

S. 1441

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1441, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to facilitate water leasing and water transfers to promote conservation and efficiency.

S. 1455

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. McCONNELL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1455, a bill to condition the provision of premium and cost-sharing subsidies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act upon a certification that a program to verify household income is operational.

S. 1456

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1456, a bill to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Shimon Peres.

S. 1487

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1487, a bill to limit the availability of tax credits and reductions in cost-sharing under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to individuals who receive health insurance coverage pursuant to the provisions of a Taft-Hartley plan.

S. 1488

At the request of Mr. COATS, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1488, a bill to delay the application of the individual health insurance mandate, to delay the application of the employer health insurance mandate, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 15

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 15, a joint resolution removing the deadline for the ratification of the equal rights amendment.

S. RES. 75

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) 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. 128

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 128, a

resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that supporting seniors and individuals with disabilities is an important responsibility of the United States, and that a comprehensive approach to expanding and supporting a strong home care workforce and making long-term services and supports affordable and accessible in communities is necessary to uphold the right of seniors and individuals with disabilities in the United States to a dignified quality of life.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Mr. WYDEN, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1491. A bill to amend the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 to improve United States-Israel energy cooperation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to speak for a few minutes about an exciting new area of collaboration between the United States and Israel, our critical ally and friend in the Middle East. Especially given the current state of affairs in the Middle East, the United States' clear and unyielding support for Israel is more important now than ever before. For the past few years, I have been a leader in the effort to enhance US-Israel collaboration on energy development, which is why I am excited today to introduce a bill that will expand this critical relationship, along with Chairman WYDEN and Ranking Member MURKOWSKI.

In December 2010, Israel made the largest natural gas discovery in the world in the past decade off its coast in the Mediterranean. The discovery, known as the Leviathan field, is estimated at 16 trillion cubic feet of natural gas, bringing Israel's total natural gas reserves to an estimated 30 trillion cubic feet. This will likely be able to satisfy Israel's domestic gas demand with enough left over to export for years to come—in fact, it is estimated that if only half of this natural gas was produced, Israel would have 100 years of its natural gas needs met.

Not only is the Leviathan discovery a game changer for Israel, both economically and geopolitically, but it is also an incredible chance for the U.S. to share our energy expertise to support a critical ally while creating economic opportunities here at home. The Gulf Coast, which provides one third of all domestically produced oil in the nation, arguably has the most advanced offshore energy industry in the world; Israel, until very recently has had almost none. With limited domestic production capacity, a non-existent regulatory framework, and a lack of related academic programs, Israel can greatly benefit from collaboration with the U.S., and we are uniquely qualified to lead this effort to help Israel success-

fully develop this natural resource. As Israel is a leader in the research and development, hi-tech and startup spaces, enhanced collaboration between the two countries can be mutually beneficial.

The United States-Israel Energy Cooperation Enhancement Bill recognizes the important relationship and potential for further collaboration between the United States and Israel on energy development, including natural gas and alternative fuels, and seeks to bolster that relationship by encouraging increased cooperation in the academic, business, governmental, and other sectors.

The bill first recognizes energy collaboration with Israel as a strategic interest of the United States and officially encourages collaboration between the U.S. National Science Foundation and the Israel Science Foundation. It then further encourages cooperation between both countries' academic communities in energy innovation technology, technology transfer, and analysis of the geopolitical implications of new natural resource development. It also urges business development engagement in the private sectors and regular engagement between the two countries' relevant agencies, departments and ministries to share best practices.

Additionally, the United States-Israel Energy Cooperation Enhancement Bill expands two already existing joint grant making programs, the Binational Industrial Research and Development Program, BIRD, and the Binational Science Foundation, BSF. Under the bill, these two programs would now include projects focused on natural gas, which are expected given Israel's recent discoveries, as well as entrepreneurial development and the advanced hi-tech sector. The legislation also reauthorizes the BIRD and BSF programs through fiscal year 2024.

Finally, the bill allows for the authorization of a United States-Israel Offshore Technology Center to further academic and technology research and development collaboration. This is the direct result of numerous conversations, meetings, and visits I have had over the past few years, and I am especially excited about the potential of this type of formal academic collaboration. Israeli universities have some of the world's leading engineering departments, but have no petroleum engineering faculty. Imagine the synergy if we could combine Israeli engineering expertise with our universities, who have the leading petroleum engineering departments in the world.

This bill builds off of my previous efforts to enhance collaboration between the United States and Israel on energy development and exploration. For several years, I have been working to strengthen the relationship between our two countries and to help our domestic energy industry. In October 2011, with the help of the Department

of Commerce and the Southwest Louisiana Economic Development Alliance, I organized the first ever oil and gas trade mission to Israel and brought 12 Louisiana oil and gas companies to the region. The mission was such a success that the Department of Commerce and I ran another trip in October 2012 that brought 15 American companies and universities. Additionally, in June of 2012, I hosted a delegation of 10 high-ranking Israeli officials in Washington and Louisiana to meet with US industry experts and federal officials, including then Secretary of the Interior Ken Salazar. The delegation also attended the Central Gulf of Mexico oil and gas lease sale in New Orleans and visited Port Fourchon and the Liquefied Natural Gas, LNG, facility in Cameron Parish. By seeing our work first-hand and learning about the US regulatory framework, they left with a keener understanding of our industry.

The United States-Israel Energy Cooperation Enhancement Bill will continue to advance this important goal. Through energy collaboration, academic cooperation, and continued government dialogue, we will create jobs for our domestic oil and gas industry and support a critical ally in the Middle East in its quest for energy independence and security. I thank my colleagues Chairman WYDEN and Ranking Member MURKOWSKI for their leadership on this issue and for cosponsoring the bill, and I urge my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent 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. 1491

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

SECTION 1. UNITED STATES-ISRAEL ENERGY COOPERATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Section 917(a) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17337(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “renewable” and inserting “covered”;

(2) in paragraph (4)—

(A) by striking “possible many” and inserting “possible—

“(A) many”;

(B) by inserting “and” after the semicolon at the end; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) significant contributions to the development of renewable energy and energy efficiency through the established programs of the United States-Israel Binational Industrial Research and Development Foundation and the United States-Israel Binational Science Foundation.”;

(3) in paragraph (6)—

(A) by striking “renewable” and inserting “covered”; and

(B) by striking “and” after the semicolon at the end;

(4) in paragraph (7)—

(A) by striking “renewable” and inserting “covered”; and

(B) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) United States-Israel energy cooperation, and the development of natural resources by Israel, are strategic interests of the United States;

“(9) Israel is a strategic partner of the United States in water technology;

“(10) the United States can play a role in assisting Israel with regional safety and security issues;

“(11) the National Science Foundation of the United States should collaborate with the Israel Science Foundation;

“(12) the United States and Israel should strive to develop more robust academic cooperation in energy innovation technology and engineering, water science, technology transfer, and analysis of geopolitical implications of new natural resource development and associated areas;

“(13) the United States supports the goals of the Alternative Fuels Administration of Israel;

“(14) the United States strongly urges open dialogue and continued mechanisms for regular engagement and encourages further cooperation between applicable departments, agencies, ministries, institutions of higher education, and the private sector of the United States and Israel on energy security issues, including—

“(A) identifying policy priorities associated with the development of natural resources of Israel;

“(B) discussing best practices to secure cyber energy infrastructure;

“(C) best practice sharing;

“(D) leveraging natural gas to positively impact regional stability;

“(E) improving energy efficiency and the overall performance of water technologies through research and development in water desalination, wastewater treatment and reclamation, and other water treatment refineries;

“(F) technical and environmental management of deep-water exploration and production;

“(G) coastal protection and restoration;

“(H) academic outreach and engagement;

“(I) private sector and business development engagement;

“(J) regulatory consultations;

“(K) leveraging alternative transportation fuels and technologies; and

“(L) any other areas determined appropriate by United States and Israel; and

“(15) the United States acknowledges the achievements and importance of the Binational Industrial Research and Development Foundation (BIRD) and the United States-Israel Binational Science Foundation (BSF) and supports continued multiyear funding to ensure the continuity of the programs of the Foundations.”.

(b) TYPES OF ENERGY.—Section 917(b)(2) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17337(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (F), by striking “and” after the semicolon at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (G), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(H) natural gas energy, including natural gas projects conducted by or in conjunction with the United States-Israel Binational Science Foundation;

“(I) improvement of energy efficiency and the overall performance of water technologies through research and development in water desalination, wastewater treatment and reclamation, and other water treatment refineries; and

“(J) conventional and unconventional oil and gas technologies.”.

(c) ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS.—Section 917(b)(3) of the Energy Independence and Security Act

of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17337(b)(3)) is amended by striking “energy efficiency or renewable” and inserting “covered”.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS; INTERNATIONAL PARTNERSHIPS.—Section 917 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17337) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (d);

(2) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (e); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) INTERNATIONAL PARTNERSHIPS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may, subject to appropriations, enter into cooperative agreements supporting and enhancing dialogue and planning involving international partnerships between the Department, including National Laboratories of the Department, and the Government of Israel and its ministries, offices, and institutions.

“(2) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Secretary may not pay more than 50 percent of Federal share of the costs described in paragraph (1).

“(3) ANNUAL REPORTS.—The Secretary may submit to the appropriate committees of Congress an annual report that describes—

“(A) actions taken to carry out this subsection; and

“(B) any projects under this subsection for which the Secretary requests funding.

“(d) UNITED STATES-ISRAEL CENTER.—The Secretary may establish a joint United States-Israel Center based in an area of the United States with the experience, knowledge, and expertise in offshore energy development to further dialogue and collaboration to develop more robust academic cooperation in energy innovation technology and engineering, water science, technology transfer, and analysis of geopolitical implications of new natural resource development and associated areas.”.

(e) TERMINATION.—Subsection (e) of section 917 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17337) (as redesignated by subsection (d)(2)) is amended by striking “the date that is 7 years after the date of enactment of this Act” and inserting “September 30, 2024”.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S.J. Res. 22. A joint resolution to promote a diplomatic solution in Syria, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, approximately 9 days ago most of us were on call and being briefed by the administration on what was evolving and how desperate and dire the situation was. At the time it was being proposed as an imminent strike that had to be done for the defense of this Nation, and we listened to that.

Immediately after that conversation we had with many Senators and Secretary Kerry, my dear friend Senator HEITKAMP called me and said: I would hope we have another option. We were looking for an option. The only thing we had before us was a vote to either support an imminent strike or not support a strike. It has been proposed if we don't show the strength of this great country of ours that it could weaken our standing in the world and our intentions might not be taken seriously the next time and also weaken the Presidency, which none of us want to do, no matter what side of the fence you might be on.

So we kept looking and talking. I canceled all my appointments in West

Virginia and Senator HEITKAMP did the same in North Dakota and we came back as soon as possible. We attended every meeting, every briefing. I went to my Armed Services Committee meeting and also the Foreign Relations Committee meeting to hear the testimony from all of the people in the administration who were making their case.

At the end of the day, it still did not rise to the level, in my mind and I think in the mind of Senator HEITKAMP as well, that we were at a point to where it would be of imminent danger to the United States. So with that, we brought all the people together, and Senator HEITKAMP—and I want her to chime in here—and myself kept pushing and pushing the people who had the knowledge and who had been down that road before—military leaders, past and present, diplomats, and also think tanks—and we finally came up with something that could be done.

I would defer to Senator HEITKAMP on this, but we kept saying if the problem is chemical weapons, why haven't we addressed that? All we knew was there was an imminent strike. We were not going to be able to take out, nor did we intend to take out or change the regime. We could not put boots on the ground, nor did we have a desire—nobody had a desire—for our military men and women to go back in. So we couldn't secure those weapons.

Senator HEITKAMP might want to say how we came to the position we came to and why we felt it was so important.

Ms. HEITKAMP. I think the first thing to talk about is the ability, first and foremost, to look at the mission and look at the event that led to the need for a discussion in this body and a discussion in this country about our relationship in Syria, and that was the use of chemical weapons by the Asad regime in their own home country against their own people.

We know that activity is not only a crime against the Syrian people, but it is a crime against humanity. It is a crime against an international standard that has been in place since World War I and has been greatly honored because of the devastating effects of using chemical weapons.

So when Senator MANCHIN and I looked at this—and we had long discussions with experts in the region—our first concern was securing those chemical weapons and what we could do to make sure those weapons would never again be used on any citizen of Syria and that we would not encourage or in any way give permission to another country to engage in that activity. That is fundamentally the greatest interest we have in securing some kind of resolution in the Congress—to address that concern.

Unfortunately, what we saw was not a targeted resolution that addressed that specific problem. Plus, what we were presented with when we returned were two options: Do nothing, which both of us concluded we could not let

an attack such as this go unresponded to. So do nothing or agree to imminent strikes, and that was not an option either of us saw as appropriate, nor was that an option we could agree to, so we looked for common ground, listening not only to the experts in the administration—the diplomats, the military experts, the national security folks—but also bringing a broader group of people together to discuss what is our mission, how do we accomplish this. The result of all of that is the resolution the Senator has before him, the resolution he and I have advanced for a discussion in this body.

It seems critical to me that 1 week ago the interjecting of the chemical weapons ban and the Chemical Weapons Convention into this discussion in a very meaningful way, looking at what is in fact international law, was absolutely critical. Today, we have a very fluid and much different landscape diplomatically. We would like to think these kinds of discussions that have occurred all across the country have driven this, along with the President's discussion with Putin, along with the administration's efforts.

So today we have a situation where we are glad to see some involvement, we are glad to see some movement, but it is absolutely critical we remind everyone that actions speak louder than words. We cannot trust, I don't think, agreements between Russia or Syria until we actually see Syria surrendering these weapons. But today we have an option on the table that is what we call the Manchin-Heitkamp alternative resolution, which can in fact engage us in a broader discussion, engage the international community.

I would say that truly was the motivation behind our work. I think the Senator would agree with that.

Mr. MANCHIN. I sure do. First of all, we all applaud President Obama for bringing it to Congress. We think this is the right place for these types of decisions, with the consequences we are facing and what the repercussions could be. But we have come to a conclusion that any type of imminent strike and the reaction from that would be greater than inaction right now. But doing nothing is unacceptable, which is how we came to this.

Basically, we call this the Chemical Weapons Control Act. The thing about the Chemical Weapons Convention, we felt—and we have heard from diplomats on this—this was the proper course. It was basically giving the Asad regime 45 days. Our resolution is very straightforward. The Asad regime has 45 days to sign and comply, and that means to identify, to secure, and to start eliminating and destroying. He cannot use, nor can he continue to produce, these types of weapons.

Also, in that 45-day period, we have asked the administration and the President to lay forth a plan for Congress to evaluate what Syria would look like at the end. If they do not sign, what are we to do and how would

Syria look? If they do sign and that still hasn't brought any peace and an end to a civil war, that needs to be looked at also.

We have all heard from our constituents. In talking to our colleagues we have even heard a lot more. We have had some who have said: Listen, we don't want a strike under any circumstances. No way on God's green Earth do we believe a strike will produce anything but repercussions.

I have said this, and the Senator and I have talked about this: If you believe that money or military might would change the course and direction of that part of the world, which we define as the Middle East or North Africa, then we would have had success by now. We have spent 12 years—the longest war in our history—and we have spent over \$1.6 trillion and the results have not been beneficial whatsoever and we have lost thousands of lives.

I have also said being a superpower means more than showing the rest of the world we have the super might to use whenever we feel it is necessary. Being a superpower comes with not only having the super military power, it comes with having the super negotiation ability, the super diplomacy, the super patience, and the super humanitarian aid, as needed. We have the ability to do all of that.

That is what we have asked for. Now we are seeing an evolving situation—not only in 24 hours, but with every 24 minutes it seems like something is changing. The Russians have said they would ask Asad's regime in Syria to sign or be involved. Syria says they have accepted. We have heard now they have said they will comply and join the CWC. These are the changes we have to continue to try to bring to fruition.

On that, we are very happy. I know the Senator and I have spoken about that—and our colleagues are looking at different options—that we didn't have different options as of Monday morning. There were no options. It was are you going to vote to strike or not vote to strike. I am pleased we are moving and I think cooler heads will prevail.

I believe the President is open to making sure the players are sincere and real, meaning what they are saying. I believe now that they have announced to the entire world, the international world, that we will sign and be honest brokers, let's put them on the spot and see if they will sign that and be part of this and become part of the 21st century, if you will.

I have and I will continue to work with my colleague. I think the Geneva Protocol of 1925 prohibits the use of chemical and biological weapons in conflict, but it did not go far enough. We know that. Syria signed the Geneva Protocol in December of 1969. They signed that one, but then they would not and have not been a signatory of the Chemical Weapons Convention of 1993. That is what we are speaking of. That one is the modern-day equivalent of the Geneva Protocol. The international community began negotiating

the CWC in 1980 to close the loopholes of the Geneva Protocol. The CWC opened for signature in 1963 and after the required 65 ratifications were received, entered into force in 1997. We have, I think, five countries that have not signed. Most countries, 191, have signed. That is what we are asking for them to comply with, which we think is the best way, because there is an implementation organization which oversees it and it is not the United States or Russia or not any other country taking the lead but basically it is a way to have the entire international community come back into play.

Ms. HEITKAMP. To add another point to what Senator MANCHIN has spoken about, which is that the results have not been satisfactory—I think the other point we need to make is the results of all that interaction over this decade-plus of activity in this region have not been what was promised. It has made the American people perhaps cynical and very hesitant to rely on what is being said today.

As one of the great honors, but also amazing pieces of sadness in my first days of being a Senator-elect, I attended two funerals for two National Guardsmen who were killed in action in Afghanistan. I remember sitting at the funerals and remember telling myself: Before you vote ever to engage in that kind of conflict, you absolutely need to look at alternatives. You owe it to our men and women in uniform. You owe it to the people of this country who have lost not only the lives of their brothers and sisters and family and friends but the people who have also invested American treasure.

What we are seeking is a discussion, a broader discussion beyond two opposite and unacceptable alternatives. What we are seeing this week—much to our appreciation—is in fact not just our proposal but other proposals coming forth, a broader discussion about what all the options are, and taking a look at how we can work together as a United States government, speak with one voice, and walk together to resolve this conflict.

We cannot ignore that we have a national security interest in working together. We have a national security interest in addressing and resolving the current issues in front of us. That discussion cannot be done among a small group of Senators. It cannot be done in back rooms with a promise of “trust us,” because some of that trust has been broken over time. So a broad, open discussion as we are having here today I think is absolutely critical to reestablishing Americans’ trust that we can in fact make the right decision in their interests and really in the interests of protecting our servicemen from chemical weapon attacks.

That is obviously a great concern of ours. We need to continue to have this dialog and we need some kind of response. The question is how measured and what that response should be.

I have very much appreciated the Senator’s willingness to work with me

and I thank the rest of the Members who have approached us who want to talk about this proposal and other proposals for their willingness to broaden their thinking about what those options are.

Mr. MANCHIN. I am so proud to be working on this with the Senator. Our staffs have worked well together. They are most competent and they have done a yeoman job. The resolution we have come with basically is the only one out there, an option today that basically controls the chemical weapons. It actually controls these chemical weapons from ever being used on another human being—which we all deplore. With that, maybe we can help, now, move on to trying to help resolve this civil war. The carnage is unbelievable.

They said there were 99,000 people killed in Syria with conventional weapons and 1,000 with chemicals. To me, every person is a life we could save, we ought to try to save. With that being said, we have to give them a chance to come be involved, and that is what we have done.

At this time last week we never thought we would have been here. This time 2 days ago we would not have thought we could be here. But we are moving in the right direction.

Let me make it clear what the resolution the Senator and our staffs have worked on does. The section, our title, is this, basically:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

The section of our coining, this section of our title

... may be cited as the “Chemical Weapons Control and Accountability Resolution of 2013.”

Basically exactly what it says. The statement of policy is this:

It is the policy of the United States that

(1) the Government of Syria must become a signatory to the Chemical Weapons Convention and take concrete steps to comply with the terms and conditions of the Convention;

(2) the failure by the government of Bashar al-Assad to sign and comply with the Convention clearly demonstrates a willful disregard of international norms on the use of chemical weapons; and

(3) if the Government of Syria does not sign and comply with the convention within 45 days after the date of the enactment of this resolution, all elements of national power will be considered by the United States Government.

That reaffirms the war powers the President has. I know there are some who do not believe that is constitutional or do not believe it is law, but we have checked it and researched it, and it is. We reconfirm that. It does not say that imminent strikes will happen at the end of 45 days. It will be up to the President to determine whether negotiations are moving in the right direction, if all players are being sincere in coming on board, but it gives him the chance to be the President, to do whatever he is elected to do. Whom-

ever he or she may be, you want the President’s office to be able to exercise the powers they have by law. That is what we have done here.

Everybody has a different approach. Some may say 45 days or you don’t need that. Fine. We are open to all that. We have said that before. But the experts who helped us put this together put in timetables they believed were reasonable and believed they were attainable.

Ms. HEITKAMP. There are some who may question whether this is capitulation or whether in fact this is a lack of showing of American unity. How would the Senator respond to those concerns?

Mr. MANCHIN. We have heard our colleagues and had some good conversations with our colleagues. We have had other people saying for real, all you are doing is trying to stall.

I said no. I don’t believe anyone really questions the might of the government. I don’t think it weakens the U.S. Government, to show super restraint, knowing the volatility of that part of the world.

Also, past experience in my State of West Virginia—and I know in the great State of North Dakota—we know when you try something and put in so much effort trying to change that part of the world and have not had the success, nowhere near, and spent \$1.6 trillion and the sacrifice of Americans—maybe that is not something we should repeat. We all know that. We get no support basically from our constituents.

Those of us who are privy to all these high-powered meetings, if you will, have not been convinced that there will be change. With that being said, I say to my friends, if you believe anyone would discount the might of this Nation? I don’t think so. The resolve of us to protect our country and our Americans? I don’t think so. Or to support our allies, our true friends and allies? I don’t think so.

But you know, back home we have a saying: Sometimes you don’t have a dog in the fight. We can’t really find a friend in that fight. That is the problem. That is the hard sell. With that being said—I have said this before—the Arab League, they should step forward. That is in their backyard. We should give all the support. We have humanitarian aid. We will give all the support we possibly can, but they need to take the lead. It cannot always be the Americans being the policemen of the world and everyone saying: OK, call 911, which goes right to Washington. They will take care of it.

I discount it when they start saying it doesn’t show your strength, we might not have that strength of reputation or it might weaken the President. No, I don’t think so. Not at all.

Ms. HEITKAMP. I think what we would say to the enemies of this country: Do not take from this democratic process and discussion a lack of resolve. We will stand together shoulder to shoulder. This is the process the Constitution gave us and the President

has asked us to engage in. It shows the strength of this country, that we can have open debate, open disagreements, but at the end of the day we will stand together and stand strongly against our enemies. There should be no comfort taken in any way, shape, or form by the enemies of our country that it somehow weakens our country. In fact it strengthens our country to have this discussion and then stand shoulder to shoulder together.

I do want to mention that during those times last week when we were attending the classified briefings, and a lot of those briefings were bicameral as well as bipartisan—I know we have that reputation today of being hyperpartisan and we cannot have meaningful and open discussion, it degenerates into pettiness and partisanship. I can tell you from my experience of sitting through every one of those briefings what I heard was reasoned discussion. What I heard was rational questioning. What I heard was an equal measure of restraint on both the Democrat and the Republican side and a search for common answers and commonality. It was that discussion that led us to introducing this type of resolution.

For those who say this is just another example of dysfunctionality, it is too bad they could not look in at those discussions because I think they would have seen a Congress that was very engaged. They would have seen individual Members who were not looking to score political points but were looking for information so they could exercise the judgment that their people, their districts, or their States elected them to exercise.

That is the process going through. It is a critical process but it cannot be done yes or no, no other options, and we are not going to have a broader discussion. That is why we are grateful for what is happening on the ground. We will wait to see if it is real. We will wait to see. It is not enough—talk is never enough. We have to see action.

But in the meantime we will continue to have these discussions about what is in America's national security interests and how we exercise our collective will with a resolution that reflects our values and our commitment to this country and its national security.

Mr. MANCHIN. I believe that as the world watches what is unfolding now, they are watching a superpower make a decision. We are using super restraint. We are using super compassion, if you will. But we are super resolved and we have the super might to do what we need to do. I don't think anyone should take that lightly.

I do not think anyone would take for granted that we will not defend this country and every citizen of this country with everything we have and try to spread humanity, if you will, all over the world. But it takes more than us as we move outside the borders of the United States of America. We need an

international community working with us. We need some of them stepping to the plate; not just the rhetoric that we hear but basic stuff. We need the United Nations to be functioning again, to have a functioning role and have a strong support role and be able to step to the plate and do it in a fashion that protects the civilized world. Those are the things we have asked for.

I think this gives it a chance. Today we have seen a breakthrough, if President Asad has said: I will sign and I will be a member and I will comply and I will have inspectors come in and I will make sure these weapons are secure and we will start destroying them, taking them off the shelf. Russia can play a part in that. They can pull their ships up, load them up, take them out, take them to a secured area. That is getting them out of that part of the world, and then hopefully we can get people working together to stop the war we have, to stop the carnage, too.

It starts here. People are looking to the United States and I think they have been looking for the leadership we have been able to give, not just in the military and not just in financial, but in some good, solid, concrete decisions that bring this suffering that is going on in Syria to an end.

I am very proud to work with the Senator from North Dakota on this issue. We are asking all of our colleagues to be involved in any way, shape, or form. We will work with them. If there is anyone who has ideas that can make this better and an even more perfect document, then we are all for that. I know the Senator from North Dakota feels that way, and I know her team feels that way also.

I thank Senator HEITKAMP for the work she has done and also the friend she has been. I believe we are close to getting this in the right direction where cooler heads prevail, and I think the world will be safer.

Ms. HEITKAMP. I thank the Senator from West Virginia for the work he has done and the leadership he has shown. I believe that when we work together, collaborate, and actually begin the discussion about what is in America's national security interest and how we can fashion a position and a resolution that reflects that national security interest and open the opportunity for a broader dialog—not just two choices but a broader dialog—we can build consensus in this body. If we can build consensus in this body and if we can work forward to build consensus in America, we can, in fact, move this issue forward, and it might be an example of what we can do with our future.

Again, I thank the Senator from West Virginia for his participation, inclusion, and the work he has done. I believe it has not only offered a very significant alternative, but it has also set an example of where we can go.

Mr. MANCHIN. I don't believe military action is going to correct what is going on with Syria. It is going to be diplomacy and democracy that will

hopefully work there. We are trying to put that forward first. More people are coming on board, and we appreciate that. We thank all of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

This is not a partisan issue. It truly has not been a partisan issue, and it won't be a partisan issue. This is an American issue that involves all of us, and it is a world issue. The world has great interest, but they also have to have participation.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 221—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF OCTOBER 7 THROUGH OCTOBER 13, 2013, AS “NATUROPATHIC MEDICINE WEEK” TO RECOGNIZE THE VALUE OF NATUROPATHIC MEDICINE IN PROVIDING SAFE, EFFECTIVE, AND AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE

Ms. MIKULSKI submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 221

Whereas, in the United States, more than 75 percent of health care costs are due to preventable chronic illnesses, including high blood pressure, which affects 88,000,000 people in the United States, and diabetes, which affects 26,000,000 people in the United States;

Whereas nearly two-thirds of adults in the United States are overweight or obese and, consequently, at risk for serious health conditions, such as high blood pressure, diabetes, cardiovascular disease, arthritis, and depression;

Whereas 70 percent of people in the United States experience physical or nonphysical symptoms of stress, and stress can contribute to the development of major illnesses, such as cardiovascular disease, depression, and diabetes;

Whereas the aforementioned chronic health conditions are among the most common, costly, and preventable health conditions;

Whereas naturopathic medicine provides noninvasive, holistic treatments that support the inherent self-healing capacity of the human body and encourage self-responsibility in health care;

Whereas naturopathic medicine focuses on patient-centered care, the prevention of chronic illnesses, and early intervention in the treatment of chronic illnesses;

Whereas naturopathic physicians attend 4-year, graduate level programs that are accredited by agencies approved by the Department of Education;

Whereas aspects of naturopathic medicine have been shown to lower the risk of major illnesses such as cardiovascular disease and diabetes;

Whereas naturopathic physicians can help address the shortage of primary care providers in the United States;

Whereas naturopathic physicians are trained to refer patients to conventional physicians and specialists when necessary;

Whereas the profession of naturopathic medicine is dedicated to providing health care to underserved populations; and

Whereas naturopathic medicine provides consumers in the United States with more choice in health care, in line with the increased use of a variety of integrative medical treatments: Now, therefore, be it