

The bill (S. 2614) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2614

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

SECTION 1. ROLLOVER OF AMOUNTS RECEIVED IN AIRLINE CARRIER BANKRUPTCY.

(a) EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE CLAIM FOR REFUND.—Section 1106(a)(3) of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 (26 U.S.C. 408 note) is amended by striking “2013” and inserting “2015”.

(b) DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULES.—Section 1106(c) of such Act is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(A)(i), by inserting “or filed on November 29, 2011,” after “2007,”; and

(2) in paragraph (2)(B)—

(A) by striking “terminated or” and inserting “terminated,”; and

(B) by inserting “, or was frozen effective November 1, 2012” after “Pension Protection Act of 2006”.

Mr. BROWN. I thank the Presiding Officer.

PROTECTING VOLUNTEER FIRE-FIGHTERS AND EMERGENCY RESPONDERS ACT OF 2014—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

TAXPAYERS RIGHT-TO-KNOW ACT

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I wish to spend a few minutes to talk as in morning business. I am not going to offer a unanimous consent request, but I am putting the majority leader on notice that I will do that before we leave today or tomorrow or whenever we leave.

Yesterday the chairman of the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, Senator CARPER, and I, thought we cleared all holds on the Taxpayers Right-To-Know Act. I wish to give a little history about that because for 2 years the House and Senate, in conjunction with the committees, have been working on this bill. The history goes back to a bill that was passed with President Obama, myself, Senator MCCAIN, and Senator CARPER, and it was the Federal Financial Transparency and Accountability Act, usaspending.gov. It was the first start towards transparency in terms of how and where we spend our money.

Quite frankly, as we got that bill through Congress, with we heard the same thing from OMB that Senator REID is representing today. President Bush and his OMB Director didn't want that bill. They didn't think the American people ought to know where their spending was going. They didn't think the American taxpayer ought to have the right to hold us accountable to know where we spent the money, on which programs, and how.

Interestingly, under Republican leadership, we passed that bill against the wishes of the OMB Director of the Bush administration, and that bill became law. The President has touted that bill as the first in a long line of trans-

parency which his administration has embraced—the idea that the American people ought to know where their money is being spent.

Since that time, we passed the DATA Act, which will move us towards better quality in terms of usaspending.gov, and then we have the Taxpayers Right-To-Know Act, which the majority leader objected to yesterday.

Here is what the Taxpayers-Right-To-Know Act says. It says the taxpayer has the right to know how many programs we have in each department, how much spending is going on in each program, and where the money is being spent. It is pretty simple, straightforward stuff that we ought to know about our government.

The question that I am asking is, Why would anybody in this body object to us knowing where our money is being spent? Why would anybody in this body object to knowing how many programs each agency has? Why would anybody in this body object to coordinating with all the transparency things that we have done thus far and make it so that 2 years from now the American people can actually see where their money is being spent, how much is being spent on each program in each State and at what location.

If somebody can give me an honest explanation and a logical reason for why we wouldn't want to do that, I will take that, and I will not offer another unanimous consent request. But the answer from OMB is that it is too hard to work. It is not too hard to work. That is exactly what the Bush administration said when we said we are going to have the transparency act and usaspending.gov. They said it was too hard, and we can't do it. We can do it.

The American people are owed that explanation, they are owed that transparency, and this administration, through its claims of being the most transparent administration should step forward and release this hold.

So before we leave here, I will offer the unanimous consent request again. If it is objected to, we will know that it has nothing to do with reality. It has nothing to do with honesty, it has nothing to do with integrity, it has nothing to do with truth, it has nothing to do with being transparent with the American people, and it has everything to do with the Federal Government saying that it is just too hard to be honest with the American people to allow them to see where we are spending the money.

I find that is really unacceptable for us, as Members of the Senate. For a Member of the Senate to stand up and say, I object to doing that, tells us that we have a long way to go on much, much bigger problems if we are going to play the game just because something is a little bit tough to do, and we are going to fall for complaining that we just can't get it done.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

SSCI STUDY OF THE CIA'S DETENTION AND INTERROGATION PROGRAM

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first, I wish to salute my friend and colleague from Oklahoma. I don't agree with probably 80 to 90 percent of what he says, but I really respect him. He is a person of integrity who really cares. When you shake his hand and make a deal, a deal is done, which is a rarity around here, and we wish him the best.

Today I rise to discuss the recently released report by the Senate Intelligence Committee. As a representative of one of the most targeted cities in the world, I feel compelled to speak about this report. I want to say clearly that I am troubled by many of its findings.

First, the many members of the CIA and the intelligence community selflessly serve this Nation and put their lives on the line. They are patriots who are committed to protecting and serving America, keeping her safe from those very real enemies who are actively seeking to do the unspeakable in terms of harm. We owe the members of the CIA and the Intelligence Committee their due recognition and gratitude. We salute them for protecting us. In many cases, they risk their lives to protect us and our freedom.

But as with many institutions in our society, be it part of the government or part of the private sector, transparency and accountability for mistakes are an essential part of the process that preserves the balance in our democracy. The fact of the matter is this report lays bare some very troubling activities on the part of the CIA. It warrants a close examination. When we find the conduct of the CIA to be grossly counter to the Nation's ideals, we must reckon with that and make sure we never go back to the days when our government sanctioned torture.

Here, I agree with my colleague and friend from across the aisle, Senator MCCAIN. He has been an unimpeachable voice on this topic, and has said time and again that these actions were torture, and that torture besmirches the honor of this great Nation.

I also agree with the remarks made by Vice President JOE BIDEN, that only a great Nation and only an open and free society can forthrightly take ownership of their mistakes, find ways to change those policies, and move positively forward on both the domestic and international levels.

It is doubtless this report contains lessons that our intelligence community must take to heart—for their goal must be to protect our Nation without sacrificing what it stands for.

Before I go any further, I wish to recognize the many years of hard work, diligence, and courage—yes, courage—on the part of my colleagues on the Intelligence Committee and their staffs for putting this report together.

I particularly wish to recognize my dear friend and colleague, the chair of the Senate Intelligence Committee, DIANNE FEINSTEIN, for her work with

this report. She has been a fearless, yet level-headed chair of the committee for many years now. She is just what you would envision as an ideal chair.

I thank her for her excellent report, where once again, she has been both fearless and level-headed.

An extensive report like this one deserves careful review, but at first reading, two things have been made very clear. First, the CIA undoubtedly went too far in its pursuit of intelligence from captured sources abroad.

As I have said in formal proceedings in this legislature before, I am absolutely opposed to waterboarding and deplore some of the tactics depicted in this report.

I believe our intelligence community can obtain information using methods that are not anathema to our Nation's values.

Second, the report makes it clear that there was a breakdown of communication between the CIA and the administration at the time of these events.

There is no doubt we live in a dangerous world. There are threats abroad and threats here in the homeland. We cannot expect to counteract these threats and protect our people and to do so in a responsible way if the CIA and the executive branch are not effectively communicating with one another.

I was astounded to learn that the report asserts that over 4 years went by without the President having full knowledge of some of the CIA's actions detailed in this report. That simply cannot be the modus operandi for the CIA. They are accountable to the government and to the people and cannot behave without proper oversight. There is so much to unpack in this report. I urge my colleagues patience and a careful examination of the work produced by my colleagues on the Intelligence Committee. It should be out in front of the American people, and now it is. We must take a very, very close look at it.

The United States, its government, and its people must take stock of this account and reckon with the conclusions of the study. We have hundreds of thousands of brave men and women posted around the world, tasked with the difficult job of keeping us safe. We should always be mindful of their dedication and thankful for their sacrifice. Their mission is demanding. It is never-ending and nearly all of them perform with a level of professionalism beyond reproach.

However, from time to time, it is important for us to review those actions to make sure they meet the hard scrutiny of our Nation's ideals while still protecting its people.

In that light the Senate Intelligence Committee report is an extremely important document for us all to examine.

Again, I thank my colleagues, especially my friend Senator FEINSTEIN, for their exhaustive and exemplary work on this report.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

ISIS AND AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE

Mr. CASEY. I rise today to discuss the fight against ISIS and the debate we are having here in the Senate and across the country about the authorization for use of military force, known by the acronym AUMF.

The debate about the appropriate use of force is, I believe, healthy for our country. The American people deserve to know when and how our servicemembers are going to be deployed to protect our national security interests. All Senators in this body have an abiding obligation to take the time to learn about this issue and to ask questions about our strategy, to thoroughly debate the strategy and the issues that relate to the authorization for use of force, and then we have an obligation to vote on the grave question of the use of military force.

It has been 6 months since ISIS began its major offensive in Iraq, taking control of key boarder crossings and the city of Mosul. The President has laid out since that time a strategy for combating ISIS through all available means—military action, diplomatic coalition building, coordinating efforts to cut off financing and recruitment, and providing humanitarian assistance.

The Administration has taken these actions under previous authorizations. In these weeks and months I have consulted with Administration officials, both military and civilian, outside experts and former diplomats, as I know many of our colleagues have. I also have listened to my constituents in Pennsylvania. We owe it to the American people to have a debate and a vote on a new authorization for use of military force that clarifies, and if necessary, places limitations on the President's authority in this fight against ISIS.

We know that 1,830 servicemembers, 91 of whom were from Pennsylvania, have been killed in Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan, and 3,482 servicemembers, of which 197 were from Pennsylvania, have been killed in Operation Iraqi Freedom. Those are two conflicts, and in Pennsylvania alone the killed-in-action number was 91 in Afghanistan and 197 in Iraq.

Thousands more have been wounded in action from Pennsylvania and from across the country—some of them grievously, permanently injured because of their service. I am mindful, as I know many are here, that with both the 2001 and 2002 authorizations for use of force, Congress moved very quickly to take that action. I understand that. We know in hindsight that in the case of Iraq, at least, mistakes were made

because leaders did not take the time to debate and ask tough questions and demand answers to those tough questions. I believe it is appropriate for us to do the following: thoroughly debate this AUMF, as we should every time we consider sending U.S. servicemembers into harm's way; second, to be prepared to continually reassess and debate our strategy against ISIS to ensure it is achieving our national security goals.

We all hope to develop an AUMF that has broad bipartisan support. However, our priority must be to give the President clear and specific authority to continue the fight against ISIS.

The Administration should have come forward with a recommendation early in the process for what they would like to see in an authorization for use of military force. I welcomed Secretary Kerry's testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee yesterday. That hearing was an important step in the right direction.

It is appropriate for the Congress to not only conduct rigorous oversight of the executive branch's decisions about military force but also, from time to time, to take steps to shape or place boundaries around the Administration's strategy. I appreciate Chairman MENENDEZ's efforts to craft an AUMF proposal that satisfies the needs of the Administration and the concerns from both sides of the aisle and across our country.

The Congress should move forward with an authorization for use of military force which addresses the following:

First, this AUMF should not allow for any significant deployment of U.S. troops in traditional ground combat roles. This is consistent with what the President has determined is necessary at this time. We also need to see nations in the region step up to do the fighting. We can't just have—to use an old expression from Pennsylvania—coat holders. That is someone that says you go do the fighting and I will hold your coat while you fight.

We need a real coalition which we have in place now but it has to be built and strengthened and fortified and sustained. That coalition, especially in the case of members of the coalition from the region, will contribute fighters to the battlefield because it is their region. It is their conflict as much as it is for other nations in the coalition.

When I say we cannot have a coalition of coat holders, I am serious about that. We need a coalition that will help us. We have already done a lot, and our people have, our taxpayers have, and our soldiers have. We need a real coalition that will do the fighting.

We also know that ISIS has taken American hostages before and will try to do so again. If, for example, the Administration has a chance to bring one of these Americans home, I want them—the Administration—to take action expeditiously and with clear authority. If the Administration disagrees with the current proposal for

authorization for exceptional circumstances or operations—for example, a search and rescue operation inside Syria or the recovery of an American hostage—the Administration should propose to us language they find acceptable to use in those difficult situations.

Second, this authorization for force should not be geographically limited. ISIS and its associated forces do not and will not respect sovereign borders. However, I would like to see language that requires the Administration consult closely with Congress if they want to consider U.S. military operation against ISIS in countries beyond Iraq and Syria. Expanding this fight geographically could have the unintended effect of prompting unrest in other countries or pushing recruits into the arms of ISIS.

Third, this authorization for use of force should have a reasonable timeline—something along the order of 3 years—with the explicit option for the administration to extend it a bit longer if needed. We cannot know exactly how long it will take us and our coalition partners to degrade and defeat this terrorist organization. However, the AUMF should not be open-ended in the way that the 2001 and 2002 AUMFs were. We have seen how difficult it is to shift gears or even to repeal an existing authorization for use of military force.

Fourth, and finally, this authorization must also address the nonmilitary components of the administrations's strategy. I was one of the first Members to call for greater support for the moderate well-vetted Syrian opposition. We know that opposition, especially in the north, is fractured and suffering, especially under the continual onslaught from Mr. Assad's barrel bombs—not to mention other actions he has taken against the opposition.

Although efforts to support them are ramping up, the brutal Assad regime has done significant damage. That is an understatement. Further, the Assad regime continues to commit unspeakable atrocities against Syrian civilians, starving, torturing, or indiscriminately murdering them in violation of international law and U.N. Security Council resolutions—that is plural.

I have also emphasized on a bipartisan basis with Senator RUBIO several years ago the importance of cutting off ISIS's finances. This could include airstrikes against known oil-smuggling pipelines or additional sanctions against facilitators. I should say with Senator RUBIO that the financing efforts or the cutting off of the financing was this year. I have worked with him in other years on other parts of Syrian policy.

As we have heard multiple administration leaders today say, there is no purely military solution to this conflict with ISIS. I would also say that if we have an authorization for force, this bill should include strict reporting re-

quirements that press the administration to answer a series of questions:

First, what are you going to do to support the moderate opposition in Syria? I have raised this over and over again with the administration and still do not have satisfactory answers.

Second, what steps are you taking to address the Assad regime's brutal barrel bomb campaign, and what are you doing to bring about a political settlement to the conflict in Syria?

Third, how is the military campaign helping to cut off the financial support that ISIS is receiving, as I mentioned before?

There is strong bipartisan agreement that ISIS proposes a clear and proximate if not immediate threat to our national security interests and those of our partners. I believe we can reach the same level of bipartisan agreement on an authorization for the use of military force.

We have no greater or more sacred responsibility than to carefully and thoroughly consider when and how we send American men and women in uniform into harm's way. I urge my colleagues in both parties to engage in this debate and to work expeditiously to pass an authorization for the use of military force. I would have preferred and I know many would have preferred that we would have passed a bill before we adjourn this year, knowing that in this holiday season there are servicemembers already deployed away from home, from their families, to support this operation, Operation Inherent Resolve.

If we cannot get that done by the end of this year, where the debate would not be fully developed enough to pass an authorization, we must get it done early in 2015. It must be among our first orders of business in the new year, in the new Congress when we come back in early January. This is a very grave matter. It is among the highest and most difficult responsibilities Congress has. I believe we will discharge that obligation with a full debate, with a debate that is well-informed and a debate that every Member participates in before we make a decision about the authorization for the use of force.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss title 30 of the National Defense Authorization Act, or NDAA, the title of which has become referred to as the lands package. As with most of the items Congress considers, this provision has generated some controversy. For my part, however, it appears that many of the concerns here are outpaced by the substance of good public lands policy being advanced here and the economic development opportunities it will generate.

The bill the committees of jurisdiction included in the package all have some form of committee procedure in either the House or the Senate. Thirty-four of the measures have passed the

House on suspension. Another nine have passed the Senate by unanimous consent.

It is also worth noting that because the Federal Government owns so much land, particularly in the Western United States, Congress has to approve all sorts of transactions involving these public lands no matter how small the tracts might be.

On the substance, I believe the bipartisan group who assembled this package of bills struck a pretty good balance, deferring to intrastate priorities that will promote responsible economic growth. In Arizona, for example, I was pleased to see the inclusion of the Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act. This is a bill sponsored by my colleague JOHN MCCAIN. I was happy to join him to advance the measure. It also shares bipartisan support in the House among Members of Arizona's House delegation: Representatives GOSAR, KIRKPATRICK, FRANKS, SALMON, and SCHWEIKERT.

At its core, this bill will facilitate access to the largest copper ore deposit in North America. By some estimates the economic impact of the mine could exceed \$60 billion over the course of the mine operations. It will support approximately 3,700 direct and indirect jobs annually.

It is also worth noting that copper is a critical component in most technologies, from weapon systems, to computers, to automobiles, to turbines that generate electricity, to name a few.

This mine would supply an amount of copper roughly equivalent to 25 percent of the U.S. demand.

Also notable is what this bill does in terms of conservation. It would preserve more than 5,300 acres of conservation land in Arizona.

Despite the broad benefits for economic development and conservation as well as the bill's bipartisan support, there has been some opposition. We have done our best to include some provisions that address those concerns. For instance, the land exchange would not occur until after the completion of a NEPA environmental impact statement. It will also generate a special management area around the large escarpment known as Apache Leap. Likewise, it will provide protections for Native Americans to continue traditional gathering and ceremonies after the land exchange has been completed so long as it remains safe to do so.

I would also note that Resolution Copper has proactively sought ways to address its anticipated water needs. To that end, I was encouraged to learn that the company has entered into a contract with the Gila River Indian Community to use a portion of the tribe's water supplies to meet the long-term needs of the mine. This is further evidence of how the measure, even before it is passed, can help foster economic opportunities for Indian and non-Indian communities around the State.

I would also like to take a moment to talk about a couple of the other positive provisions in the lands package. From a resource management perspective, it would support further economic activity on Federal lands by conveying approximately 110,000 acres of land out of the Federal estate. This includes not only the aforementioned Resolution Copper project but also a Copper mine in Nevada, timber harvests in Alaska, and coal production in Montana.

The lands package also includes a provision that would streamline the permitting process for oil and gas leases. This is critical. We have seen the pace of oil and gas production on Federal lands decline in recent years while development on private lands has increased significantly. This measure also improves the permitting process for grazing and makes a downpayment on so-called payment in lieu of taxes, or PILT. This is critical in helping communities that are burdened with tracts of Federal land to meet the obligations of providing services related to those lands without a corresponding tax base. This applies to a lot of the land in rural Arizona.

Although reasonable people can disagree, I believe this is a good measure for the State of Arizona and the United States as a whole. I am pleased to see that it will advance as part of this package. I know the lands package was difficult to negotiate. They always are. It has achieved strong bipartisan support. I think it does strike the right balance between deference to intrastate concerns and Federal lands decisions. I urge support of the legislation.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am on the floor this evening for "Time to Wake Up" speech No. 82.

Scientists tell us that the evidence for climate change is now "unequivocal"—not a word often used in scientific writing. The American people know that climate change is real.

In a new poll released by the insurance firm Munich Re, 8 out of 10 Americans believe the climate is changing. They see it happening around them. The American people also know we need to cut our carbon pollution if we are to avoid the worst effects of climate change. We can't keep burning carbon-polluting fossil fuels indiscriminately. Seven out of 10 Americans put using more carbon-free energy, such as solar and wind, among the best ways to battle climate change.

Changing the way we generate power will help cut emissions from the larg-

est sources of carbon pollution in the country, our coal-fired powerplants. The Energy Information Administration notes that coal generates less than 40 percent of our country's electricity while it generates 75 percent of the carbon pollution from the power sector.

The 50 dirtiest coal plants in America emit more carbon pollution than all of South Korea or all of Canada, which brings us to the war on coal.

Every effort to protect the American people from coal pollution has been denounced by the fossil fuel industry and its various mouthpieces as a "war on coal." When EPA proposed limits on emission from new powerplants, we heard "war on coal." When EPA promoted limits on existing powerplants, "war on coal." For mercury limits, ozone limits, particulate limits, always "war on coal."

The war on coal is a fabrication. The denial machine, funded by fossil fuel money, literally owns the war on coal. The Web site waroncoal.com is owned by American Commitment, a 501(c)(4) nonprofit that has been funded by the Koch brothers-backed group Freedom Partners. War-on-coal is a public relations strategy, a catchphrase, a gimmick that serves to distract people from the harm coal wreaks on us.

Dr. Drew Shindell is a professor at Duke University. He worked at NASA for two decades. Last week in the Environment and Public Works Committee he said:

We hear a lot up here on Capitol Hill about the war on coal; what we forget about is coal's war on us.

So let's talk about the so-called war on coal versus coal's war on us. When Republicans talk about President Obama's war on coal, they leave a lot out. They leave out that coal companies have shifted to big open-topped mines—what is called mountaintop removal—so they can lay off miners and still produce the same amount of coal. They leave out that coal simply can't compete with today's cheaper, cleaner burning natural gas.

In 2012 Duke Energy's own CEO acknowledged that EPA's proposed climate rule for new powerplants was not to blame. This is what he said:

The new climate rule is in line with market forces anyway. We're not going to build any coal plants in any event.

"We're not going to build any coal plants in any event," he said.

He continued:

You're going to choose to build gas plants every time, regardless of what the rule is.

That is not a regulatory war on coal; that is the free market operating.

EPA's proposed Clean Power Plan for existing powerplants is the newest PR front in the imaginary war on coal. EPA projects that the Clean Power Plan will yield between \$55 billion and \$93 billion in benefits per year by 2030, compared to \$7 billion to \$9 billion to comply with the rule. That math makes it a winner for the American people. Some war on coal. What would they expect us to do—give up \$90 bil-

lion at the high end in benefits for the American people in order to avoid a \$9 billion compliance cost, again at the high end? Again, \$90 billion for the American people versus \$9 billion in compliance—who wouldn't take that deal?

If the Obama administration is waging a war on coal, it has a funny way of going about it. Coal exports grew by 44 percent from 2008 to 2012. The Obama administration keeps opening up Federal lands to coal extraction, awarding many leases at below-market rates. It actually took a Federal judge in Colorado to tell the Obama Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service to factor the cost of climate change into their cost-benefit analysis of coal mining leases. The Federal agencies had looked at only one side of the ledger. They counted the economic benefits of mining coal but not the costs. Some war on coal. Two years ago the Obama Army Corps of Engineers fast-tracked environmental review of a proposed coal export terminal on the Columbia River in Oregon. Local communities and tribes objected, and the State of Oregon denied the permit for the project. If that is what a Federal war on coal looks like, somebody didn't get the memo.

On the other side, let's look at what coal's war on us looks like. Evidence that mining and burning coal harms our health and our environment and our oceans is undeniable. It is this other side of the coal ledger which hits home in Rhode Island and Connecticut and many other States, and it is that side which the polluters want to ignore and obscure with "war on coal" rhetoric.

Burning coal releases carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases. That warms our atmosphere, bringing changes we are already seeing in seasons, weather, and storms. There is a strong association between global warming and the kinds of rain bursts that flooded homes and businesses in Rhode Island in 2010, for instance.

Coal burning contributes to the formation of toxic ground-level ozone, which is a cause of the bad air days in my home State of Rhode Island. Kids with asthma in the emergency room in Rhode Island are connected with midwestern powerplants that burn coal and pump often unscrubbed emissions up smokestacks designed to move the problem downwind—out of State, out of mind.

Don't overlook our oceans, which absorb about one-third of the carbon pollution being emitted and most of the excess heat. As a result, oceans are becoming more acidic, water temperatures are rising, and sea levels are rising across the globe. In Rhode Island the sea is up nearly 10 inches at the tide gauge at Naval Station Newport since the 1930s, when we had our great hurricane of 1938.

So whether you have a flooded home or are a mom with a child with asthma in the emergency room or somebody

with coastal property facing 10-inch higher seas, there are costs to coal. This is all virtually indisputable, and it follows immutable laws of nature. Damage to coastal homes and infrastructure from rising seas and erosion, asthma attacks in children triggered by smog, forests dying from beetle infestations and unprecedented wildfire seasons, farms ravaged by worsened drought and flooding—these are all real costs to Americans. This other side of the coal ledger counts too.

It even hits home in coal country, where blowing up mountaintops pollutes streams and harms folks around the mining operations. West Virginia University has linked the dust thrown up by these mountaintop mines to lung cancer among nearby residents.

Coal-fired powerplants are the biggest sources of mercury pollution in the United States, and they also emit arsenic, acid gases, and other toxins.

Dr. Shindell, whom I mentioned earlier, is an expert in atmospheric chemistry and health. Here is what he told the EPW Committee last week:

Of all of the sources of the emissions that lead to poor air quality in the United States, coal burning is the single largest, causing by my calculations about 47,000 premature deaths per year. That happens to be larger than the total number of Americans killed in all of the years of the Vietnam War by hostile fire.

If you look at the casualties, the Federal Government isn't waging a war on coal. If there is any war, coal is waging a war on us.

This is business as usual for the polluter industry and its propaganda apparatus. Coal companies have long fought public health standards, mine worker protections, and compensation for ailments such as black lung disease, as well as efforts to address acid rain or reduce toxic pollutants, such as mercury, that cause brain damage in kids.

In 1989 Southern Company's CEO Edward Addison testified that acid-rain controls would increase electricity rates in States with the most coal power by 10 to 20 percent by 2009. Well, we couldn't evaluate that prediction then, but now we can. This is a fact: In the 10 States with the most coal, rates actually fell. Big Coal's war on the truth has a long history.

I recently had the opportunity to visit West Virginia with Senator MANCHIN to learn about what coal means to the Mountain State economy. I get it. We need to care about the miners, the truckers, the powerplant operators, the engineers, and others who make their living in this industry. It would be wrong to ignore their plight, just as it is wrong when the coal industry tries to ignore the effects of its carbon pollution.

I think we need a carbon fee to correct the market and to slow climate change. I am sure I will hear that is a war on coal. It is not. It is simple fairness. It is simply paying for the mess you cause. That is not war. It is not

even punishment. It is just fair accounting, taking both sides of the ledger into account.

When people do that—economists and scientists—they calculate the cost of carbon pollution as what they call the social cost of carbon. The administration estimates the social cost of carbon at around \$40 per ton of carbon pollution—\$40 per ton. The effective cost to polluters for causing that mess is zero.

My carbon fee bill would correct that. It would correct what even economists and groups as conservative as the American Enterprise Institute agree is a market failure, and then return every dollar of the fee to the American people. That could include transition assistance for coal workers—and assistance for communities far from coal mines, like in Rhode Island, facing these costs of climate change. It is also becoming increasingly clear that a revenue-neutral carbon fee will spur innovation, create jobs, and boost the economy nationwide.

So it is time to end the polluters' holiday from responsibility. It is time to see through their fanciful war on coal, and protect those facing the effects of coal's war on us and coal's war on the truth. It is time to seize the economic benefit of a clean energy economy. It is time to wake up.

I yield the floor to my friend, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Rhode Island. I am so happy to follow him on the floor today and to see him again. We have worked together on so many important issues. It is wonderful to see the Presiding Officer to be back on the floor.

I come today for a very special reason. I am so proud to present to the Senate a package of lands bills that have been included in the Defense Authorization Act.

What is significant about this particular package is it is quite large, and it is the first package in almost 6 years and almost three Congresses, which is quite an accomplishment for our committee.

I am so proud of the staff of our committee, Energy and Natural Resources. I made this a priority when I took over as Chair 9 months ago. It was a long shot to see if we could put any package at all together that had eluded us for several Congresses, but I worked very closely with my counterpart, Congressman HASTINGS, in the House. We met on several occasions with our top staff and committed to do all we could to see what was possible.

One of the important principles that made this grand compromise possible—and there are Republican bills and Democratic bills; it is very well balanced as between the parties, but also geographically in projects and expansions of parks, creation of new parks, and land transfers. The principle that we followed is it is revenue neutral. Some of these bills raise money, some

of these bills spend money, but the lands package is revenue neutral. I think the taxpayer is going to get some extraordinary value in the package being presented today.

In addition, one of the principles I pushed very strongly is to make sure that this package included opportunities for the development of our natural resources. We are very proud of our wilderness areas. We are very proud of our parks. We are very proud of our areas that are off limits to economic development. But there are parts of the Federal landscape of public lands that should be developed—whether it is forests, or oil and gas, or hard-rock mining, for the benefit of the taxpayer and for our overall economy. That was a very important principle for me and of course for Congressman HASTINGS.

We also wanted to make sure that we expanded our national park system. Again, this has been a 6-year hiatus, almost three Congresses. We have not been able to make any progress on adding to the beautiful heritage areas and special national park system that America is known for and helped to pilot for the world. Next year will be the 100th anniversary of the founding of the National Park Service, and we are excited about the additional eight new national parks that will be created by this lands package, and it expands the boundaries of six existing national parks.

One of the expansions I want to note particularly is in Texas, in San Antonio. It expands the San Antonio Missions National Historical Park. The reason I am excited about this is because the San Antonio missions are next on the list in the United States sites to be designated as world heritage sites. I had a great opportunity to help our only site in Louisiana, Poverty Point, achieve that designation just a few months ago. What an extraordinary action it was to be there when we cut the ribbon on a site that is going to continue to be excavated that we believe is over 3,500 years old, with a very sophisticated Native American settlement on these beautiful raised mounds in one of the highest points in the Louisiana-Mississippi delta area. I was excited to see that San Antonio missions will be next. This puts these sites on the same level as the Grand Canyon and other really extraordinary international places of cultural significance. So that is one example.

In the new national parks, it has only taken us 200-something-plus years, with Senator CARPER and Senator COONS, to get a national park in Delaware. They were the only State without a national park. Although they are small in size, they are very important as they are the first State in the Union. So as it would be appropriate, the name of their park is the First State National Park. So now every State in the United States has at least one national park. Of course, some States have many more. Our commitment is to continue this great heritage for our Nation for generations to come.

This package represents a major milestone in our work to reach a consensus across party lines. We will clear much of the backlog of the public lands bill that has built up in the Senate, last passed in the omnibus package 5 years ago. It is worth noting the Congressional Budget Office has again scored this as revenue neutral.

Let me speak for a minute about a few Louisiana priorities. Although most of these bills do not have anything to do with Louisiana—we did not have any major expansion efforts of any of our parks to present—I did wish to discuss two meaningful impact on the economy of my State.

The first provision will ensure the economic vitality and viability of the Toledo Bend hydroelectric project located on the beautiful Sabine River on the Louisiana-Texas border. Toledo Bend provides power to thousands of Louisiana homes and serves as an economic engine for our western border with Texas.

The project was first licensed in 1963. Russell Long and our congressional delegation were very instrumental in getting this dam for hydropower established in our State. Although we are known for oil and gas, we do have some hydropower in our State. It was relicensed in August—I am proud of, with my support and leadership—for an additional 50 years, which is a terrific certification on the part of the Federal Government that this project is fulfilling its original goals and objectives. Not only is it generating power, it is providing an extraordinary recreational opportunity.

This project includes a dam which impounds a 185,000-acre reservoir, the largest manmade body of water in the South, and a powerhouse capable of generating 81 megawatts of electricity. The project is operated primarily for water supply purposes, secondarily for hydropower, and thirdly for recreation. But it has become an extremely popular recreational site both on the Texas side and on the Louisiana side. It is an interesting project, because we have joint jurisdiction. The Texas Commission runs its side, the Louisiana Commission runs our side, and it occupies about 3,800 acres of Federal land in a narrow 3-foot strip along the shore of the reservoir where it borders the Sabine National Forest and Indian mounds.

Under current law, just because of that 3-foot strip, the forest, land, and other Federal agencies were claiming jurisdiction just because of this very narrow edge around the Toledo Bend. So we eliminated their jurisdiction. It gave the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission the basis to impose annual charges. We didn't think that would be fair, so we carved out a much-needed exemption that would prohibit undue regulation, and allow the local governmental structures and appropriate Federal agencies to determine the best use of this land. Local zoning ordinances will apply, local rules about what areas

can be developed privately and publicly. There is plenty of public access to this reservoir. We hope, and I anticipate, that it will be another momentum builder for the economic development in this region.

Significantly for me—I have worked on it for many years, because I have been aware of this since I was a legislator years ago and the real need to develop this as a really first-class destination for resorts, hotels, marinas—not only for the people who live and have property there, but for visitors who may come from all over the region.

In addition, Fort Polk is situated only about 40 miles away. So it is within driving distance for soldiers and their families for recreation. It is really quite beautiful. It is isolated. We don't have quite enough highway infrastructure I think for us to develop it in a way that we really should, but that will come with time. But this was a very important step to get the 50-year certification to move forward. And now our local communities—the parishes of Sabine, DeSoto, and Vernon—can lean forward and dream and plan for how this area can be developed.

The second Louisiana-related provision authorizes the National Park Service to study areas along the Lower Mississippi River in Plaquemines Parish for the potential addition to the national park system. It is just a study, but this Lower Mississippi area is of course rich in cultural history. It was first traveled by Spanish explorers in the 1500s and later, in 1699, became the site of the first fortification on the Lower Mississippi River known as Fort Mississippi.

The area to be studied includes several other historic fortifications, including Fort St. Philip, which played a key role during the Battle of New Orleans and was the final major battle of the War of 1812. While Andrew Jackson's forces were successful on land, it was William Overton's 10-day defense of the back door to New Orleans that helped seal the American victory.

Fort Philip, and its companion fort located across the river, Fort Jackson, also played a pivotal role during the siege of New Orleans during the Civil War. These two forts, with their withering crossfire, held the Union Navy at bay for 12 days. And the history goes on and on.

These special places are tangible links to the dramatic stories of our Nation's history and deserve to be studied for inclusion in our national park system.

Let me underscore again how important I think is the principle of developing our public resources in the right ways—preserving what we can, conserving what we must, but developing what we can for the benefit of the taxpayer. That is one of the underlying principles of this grand compromise. I recognize that to break the logjam, particularly with the House of Representatives, we needed to find a way

to address both the development of natural resources and conservation and preservation, as well as the expansion of our public lands and public parks. This package reflects that balance. Let me mention a couple of the economic development provisions.

We will convey 70,000 acres in the Tongass National Forest to Sealaska, an Alaska Native corporation, to complete its land settlement under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act. This legislation has been a long-standing priority for Senator BEGICH and Senator MURKOWSKI. I thank them both for their extraordinary leadership in working on this land transfer.

This bill has been considered in the Energy and Natural Resources Committee for years, and the final language was carefully negotiated with the Department of Agriculture. So I thank the Department for helping us work out this extraordinary land transfer.

Another provision which was included at the request of Senator MCCAIN and Senator FLAKE and which has been worked on by the Arizona delegation is a land exchange in Arizona between the Forest Service and the Resolution Copper company to allow development of a major copper mine. My friend TRENT FRANKS has been a leader in this area as well in the House and in his legislative district, and I have had good conversations with him. This may be the deepest copper mine in the United States of America. It is going to be one of the richest in the world.

There was some original language in this legislation that was perhaps not as responsible as it should have been—or as sensitive maybe is a better word—to some of the needs or requests of some of the nearby tribes. We tried to address some of their concerns in the final language. We haven't, of course, settled all complaints, but we have settled as many as we can.

This is an extraordinarily valuable asset for the people of the United States, and the people of the United States own this land and right now own the potential copper that would come out of this mine. I most certainly, through my staff, have insisted and negotiated that the taxpayers get a fair exchange, that they are not underpaid in any way in this transfer and this development. I am very hopeful that the Forest Service, which will continue under the authorization in this bill to negotiate, will make sure the taxpayers of the United States are paid fairly for the exchange of this very valuable property, which will create many jobs in Arizona and which will create opportunities for economic development in our whole country and around the world, as copper is a very valuable substance. One of my overriding conditions for approval was to make sure the taxpayers get a full benefit.

While the Sealaska and Resolution Copper provisions have drawn most of the attention in this bill, in total the

package includes many other prominent Federal land conveyances, all which will allow for community services such as cemeteries and schools, provide land for development by local communities, allow for outdoor recreational opportunities, and increase management efficiencies for both public and adjacent private land.

The package also wonderfully includes almost 250,000 acres of new wilderness designations, including in Washington State. I thank Senator CANTWELL and Senator MURRAY for their advocacy for their State and for our Nation. Senator TESTER has been a strong proponent for the State of Montana, Senator REID in the State of Nevada, and in the State of Colorado, Senator BENNET and Senator MARK UDALL, and, of course, in New Mexico we have had some expansion of wilderness areas. Each of these bills was the product of years of discussion among stakeholders and each State's congressional delegation.

In addition to wilderness designations, the package will protect the watershed of over 360,000 acres of natural forest lands adjacent to Glacier National Park and will designate 200,000 Forest Service and BLM lands in Montana as the Rocky Mountain Front Conservation Heritage area and protect 70,000 acres of the Hermosa Creek Watershed in Colorado.

Among the eight new national parks are two in Maryland and New York that celebrate the life of Harriet Tubman, known, of course, for her great role in civil rights and developing the Underground Railroad and for so many other things she did as a leader at that time. Our new national parks will protect 80,000 acres of forest land and volcanic peaks in New Mexico; designate the first national park in Delaware; protect fossil resources outside of Las Vegas; and interpret the story of the World War II Manhattan Project in Washington State, which was so important to Representative HASTINGS. Tennessee and New Mexico are, of course, also included in that history and the Colt firearms company in Hartford, CT, which is an unusual kind of park to celebrate, but it is part of the American development of manufacturing, and the Colt firearms company played a major role. So we have that included in this bill.

The individual bills that are included have been developed with local support and in many cases have been priorities of Senators for years. I am pleased to have played a pivotal role in building this comprehensive package, and it took a lot of compromising and an awful lot of hard work.

I thank the lead Senator on the Defense bill, Mr. LEVIN, for allowing us to be part of the Defense authorization bill, along with Senator JACK REED, whom I spoke with on many occasions along with Senator LEVIN, because without their support I don't know if this bill could have survived standing alone with one or two strong objections

still out there. But they can't fight the Defense authorization bill. Tucking it in a bill that is going to pass and will not be vetoed is a way to move these bills forward.

It does enjoy broad and deep bipartisan support from literally hundreds of Members of Congress, and hundreds of staffers have spent hours and hours, and the executive branch—particularly Interior and Agriculture—has spent hours negotiating the fine details of this package.

I thank David Brooks, who is a lead staff member with our committee, Energy and Natural Resources, who has been a magnificent staffer here in the Senate for many years. He is known as the Senate expert on public lands, and that title certainly is appropriate for a man who knows so much and cares deeply about our public spaces and finding the right balance between preservation, conservation, and development.

I thank Liz Craddock, who is my staff director for the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, who was absolutely tireless. Not only running the committee in my absence, sometimes when I was on the campaign trail, but also taking appropriate time to come and work with me for reelection and in addition putting together, with David, this package while all this was going on is really a testimony to their professionalism. I thank them very much.

I thank all the Members of my side particularly for their patience and their understanding as we worked through this package of almost 80 to 90 bills and the subcommittees that worked so well moving them forward.

I will submit this for the RECORD. There may be other Senators, I am sure, who want to put in individual remarks for the parks and projects and land swaps, but I think it is pretty remarkable that we have cleared up 6 years of backlog at zero expense to the taxpayer with extremely broad and deep bipartisan support.

I will only say as one of my last remarks on the Senate floor that it is possible to find common ground if we are willing to look for it and work hard enough to find it. We need to have our eyes open a little wider. We need to put our shoulder to the wheel a little bit stronger, and if we can do that, we can move a lot of significant legislation through that benefits generations of our citizens and taxpayers for years to come.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I have come down to the floor today to talk

about the package of public lands measures included in the House-passed Defense bill. I am told we are likely to vote on that bill as early as tomorrow in the Senate.

Within the lands package is a measure we worked on called the Hermosa Creek Watershed Protection Act.

The watershed, which is pictured here, is a beautiful parcel of national forest land up the road from Durango in the southwest corner of Colorado.

I will say at the outset that our office may have introduced the bill in the Senate, but it was really the people I represent in southwest Colorado who wrote every bit of this piece of legislation.

Over 6 years ago, a diverse group of local citizens, mountain bikers, anglers, outfitters, local officials, and many others all got together to talk about the future of the land. Everyone involved liked to visit the area for recreation or to do business there. Their discussion was to developing a plan to manage the area so everyone could enjoy it and benefit from the multiple uses well into the future.

Over the Memorial Day weekend in 2011, the Hermosa workgroup invited my family and me for a hike through the watershed and to join the discussion, and we took them up on that offer.

We loaded up the van, drove to Durango, and met the working group at the Hermosa Creek trailhead.

My youngest daughter Anne, who was then probably about 8, made a hiking stick out of a nearby fallen branch, and we started up the trail with 40 or so others from the local community.

The Presiding Officer knows this area well. As we climbed higher and higher, we were overcome by the beauty around us and the forests and valleys and crystal-clear streams and unspoiled views in almost every direction.

After about an hour, the group pulled off the forest service trail into a meadow, and as Anne, Halina, and Caroline Bennet, my three daughters, made me a dandelion necklace out of the dandelions that were there, we started a discussion about what this area meant to the people who were on this trip.

The sportsmen came to fish for native Colorado cutthroat trout and for back-country elk hunting. The mountain bikers came to enjoy single-track riding trails known throughout the country and throughout the world. The local water districts love Hermosa because it provides clean water for the city of Durango, and workers in the timber and mining industry stress that some of the watershed could contribute to extractive development in the future.

The upshot of the discussion we had in the meadow that afternoon was an agreement to work together on a bill, a balanced bill that managed the watershed so it would contribute to the local economy long into the future. More than just working on this bill, I think

the people in that meadow set out to prove that people in this country can still work together and set an example for the U.S. Congress.

After nearly 3½ years of negotiations since that hike, we are on the verge of passing that bill and sending it to the President for his signature. The Hermosa Creek Watershed Protection Act governs the entire watershed. It includes provisions to allow for multiple uses, such as timber harvesting for forest health, continued access for Colorado's snowmobilers—a critical provision to allow Silverton's winter economy to continue to prosper.

The bill enhances opportunities for back-country fishing made possible by the great work of Trout Unlimited and Colorado Parks and Wildlife to reintroduce native cutthroat trout to the watershed.

The bill also adds—importantly—nearly 40,000 acres to the National Wilderness Preservation System, lands that provide unique and important opportunities for solitude and reflection, lands that will remain undeveloped forever so that they will always have clear streams to fish and lush forests for local outfitters to take clients into the forest on horseback.

I am proud to report that the bill has the unanimous bipartisan backing of the two county commissions involved, the San Juan County Commission and the La Plata County Commission. I thank those commissioners for their leadership, collaboration, and their vision, and the two local towns, Durango and Silverton. It has the support of the Hermosa Creek Workgroup, ranging from hardrock miners to environmental groups. These are the people we say can never get along and can never get anything done because everybody has to get only their position and disregard the position that the other has, and we have proven that is not true, as I said, ranging from hardrock miners to environmental groups such as the San Juan Citizens Alliance, Conservation Colorado, and The Wilderness Society.

It has the support of sportsmen, Trout Unlimited, and the back-country hunters and anglers.

The Hermosa bill is also supported by the local water district, the Southwestern Water Conservation District.

The outdoor recreation community—including the Colorado Snowmobile Association, Colorado Off-Highway Vehicle Coalition, and the Trails 2000 mountain bike group—supports the measure. And support for Hermosa is especially strong from the local business community. Companies as diverse as fly shops, car dealerships, the Durango Chamber, and Mercury Payment Systems, one of the area's largest employers, all agree that protected public lands add to the region's quality of life and help them attract topnotch talent to the region.

This bill grew from the grassroots up. Republicans, Democrats, and Independents worked together to cement a long-term plan for their community's future.

I thank Senator UDALL, a long-time champion for Colorado's public lands and wilderness, for joining me as a co-sponsor of the bill.

I also wish to thank Congressman SCOTT TIPTON, our partner in the House, for supporting this bill and demonstrating that bipartisanship still exists in some corners of the Capitol. He has been outstanding to work with, as has his staff, and I look forward to collaborating on other conservation measures in the future.

To close and bring this back to the beginning—I see my colleague is here—I don't have to convince most people that Colorado is a special place. Many people from all over the United States have been to our State to ski our mountains, run our rivers, or climb a 14er.

The Hermosa Creek watershed represents some of the best Colorado has to offer. It deserves to be protected, and that is what this bill does.

However, in some respects, I wish Hermosa didn't have to pass this way. This lands package is a great achievement. It came through a robust bipartisan and bicameral process, and that work is something truly to be commended.

At the same time, I think the Hermosa Creek bill could have passed by unanimous consent years ago as a stand-alone bill, or as part of another smaller, bipartisan, bicameral package that didn't have to wait almost 6 years while local communities all across the country have been left in limbo. People there don't work on the same time that people here work, and their expectations are that we are going to move things along. No one should object to bipartisan, commonsense measures that are widely supported. But instead of regular order, we are left voting on large packages of lands bills every number of years.

In fact, save one wilderness bill that passed earlier this session, Congress has not passed a wilderness bill since 2009. Congress has not passed one wilderness bill since 2009—I suppose we passed one.

Last Congress was the first time a session of Congress hadn't passed a wilderness bill in the 50-year history of the Wilderness Act. That had never happened before, whether the Senate was Democratic or the Senate was Republican, whether the House was Democratic or Republican, or whether the President was a Democrat or a Republican. It never happened before. This Congress—provided the vote goes well tomorrow—will have waited until the eleventh hour.

The 2009 bill, which was one of the very first ones I voted on as a Senator, created 2 million acres of new wilderness.

The package we will vote on tomorrow contains several hundred thousand acres more, including nearly 40,000 new wilderness acres, as I mentioned in the Hermosa bill. While that is great progress, and it truly is, I wish we were doing more.

Despite dozens of other widely supported conservation proposals that have been introduced this session, there are only four other wilderness bills included in this package. Once again, I am strongly supportive of the package, and I urge my colleagues to vote yes. But in the new Congress we ought to hit the reset button and truly honor the intent of the Wilderness Act—which President Johnson signed into law 50 years ago—by passing more wilderness bills. I can't think of a better anniversary present for the landmark law than for the 114th Congress to return and pass more of these bills.

Let's defy expectations about what the change in the majority means here. Let's lift up the bipartisan work that is happening around here and pass more of these bills.

Historically conservation has been a bipartisan issue going all the way back to Teddy Roosevelt, and I hope we might return to the cooperation we have seen in the decades since then and get some more wilderness and conservation done for the American people.

This is a glorious and beautiful country that we all represent. We ought to save some of it for our kids and grandkids by passing this package and coming together on some others.

I urge yes on the bill.

I thank the Presiding Officer for all of his work to make sure we could bring this lands bill together with the NDAA bill.

I urge a "yes" vote.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I thank my colleague from Alaska for allowing me to go ahead with my remarks.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I thank my colleague and his comment about the courtesy for allowing him to go first. I think the Senator from Colorado was scheduled to go first, and we were just a little bit behind, so I was pleased to listen to my friend's comments about one of the provisions in this NDAA lands bill, and I thank him for those comments.

I also wish to acknowledge the comments of the Senator from Louisiana, our chairman of the Energy Committee. I have had the pleasure and privilege of working with her as the ranking member on the committee now for the past 6 to 8 months since she has held the chair. But even before that, I have had the honor and privilege of working with her on so many energy issues.

As the Senator from Louisiana was detailing the contents of this lands package that is contained within the NDAA bill, I was reminded of what a good partnership we have had working together on the committee. They are not exactly easy issues that come before us. They generate a level of controversy—certainly a level of debate and dialog—but there has always been

good, civil debate and dialog as we try to work through some very difficult issues.

As Senator LANDRIEU leaves the Senate at the end of this Congress, I want her to know, as I stated in committee just this morning, how much I have appreciated the good work she has done, not only on energy issues, but the good work she has done on behalf of the people whom she represents in Louisiana.

If there is anybody who exemplifies the word “tenacious,” it is MARY LANDRIEU, and I think the people of her State have enjoyed the benefit of the very tenacious approach and how my friend and colleague takes care of those she represents. I thank the Senator for that.

I too wish to add my comments this evening in support of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, and more specifically, to the public lands package, which is title 30.

As Senator LANDRIEU detailed in greater specificity, what we have here is a collection of smaller bills related to public lands. Just because a bill is small and somewhat discreet in terms of its area of impact, it doesn't mean these are not issues that are critically important to the people of that State, critically important to that region.

With so many of these bills that are now part of this package, we have spent months—and in some cases we have spent years—developing, considering, refining, amending, and working through these packages. We have spent weeks negotiating which ones will actually be in the package that we have before us in title 30. We have now arrived at this point where we have a bipartisan and bicameral consensus in support of it.

What I wish to do with my time this evening is to explain how this package is fundamental to economic development in our Western States.

I also wish to lay out what this package is as well as what it isn't because I think there have been some misconceptions about what is contained in this. I also want to provide a little bit of insight into the process by which we crafted this and why it is now time for the Senate to do what the House has already done in passing it by a very overwhelming margin.

But before we get into the substance of some of these measures, I think the Senate needs to understand why we want this package, why we need to pass it now rather than waiting until the next Congress or perhaps the one after that or perhaps whenever we have a slow day around here. So I will proceed to the basics of some of this.

It is probably best described by just looking at the map. The dominant landowner in the United States is the Federal Government. The Federal Government, like it or not, owns roughly 640 million acres of land. That is more than one-quarter of our country that is held by the Federal Government. Ninety-three percent of these lands are clustered in just 12 Western States. So

we can see here our Federal fault line. These 12 Western States are areas where less than 50 percent of the land is owned or held by the State and private interests. When we look at this divide, on this side, more than 95 percent is state-controlled land.

So we have a situation where in many of our Eastern States the Federal Government owns just a small fraction of the lands. But if we look to some of our Western States and we look at the extent of Federal ownership, this is where the picture comes into greater focus. In Wyoming, 42.3 percent of the State of Wyoming is held in Federal lands. In my State of Alaska, 69 percent of the State of Alaska is federally owned. Nevada walks away with No. 1, where over 80 percent of the State of Nevada is held by the Federal Government.

For folks back on the east coast, what does that mean? Let's say it presents some real difficulties for us in the West. Say we want a minor land conveyance—not a big deal. But if a person lives in a State such as New York with less than 1 percent of Federal lands, chances are that person can go see a real estate attorney and they can have a document drawn up, and they might even be able to draw it up in 1 day or maybe it takes a couple of days, but a person can complete a transaction without too much difficulty. If a person tries to do a conveyance in 1 of our 12 Western States, where 93 percent of the Federal lands are, it is a different story. Chances are a person will not have the same luck as they might in New York. Even if they are seeking the smallest of land conveyances, say 1 acre—just 1 acre is all we want to move from the Federal side to the State side, to a local side, to the private side—a person does not go see an attorney. A person needs to go talk to one of the four Federal land management agencies to get approval for their request, and they are not done there. Then a person needs to go see their Congressman and their Senator because they need Federal legislation to make it happen. It honestly takes an act of Congress. In the East, in places where land ownership is different than it is in the West, people can handle all of these conveyances. We can work through some of what we are seeing in this public lands package. We can do it through private transactions. But in the West, it takes an act of Congress for a land conveyance.

That is why we see hundreds of public lands bills introduced each Congress. It underscores why their passage is so critical to economic development and to job creation in our country. I have to admit, I am pleased the Senator from New Mexico is in the chair today, coming from a State such as New Mexico, which is at 41.77 percent. The Presiding Officer knows full well what we are talking about when we talk about the imperative of our communities that are asking for a little relief when it comes to a land convey-

ance, and the level it rises to is not the city council, it is not the mayor or the legislator or the Governor, it is a Congressman and Senator, and ultimately signed into law by the President of the United States.

So what are we actually looking at in this package? After truly months of negotiations, perhaps a few near-death experiences, and many temptations to walk away, we have agreed to a balanced, budget-neutral, revenue-neutral, bicameral, bipartisan package contained in title 30. These provisions that are contained here will create jobs. They will create thousands of American jobs. They will cut the redtape to energy production. They will boost American mineral production. They protect multiple use and public recreation. They convey Federal land for community development. They protect our treasured lands through measured conservation, and they provide new means for private dollars to support our national parks.

We have included a bipartisan provision to streamline oil and gas permitting on our Federal lands. It is supported by the Western Governors' Association. It cleared the Senate by unanimous consent before the elections. So think about that. So many things get tied up in the politics of elections, but this was so important to so many, on a bipartisan basis, on a regional basis, we moved it through the Senate by unanimous consent.

We have included a provision to address the backlog of the grazing permit renewals for our western ranchers to ease their burdens. Then there is another provision we have included that will help to hopefully protect the collapse of the timber industry in Southeastern Alaska with the conveyance to our Alaska Native peoples—a promise that has been 40 years—40 years—in achieving.

We have included a major priority for Arizona. This is an issue Senator LANDRIEU spoke to, an extensively negotiated land exchange led by Senator MCCAIN and Senator FLAKE. I know Senator MCCAIN has been working on this for a decade to find a way to responsibly open a copper deposit that could meet 25 percent of our country's needs while at the same time taking incredible care to protect and maintain access to cultural resources and traditional uses of those lands.

There is another provision that relates to Nevada which also facilitates development of a different copper mine. But now think about this. We are going to have an opportunity in Nevada and in Arizona to extract copper. Our military needs copper. The construction industry needs copper. The automotive industry needs copper. The renewable energy industry needs copper. There are so many benefits to be had here.

We have some provisions that are contained in this package that perhaps generate fewer headlines but are still hugely important for local communities. Probably the best example of

this is a provision for a school in Minnesota. This is a measure we have been working on with Senator FRANKEN. But it facilitates a land exchange of just 1 acre—1 acre to a school in Minnesota—a single, lonely acre. We probably have people saying, So do we really have to pass a bill in order to make that happen? The simple answer is yes. That is why we are here. That is why we are including these provisions—so many provisions—in this very important bill.

I also want to mention what the package is not—what it does not do, what it does not contain, and some of the parade of horrors that certain groups have been saying that in fairness, they are not looking again to the balance we have achieved with this overall package.

We saw some rightful concerns emerge before this title was finalized. Everybody's ears always perk up when they hear "public lands package," wondering what it is going to be. But we have seen some inaccurate criticisms emerge even after the release. It is one thing if they haven't seen what is in it. It is another thing to look at it and then be critical of it.

As I mentioned earlier, this is a balanced, revenue-neutral package. We have taken great care to make sure it is not all focused on new wilderness, new parks. In Western States, and particularly coming out of Alaska, we are just not going to have the support we need if it is all focused on wilderness and parks, so it is not. There is a conservation piece, absolutely, and it is a strong conservation piece, and I think it is a good, balanced one. But we also have the very important development piece that is critical to what is contained within.

To those who have spoken out against creating new national parks, given the maintenance backlogs that I think we recognize—it could be as high as \$20 billion. I get it. I agree with Senator COBURN that we must address the backlog issues, the maintenance issues, and I thank him for the scrutiny he and his staff have given to this issue and the report they came out with. We are going to be working to address that in a manner that is constructive and long term. I want to reduce the backlogs, and we will do it.

Again, this has been judged to be revenue neutral. Through its passage, we could make progress on the backlog issue.

One provision that is contained in the bill that will help is the authorization of a National Park Service commemorative coin. There are 75 Senators who are cosponsors that will allow for additional funds to be raised. Senator COBURN has a measure in here that will allow for appropriate recognition of volunteers to our national parks. We have also tailored this package to include the wilderness provisions, but it is a discrete number. All of these have strong local and congressional support. We are looking at less than 250,000 acres in all, and actually from a practical perspective, far less than that. Most of these provisions

were sponsored by a House Republican. Some have been endorsed by a Governor or a State legislature. With others, we are simply making it official. Nearly half of what would become wilderness is already managed as if it were wilderness. It is in wilderness study areas or it is in roadless area designation.

This is not a zero-sum game because we should be focused on the productive value of our public lands above all else. But for those who are kind of keeping score—is this acre per acre—I want to remind people that the package transfers almost 110,000 acres of Federal land into State or private hands through conveyances, exchanges, and sales. We are also releasing more than 26,000 acres of land from wilderness study back into multiple use. Examples of what those lands could be used for include building of transmission lines or motorized recreation.

I know some have raised issues about the various studies that are contained within the bill which, in my view, are more a matter of due diligence than anything else. Because a further act of Congress will be required before any new park, any new museum or wild or scenic designation can be established, and then we have the funding aspect of it as well. So, again, these are studies. This is not the creation of a new museum. This is not the creation of a new park. These are studies.

I think it is also important to reiterate that we have taken great care to protect private property. We have forbidden the use of eminent domain and the condemnation of private property. We have also set a positive precedent by eliminating the potential use of buffer zones around designated lands.

Again, I am going to say it one more time: This package is the result of bipartisan and bicameral negotiation, weeks of meetings amongst Members and staff of the committees of jurisdiction, the committees that have crafted the overall NDAA bill, leadership in both Chambers, and many individual Members.

For those who would suggest that this package was somehow hastily assembled, that this is some kind of rush to judgment, it is at the end of a very long and actually a very traditional process. We have considered, debated, and amended these provisions over the course of Congress using the committee process and the House and Senate floor when we could. Every bill within this package has been reviewed by the committees of jurisdiction. We are not hopscotching over anybody. At least 30 bills have passed the House and 7 have passed the Senate. Even though we haven't devoted time to a large package of individual bills, some of these provisions have been considered in multiple Congresses. You may look through the list, and they look like reruns. It is because we have tried, and the process didn't allow for full completion.

What we have with title 30 builds upon the lands and natural resource provisions that were included in the

initial House-passed NDAA. These were provisions that were primarily the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee's jurisdiction.

We have seen in the past the NDAA bill include public lands packages. It has happened enough times that the House leaders actually name the House Resources Committee as official conferees to it. But I think what is very important for us to remember about this lands package is that what we have done, this effort, has taken no time and no funding away from our military or our veterans, nor has its inclusion held the NDAA back for a single moment here.

I think we would all prefer a process where we could take the time to bring up Senator BENNET's bill on the floor and talk about it and have him tell us about all the magic of this region, but we haven't seen that in this body in far too long. I would prefer that process where all these bills could be considered individually on their own, but know that we have reviewed everything closely. This is a revenue neutral package. We found the right balance and reached bipartisan and bicameral agreement. We don't need to start over. We don't need to be working these same bills in a new Congress. We don't need to see a groundhog's day with so many of these measures that are small but are so important to these Western States. It is time to finish this. It is time to pass these reasonable measures. So I would encourage the Senate to support this package as part of the larger NDAA bill so that we can fulfill our responsibility to those in the Western States and those who have public lands that we are happy to have, but we also need to know we can have a level of responsiveness within our system to allow us to work those lands.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I would like to thank the Senator from Alaska for her tireless efforts on the lands bill and the NDAA bill and the bipartisan spirit she brought to all of these negotiations over a long period of time. She is to be commended for it. I don't think we would be anywhere close to where we are without her work. I thank her for that.

I am here to speak briefly about the Intelligence Committee's report on the CIA's interrogation methods. I support the committee's decision to release the report. As a country, it shows we have the courage to face the truth no matter how ugly that truth may be. Coloradans need to know the truth. The American people deserve to know the truth. Our willingness to face this difficult truth reminds us that we live and we are lucky to live in the most open and transparent democracy the world has ever known. Unlike the acts brought to light by the Intelligence Committee report, the willingness for self-examination is something to be celebrated about America.

The report will be the subject of significant debate over the coming weeks and months and maybe even years, as it should be. Nobody should be cavalier about the risks that are associated with the release of this information, but this is a discussion our country needs to have.

Although I am still reviewing the report, a couple of things are pretty clear at the outset.

First, the use of so-called enhanced interrogation techniques failed to secure accurate information or cooperation from detainees. The very first finding of the report says:

While being subjected to the CIA's enhanced interrogation techniques and afterwards, multiple CIA detainees fabricated information, resulting in faulty intelligence. Detainees provided fabricated information on critical intelligence issues, including the terrorist threats which the CIA identified as its highest priorities.

Not only has torture not made the country safer, it may have made us less safe—at least according to this report.

Second, the report reveals that the CIA withheld information from the FBI, the State Department, and the Director of the Office of National Intelligence. It denied access to detainees and provided inaccurate information about the interrogation tactics. Information was withheld from former Secretary of State Colin Powell out of concern he would "blow his stack if he were to be briefed on what's been going on." The CIA repeatedly misled Congress and impeded oversight by its own inspector general.

The report rebuts any notion that these brutal tactics led to actionable intelligence that made our country safer. It highlights the lengths to which people systematically misled other agencies, the Congress, and for years the American people. But most significantly, this report—and I thank the Presiding Officer for his service on the Intelligence Committee. It is a committee that by definition people can't learn very much about, and I know it takes a lot of time and an awful lot of work that can go underappreciated. But this week we are learning why the work on that committee is so important.

Most significantly, as I was saying, this report has reminded us that the use of torture is completely at war with who we are as a country and the ideals we hold. Throughout our country's history, our American values—the notion that all people are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable, sustainable rights—have sustained us through our most difficult times. They helped us triumph in World War II and eventually led to the fall of communism during the Cold War. They have attracted millions of immigrants to our shores. They inspired generations of Americans to rectify the inequality that exists in their own time to create a more perfect union. In fact, the values of democracy

and human dignity are what brought my mother and her family to the United States after surviving the horrors of the Holocaust in Poland. It was a place that they called beautiful America, as much an idea as it was a place to them. Torture is repugnant to these fundamental American ideals.

It is often said that the strength of our democratic institutions is tested during times of crisis. Understanding what happened and ensuring we won't use torture again will help our democratic institutions persevere in the future and serve future generations as well as the generations that were here before. It will demonstrate that we are better and we are stronger than our enemies. It will ensure that our uniquely American values will continue to inspire people like my mother and her parents all across the globe.

I yield the floor.

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

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

HAVEN ACT

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to engage in a colloquy with my colleagues Chairman LEVIN of the Committee on Armed Services and Chairman JOHNSON of the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

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

Mr. REED. I join with my colleagues to speak about the inclusion of the HAVEN Act in the National Defense Authorization Act we are considering today. The HAVEN Act, which I sponsored along with Senator JOHANNIS, authorizes a pilot program to help make repairs or modifications that are necessary for disabled or low-income veterans to stay in their homes. The HAVEN Act lies within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, to which it has been referred. However, working in close coordination with the chairman of the banking committee, we were able to include this measure in the NDAA bill, in recognition of its potential to assist veterans of our armed services who are in need; isn't that correct, Chairman JOHNSON?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Senator REED is correct, I thank him for working with me on this matter and for his continued advocacy on behalf of veterans.

Mr. LEVIN. I would like to thank both Senator REED and Chairman JOHNSON for working with our committee to include the HAVEN Act within the bill we are considering today.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate

proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

TRIBUTE TO JAMES BAKER

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, James Baker has served the State of Vermont with great distinction over many years, and I was saddened when he announced his retirement in 2009 after 3 decades with the Vermont State Police. To no one's surprise, he finished his tenure there at the top, as commander.

But we knew retirement would not last long for a man of his talents.

In 2010, Jim Baker answered the call to step in where he was most needed, taking the helm of the Rutland City Police Department when the department and the community were beset by turmoil. Chief Baker's leadership and loyalty was infectious, and his plan to serve for only a few months turned into a few years.

During that time, Chief Baker pulled together a team of committed neighbors, businesspeople and community organizers to face the challenges head-on. They tackled blighted neighborhoods and encouraged new investment. They sent a strong message to drug dealers: NOT in our community. And they developed a statistical mapping system to reduce crime in the city's worst-hit blocks. This effort, known as "Project VISION," has shown great success.

With Rutland now on a steady course, one might think Chief Baker would again be thinking of retirement, but that will not be the case. Instead, Jim Baker will be bringing his leadership talents to Washington D.C., where he will serve as director of law enforcement and support with the International Association of Chiefs of Police.

Rutland's loss is our Nation's gain. I look forward to a continued working relationship with Jim, and thank him for his dedication and leadership to the State of Vermont. I ask that the following profile of Jim Baker, which recently appeared in the Vermont weekly Seven Days, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From Seven Days, Nov. 19, 2014]

INFLUENTIAL POLICE CHIEF HAS A NEW GIG

(By Mark Davis)

When Jim Baker first took over Rutland's scandal-plagued police department in the winter of 2012, he had a running joke with the mayor.

In department-head meetings during which a particularly vexing problem arose, Baker would hold up his city-issued notebook and point to the first word of his job title. "Mayor, mayor, look—'interim,' OK?" Baker would say to Mayor Chris Lours. "That question is for the next guy."

Baker, a former head of the Vermont State Police, initially signed on for a six-month stint as Rutland's chief of police. Nearly