

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

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

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

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

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

Some of my friends in Illinois see this issue a lot differently. They think if everybody carried a gun then good people would shoot down the bad people. I am skeptical. History tells us that most of the time the guns that good people carry are not used as effec-

tively as they hoped they would be used and sometimes even injure the person carrying it. I still trust law enforcement as a first line of defense for families and neighborhoods all across my State. Law enforcement has told us loudly and clearly: Stop wasting your time in Washington. Address the issues that make a difference in the neighborhoods and lives of families of Chicago and Illinois and this Nation. Make this a safer Nation—14 dead, 82 wounded over the weekend in Chicago.

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

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

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

COAL PRODUCTION TAX CREDIT

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

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

The Crow Nation in Southeast Montana relies on this tax credit to drive their economy. Like many of our tribal nations, the Crow Nation suffers from a much higher unemployment rate than the rest of the country. Unemployment for the Crow Nation is around 50 percent. That is unacceptable. I was proud to work with Chairman WYDEN to have this provision added to the EXPIRE Act. The political games being played to bring down an important piece of bipartisan legislation are a clear example of why Washington is broken. Congress must take action now. This vital

provision will keep tribal jobs and revenue intact. Extending this provision also means more money for our schools and public infrastructure in Indian Country. When I traveled to Montana's tribal nations in my first week as a Senator, Crow leaders, including tribal chairman Darin Old Coyote, shared with me how important this tax credit is for the future of the Crow Nation.

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

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

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

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

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

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

ISRAEL

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

By the way, when you read Palestinian textbooks and go to schools and read about what the children are taught—vitriolic hatred, not only of Israel but of the Jewish people—you sometimes understand maybe why not

support but condemn and sort of gain some inkling of understanding of why so many are filled with hatred. But who is putting out those textbooks? Not just Hamas—the Palestinian Authority and many Palestinian governing units.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There is no moral equivalency.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

BIPARTISAN SPORTSMEN'S ACT

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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