries to rapidly collect information on the diagnosis and treatment information of children with cancer, and $1 million for the Secretary of Health and Human Services, HHS, to help educate families about treatment options and follow-up care.

Then, last year, I met Grace. Grace, from Providence, RI, is now 10 years old and is a survivor of medulloblastoma, another type of tumor that forms in the brain. Grace and her family reminded me that we must do more to ensure biomedical advances can continue so that better treatments will become available.

With Ben and Grace, and their families, in mind, I have been working to update the original Caroline Pryce Walker Conquer Childhood Cancer Act.

As such, the reauthorization we are introducing today would help create a comprehensive children's cancer biorepository for researchers to use in searching for biospecimens to study, would improve surveillance of childhood cancer cases, and would require a study of ways to encourage the development of novel treatments.

I am also pleased to be reintroducing the Pediatric, Adolescent, and Young Adult Cancer Survivorship Act. Through increased research and advances in medical innovation, the population of survivors of childhood cancer has grown from just four percent

surviving more than five years in 1960 to nearly eighty percent today.

Unfortunately, even after beating cancer, as many as ⅔ of survivors suffer from late effects of their disease or treatment, including second cancers and organ damage. This legislation would enhance research on the late effects of childhood cancers, improve collaboration among providers so that doctors are better able to care for this population as they age, and establish a new pilot program to begin to explore models of care for childhood cancer survivors.

We must do more to ensure that children survive cancer and any late effects so they can live a long, healthy, and productive life. I look forward to working with Senator FISCHER, and our colleagues, to see these bills enacted.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 1252. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the Missisquoi River and the Trout River in the State of Vermont, as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am pleased today to join my Vermont colleague Senator SANDERS to introduce the Upper Missisquoi and Trout Rivers Wild and Scenic River Designation Act.

The Upper Missisquoi River gathers itself from snowmelt and from pristine springs and cedar bogs in the forests of Vermont's Northeast Kingdom. As it flows from the town of Lowell to the town of Westfield, this lovely mountain brook grows large enough to float a small canoe during its winding journey through Vermont's forests and meadows. A paddler on this section is treated to a stream that runs crystal clear and abounds with trout and other fish as it winds through pine forest and silver maple flood plains, to meadows dotted with grazing Holstein cows.

The beauty and wildness of the river is undiminished as it swells on its journey north through the towns of Westfield, North Troy, and Troy, and crosses into the Canadian Province of Quebec. Not far downstream the river reenters the United States and winds its way across more miles of pastoral countryside in Northern Vermont through Richford, Berkshire, and Enosburg. Along the way it gathers the ice-cold, pristine flow of the Trout River in the town of Montgomery.

The scenery along the Upper Missisquoi and Trout Rivers in these towns is spectacularly beautiful, the water quality is superb, public access is unlimited, and Vermonters along the shores are eager to share these treasures with visitors from near and far. The Upper Missisquoi and Trout Rivers epitomize Wild and Scenic Recreational Rivers of national significance, and I am proud to join Senator SANDERS in introducing this legislation.

A Federal Wild and Scenic Recreational River designation should only be considered after the resource has been closely studied and if this designation is actively sought by people living in the area. We can report to the Senate that both of these tests are met for the Upper Missisquoi and Trout Rivers.

Seven years ago a group of people living along the rivers asked Vermont's delegation to the Congress to request a Wild and Scenic River Study, and for more than 5 years these Vermonters—with tremendous support from their neighbors, the neighboring towns, and the National Park Service—have assessed the river, turn by turn, mile by mile, and they have worked hard to plan for its protection and recreational use. The study committee kept their neighbors along the rivers and local elected leaders fully engaged at every step. Their hard work paid off this past March when the citizens of each of the affected, towns, at Vermont town meetings—those revered democratic institutions of self-government in our State—voted in favor of seeking the Wild and Scenic River designation.

This has been one of the most locally driven and strongly supported resource conservation initiatives to come before the Congress, and I commend the study committee and all of Vermonters in these towns for their hard work and cooperation.

A National Wild and Scenic River designation will help these two rivers reach their full potential as major engines of the Northeast Kingdom's tourism economy and at the same time help to ensure that the ecosystem is protected and enhanced for future generations.

The Upper Missisquoi River and the Trout River meet each of the criteria for a National Wild and Scenic River designation. The management of the rivers has been carefully planned, and the designation is actively sought by Vermonters living in communities along the rivers. I am proud to join Senator SANDERS and PETER WELCH, Vermont's Representative in the other body, in introducing this bill and taking this commendable effort to the next level.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. REED, Ms. CANTWELL, and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 1256. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to preserve the effectiveness of medically important antimicrobials used in the treatment of human and animal diseases; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Preventing Antibiotic Resistance Act.

This legislation puts in place reasonable safeguards on when and how antibiotics can be used in agriculture.

Few people realize that antibiotics are used in animal agriculture; even fewer realize the scope of the problem.

Last year 29.9 million pounds of antibiotics were sold in the U.S. for meat and poultry production. That is four times what was used in all forms of human medicine.

But there is more to be concerned about. The vast majority of these drugs are fed to healthy livestock and poultry, with little or no veterinary oversight. The drugs are used for growth promotion, to fatten up animals before slaughter.

At these low levels, the doses are not large enough, or powerful enough, to eliminate all the bacteria inside the animal's body. The small dose only kills off the weakest bacteria, leaving the strongest, most resistant bacteria behind to reproduce.

It creates a perfect storm for antibiotic resistance.

This isn't just a problem for the animals. These antibiotic resistant pathogens make their way into our food, our water, and our communities.

A recent study published in the medical journal Clinical Infectious Diseases found that nearly 50 percent of grocery store meat was contaminated with antibiotic resistant pathogens. Even more concerning, 25 percent of the meat was contaminated with pathogens that were resistant to three or more type of antibiotics.

Antibiotics are the closest thing to a ''silver bullet'' in human medicine. They are capable of wiping out a wide variety of bacterial infections. But we are in danger of losing this weapon in the fight against infectious diseases.

Tens of thousands of people in the U.S. die each year from antibiotic resistant infections. Unfortunately, we are learning the hard way that these precious, lifesaving drugs no longer work as well as they once did.

That is why I am so committed to this bill, to preserve the efficacy of these drugs that save lives every day.

The Preventing Antibiotic Resistance Act directs the Food and Drug Administration to prohibit the use of antibiotics in ways that accelerate antibiotic resistance.

The bill requires drug companies and producers to demonstrate that they are using antibiotics to treat clinically diagnosable diseases, not just to fatten their livestock.

But the bill takes a nuanced approach; the restrictions only apply to the limited number of antibiotics that are critical to human health. Any drug not used in human medicine is left untouched by this legislation.

The Preventing Antibiotic Resistance Act also preserves the ability of farmers to use all available antibiotics to treat sick animals. If a veterinarian identifies a sick animal, or a herd of animals that are likely to become sick, there are no restrictions on what drugs can be used.

This legislation is not revolutionary. Fifteen years ago Denmark became the first country to ban the routine use of antibiotics in the food and water of livestock. The entire European Union

followed suit in 2006. Australia, New Zealand, Chile, Korea, Thailand, the Philippines and Japan have also implemented full or partial bans on nontherapeutic uses of antibiotics.

But the majority of producers in the U.S. have not followed suit; and it is time for a wakeup call.

Put simply—irresponsible use of antibiotics endangers us all. And if the drugs can't be used safely, they shouldn't be used at all.

Some still refuse to accept the facts; they say that there is no evidence that antibiotic use in agriculture leads to infections in humans.

They are wrong.

Rear Admiral Ali S. Khan, MD, MPH, Assistant Surgeon General and Director of the Office of Public Health Preparedness and Response at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, testified in the House Energy Committee that ''studies related to Salmonella as both a human and animal pathogen, including many studies in the United States, have demonstrated that use of antibiotic agents in food animals results in antibiotic resistant bacteria in food animals, resistant bacteria are present in the food supply and are transmitted to humans, and resistant bacterial infections result in adverse human health consequences, e.g., increased hospitalization.''

Doctor Joshua Sharfstein, Principal Deputy Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, also testified at the hearing and agreed with Rear Admiral Khan. The FDA, he said, ''supports the conclusion that using medically important antimicrobial drugs for production purposes is not in the interest of protecting and promoting the public health.''

Quantitative evidence from the EU and Canada also support this conclusion. In response to public health concerns about the rise of resistance to the antibiotic cephalosporin in Salmonella and E. coli, chicken hatcheries in Québec voluntarily stopped using the drug in February 2005. Following the ban, the public health agency of Canada reported a dramatic 89 percent decrease in the incidence of resistant salmonella in chicken meat and 77 percent decrease in related human infections. Once the drug was partially reintroduced in 2007, antibiotic resistant infections in people jumped back up 50 percent.

Unfortunately we are fighting an uphill battle with antibiotic resistant infections. Our tools and resources are diminishing even while the number and severity of these infections are increasing.

One example is Methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus, or MRSA. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, CDC, MRSA infections in 1974 accounted for only two percent of the total number of staph infections; in 1995 it was 22 percent; and by 2004 it was 63 percent.

CDC estimates that by 2005, there were 94,360 MRSA infections in the United States. Tragically, about 19,000 of them, 20 percent, were fatal. The primary reason is that MRSA is virtually immune to almost every antibiotic used in modern medicine.

By comparison, during the same year there were 17,011 deaths due to AIDS; so the scope and consequence of this problem is stunning.

Of course not all MRSA is derived from the overuse of antibiotics on the farm. Many infections are acquired in the hospital, and it is believed that these bacteria became resistant to antibiotics due to the misuse of drugs in human medicine.

But MRSA is infecting individuals who have not been in a hospital setting.

There is strong evidence that at least one strain of MRSA infecting people is coming directly from livestock. This strain, known as ST398, has been shown to disproportionately infect farmers and their families. Like all MRSA, ST398 is resistant to the antibiotics methicillin and oxacillin. But resistance to other antibiotics is also common among ST398 strains which make treatment especially challenging.

A study by the CDC in December 2009 showed that hospital-acquired MRSA strains and community-acquired MRSA strains such as ST398 are trending in opposite directions.

The study found that community-acquired MRSA, a type of MRSA that did not emerge in the hospital setting and is not contracted there, increased 700 percent between 1999 and 2006.

By contrast, hospital-acquired MRSA cases declined roughly 10 percent over this same time period.

Over the past decade, it has become clear that MRSA is not just a problem for hospital administrators. More and more individuals are acquiring this devastating infection in their homes, at their gyms or in restaurants.

While it is exceedingly difficult to determine the exact extent that antibiotic use in agriculture influences individual MRSA cases, we know for certain that statistical evidence overwhelmingly suggests that a reduction of antibiotic use in agriculture will result in a reduction of highly resistant MRSA cases.

Since the recent data released by the FDA confirm that more than 80 percent of all antibiotics sold in this country are for meat and poultry producing animals, one can reasonably conclude that a reduction of antibiotic use in agriculture will result in a reduction of highly resistant MRSA cases.

This legislation will very likely reduce the number of resistant infections and will very likely save lives.

But some still claim that this legislation may make our food supply less safe. They argue that antibiotics keep our animals healthy, and healthy animals make for healthy food.

But research shows us that these concerns are misguided. More than 375 public, consumer and environmental health groups, including the American Medical Association, the American Public Health Association, and the Infectious Diseases Society of America, support the legislation.

This bill makes incremental changes to ensure that our actions on the farm do not negatively impact the health and well being of our farmers, their families, and every one of us who consume the food they produce.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to pass these critical reforms.

By Mr. WYDEN (by request):

S. 1268. A bill to approve an agreement between the United States and the Republic of Palau; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce legislation to strengthen the relationship between the United States and the Republic of Palau, one of our closest and most reliable allies. This legislation, if enacted, would implement the recommendations of the 15-year review called for under the Compact of Free Association between our two nations.

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources will be holding a hearing on insular issues on Thursday, July 11, and it is my intention to add this bill to the agenda for that hearing.

Palau is located in the western Pacific about 800 miles south of Guam and 500 miles east of the Philippines. The close ties between the U.S. and Palau date from World War II, when Japanese forces were defeated in the Battle of Peleliu with a loss of nearly 2,000 U.S. marines. In 1947, the islands became a District in the United Nations Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. The United States was appointed Administrating Authority of the Trust Territory with the responsibility to promote economic and political development. Because of the United States' strategic interest in this region, the Trust Territory was established as the only U.N. ''Strategic'' Trust under the authority of the U.N. Security Council, as opposed to the U.N. General Assembly.

In 1982, Palau signed a 50-year Compact of Free Association that was approved by the U.S. in 1986, P.L. 99–658. The Compact went into effect on October 1, 1994, and the U.N. Trusteeship was subsequently terminated, making Palau a sovereign, self-governing state in free association with the United States. The Compact provides the U.S. with the ability to deny the use of Palauan territory to the military forces of other nations, and to establish military bases in Palau, should the need arise. These security provisions are described by the administration as ''vital'' to U.S. regional security and diplomatic interests.

The U.S. and Palau completed a formal review of the Compact in 2010 and, on September 10, 2010, signed an agreement with amendments to the Compact based on the conclusions and recommendation of the review. The bill

being introduced today would approve this agreement and its appendices and incorporate them into the law which established the Compact.

First, the legislation would extend and phase-out annual financial assistance over 11 years, through 2024, for operations, construction, maintenance and trust fund contributions totaling $165 million, or an average of $15 million annually. Second, the legislation significantly enhances accountability of U.S. financial assistance by requiring Palau to undertake financial and management reforms. Third, the bill would require any Palauan entering the U.S. to have a Palau passport. This would be the same requirement that was imposed on citizens of Micronesia and the Marshall Islands when their Compacts were reviewed and amended in 2003.

This agreement and legislation reaffirms and strengthens the special ties between the U.S. and Palau. Together we will continue our commitment to regional security. The United States will continue to be responsible for the security and defense of Palau, and the U.S. is honored to have the continued service of the men and women of Palau in the U.S. armed services. Strategic denial and the associated base rights provided for under the Compact were originally designed to counter the Cold War threat in the Pacific. While the Cold War has ended, the U.S. continues to face new challenges in the region.

I look forward to working with officials in the administration and in Palau who conducted the Compact Review and concluded this important agreement. I urge my colleagues to join with me in approving this agreement and assuring the continued strength of this historic partnership.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1268

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. APPROVAL OF THE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE REPUBLIC OF PALAU.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AGREEMENT.—The term ''Agreement'' means the Agreement and appendices signed by the United States and the Republic of Palau on September 3, 2010.

(2) COMPACT OF FREE ASSOCIATION.—The term ''Compact of Free Association'' means the Compact of Free Association between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Palau (48 U.S.C. 1931 note; Public Law 99–658).

(b) RESULTS OF COMPACT REVIEW.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Title I of Public Law 99–658 (48 U.S.C. 1931 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 105. RESULTS OF COMPACT REVIEW.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Agreement and appendices signed by the United States and the Republic of Palau on September 3, 2010 (referred to in this section as the 'Agreement'), in connection with section 432 of the Compact of Free Association between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Palau (48 U.S.C. 1931 note; Public Law 99–658) (referred to in this section as the 'Compact of Free Association'), are approved—

''(1) except for the extension of article X of the Agreement Regarding Federal Programs and Services, and Concluded Pursuant to article II of title II and section 232 of the Compact of Free Association; and

''(2) subject to the provisions of this section.

''(b) WITHHOLDING OF FUNDS.—If the Republic of Palau withdraws more than $5,000,000 from the trust fund established under section 211(f) of the Compact of Free Association in any of fiscal years 2011, 2012, or 2013, amounts payable under sections 1, 2(a), 3, and 4(a), of the Agreement shall be withheld from the Republic of Palau until the date on which the Republic of Palau reimburses the trust fund for the total amounts withdrawn that exceeded $5,000,000 in any of those fiscal years.

''(c) FUNDING FOR CERTAIN PROVISIONS UNDER SECTION 105 OF COMPACT OF FREE ASSOCIATION.—Within 30 days of enactment of this section, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Secretary of the Interior such sums as are necessary for the Secretary of the Interior to implement sections 1, 2(a), 3, 4(a), and 5 of the Agreement, which sums shall remain available until expended without any further appropriation.

''(d) AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated—

''(1) to the Secretary of the Interior to subsidize postal services provided by the United States Postal Service to the Republic of Palau, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and the Federated States of Micronesia $1,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2024, to remain available until expended.

''(2) to the head of each Federal entity described in paragraphs (1), (3), and (4) of section 221(a) of the Compact of Free Association (including the successor of each Federal entity) to carry out the responsibilities of the Federal entity under section 221(a) of the Compact of Free Association such sums as are necessary, to remain available until expended.''.

(2) OFFSET.—Section 3 of the Act of June 30, 1954 (68 Stat. 330, 82 Stat. 1213, chapter 423), is repealed.

(c) PAYMENT SCHEDULE; WITHHOLDING OF FUNDS; FUNDING.—

(1) COMPACT SECTION 211(f) FUND.—Section 1 of the Agreement shall be construed as though the section reads as follows:

''SECTION 1. COMPACT SECTION 211(F) FUND.

''The Government of the United States of America (the 'Government of the United States') shall contribute $30,250,000 to the Fund referred to in section 211(f) of the Compact in accordance with the following schedule—

''(1) $11,000,000 in fiscal year 2014;

''(2) $3,000,000 in each of fiscal years 2015 through 2017;

''(3) $2,000,000 in each of fiscal years 2018 through 2022; and

''(4) $250,000 in fiscal year 2023.''.

(2) INFRASTRUCTURE MAINTENANCE FUND.—Subsection (a) of section 2 of the Agreement shall be construed as though the subsection reads as follows:

''(a) The Government of the United States shall provide a grant of $6,912,000 for fiscal year 2014 and a grant of $2,000,000 annually from the beginning of fiscal year 2015 through fiscal year 2024 to create a trust fund (the 'Infrastructure Maintenance Fund') to be used for the routine and periodic maintenance of major capital improvement projects financed by funds provided by the United States. The Government of the Republic of Palau will match the contributions made by the United States by making contributions of $150,000 to the Infrastructure Maintenance Fund on a quarterly basis from the beginning of fiscal year 2014 through fiscal year 2024. Implementation of this subsection shall be carried out in accordance with the provisions of Appendix A to this Agreement.''.

(3) FISCAL CONSOLIDATION FUND.—Section 3 of the Agreement shall be construed as though the section reads as follows:

''SEC. 3. FISCAL CONSOLIDATION FUND.

''The Government of the United States shall provide the Government of Palau $10,000,000 in fiscal year 2014 for deposit in an interest bearing account to be used to reduce government arrears of Palau. Implementation of this section shall be carried out in accordance with the provisions of Appendix B to this Agreement.''.

(4) DIRECT ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE.—Subsection (a) of section 4 of the Agreement shall be construed as though the subsection reads as follows:

''(a) In addition to the economic assistance of $13,147,000 provided to the Government of Palau by the Government of United States in each of fiscal years 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013, and unless otherwise specified in this Agreement or in an Appendix to this Agreement, the Government of the United States shall provide the Government of Palau $69,250,000 in economic assistance as follows—

''(1) $12,000,000 in fiscal year 2014;

''(2) $11,500,000 in fiscal year 2015;

''(3) $10,000,000 in fiscal year 2016;

''(4) $8,500,000 in fiscal year 2017;

''(5) $7,250,000 in fiscal year 2018;

''(6) $6,000,000 in fiscal year 2019;

''(7) $5,000,000 in fiscal year 2020;

''(8) $4,000,000 in fiscal year 2021;

''(9) $3,000,000 in fiscal year 2022; and

''(10) $2,000,000 in fiscal year 2023.

The funds provided in any fiscal year under this subsection for economic assistance shall be provided in 4 quarterly payments (30 percent in the first quarter, 30 percent in the second quarter, 20 percent in the third quarter, and 20 percent in the fourth quarter) unless otherwise specified in this Agreement or in an Appendix to this Agreement.''.

(5) INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS.—Section 5 of the Agreement shall be construed as though the section reads as follows:

''SEC. 5. INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS.

''The Government of the United States shall provide grants totaling $40,000,000 to the Government of Palau as follows: $30,000,000 in fiscal year 2014; and $5,000,000 annually in each of fiscal years 2015 and 2016; towards 1 or more mutually agreed infrastructure projects in accordance with the provisions of Appendix C to this Agreement.''.

(d) CONTINUING PROGRAMS AND LAWS.—Section 105(f)(1)(B)(ix) of the Compact of Free Association Amendments Act of 2003 (48 U.S.C. 1921d(f)(1)(B)(ix)) is amended by striking ''2009'' and inserting ''2024''.

(e) PASSPORT REQUIREMENT.—Section 141 of Article IV of Title One of the Compact of Free Association shall be construed and applied as if it read as follows:

''SEC. 141. PASSPORT REQUIREMENT.

''(a) Any person in the following categories may be admitted to, lawfully engage in occupations, and establish residence as a nonimmigrant in the United States and its territories and possessions without regard to paragraphs (5) or (7)(B)(i)(II) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(5) or (a)(7)(B)(i)(II)), provided that the passport presented to satisfy section 212(a)(7)(B)(i)(I) of such Act is a valid

unexpired machine-readable passport that satisfies the internationally accepted standard for machine readability—

''(1) a person who, on September 30, 1994, was a citizen of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, as defined in title 53 of the Trust Territory Code in force on January 1, 1979, and has become and remains a citizen of Palau;

''(2) a person who acquires the citizenship of Palau, at birth, on or after the effective date of the Constitution of Palau; or

''(3) a naturalized citizen of Palau, who has been an actual resident of Palau for not less than five years after attaining such naturalization and who holds a certificate of actual residence.

''(b) Such persons shall be considered to have the permission of the Secretary of Homeland Security of the United States to accept employment in the United States.

''(c) The right of such persons to establish habitual residence in a territory or possession of the United States may, however, be subjected to non-discriminatory limitations provided for—

''(1) in statutes or regulations of the United States; or

''(2) in those statutes or regulations of the territory or possession concerned which are authorized by the laws of the United States.

''(d) Section 141(a) does not confer on a citizen of Palau the right to establish the residence necessary for naturalization under the Immigration and Nationality Act, or to petition for benefits for alien relatives under that Act. Section 141(a), however, shall not prevent a citizen of Palau from otherwise acquiring such rights or lawful permanent resident alien status in the United States.''.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 190—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT FOREIGN ASSISTANCE FOR CHILD WELFARE SHOULD ADHERE TO THE GOALS OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT ACTION PLAN ON CHILDREN IN ADVERSITY

Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Ms. LANDRIEU) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.:

S. RES. 190

Whereas, as of 2013, there are at least 153,000,000 children in the world who have lost at least 1 parent, and of those children, approximately 17,800,000 have lost both parents;

Whereas more than 400,000,000 children in developing countries are living in extreme poverty;

Whereas more than 115,000,000 children are engaged in hazardous work and more than 5,500,000 children are in situations of forced labor;

Whereas 36 percent of girls and 29 percent of boys around the world have been sexually abused;

Whereas at least 2,000,000, and probably many more, children are raised in institutional care;

Whereas millions of children throughout the world live under conditions of serious deprivation or danger, and children who experience violence or are exploited, abandoned, abused, or severely neglected also face significant threats to their survival and well-being, as well as profound risks that have an impact on their human, social, and economic development;

Whereas children in the most dire circumstances, including children without protective family care, or who are living in abusive households, on the streets, or in institutions, trafficked, participating in armed groups, or exploited for their labor, face a multitude of risks posed by extreme poverty, disease, disability, conflict, and disaster;

Whereas family reunification, kinship care, and domestic and intercountry adoption promote permanency and stability to a far greater degree than long-term institutionalization;

Whereas permanent family care, transitioning children from institutions into protective family care, and preventing violence within households and in schools are associated with reduced infant and child mortality, decreased grade repetition, decreased future criminal activity, decreased drug use and abuse, fewer teen pregnancies, and higher economic earning potential;

Whereas past efforts by the United States to assist vulnerable children in low- and middle-income countries have not always been coordinated among the Federal agencies responsible for foreign assistance, and that lack of coordination has sometimes resulted in a fragmented response;

Whereas, with the increasing number of children in need, limitations on Federal funding, and multiple Federal agencies involved in efforts to assist children in need, it is more important than ever to improve the coordination and coherence of those efforts in order to maximize the effect on children;

Whereas the Assistance for Orphans and Other Vulnerable Children in Developing Countries Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–95; 119 Stat. 2111), which passed the House of Representatives by a vote of 415 to 9 and passed the Senate by unanimous consent, called for a comprehensive, coordinated, and effective response on the part of the Government of the United States to assist the most vulnerable children in the world;

Whereas the Special Advisor for Assistance for Orphans and Vulnerable Children appointed under section 135(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2152f(e), in coordination with 7 Federal agencies, released the United States Government Action Plan on Children in Adversity as the first-ever whole-of-government strategic guidance for foreign assistance for children provided by the United States; and

Whereas the United States Government Action Plan on Children in Adversity seeks to ensure that all activities of the Government of the United States are coordinated among appropriate Federal agencies and integrated into relevant foreign policy initiatives of the United States, with the goal of promoting permanent family care and integrating evidence-based practices that are in the best interest of children: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) a comprehensive action plan for addressing the needs of children living in adversity should be sanctioned by the highest level of the Government of the United States;

(2) Federal funding that currently goes toward projects and research benefitting children in low- and middle-income countries should be coordinated among the Federal agencies that receive it with the goals of—

(A) promoting permanent family care for the most vulnerable children in the world;

(B) reducing the number of children who experience violence, exploitation, or abuse; and

(C) eliminating unnecessary duplication and contradictory approaches within the Government of the United States; and

(3) the United States Government Action Plan on Children in Adversity has the potential to realize those goals and create a more effective and efficient response by the Government of the United States to assisting the most vulnerable children in the world.

SENATE RESOLUTION 191—DESIGNATING JULY 27, 2013, AS ''NATIONAL DAY OF THE AMERICAN COWBOY''

Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. JOHANNS, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. REID, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. TESTER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 191

Whereas pioneering men and women, recognized as ''cowboys'', helped establish the American West;

Whereas the cowboy embodies honesty, integrity, courage, compassion, respect, a strong work ethic, and patriotism;

Whereas the cowboy spirit exemplifies strength of character, sound family values, and good common sense;

Whereas the cowboy archetype transcends ethnicity, gender, geographic boundaries, and political affiliations;

Whereas the cowboy is an excellent steward of the land and its creatures, who lives off the land and works to protect and enhance the environment;

Whereas cowboy traditions have been a part of American culture for generations;

Whereas the cowboy continues to be an important part of the economy through the work of many thousands of ranchers across the United States who contribute to the economic well-being of every State;

Whereas millions of fans watch professional and working ranch rodeo events annually, making rodeo one of the most-watched sports in the United States;

Whereas membership and participation in rodeo and other organizations that promote and encompass the livelihood of cowboys span every generation and transcend race and gender;

Whereas the cowboy is a central figure in literature, film, and music and occupies a central place in the public imagination;

Whereas the cowboy is an American icon; and

Whereas the ongoing contributions made by cowboys and cowgirls to their communities should be recognized and encouraged: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates July 27, 2013, as ''National Day of the American Cowboy''; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I am proud to submit a resolution today to designate Saturday, July 27, 2013 as National Day of the American Cowboy. My late colleague, Senator Craig Thomas, began the tradition of honoring the men and women known as ''Cowboys'' 9 years ago when he introduced the first resolution to designate the fourth Saturday of July as National Day of the American Cowboy. I am proud to carry on Senator Thomas's tradition.