

Roberts	Sessions	Toomey
Rubio	Shelby	Vitter
Scott	Thune	Wicker

NOT VOTING—2

Boozman	Coats
---------	-------

The nomination was confirmed.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

WATER RESOURCES REFORM AND DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2014—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Chair lays before the Senate the conference report to accompany H.R. 3080, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3080), to provide for improvements to the rivers and harbors of the United States, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment and the Senate agree to the same, signed by a majority of the conferees on the part of both Houses.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings in the RECORD of May 15, 2014.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Colleagues, I am going to take 25 seconds. This is a great day for the Senate, for every single Member in this body, and our States, for jobs, for business, for ecosystem restoration, for our oceans. It is a great bill. I hope we will have a great vote on this bill.

Senator VITTER and I agree. I will yield my remaining time to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I urge a "yes" vote also. This is a strong bipartisan bill. There were only four "no" votes in the House and a strong positive editorial in the Wall Street Journal. Vote for infrastructure and jobs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the conference report to accompany H.R. 3080.

Mr. CORKER. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) would have voted "yea."

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

The result was announced—yeas 91, nays 7, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 163 Leg.]

YEAS—91

Alexander	Grassley	Nelson
Ayotte	Hagan	Paul
Baldwin	Harkin	Portman
Barrasso	Hatch	Pryor
Begich	Heinrich	Reed
Bennet	Heitkamp	Reid
Blumenthal	Heller	Risch
Blunt	Hirono	Rockefeller
Booker	Hoeven	Rubio
Boxer	Inhofe	Sanders
Brown	Isakson	Schatz
Cantwell	Johanns	Schumer
Cardin	Johnson (SD)	Scott
Carper	Kaine	Sessions
Casey	King	Shaheen
Chambliss	Kirk	Shelby
Cochran	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Collins	Landrieu	Tester
Coons	Leahy	Thune
Corker	Levin	Toomey
Cornyn	Manchin	Udall (CO)
Crapo	Markey	Udall (NM)
Cruz	McCaskill	Vitter
Donnelly	McConnell	Walsh
Durbin	Menendez	Warner
Enzi	Merkley	Warren
Feinstein	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Fischer	Moran	Wicker
Franken	Murkowski	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murphy	
Graham	Murray	

NAYS—7

Burr	Johnson (WI)	Roberts
Coburn	Lee	
Flake	McCain	

NOT VOTING—2

Boozman	Coats
---------	-------

The conference report was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF RICHARD G. FRANK TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

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

The bill clerk read the nomination of Richard G. Frank, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services.

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

The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to yield back all remaining time on both sides.

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Richard G. Frank, of Massachusetts, to

be an Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services?

The nomination was confirmed.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

TO PROTECT AND ENHANCE OPPORTUNITIES FOR RECREATIONAL HUNTING, FISHING, AND SHOOTING—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I want to speak briefly on three topics this afternoon: human trafficking; the terrorist attack at Fort Hood, TX, in 2009; and finally, the way the Senate has become a killing ground for good ideas because of the practices of the majority leader.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING

Starting with human trafficking, we know that while slavery was formally abolished in the United States years ago, it continues today in the form of human trafficking. Tragically, too many children are victims of modern-day slavery—literally tens of thousands right here in America. That is why in recent years I have joined with colleagues on both sides of the aisle—obviously, this is not a political or partisan issue—to work together in a bipartisan way to introduce a series of bills aimed at accomplishing three things: No. 1, shedding light on this tragic reality. Most people in their communities around the country are not even aware of the scourge of human trafficking that is happening right under their nose. No. 2, we have tried to do everything we can to save children—minors—from the sex trade. And No. 3, we have tried hard to bring these traffickers to justice.

I was proud to be one of the cosponsors of the 2012 Child Protection Act, which gave law enforcement agencies better tools with which to protect children and apprehend criminals. More recently, I joined with the senior Senator from Oregon, Mr. WYDEN; the senior Senator from Minnesota, Ms. KLOBUCHAR; and the junior Senator from Illinois, Mr. KIRK, to introduce something we call the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act.

Our bill would establish a domestic trafficking victims fund that doesn't come from tax dollars but, rather, from fees and fines paid by people who commit law enforcement offenses. It would allocate tens of millions of dollars to both fight human trafficking and, just as importantly, to help victims get the sorts of services they need in order to heal and to become productive citizens once again. It would also give law enforcement officials more tools to crack

down on human trafficking and the broader criminal networks that support them.

The bill would streamline human trafficking task force investigations by giving investigators access to better technologies and enhance cooperation between Federal and State law enforcement partnerships. It would also allow law enforcement officials to prosecute each and every member of a human trafficking organization, as opposed to merely the on-the-ground managers, and it would increase the penalties for criminals who prey on children through sex slavery.

Finally, it would improve the availability of restitution and witness assistance for trafficking victims by allowing for a larger portion of forfeited Federal criminal assets to go directly to the victims.

To be clear, as I said a moment ago, this bill would be funded by the fines imposed on the people who commit the crimes of child pornography, child prostitution, sexual exploitation, human trafficking, and commercial human smuggling offenses at the Federal level, and it would not increase the Federal deficit.

Earlier this week, the House of Representatives acted by passing its own version of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, and I would urge the majority leader and the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee to bring the Senate version up for a vote in the committee and on the floor of the Senate as soon as possible. After all, during a time when politics seems to pervade everything here in Washington, DC, and we are approaching a midterm election where it seems so hard to do things that should be easy, this is one thing we ought to be able to do together.

FORT HOOD

I would also urge the majority leader to allow a vote on separate legislation that has already been approved by the House Armed Services Committee as an amendment to the national defense authorization bill, and is now being introduced as an amendment to the Senate bill by my colleague Senator CRUZ of Texas, who sits on the Armed Services Committee.

This legislation I am referring to I first introduced several years ago following the terrorist attack on American soil at Fort Hood, TX, when MAJ Nidal Hasan killed 13 people and injured dozens more. These individuals who lost their lives deserve the same sort of recognition on the field of battle as people who lost their lives in other parts of the world—perhaps overseas. The same benefits should be available to the families of those who survive terrorist attacks anywhere in the world.

There is no doubt about the fact that what happened at Fort Hood on November 5, 2009, was a terrorist attack. The shooter happened to be a lone-wolf terrorist, happened to be an American citizen, and happened to be a member

of the U.S. Army, but he was also a radicalized Islamist who reportedly exchanged at least 20 emails with a senior Al-Qaeda member before committing this massacre. The Al-Qaeda leader with whom he corresponded is someone who has since become more notorious and even better known—a man named Anwar al-Awlaki. This person was also the one who maintained a relationship with a terrorist who tried to blow up Northwest Airlines flight 253 on Christmas day in 2009, less than 2 months after the Fort Hood attack.

We have just had a vote on one of the lawyers who wrote the memo by which President Obama authorized a drone attack on Anwar al-Awlaki on September 2011 overseas, so there is no question the Fort Hood shooter believed he was acting on behalf of Al-Qaeda. There is no one who can deny he shouted “Allah akbar” before opening fire, and no one who can deny he has since described the act as an act of jihad.

Yesterday I had the chance to question FBI Director James Comey, and I asked him whether he agreed with the assessment that this incident was “workplace violence,” which some have amazingly called this, or whether he thought this was an Al-Qaeda-inspired attack of terrorism here on America soil. His response—something I thought would have been painfully obvious—was yes, it was a terrorist attack in 2009.

Was the shooter a card-carrying member of Al-Qaeda? Well, I am not sure exactly what that is, but to me that is the wrong question entirely. We have to remember that Al-Qaeda leaders, such as Ayman al-Zawahiri has called upon his terrorist followers to commit dispersed, small-scale attacks exactly like the one that occurred at Fort Hood in 2009. We do know, from the rich evidence that was discovered during the prosecution of Major Hasan, that the Fort Hood shooter was most certainly a disciple of Anwar al-Awlaki.

The awarding of Purple Hearts should not be contingent on geography. In other words, if an Al-Qaeda-inspired terrorist kills a group of our brave men and women in uniform overseas, it shouldn't be treated any differently than if one of their inspired terrorists kills one of our members of the military here at home as well. The soldiers who were killed or wounded at Fort Hood were casualties of a global war on terror, period, and they deserve to be treated as such by the U.S. Government. They deserve the exact same recognition that military victims of Al-Qaeda's terrorist attack in New York on September 11, 2001, received—the same recognition they received—nothing more and nothing less.

Awarding them the Purple Heart is a matter of justice, a matter of honor, and a matter of honesty.

The House of Representatives has shown great leadership on these issues that should unite us both on the huge

trafficking front and on the Purple Heart recognition I just mentioned. It is time now for the Senate to follow suit, and I hope the majority leader will help us get this legislation up, move it across the floor, pass it, and send it to the President so he can sign it into law.

SENATE OPERATION

The third point is that I cannot let the remarks of the majority leader this morning pass without comment—the remarks majority leader HARRY REID made on the floor this morning about how the Senate is being operated.

The majority leader came to the floor this morning and called the legislative process a game. He accused Republicans of stalling important pieces of legislation, such as the 55 provisions of the tax extenders bill that died last week in the Senate. But we need to be clear about exactly who is responsible and what has happened.

This is the third time in 2 weeks the majority leader has killed legislation which enjoys broad bipartisan support.

First, it was the energy efficiency bill known as the Shaheen-Portman bill. The majority leader killed that piece of legislation when he refused any opportunity—either for Democrats or Republicans—to offer any amendments and get votes on those amendments. If he had simply done that, that legislation would be on its way to President Obama today, if not already signed into law.

Then last week we saw these 55 expiring tax provisions, some of which enjoy broad bipartisan support, such as the research and development tax credit and the deduction for State sales tax, which is important to my State because income taxes paid at the State level are deducted from the Federal income tax bill of people who live in those States and pay State income tax.

As a matter of fairness and parity, I support a number of the provisions in the tax extenders bill. But when the majority leader brought it to the floor and he refused to allow any amendments whatsoever to this legislation, the minority, of which I am a member, had no choice but to stop that legislation in its tracks because that is the only leverage we had to wake up the majority leader and say it is important for the minority and the people we represent to have a voice in what happens on the Senate floor.

Our Founding Fathers decided that each State would get two Senators. But when one or maybe both of those Senators are in the minority party and if they are shut out of the legislative process entirely because all amendments and even constructive suggestions are denied, then my constituents—the 26 million people I represent in the State of Texas—have been shut out of the process and denied the constitutional representation they are guaranteed under our founding documents.

There is a theme that resulted in these bills killed by the majority leader; that is, since the 113th Congress,

the majority leader's utter refusal to allow debate and votes on amendments by Members of both parties—both parties.

While I am not happy about the fact that my constituents have been shut out of this process, I would think my Democratic friends' constituents can't be happy about the fact that they have been shut out of the process as well.

Here is an amazing statistic. Our Democratic Senators have introduced 676 amendments to bills on the floor since last July. That is 676 amendments not by the minority party but by the majority party that controls this body. Do we know how many votes they got on Democratic amendments? They got 7 votes on Democratic amendments since the beginning of the 113th Congress.

During that same period of time, Republicans have filed hundreds of amendments too. That used to be the way the Senate worked. Both parties participate, we represent our States, and we have full and open debate and an amendment process. Then we vote, the majority rules, and then bills get passed and sent to the President for signature. But no more under this majority leader. Now, during this same time frame, while Democrats only got 7 rollcall votes, the minority got 9 rollcall votes since last July.

So I find it a little ironic that, both on the energy efficiency bill and the tax extenders bill, it was Senate Republicans who stood up—not only for the right of minority party Senators to get votes on amendments they had filed, but also for the right of our Democratic colleagues in the majority party who have basically been frozen out of the process as well.

It might be true that constituents back home in those States where Democratic Senators were elected would be asking the question: Look. My Senator who I voted for, whom I support, is a Member of the majority party. But you're telling me that they can't participate in the legislative process by offering good ideas to make legislation better and to get votes? How ineffectual can you be?

I happen to know from talking to many of my Democratic colleagues that they are not happy about the process either. And it is not just about process. It is not just about the prerogatives of individual Senators. This is about the constitutional guarantees of representation by two Senators for each State, and the rights of the minority to participate in the process and the people that I represent back home in Texas being shut out of the process altogether.

So the Senate has become a virtual killing floor for good bipartisan ideas because of the way the majority leader has run the Senate.

Then there is what happened yesterday on the patent reform bill. I have been a member of the Judiciary Committee since the time I got to the Senate, and we have been working very

hard to try to deal with the problem of patent trolls.

Patent trolls are big a problem in industries we wouldn't even suspect, including real estate, restaurants—not to mention high tech, pharmaceutical manufacturers, and the like. But what happens is people buy patents, not for the purpose of making something, not for the purpose of being productive, but for the purpose of having a basis upon which to file a lawsuit. Then they shake down small startups, the innovators, the people who we are depending upon to create new products that will make our lives better, make us healthier and make us all live longer, and help grow our economy to create jobs. These people are either being snuffed out altogether or are very much prejudiced in terms of their ability to grow because of all of this patent troll activity.

I have been working closely with the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Senator LEAHY, who has been working hard on this issue; Senator SCHUMER, the Senator from New York, a Democrat; Senator HATCH, who is a senior Member of the Judiciary Committee; and Senator GRASSLEY from Iowa, who is the ranking Republican on the Judiciary Committee. We were in a pretty good place yesterday where we thought, as a result of hard negotiations and good bipartisan work, we were going to be in the position for the chairman of the Judiciary Committee to mark up and to vote on a patent reform bill in the Senate Judiciary Committee this morning, only to be told last night that the majority leader basically killed that bill before it could even be acted on in the Judiciary Committee.

So this is the third time in 3 weeks the majority leader has basically been responsible for killing good bipartisan legislation—the energy efficiency bill, the tax extenders bill, and now the patent reform bill.

It is the majority leader's imperial leadership, where he is not just the floor leader for his party, he is not just the traffic cop for the Senate, but he is the one who wants to pick and choose who gets to participate in the legislative process. In the process, he has shut out not just Republicans but Democrats too, and he has turned this institution which used to be known as the world's greatest deliberative body into a pale imitation of what it used to be.

I continue to hope, maybe because I am an optimist by nature, that the majority leader will see the error of his ways and realize he is not only hurting my constituents but he is hurting the constituents of every Member of the Senate by denying us an opportunity for an open legislative process where everyone's voice can be heard, where the American people can watch and listen, where they can reach their own conclusions about the merits of each argument, and where they can hold us accountable for how we vote. That is what elections are supposed to be about.

So I hope some day the majority leader will change his attitude about an open legislative process and will help restore the Senate's status as the world's greatest deliberative body. I predict if he does not do that, the voters may well do that in November by changing the hands of the majority from the Democratic party to the current minority party. Then things will change, and this body will return to its status as the world's greatest deliberative body.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WALSH. Madam President, I served 33 years in the National Guard. When I joined the Guard, I swore an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic. I have taken a similar oath as a Senator.

Former Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army Gordon Sullivan famously wrote, "Hope is not a method."

I didn't come to Congress to hope. I approach my work here with the lessons I learned in the military: Find solutions and work together to overcome challenges.

Unfortunately, that approach is not how it works in Washington. Too many people here don't care about solutions, and many ignore the problems.

There is no greater proof than climate change. Here we are in 2014, almost 50 years after President Johnson warned that "by burning fossil fuels humanity is unwittingly conducting a vast geophysical experiment."

Yet irresponsible leaders in Washington pretend that climate change isn't real. They pretend that humans aren't causing it. They hope they can go along with the status quo. But Montanans know better.

Here are the facts:

Carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere are now higher than at any time in human history.

The 12 hottest years on record have been in the last 15 years.

The average temperature in Montana is 2.5 degrees higher than in 1900.

And spring runoff now occurs 1 week to 4 weeks earlier.

In Montana, climate change has contributed to the worst mountain pine beetle epidemic in recorded history. The combination of mild weather and stressed trees has allowed beetles to spread further and longer. Their legacy is red trees, then dead trees, then wildfires like we have never seen before.

Fire season is now 11 weeks longer than when I was a kid. The amount of forest that burns in the West has doubled. Fires are burning longer and burning more trees each and every year.

The best guess from America's scientists is that 3 to 4 times more forest will burn each year by the middle of this century, devastating rural communities that rely on timber and tourism.

In 2000, I led the response of the Montana National Guard to the historic wildfires in Montana. We activated over 1,800 of Montana's soldiers and airmen. That year, about 1 million acres of Montana were burned. Businesses and landowners lost over \$3 million a day.

Suppressing wildfires now consumes up to 40 percent of the Forest Service's budget. This is unsustainable. It reduces the agency's ability to fund other programs like hazardous fuel reduction and trail maintenance.

In Montana we have a saying that if you don't like the weather, stick around for an hour and it will change. But under climate change, it is changing across a wider range. Rains are falling more intensely, increasing erosion and runoff. The trend of more frequent and more intense rainfall is likely to continue. Heat waves and drought have also become more intense. What all of this means for Montana's agriculture is hard to predict, but without a doubt our biggest industry faces big uncertainty. The uncertainty in agriculture is especially true for water delivery, both for livestock and irrigated crops. As snow in the winter shifts to rain and extreme weather gets worse, it is becoming harder to run irrigation systems that were designed for the climate of 100 years ago.

We saw one of the worst droughts in history hit Montana ranchers and farmers in 2012. The year before Montana experienced a 500-year flood in the Missouri River Basin. Across the Great Plains the floods caused \$2 billion in damage. Across the Nation we are paying out of our nose for extreme weather and natural disasters—\$110 billion in damage in 2012 alone.

Climate change will also damage our tourism, which is Montana's second biggest industry. Glacier National Park itself is losing its namesake. Its ecosystem will change. Its cold water, which supports unique species and a strong trout fishery, will no longer be fed by melting ice. The communities in the Milk River Basin which receive 70 percent of their water from glaciers will also be impacted. Snowpack across the Rockies has already decreased 20 percent on average since 1980. In parts of Montana it may decrease by 50 percent in my lifetime.

Winter tourism in Montana is also big business, generating over \$150 million in income and supporting over 4,500 jobs. But less snow means fewer jobs. Skiing and snowmobiling contribute \$265 million to the Montana economy. During the low snowfall winters of 2002 and 2005, Montana ski resorts lost \$16 million in revenue compared to heavy snow years.

Warmer temperatures also harm hunting, fishing, and our booming outdoor industry, which supports more than 64,000 jobs and attracts 11 million visitors to Montana each year. Warmer streams and fewer trout translate to direct reduction in Montana jobs. Stream closures in recent years be-

cause of warm water are the first proof of this threat. Nearly 50 percent of habitat for the bull trout and cutthroat trout could be lost in the West this century. Big game species such as moose and elk face similar threats with a warmer climate.

Rural communities across Montana are especially vulnerable to climate change. Many of them rely on single sectors tied to the land, from timber to grain to outfitting, and are less able to adapt to a changing economy.

I know what resource development looks like. My hometown of Butte was once known as "the Richest Hill on Earth." The copper mined on that hill helped us win World War II, but today it is part of the largest Superfund site in America, including the Berkeley Pit. Mining continues to be an important industry in Montana, and Butte still churns out copper that is used around the world. Fortunately, Butte has also diversified. It now has good paying jobs in manufacturing and aerospace. One lesson I took from growing up there is we cannot afford another Berkeley Pit anywhere. Climate change is the equivalent of a Berkeley Pit: Ignore first; ask questions later.

Montanans understand the dilemma we are facing. We are the Treasure State. Our history is the history of resource development: from beaver trapping to the gold rush, copper mining to railroads and the open range, the homestead movement to the timber and fossil fuel booms. But along with the booms came a lot of busts.

In Montana we had to spend tons of money on fixing our past mistakes. Over \$1.5 billion has been spent at our Superfund sites alone. Each year we spend another \$13 million to clean up abandoned mine lands. If only our resources had been developed the right way the first time, all that money could have been spent on drinking water or better roads or lower student loans or researching cures for disease.

I know there are no easy solutions to the challenges we face today. Today 82 percent of energy used in the United States comes from fossil fuels. I am proud to represent a State with more than \$1.6 billion in investment in wind energy since 2005. Renewable energy does have a bright future. A 2009 study ranked Montana's wind resources as the second best in the Nation. Montana also has potential for solar energy and is one of only 13 States with the potential to produce commercial geothermal energy. Renewables, including wind, are not always the right answer. Our current power grid has real physical limitations. I will continue supporting renewable energy and upgrades to the grid because we need to reduce our carbon emissions. But we cannot ignore today's reality.

Look at me standing here. I flew here on a plane that burns jet fuel. I am wearing cotton, and I eat wheat and corn, all of which depend on fertilizers, were irrigated using power from coal and natural gas, and were transported

by diesel. I am speaking into a microphone and a camera that need electricity. In the United States in the year 2014, we either dig up or pipe up five-sixths of our entire energy. I couldn't do my job and visit Montanans without fossil fuel—and I understand that—and many of them wouldn't have jobs either.

Montana is one of about a dozen States that is a net exporter of energy. The oil and gas industry directly employs over 4,000 workers. Our unemployment rate in Montana is currently at 4.8 percent, in part because of the good jobs in the Bakken. We have 2,000 workers directly in the coal industry, from mining it to burning it to maintaining the boilers that burn it. Coal alone is responsible for over \$100 million of revenue each year in the State and local economy. I don't agree with some people who want to just pull the plug on coal. The United States burns only 11 percent of the coal consumed globally each year. The less we invest in cleaning up coal, the less likely we are to make a dent in climate change. We cannot just take our ball and go home. That simply outsources our pollution problem to countries such as China.

I know firsthand of the value of domestic energy. In 2004 and 2005 I led the largest deployment of Montana men and women to war in 60 years, more than 700 of Montana's finest went with me to Iraq. Some of them didn't return home with me; some of them returned severely injured. The debate leading up to the war focused on weapons of mass destruction and the connection of Saddam Hussein to the war on terrorism, but since World War II our strategic interest in the Middle East has been oil. Our dependence on foreign oil should never again be a reason for war. I don't want countries forced to make military decisions or tempted to put soldiers on the ground because they are afraid that their economy will freeze up without energy from other countries. That means I want more oil responsibly produced here in the United States from places such as the Bakken. It means that I support a project like the Keystone XL Pipeline, which will make us more energy secure and strengthen the economy of eastern Montana, while ensuring precautions are taken to guarantee pipeline safety and reliability and protect private property rights. Private industry jump-started by government-funded research and development has already provided part of the solution. The access to tight oil and gas has made us more energy secure. The trend is in the right direction. Less than half of the oil consumed by Americans now comes from other countries.

Yet even if we continue to increase domestic production by displacing foreign oil, we are still exposed as a country to two risks. First, oil remains a necessary ingredient in our economy. Second, the oil market continues to be a global one, exposing us to price

swings that can seriously harm our own economy. Therefore, in addition to more domestic oil production, we need to diversify our transportation fuels. The growth of advanced biofuels in America is the way to do that. I support diversifying our fuel sources by developing homegrown alternatives such as biodiesel, jet fuel from camelina, and ethanol from wheat and barley to reduce demand for foreign oil.

I also support the military's continued investment in renewable energy. The impacts of climate change also have a strong national security connection. The Defense Department's Quadrennial Defense Review has found a direct link between climate change and national security threats like terrorism. Climate change is a threat multiplier. Higher sea levels and extreme weather increase poverty, humanitarian crises, and political instability.

I know what political instability abroad can mean. It can mean our servicemembers, our sons and daughters, will be put in harm's way in order to protect our way of life. As a veteran and someone who has sworn an oath to this country, these impacts concern me because they make us less safe.

Today despite all the evidence that climate change is harming us and will hurt our children and grandchildren even more, we seem stuck. Congress is handcuffed by folks who have their heads in the sand. Instead of taking responsibility to solve this problem, they are choosing to ignore it. The Clean Air Act has helped Americans tackle pollution for over 40 years because it was written to last. The Supreme Court has spoken and the law is clear. But using a section of the law drafted when the Beatles were still recording is not the ideal way to tackle climate change, given how much our understanding has evolved since then on pollution control. Ninety-seven percent of climate scientists agree that climate change is a human-caused problem. In the military 97 percent is about as certain as a mission can get. But that is not good enough here in Washington.

Climate change is another example of why Washington is broken. We have an agency writing regulations with enormous impact on all Montanans, using congressional directions written when I was a child. We have an agency trying to put out a fire with a trowel because that is the only tool it has. I am committed to putting the fire out because we cannot afford inaction. The benefits of acting are clear, but I would prefer to use the right tool for that job. Yet Washington is so broken that the alternative is to do nothing. Plan B is repeal. Plan B ignores reality. I cannot accept that.

I will be watching the EPA's Clean Air Act regulations closely to keep the agency accountable to Montanans and make any final rules workable for Montana. Members of Congress should be taking responsibility and upholding

the oaths we all swore to. We should agree that climate change is a clear enemy and take steps to stop it.

I strongly support a bigger investment in securing a responsible future for coal: tax credits, loans, loan guarantees, and grants for carbon capture as well as sequestration. I have cosponsored bills and signed letters. I have pressed Senators to maintain existing incentives for coal. Coal does have a future, but it needs to lower its emissions. Montana is already leading the way with cutting-edge research in carbon sequestration. Beyond fossil fuels, our forests are a carbon sink, absorbing about 12 percent of U.S. greenhouse gas emissions each year. But climate change itself threatens this important service provided by our forests. More active management, especially under the new farm bill authority to address beetle-killed forests is critical. Getting the biogenic emissions rule right, on the largest possible geographic scale, is critical for forests to continue absorbing CO₂ emissions.

I support other energy options to reduce carbon emissions, including reduced energy demand overall and retrofitting nonpowered dams. Whatever rule the EPA proposes under the Clean Air Act for existing power plants, Montana and other States must take the lead role in implementation.

The United States has always led the way with innovative technology, from the first oil wells and nuclear reactors to the first solar cells and hydraulic fracturing. In fact, access to tight natural gas formations in the last decade has already helped lower our carbon-related emissions by 10 percent. Despite the serious challenges imposed by climate change, I am confident that America can innovate solutions while creating good paying jobs and new technology. But as a first step we cannot put our heads in the sand and continue with business as usual. The reason is simple. If we continue with business as usual, the people left with the mess will be the next generation.

The people left taking responsibility for our emissions will be my granddaughter Kennedy and all of our grandchildren. If we don't act now, Kennedy will grow up in a Montana that burns every summer. She won't be able to fly-fish because the rivers are too hot for trout. Kennedy will have to explain to her kids what glaciers were. When I took office, I swore an oath to make the right choice, and I am committed to solving climate change for Kennedy and for future generations.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded, and to speak as in morning business.

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

WRDA PASSAGE

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Madam President, today the Senate passed the Water Resources Reform and Development Act. It has been too long since Congress last addressed our water infrastructure, and I want to applaud Chairwoman BOXER and Ranking Member VITTER for their diligent work and unswerving commitment to making this bill a reality.

The fact that an infrastructure bill of this magnitude can be passed without earmarks and with a balance of reforms and authorizations for critical projects is a testament to good leadership and a desire by Members of Congress on both sides of the Capitol to better our Nation.

One of the projects this bill advances is crucial to not only my State of Georgia but to the entire country. Passage of this bill, with the enhanced authorization it contains for the Savannah Harbor Expansion Project, will be the culmination of years of work for the State of Georgia and project stakeholders—and my entire time serving in the Georgia congressional delegation.

The idea to expand the Port of Savannah was in its infancy when I first came to Congress in 1994. The Port of Savannah had just been deepened, and we realized then that it was not enough; more and bigger ships were coming in. In 1996 a reconnaissance study was authorized to determine whether the port should be deepened even further. While the need to deepen the channel to accommodate larger ships has been a constant issue, the port itself has been able to operate and grow through its own innovation—Georgia ingenuity at its best. In fact, between 2000 and 2005, the Port of Savannah was recognized as the fastest growing seaport in the country. The port continues to grow and is consistently breaking its own records.

In 2006, the Panama Canal expansion was approved by a national referendum in Panama, officially kicking off the race in Savannah to get this project under construction. The people of Georgia told us this project needed to happen. All levels of the government—local, State, and Federal—from all political persuasions agreed and have given their utmost to this project. It has been my No. 1 economic priority for Georgia the entire time I have been in office.

The WRDA bill in 1999 gave the authorization to expand the port, and while there were cheers all around from those of us in the congressional delegation, little did we know of the tremendous battles yet to come. All the way until the present, every step has been a struggle. We have jumped 15 years of hurdles to bring this project to fruition.

I even recall one instance where we thought we had things taken care of from the standpoint of all the mitigation that needed to be done with the port, which is located on the Savannah River. We then found out there was an endangered species that needed to be

protected because the city of Augusta, which is 136 miles upstream, is also located on the Savannah River. We then had to go back, have another study done, and after months and months we finally came up with a fish ladder project that was to be installed in Augusta, 136 miles north of the Savannah Port, but we got that done.

We still may face more obstacles as we guide this project to completion, but the fact remains that for every \$1 invested in the project, the Nation will see a nearly \$6 return. For Georgia, the value of SHEP is almost immeasurable. The port already supports some 300,000 jobs across our State, and when post-Panamax vessels start rolling into Savannah, the economic benefits will increase dramatically.

Georgia has always been a great place to do business, and a big reason for that is we have had strong leadership at the State level—leaders who understand that making investments in economic development projects can give great returns.

In this case the Port of Savannah is an epicenter of worldwide commercial traffic. The imports and exports associated with this port expansion mean that jobs will be created not only in my home State but all throughout the country.

Congress has once again agreed with us that SHEP is a vital project for our country. Now that we have completed our work, it is imperative that the administration carry through with its commitments.

The Project Partnership Agreement, which is a document that details the construction plans for a Corps of Engineers project, needs to be finalized and signed immediately. I have complete faith in the ability of the Corps and the Georgia Ports Authority to get that document finished as soon as possible—based on their commitments to me and Senator ISAKSON.

We didn't close the book on this project today, but we did jump forward by several chapters. Ensuring the appropriate language was included in this bill to move SHEP forward and voting today for this bill have been the highlight of my final year in Congress and represent the culmination of years of work by me, Senator ISAKSON, as well as many others.

I want to state my thanks once more to Chairwoman BOXER and Ranking Member VITTER for working with us on this matter. Their tireless efforts have done more for this country and for Georgia than they may realize.

The work of those Senators and their staffs as well as the work of Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member RAHALL and their staffs on the House side will be felt by users of waterways on rivers and lakes, by barge operators, commercial and recreational boaters, by cities, counties, and States, and by everyone in this country who uses and consumes water.

This bill represents the fulfillment of a commitment I made to my constitu-

ents to see the harbor deepening through, and I look forward to the day when I am in Savannah and watch a big shovel go underwater to start deepening that port once again.

I suggest the absence of a quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CHINESE TRADE PRACTICES

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I rise this afternoon to speak about the impact of this week's announcement that members of China's People's Liberation Army hacked into the computer systems owned by Pennsylvania companies to steal trade secrets on our trade policy.

As we all know, a grand jury in Pittsburgh indicted five individuals for hacking into several companies' computers and a labor organization, United Steelworkers, in western Pennsylvania. The companies included Westinghouse Electric, Alcoa, U.S. Steel and, as I mentioned, the United Steelworkers union. According to reports, the individuals in the indictment are accused of stealing trade secrets to benefit Chinese industry, which is heavily sponsored by the Chinese Government.

This is just the latest example of the unlevel playing field to which our domestic firms are subjected. To give an example, Pennsylvania, as are many areas around the United States, is experiencing an energy renaissance—Pennsylvania natural gas—which stands to greatly benefit the Commonwealth's economy. For the steel industry, it means the opportunity to sell a lot of pipe to natural gas drilling sites. Our foreign competitors also see this opportunity and have responded by aggressively pursuing our market. This competition is expected and would be OK if—if it was fair. Of course, in this instance it is not.

In fact, our domestic steel industry is facing a new crisis. After successfully beating back unfair competition from the Chinese, our domestic producers are facing a surge of imports from around the globe. According to a recent report by the Economic Policy Institute, domestic steel imports increased by almost 13 percent from 2011 to 2013. Without action, we stand to lose half a million jobs around the United States and some 35,000 in Pennsylvania alone. Just from this action, just from them flooding our markets in a way that is illegal and unfair, half a million jobs could be lost. We can't afford to send these good-paying jobs overseas.

We should act to level the playing field for our domestic steel industry by aggressively enforcing our trade laws and providing essential relief to this

critical industry. For too long unfair trade practices and economic policies have cost jobs in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and across the country.

I will return now to the recent indictment I mentioned at the outset of my remarks.

This move is further evidence of China's anticompetitive trade practices. What I just said is an understatement. These trade practices have taken a dramatic toll on Pennsylvania businesses and pose a threat to our national security.

The Obama administration has taken steps to crack down on China, but we must also pursue congressional action. We know that currency manipulation continues to take a huge toll on U.S. businesses. Last Congress, the Senate passed a tough bill to help level the playing field for our companies by holding countries that undervalue their currency accountable. The House failed to take up this important bill. We must take action.

I am an original cosponsor of the Currency Exchange Rate Oversight Reform Act of 2013. I call on all Senators to turn our attention to this bill to send a strong message to the Chinese Government that they cannot continue to cheat our companies. When China cheats, we lose jobs. It is that simple. The evidence is overwhelming. Our bipartisan bill will help American manufacturers and workers by clarifying that our trade enforcement laws can and should be used to address currency undervaluation. More broadly, the bill would improve oversight by establishing objective criteria to identify misaligned currencies. Also, it would impose tough consequences for offenders.

I believe strongly that before proceeding with our busy trade agenda, as some might want to do, and passing additional trade agreements or fast-track legislation, we should take a close look at our trade enforcement policies first, including aggressively addressing currency manipulation.

Pennsylvania companies are some of the best in the world, and I am committed to cracking down on unfair trade practices that hurt their ability to compete.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to finish this speech.

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

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about our Nation's first freedom—religious liberty.