bring about the passage of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act.

First and foremost, I thank Chairman HATCH for his partnership throughout the process. I think Chairman HATCH and I can smile a bit looking back on some very spirited debates in the process of getting to this point. I do want colleagues to understand that Chairman HATCH has been a true leader in this bipartisan effort in the Finance Committee and on the floor. I thank Chairman HATCH and his staff for all they have done.

I think both Chairman HATCH and I also want to acknowledge our partner in the House, Chairman RYAN. All through the discussions, Chairman HATCH, Chairman RYAN, and myself, all tried to make sure that we would have a bipartisan, bicameral collaborative effort. The three of us obviously don't see eye to eye on everything, but we thought it was very important to try to come together and move an extraordinarily important and challenging economic policy forward for the country. Chairman RYAN has been there every single step of the way, and we look forward to returning the favor as he moves this historic package through the House and on to the President's desk.

We also thank Leader MCCONNELL for his work in shepherding this package through the process. It has not been easy, but Leader MCCONNELL has had a single-minded focus in terms of getting this bill across the finish line.

While we are on the subject of Senate leadership, I especially want to acknowledge the extraordinary contributions of my Pacific Northwest colleague Senator MURRAY and her staff. Over the last few years, colleagues, we have seen time and time again Senator MURRAY demonstrate her extraordinary ability. She is a person of modest size, but she is sure good at getting big things done. This bill is no exception, and it could not have happened without her leadership and help.

Finally, I note Chairman HATCH and I wish to thank all the members of the Finance Committee because they had a lot of good ideas, and they were constructive in terms of bringing this debate along, recognizing that we had strong differences. Every single member of the Finance Committee made a meaningful contribution, whether it was to the policy or to the process. Chairman HATCH and I want to say that when you look at a full recounting of all the great work done by Finance Committee members, if we were to do it all night, we would keep you all the way through the recess.

I wrap up with a quick word of my thanks to my staff who have done an exceptional job putting the legislation together: Jayme White, Elissa Alben, Greta Peisch, Anderson Heiman, Keith Chu, Malcolm McGreary, Danielle Deraney, Kara Getz, and Juan Machado.

I close by way of saying I think it is fair to say that there were a lot of observers, both in and outside this body, who thought it would not be possible to move forward on an issue like this—which is going to affect 40 percent of the global economy—in a bipartisan fashion. We know there are going to be a billion middle-class consumers in the developing world in 2025, and they want to ''Buy American.'' They like our brand.

With the extraordinary leadership of Chairman HATCH and many others who contributed to this effort, I think once again there is going to be a very significant array of economic opportunities for the people we represent to get high-skill, high-wage, export-related jobs with products and services that we sell to these countries.

So I close this part of the debate tonight—again, as we began, I think, 7 months ago, Chairman HATCH, by telling you that this, to me, is what we are sent to do, tackle the big issues in a bipartisan way.

With that, I yield the floor.

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 9:36 p.m., recessed subject to the call of the Chair and reassembled at 11:13 p.m. when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. SESSIONS).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

USA FREEDOM ACT OF 2015—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to H.R. 2048.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 87, H.R. 2048, a bill to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes.

MORNING BUSINESS

THE GRAND STAIRCASE-ESCALANTE NATIONAL MONUMENT GRAZING PROTECTION ACT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have always been proud of Utah's rich heritage. Utah is blessed with incredible natural resources, beautiful landscapes, and breathtaking vistas. Utahns have always understood the importance of maintaining a responsible balance between the development of our abundant resources and the need to protect the unique natural features of our State. Today, though, the executive branch threatens to disrupt that delicate balance. Countless rural communities in Utah are currently facing difficult challenges to their way of life as the Bureau of Land Management, BLM, increases restrictions on traditional economic activities, such as ranching and grazing operations on Federal land.

Under President Theodore Roosevelt's leadership, Congress passed the Antiquities Act of 1906—a short, four-paragraph law that gave the President unilateral authority to designate areas as national monuments. Such designations were intended to protect special areas in our country that have particularly significant natural, historical, or cultural features. Congress crafted these designations to be limited in scope and ''confined to the smallest area compatible with proper care and management of the objects to be protected.'' At that time, the Antiquities Act was an essential tool to protect our Nation's historical treasures against growing dangers, such as looters and vandals. Congress drafted this law after archaeologists noticed that America's natural treasures were turning up in overseas museums and private collections.

After President Roosevelt signed the Antiquities Act into law, he subsequently set aside nearly 20 such natural and cultural landmarks. These monument designations were limited in scope and designed to protect specific locations rather than massive acreages. For example, the total area of our Nation's first national monument, Devil's Tower in Wyoming, spans only about 2 square miles. Unfortunately, over time, the use of the Antiquities Act has evolved from protecting historic landmarks to restricting development across vast swaths of land without any meaningful local input. For example, on September 18, 1996, President Bill Clinton issued a proclamation designating nearly 1.9 million acres in southern Utah as the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument. Utah's entire congressional delegation, the Utah State Legislature, and then-Governor Mike Leavitt all strongly opposed this proclamation. President Clinton's declaration was made without so much as a ''by your leave'' to the people of Utah. There were no consultations, no hearings, no townhall meetings, no TV or radio discussions, no input from Federal land managers, no maps, no boundaries—nothing. In fact, Utah's elected representatives in Washington had to learn about the proclamation from the Washington Post.

There are significant impacts on the ground when a monument is designated not only on Federal land but also on State and private land. Had President Clinton consulted with the State and the delegation, he would have learned that the designation would land-lock and render useless 200,000 acres of Utah School Trust Lands—lands held in trust for the education of Utah's children. This designation deprived Utah schools of a significant revenue source. Fortunately, Utah's congressional delegation was eventually able to pass legislation allowing these school trust

lands to be swapped out of the monument boundary. While this legislation helped the schools, much of the local population still lost their jobs because of the President's declaration.

The only silver lining in this debacle was language written into the President's proclamation that protected livestock grazing on the monument. While the President blocked significant mineral development and other economic activity in the 1.9 million-acre area, he at least understood that blocking traditional grazing in the area was untenable. Sadly, since the 1996 monument designation, nearly 28 percent of the Federal livestock grazing animal unit-months, AUMs, have been suspended, according to the Utah Cattlemen's Association.

According to the 2015 Economic Report to the Governor prepared by the Utah Economic Council, ''[o]f Utah's 45 million acres of rangeland, 33 million acres are owned and managed by the federal government, while only 8 million acres are privately owned.'' With that in mind, most ranching operations in Utah must combine private grazing, feed importation, and access to the renewable grasses and forage through Federal grazing leases in order to be economically viable. Unfortunately, since the late 1940s, the Utah Farm Bureau found that the BLM and the Forest Service have drastically cut or suspended Utah's total livestock grazing AUMs from 5.4 million AUMs in 1949 to just over 2 million in 2012.

With grazing on Federal land already in peril, grazing on the monument is at even greater risk. Currently, the BLM is considering an amendment to the Management Plan that would eliminate grazing on the monument altogether. If the BLM eliminates grazing on the monument, there would be significant negative economic impacts to the area. Consider the economic benefits grazing already brings to these rural counties in Utah. The Utah Farm Bureau reports that ''around 11,500 feeder cattle sold out of Kane and Garfield County ranches brought in more than $16 million dollars and generated in excess of $25-$30 million based on a conservative economic multiplier. With about one-half of the calf crop coming from grazing allotments within the monument, of that total, about $8 million in direct feeder cattle sales and between $12—$15 million in economic activity is tied directly back to cattle grazing on the monument.''

Those ranching dollars create jobs in Utah's rural counties. The money also contributes to local tax revenue and supports vital public services. Eliminating grazing on the monument would have disastrous implications for the local economy.

The poor stewardship of the land presents another risk even beyond its effects on grazing and the local economy. The rangeland on the monument is being mismanaged. Even if the BLM decides to change course overnight and restore grazing to the historic levels that existed before the designation of the monument, the land in its current state would not be able to sustain it. Over the last 20 years, we have witnessed a worrisome decline in rangeland health. With this decline, livestock carrying capacity has also decreased.

To protect rangeland health, I joined Senator MIKE LEE and Congressman CHRIS STEWART to introduce the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument Grazing Protection Act. This bill would direct the BLM to create and implement a management program within the areas of the monument to improve rangeland conditions for wildlife and livestock carrying capacity. It would also restore livestock grazing to the historic levels that existed before the designation. There are many things BLM can and should be doing to restore rangeland health. Improving the range would not only benefit ranchers and affected communities but also bring significant ecological and environmental benefits to the entire area. This legislation will direct the BLM in that effort.

This is a commonsense bill that will restore Utah's rangeland to health. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

USA PATRIOT ACT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today I wish to speak on a critical national security issue: the importance of renewing the authority for essential anti-terrorism tools which is set to expire by the time Congress returns to Washington after Memorial Day.

Every single Member of this body remembers where he or she was on September 11, 2001. I was here in the Senate. I remember evacuating the Capitol and the office building. I remember standing on the lawn outside, wondering if a plane was headed toward this very building.

That terrible day gave us a taste of what terrorists want to visit upon our country. We realized that these fanatics would stop at nothing to kill innocent men, women, and children and to bring our country to its knees.

Knowing the threat this country faced, we resolved not to let bureaucratic red tape hinder the ability of our law enforcement and intelligence communities to keep us safe. As the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, I joined with colleagues of both parties as well as the Bush administration to craft the USA PATRIOT Act, which passed the Senate 98 to 1. The PATRIOT Act and its subsequent reauthorizations have proven critical to our ability to investigate terrorist threats and prevent another mass-casualty attack on the homeland.

Let me make one matter perfectly clear: we continue to face a very serious terrorist threat. The evil that struck us on September 11 has metastasized and continues to present a clear and present danger to the national security of the United States. As the American people's elected representatives, it is our primary duty to keep this country safe. Accordingly, we must continue to provide the necessary tools to the law enforcement and intelligence communities that have helped keep this Nation safe for the past 14 years.

Unfortunately, some of these tools have become quite controversial, despite the repeated showing of strong bipartisan support for them. The collection of telephone metadata under section 215 has drawn particular criticisms and worrisome calls for ''reform.'' I find this development enormously concerning.

Consider what President Obama himself had to say about our need for such a capability:

> The program grew out of a desire to address a gap identified after 9/11. One of the 9/11 hijackers, Khalid al-Mihdhar, made a phone call from San Diego to a known al-Qaeda safe house in Yemen. NSA saw that call, but it could not see that the call was coming from an individual already in the United States. The telephone metadata program under Section 215 was designed to map the communications of terrorists so we could see who they may be in contact with as quickly as possible.

The President was absolutely right. The collection of telephone metadata in bulk facilitates our mapping of terrorist networks and our ability to disrupt terrorist plots. Contrary to the wild fantasies that critics frequently spout, this collection does not meaningfully intrude on our privacy. It does not involve the NSA listening in on anyone's calls. It is simply a very important means of finding a proverbial needle in a haystack. We should reauthorize this authority without delay.

A number of my colleagues have taken a different approach, taking up the cause of the so-called USA FREEDOM Act to ''reform'' our counterterrorism efforts. I find the name of this bill ironic, in the sense that their legislation aims to restore a freedom that was never under threat while sacrificing critical tools that secure our freedom.

For instance, under this legislation, metadata would no longer be collected by the government but instead retained by private communications corporations. While this idea may seem initially appealing, I have strong reservations about such an approach. Their proposal contains no requirement for these companies to maintain this data for any length of time. Without such a requirement, the effectiveness of a search would obviously be compromised.

This is hardly my only concern. Consider also the provision of the so-called FREEDOM Act that would create a body of outside experts to advise the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court on the government's warrant applications. Such an unprecedented move would cause serious constitutional concerns and could undermine the adversarial system which at the core of the judicial branch.