

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

measures that speak to some of the regulatory reforms that will provide greater access for our sports men and women, whether on the water or on the land, whether it is the Hunting, Fishing, and Recreational Shooting Protection Act, the Target Practice and Marksmanship Training Support Act, which provides for revenues and dollars to help with hunter education programs—very important for us around the country—electronic duck stamps, Farmer and Hunter Protection Act, Hunting Heritage Opportunities Act—again, all provisions and measures Senator HAGAN and I have worked on to build these initiatives into one package to focus on how we can do more to provide for greater access for our sports men and women around the country.

But we also provide for some very important conservation principles. We include the North American Wetlands Conservation Act and the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Reauthorization Act, some very important measures. We have a provision we have included from Senator HEINRICH, the Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act reauthorization. So it is not just on the access side, but it is also focused on the conservation side as well.

There is very strong support not only within this body but also within sports organizations all over the country. Some 42 different organizations have come together to sign a letter in support of advancing this measure through the Senate.

We spend a lot of time here on the Senate floor talking about: Well, we might be able to advance something in the Senate, but we don't know how it is going to fare on the House side. We have already seen good action, similar legislation sponsored by Congressman LATTA from Ohio, that passed the House on February 5 of this year by over a 100-vote margin. So clearly the support is not only bipartisan, it is bicameral.

What we have done, working together with Senator HAGAN and her good staff, is worked hard to try to coordinate these efforts to ensure that the House and Senate bills are closely aligned, so that when we move something out of here we don't have to guess as to what might happen, we know we are going to have good, strong support.

I am obviously very hopeful that we can complete our work on this bill. But before we complete the work on the bill, we have to be able to start work on the bill.

I also recognize that unless we can agree to an open and a fair amendment process where we actually take some votes around here on amendments offered by folks on both sides, we are probably unlikely to make progress on this bill. I think that is very unfortunate, because I know there are a lot of folks in my State hoping we are going to move on this, who are saying: If the Senate can't come together on something like a bipartisan sportsman

package, where you have 46 Members coming together to do this, wow, how are they going to do anything? We need to be able to demonstrate we can work together on some of these initiatives where there is a good level of consensus.

I hate to be in the place where we are right now, arguing about whether we are going to be able to take up any relevant amendments. I want us to take up these relevant amendments.

I like the bill Senator HAGAN and I worked on. If I didn't like it, I wouldn't be standing here trying to advance and encourage my colleagues that we move forward to it. But I also know that as good as Senator HAGAN and I are in representing these issues, we don't have a monopoly on all the good ideas. We don't have a monopoly on everything coming from different parts of the country. We need to have input from our colleagues.

I will remind us that the measure in front of us is not a measure that has gone through the full committee process. This is a measure that has advanced to the floor through a process known as rule XIV, where it hasn't had the benefit of Members advancing their amendments through the committee process.

I want to have an amendment process. I want to have the debate on some of the measures we have in front of us. I want to stand and tell people why I think it is important we provide for additional access for our sports men and women on our public lands and that we can be doing more to help incentivize that. But we have to have that amendment process.

As many of my colleagues know, we have been here before. We have been here as recently as 2012. It was a highly frustrating experience. We had a similar sportsmen's bill that was bogged down—basically, it was political posturing—late last Congress and it didn't go anywhere as a result.

So with that history in mind, and knowing what we went through in 2012, I decided last July 2013 to introduce my own sportsmen's package. What I wanted to try to do is figure: OK, let's see if we can take some of the politics out of this measure, try to be very bipartisan, try to be nonpolitical.

As the ranking member of the committee with jurisdiction and as one who wasn't up for election at this point in time, I felt I was in perhaps a good spot to maybe lead this thing forward. So we put the ideas out there in November. Senator HAGAN introduced her own bill, the SPORT Act. What became very apparent to both of us was that if we continued down this two-track path, we would not be successful in passage.

Senator HAGAN and I agreed: We know what the goal is, passage of good bipartisan legislation. So we sought middle ground and we put together what we think is common sense. We took good ideas that both of us had, we melded them and we put together what

we think are the best interests of the sportsmen's community around the country. Then we went out and recruited our cosponsors, we secured the time for floor consideration, and now we are here, caught in the same argument about whether relevant amendments from our caucuses should be allowed.

My answer on this is pretty simple. It is a flatout yes. Yes, of course relevant amendments should be allowed. Yes, we should actually be doing our job here in the Senate, taking good ideas from both sides and advancing a package that, again, hasn't gone through the traditional path of the committee process.

Senator HAGAN and I have again built this, and many of our colleagues agree with it; otherwise, they would not have signed on as cosponsors. We greatly appreciate their support. But, again, I think it is important to get their perspectives on this initiative before we take a final vote on the bill.

I do want to be very clear, because I heard comments this morning that Republicans are somehow or another filibustering this bill. I find that kind of stunning. The Republican conference is absolutely prepared to vote on all relevant amendments. We have a list. Last evening when I left, there was a list of 13 that had been filed. This morning, that list has grown. It has doubled. It is probably growing as we speak. Let's get moving on these relevant amendments—these amendments that are tied to the bill itself.

It is not just Republican amendments. We have a good handful of them I would like to see advanced. There are amendments on both sides, and some of these amendments are very relevant to specific States.

I know Senator LANDRIEU has an amendment that is very unique to Louisiana. It is the Kisatchie National Forest deer hunting amendment, very specific to Louisiana. It wasn't included in the package Senator HAGAN and I built because we were trying to do it broader, more comprehensive, national in scope. But if Senator LANDRIEU feels this is an important piece to have, she should have an opportunity to weigh in on that.

Senator CARDIN and Senator CRAPO have introduced an amendment, the National Fish Habitat Conservation Act—again, a bipartisan amendment led by Senator CARDIN, clearly relevant to this measure. Why would we not want to have the opportunity to advance some of these provisions that Members feel will enhance a bill that already has good, strong support.

I want to make sure Members know I am fully committed to a full and open amendment process; that Republicans would like to see a full and open amendment process; and that we get moving. Instead of talking about getting moving, we actually make that happen.

I thank those who have come forward and offered their support for this measure. A lot of work has gone into

crafting the bill. But I am fearful that, once again, we are at risk of basically being cast aside because of political concerns.

I ask the majority leader to reconsider his view that relevant amendments are too difficult to vote on. We have to return to regular order. We have to have a fair and healthy debate on legislation—especially legislation such as this that has not gone through the committee process, has good, strong support, but needs to have further input from Members all over the country.

I appreciate the consideration of the body here in trying to advance a measure that will help us not only when it comes to access for our fishermen and our sports men and women, provides for further conservation measures, but also helps us to advance a process in this body that at this time we so desperately lack.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, I rise to speak about a very troubling issue—to speak about innocent lives being stolen from communities and neighborhoods across our country and around the globe. I speak of the issue of human trafficking.

Last month, in more than 100 U.S. cities—just last month—168 children were rescued from sex trafficking and 281 pimps were arrested on Federal and State charges.

The weeklong campaign known as Operation Cross Country was conducted by the FBI, law enforcement officials, and the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. It underscores a heartbreaking reality: Human trafficking is not a far-away problem. It is happening right here in America, in all 50 States.

Each year thousands of men, women, and children are robbed of their basic freedom to live as they choose. They become victims of a rampant and evil crime, coerced through intimidation and even through violence to work as laborers or prostitutes. According to estimates from the Polaris Project, a nonprofit organization dedicated to fighting human trafficking, there were more than 5,000 potential trafficking cases in America last year. However, the precise number of domestic victims is unknown.

It should be noted that sex trafficking affects individuals of all backgrounds and races, but it disproportionately impacts women, both domestically and internationally. According to the Polaris Project, 85 percent of sex trafficking victims in the United States are women. Although news headlines often glibly refer to a “war on women” in political terms, we as policy makers might well devote more of our energy to the issue of sex trafficking—a real war, a daily war, a

nightmarish war—faced by the most vulnerable among us—young women who are bought and sold against their will for sex.

I stand with colleagues from both political parties in calling for an end to this nightmare. We must not ignore the horror stories on our doorsteps. Earlier this year 16 children ranging in age from 13 to 17 years old were rescued from a sex trafficking operation at the Super Bowl, one of our most celebrated events—the scenario of horror for these 13- to 17-year-olds. These young Americans deserve justice and they deserve rehabilitation.

Our friends in the House of Representatives have recently passed a package of bills on antitrafficking, and I hope we will soon consider similar efforts in the Senate. To highlight a few, Senator RUBIO has introduced a bill to help protect children in foster care from becoming victims of trafficking; Senator CORNYN has introduced legislation for increasing federal resources available to trafficking victims; and Senator KLOBUCHAR has introduced legislation to help ensure that minors who are sold for sex are not prosecuted as perpetrators but properly treated as the victims they really are.

This week I have introduced the End Trafficking Act of 2014. Similar to the legislation put forward by my colleagues, my bill would ensure victims of trafficking receive the treatment they need to lead healthy, free, and productive lives. One proposal in my bill would be a court-based pilot program modeled after Hawaii’s girls courts, similar to the Federal drug court system. Rather than being correctly treated as victims, trafficked juveniles are often charged with a delinquency offense and detained. Many do not receive the counseling or support they need while in detention and some even return to the trafficker who abused them.

My bill supports a specialized court docket and integrated judicial supervision that would put the well-being of the victim first. Detention does not amount to rescue, and these victims need to be rescued. They should have an opportunity to return home and receive treatment.

Human trafficking is a complex problem that demands multifaceted solutions. Supporting the victims is only one part of the equation. We must also target those who perpetuate these atrocious crimes. The legislation I have introduced also seeks to punish those responsible for trafficking—the providers and the buyers—the pimps and the johns. First, there should be strict enforcement of laws already on the books that prohibit the purchase of sex with minors. Second, child victims should have a longer statute of limitations period during which to file civil lawsuits against their traffickers. Finally, those who distribute or benefit financially from commercial advertising that promotes prostitution should face criminal charges also. My bill would do all three.

We have seen the value of coordination among local, State and Federal agencies to fight trafficking. This was certainly true in Operation Cross Country. Working together, agencies and law enforcement partners can improve the ways they target traffickers to help victims.

We all need to realize that in the United States—the freest, most prosperous nation in the world—traffickers still find and transit victims. Our efforts to fight trafficking within our borders are important to fight against trafficking worldwide. There are some 21 million people around the world who endure this cruel form of modern day slavery. There is no other way to put it. Although the United States cannot single-handedly eradicate the problem, we can serve as a model for other countries to follow by preventing trafficking and supporting victims here at home.

Again, the title of the bill is the End Trafficking Act of 2014—introduced this week. I am looking for cosponsors. I am looking for Republicans, Democrats, and Independents to come forward and say with a unified voice that this Senate, this Congress, this Federal Government, intends to put the full weight of our efforts toward combating this serious national and international problem.

I suggest the absence of a quorum and, following procedure, Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the time be equally divided between Republicans and Democrats for the remaining period of morning business.

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

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

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

PROTECTING WATER AND PROPERTY RIGHTS

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, today I rise in support of Barrasso amendment No. 3453 to the underlying bill. This amendment actually has 36 cosponsors—36 of my fellow colleagues have cosponsored legislation called the Protecting Water and Property Rights Act of 2014, and this legislation is identical to the amendment we have on the floor today.

The amendment restricts the expansion of Federal authority by this administration’s EPA to encompass all the wet areas on farms, ranches, and suburban homes all across America. More specifically, the amendment eliminates the administration’s proposed rule—a rule to implement this