diplomacy can achieve what isolation and hostility cannot.

For this reason, I will support the deal.

Prior to the interim negotiation in November of 2013, and even in the face of a punishing international sanctions regime, Iran's nuclear program was marching ahead. Iran had amassed more than 19,000 centrifuges to enrich uranium, and that number was growing. Iran had produced more than 11,000 kilograms of enriched uranium, and that stockpile was growing. Iran had perfected the ability to enrich uranium to the 20-percent level, and that enrichment level was growing. Iran was constructing a heavy-water facility at Arak capable of producing weapons-grade plutonium, and Iran only allowed limited IAEA access to its declared nuclear facilities, shielding its operation and inspection of covert nuclear sites.

The program, when diplomacy began, was months away from being able to produce enough enriched uranium to make a nuclear weapon.

Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu told the United Nations in 2012:

> For over seven years, the international community has tried sanctions with Iran. Under the leadership of President Obama, the international community has passed some of the strongest sanctions to date. . . . It's had an effect on the economy, but we must face the truth. Sanctions have not stopped Iran's nuclear program.

We must face the truth. A punishing sanctions regime did not stop Iran's nuclear program. The nuclear program will only stop by a diplomatic agreement or by military action. While military action has to be an option, it is in America's interest—and in the interest of the entire world—to use every effort to find a diplomatic resolution. In fact, that was the purpose of the Iranian sanctions to begin with—to open a path to a diplomatic solution.

We now have a diplomatic solution on the table. The JCPOA is not perfect because all parties made concessions, as is the case in any serious diplomatic negotiation. But it has gained broad international support because it prevents Iran from getting sufficient uranium for a bomb for at least 15 years. It also stops any pathway to a plutonium weapon for that period, and it exposes Iranian covert activity to enhanced scrutiny by the international community forever.

Under the deal, Iran does the following: It affirms that ''under no circumstances will Iran ever seek, develop or acquire any nuclear weapons,'' it reduces its quantity of centrifuges by more than two-thirds, and it slashes its uranium stockpile by 97 percent to 300 kilograms for 15 years. This is dramatically less than what Iran would need to produce even a single weapon. It caps the enrichment level of the remaining uranium stockpile at 3.67 percent. It reconfigures the Iraq reactor so that it can no longer produce weapons-grade plutonium. It commits to a series of limitations on R&D activities to guarantee that any nuclear program will be ''for exclusively peaceful purposes'' in full compliance with international nonproliferation rules. Finally, Iran agrees to a robust set of international inspections of its declared nuclear facilities, its entire uranium supply chain, and its suspected covert facilities by a team of more than 130 international inspectors.

After year 15, the unique caps and requirements imposed on Iran are progressively lifted through year 2025. After year 25, Iran is permanently obligated to abide by all international nonproliferation treaty requirements, including the extensive inspections required by the NPT Additional Protocol, and its agreement that it will never ''seek, develop, or acquire any nuclear weapons'' continues forever.

If Iran breaks this agreement, nuclear sanctions may be reimposed. The United States reserves the right to sanction Iran for activities unrelated to its nuclear program, including support for terrorism, arms shipments, and human rights violations.

Finally, and importantly, the United States and our partners maintain the ability to use military action if Iran seeks to obtain a nuclear weapon in violation of this deal. The knowledge of the Iranian program gained through extensive inspections will improve the effectiveness of any military action, and the clarity of Iran's commitment to the world—in the first paragraph of the agreement—that it will never pursue nuclear weapons will make it easier to gain international support for military action should Iran violate their unequivocal pledge.

This deal does not solve all outstanding issues with an adversarial regime. In that sense, it is similar to the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty President Kennedy negotiated with the Soviet Union in the midst of the Cold War. Iran's support for terrorism remains a major concern, and we must increase efforts with our regional allies to counter those malign activities. But at the end of the day, this agreement is not about making an ally out of an adversary, it is about denying an adversary a path to obtaining nuclear weapons.

This deal takes a nuclear weapons program that was on the verge of success and disables it for many years through peaceful diplomatic means with sufficient tools for the international community to verify whether Iran is meeting its commitments. I hope this resolution might open the door to diplomatic discussion of other tough issues with Iran.

In conclusion, monitoring this agreement and countering Iran's nonnuclear activity will require great diligence by the United States, our allies, and the IAEA, and there will be an important role for Congress in this ongoing work. I look forward to working with my colleagues on measures to guarantee close supervision and enforcement of this deal. That work will be arduous, but it is far preferable to allowing Iran to return to a march toward nuclear weapons. It is also far preferable to any other alternative, including war.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m. today.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:46 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

CYBERSECURITY INFORMATION SHARING ACT OF 2015—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I would like to thank my friend from Florida, Senator NELSON, for allowing me to speak for 5 minutes. I ask unanimous consent that he be recognized immediately following me—not the Senator from New Mexico, the Senator from Florida.

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

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of S. 754, the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act. I want to thank my colleagues Chairman BURR and Vice Chairman FEINSTEIN for their leadership on this critically important legislation. This bill, of which I am an original cosponsor, was overwhelmingly approved by a 14-to-1 vote in the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence in March.

Enacting legislation to confront the accumulating dangers of cyber threats must be among the highest national security priorities of the Congress. Cyber attacks on our Nation have become disturbingly common. More recently, it was the Office of Personnel Management. A few weeks before that, it was the Pentagon network, the White House, and the State Department. Before that it was Anthem and Sony—just to name a few. The status quo is unacceptable, and Congress needs to do its part in passing this legislation. But the President, as our Nation's Commander in Chief, must also do his part to deter the belligerence of our adversaries in cyber space.

The threats from China, Russia, North Korea, and Iran—not to mention the aspirations of terrorist organizations like ISIL and Al Qaeda—are steadily growing in number and severity. And our national security leadership has warned us repeatedly that we could face a cyber attack against our Nation's critical infrastructure in the not too distant future. I believe our response to such an attack, or lack thereof, could define the future of warfare.

To date, the U.S. response to cyber attacks has been tepid at best, and nonexistent at worst. Unless and until

the President uses the authorities he has to deter, defend, and respond to the growing number and severity of cyber attacks, we will risk not just more of the same but emboldened adversaries and terrorist organizations that will continuously pursue more severe and destructive cyber attacks.

As ADM Mike Rogers, the commander of U.S. Cyber Command, told listeners at the Aspen Security Forum a couple weeks ago, ''to date there is little price to pay for engaging in some pretty aggressive behaviors.'' According to James Clapper, the Director of National Intelligence, ''we will see a progression or expansion of that envelope until such time as we create both a substance and psychology of deterrence. And today we don't have that.''

According to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Dempsey, our military enjoys ''a significant military advantage'' in every domain except for one—cyber space. As General Dempsey said, cyber ''is a level playing field. And that makes this chairman very uncomfortable.'' Efforts are currently underway to begin addressing some of our strategic shortfalls in cyber space, including the training of a 6,200-person cyber force. However, these efforts will be meaningless unless we make the tough policy decisions to establish meaningful cyber deterrence. The President must take steps now to demonstrate to our adversaries that the United States takes cyber attacks seriously and is prepared to respond.

This legislation before us is one piece of that overall deterrent strategy, and it is long past time that Congress move forward on information sharing legislation. The voluntary information sharing framework in this legislation is critical to addressing these threats and ensuring that the mechanisms are in place to identify those responsible for costly and crippling cyber attacks and, ultimately, deter future attacks.

Many of us have spent countless hours crafting and debating cyber legislation back to 2012. Mr. President, 2012 was the last time we attempted to pass major cyber legislation. This body has come a long way since that time. We understand that we cannot improve our cyber posture by shackling the private sector, which operates the majority of our country's critical infrastructure, with government mandates. As I argued at that time, heavyhanded regulations and government bureaucracy will do more harm than good in cyber space. The voluntary framework in this legislation represents the progress we have made in defining the role of the private sector and the role of the government in sharing threat information, defending networks, and deterring cyber attacks.

This legislation also complements actions we have taken in the National Defense Authorization Act, or NDAA, currently in conference with the House. As chairman of the Armed Services Committee, cyber security is one of my top priorities. That is why the NDAA includes a number of critical cyber provisions designed to ensure the Department of Defense has the capabilities it needs to deter aggression, defend our national security interests, and, when called upon, defeat our adversaries in cyber space.

The NDAA authorizes the Secretary of Defense to develop, prepare, coordinate, and, when authorized by the President, conduct a military cyber operation in response to malicious cyber activity carried out against the United States or a United States person by a foreign power. The NDAA also authorizes $200 million for the Secretary of Defense to assess the cyber vulnerabilities of every major DOD weapons system. Finally, Congress required the President to submit an integrated policy to deter adversaries in cyber space in the fiscal year 2014 NDAA. We are still waiting on that policy, and this year's NDAA includes funding restrictions that will remain in place until it is delivered.

Every day that goes by, I fear our Nation grows more vulnerable, our privacy and security are at greater risk, and our adversaries are further emboldened. These are the stakes, and that is why it is essential that we come together and pass the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act.

Mr. President, I thank again my friend from Florida, who is a valued member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, for his indulgence to allow me to speak. I thank my colleague.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I rise to announce my decision on the Iranian nuclear agreement, the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

This decision of mine comes after considerable study of the issue—as have our colleagues in the Senate taken this quite seriously. I have talked with folks on all sides of the issue. These include colleagues as well as constituents. It includes experts on the Middle East and Central Asia, arms control experts, foreign allies, and, as we say in my constituency, it includes just plain folks. I want to say that Secretary Moniz, a nuclear physicist, has been especially helpful.

Needless to say, I wish that the three Americans jailed in Iran and Bob Levinson, a former FBI agent missing in Iran for 8 years, had been a part of an agreement—of this agreement—to return them. The Levinson family in Florida is anxious for information and help to return Bob. This is personal for me.

I am a strong supporter of Israel, and I recognize that country as one of America's most important allies. I am committed to the protection of Israel as the best and right foreign policy for the United States and our allies.

I am blessed to represent Florida, which also has among our citizens a strong and vibrant Jewish community, including many Holocaust survivors and Holocaust victims' families, some of whom I have worked with to help them get just compensation from European insurance companies that turned their backs on them after World War II and would not honor their insurance claims.

In our State we are also proud to have a Floridian, a former U.S. and Miami Beach resident, as the Israeli Ambassador to the United States. Ambassador Ron Dermer grew up in Miami Beach. His father and brother are former mayors. He is someone I have enjoyed getting to know and have had several conversations with over the years and recently spent time talking to him about his opposition to this joint agreement.

I acknowledge that this has been one of the most important preparations and will be one of the most important votes that I will cast in the Senate because the foreign and defense policy consequences are both huge for the United States and our allies.

Unless there is an unexpected change in the conditions and facts before the vote is called in September—and it will be called on the very first day that we return in September—unless there is an unexpected change, I will support the nuclear agreement between Iran and the P5+1—which are the United States, the UK, France, Russia, China, and Germany—because I am convinced it will stop Iran from developing a nuclear weapon for at least the next 10 to 15 years. No other available alternative accomplishes this vital objective.

The goal of this almost 2-year negotiation—culminated in this deal—was to deny Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon. This objective has been fulfilled in the short term. For the next 10 years, Iran will reduce its centrifuges—the machines that enrich the uranium—by two-thirds. They will go from more than 19,000 centrifuges to 6,000. Only 5,000 of those will be operating, all at Natanz, all the most basic models. The deeply buried Fordow facility will be converted to a research lab. No enrichment can occur there, and no fissile material can be stored there. For the next 15 years, Iran's stockpile of low-enriched uranium—which currently amounts to 12,000 kilograms; enough for 10 bombs—will be reduced by 98 percent, to only 300 kilograms. Research and development into advanced centrifuges will also be limited. Taken together, these constraints will lengthen the time it would take for Iran to produce the highly enriched uranium for one bomb—the so-called breakout time. It will lengthen it from 2 to 3 months that they could break out now to more than 1 year. That is more than enough time to detect and, if necessary, stop Iran from racing to a bomb.

Iran's ability to produce a bomb using plutonium will also be blocked under this deal. The Arak reactor—which as currently constructed could produce enough plutonium for one to

two bombs every year—will be redesigned to produce no weapons-grade plutonium. And Iran will have to ship out the spent fuel from the reactor forever.

Iran signed the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty in 1968, in which they agreed they would not pursue nuclear weapons. Iran has reaffirmed this principle in this joint agreement. Iran also says they want to eventually make low-grade nuclear fuel, as other NPT-compliant nations do, in order to produce electricity. If they comply, they will eventually be allowed to do so under this joint agreement. Our expectation is that in 15 years, when Iran can lift the limit of 300 kilograms of low-enriched uranium, if they have not cheated, they will continue to abide by their NPT obligations and use their fuel only for electricity and medical isotopes. If they deviate from those civilian purposes, then harsh economic sanctions will result, and, very possibly, U.S. military action.

The world will be a very different place in 10 to 15 years. If we can buy this much time, instead of Iran developing a nuclear bomb in the near future, then that is reason enough for me to vote to uphold this agreement. If the United States walks away from this multinational agreement, then I believe we would find ourselves alone in the world with little credibility, but there are many more reasons to support this agreement.

The opponents of the agreement say that war is not the only alternative to the agreement. Indeed, they, as articulated by the Israeli Ambassador, say we should oppose the agreement by refusing to lift congressional economic sanctions, and the result will be that the international sanctions will stay in place, that Iran will continue to feel the economic pinch, and therefore Iran will come back to the table and negotiate terms more favorable to the United States and our allies.

If the United States kills the deal that most of the rest of the world is for, there is no question in this Senator's mind that the sanctions will start to erode, and they may collapse altogether. We just had a meeting with all the P5+1 Ambassadors to the United States, and they reaffirmed that exact fact. Sanctions rely on more than just the power of the U.S. economy, they depend on an underlying political consensus in support of a common objective. China, Russia, and many other nations eager to do business with Iran went along with our economic sanctions because they believed they were a temporary cost to pay until Iran agreed to a deal to limit their nuclear program. That fragile consensus in support of U.S. policy is likely to fall apart if we jettison this deal.

I think it is unrealistic to think we can stop oil-hungry countries in Asia from buying Iranian oil, especially when offered bargain basement prices. It is equally unrealistic to think we can continue to force foreign banks that hold the Iranian oil dollars—banks in China, India, Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan that have sequestered Iranians' oil dollars—it is unrealistic to expect that they will hold on to that cash simply because we threaten them with U.S. banking sanctions. How will such threats be taken seriously when these countries, taken together, hold nearly half of America's debt, making any decision to sanction them extraordinarily difficult. Killing this deal by rejecting it means the sanctions are going to be weaker than they are today, not stronger, and the United States cannot simply get a better deal with Iran, with less economic leverage and less international support. That is a fact we are having to face. Of course, if we rejected it and if the sanctions crumbled, all of this would probably happen while Iran would be racing to build a bomb. Without this deal, Iran's breakout time could quickly shrink from months to a handful of weeks or days.

It is reasonable to ask why Iran would agree to negotiate a delay in their nuclear program that they have advanced over the years at the cost of billions of dollars. The simple answer is they need the money. The Iranian economy is hurting because of the sanctions, and Iran's Supreme Leader needs to satisfy rising expectations of average Iranians, who are restless to have a bigger slice of the economic pie with more and better goods and supplies.

So they have an interest in striking a deal, but does that mean we trust Iran's Government? No, not at all. The Iranian religious leadership encourages hardliners there to chant ''Death to America'' and ''Death to Israel.'' Therefore, this agreement can't be built on trust. We must have a good enough mechanism in place to catch them when and if they cheat; in other words, don't trust but verify.

I believe the agreement sets out a reasonable assurance that Iran will not be able to hide the development of a bomb at declared or undeclared sites. The International Atomic Energy Agency inspectors will have immediate access to declared sites—the Arak reactor and the enrichment facilities at Natanz and Fordow.

For the next 20 to 25 years, inspectors will also have regular access to the entire supply chain, including uranium mines and mills, centrifuge production, assembly, and storage sites. That means inspectors will catch Iran if they try to use the facilities we know about to build a weapon or if they try to divert materials to a secret program. To confirm that Iran is not building a covert bomb, this agreement ensures that inspectors will have access to suspicious sites with no more than a 24-day delay. I know there has been a lot of conversation about that. It is broken off into days. At the end of the day, it must be physical access. Now, would this Senator prefer they get in instantaneously? Of course. Could Iran hide some activities relevant to nuclear weapons research? Possibly. But to actually make a bomb, Iran's secret activity would have to enrich the fuel for a device—and they couldn't cover that up if they had years, let alone do so in a few weeks. Traces of enriched uranium or a secret plutonium program do not suddenly vanish, and they can't be covered up with a little paint and asphalt. So I am convinced that under the agreement, Iran cannot cheat and expect to get away with it.

On top of the unprecedented IAEA inspections established by this deal is the vast and little understood world of American and allied intelligence. This Senator served on the Intelligence Committee for 6 years and now has clearances on the Armed Services Committee. I can state unequivocally that U.S. intelligence is very good and extensive and will overlay IAEA inspections. Remember, we discovered their secret activities in the past, even without the kinds of inspections put in place by this joint agreement. So if Iran tries to violate its commitment—its commitment not to build nuclear weapons—and if the IAEA doesn't find out, I am confident our intelligence apparatus will.

What about the part of the joint agreement that allows the conventional arms embargo to be lifted in 5 years and missile technology to be lifted in 8 years? I understand it was always going to be tough to keep these restrictions in place, and I don't like that those restrictions are not there. Fortunately, even when the arms embargo expires, five other U.N. resolutions passed since 2004 will continue to be in force to prohibit Iran from exporting arms to terrorists and to militants. These have had some success, albeit limited, as in the case of the U.S. Navy stopping arms shipments to the Houthis in Yemen. These same U.N. resolutions will stay in place to block future Iranian arms shipments to others. We also have nonnuclear sanctions tools we can—and we must—continue to use to go after those who traffic in Iranian arms and missiles.

Will this agreement allow Iran to continue to be a state sponsor of terrorism? Yes, but they now have the capability to develop a nuclear weapon within months and still be a state sponsor of terrorism. I believe it is in the U.S. interest that Iran is not a nuclear power sponsoring terrorism. As dangerous a threat that Iran is to Israel and our allies, it would pale in comparison to the threat posed to them and to us by a nuclear-armed Iran.

Would I prefer a deal that dismantles their entire program forever and ends all of Iran's bad behavior? Of course I would. But how do we get a better deal that the opposition wants? We don't have that opportunity if the sanctions fall apart, and that is exactly what would happen if we reject this deal. Iran will emerge less isolated and less constrained to build a nuclear weapon.

Under the deal, we keep most of the world with us. That means, if the Iranians cheat, they know we can snap back the economic sanctions and cut off their oil money. This joint agreement declares that Iran will never ever be allowed to develop a nuclear weapon. If they break their agreement, even in 10 or 15 years, every financial and military option will still be available to us, and those options will be backed by ever-improving military capabilities and more and better intelligence.

So when I look at all the things for the agreement and against the agreement, it becomes pretty obvious to me to vote in favor of the agreement.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, our government was recently struck by a devastating cyber attack that has been described as one of the worst breaches in U.S. history. It was a major blow to the privacy of millions of Americans. We know the private sector is vulnerable to attack as well. The House has already passed two White House-backed cyber security bills to help address the issue. Similar legislation is now before the Senate. It is strong, bipartisan, and transparent. It has been vetted and overwhelmingly endorsed 14 to 1 by both parties in committee.

It would help both the public and private sectors to defeat cyber attacks. The top Senate Democrat on this issue reminds us it would protect individual privacy and civil liberties too. Now is the time to allow the Senate to debate and then pass this bipartisan bill.

In just a moment, I will offer a fair consent request to allow the Senate to do just that. The Democratic leader previously said that both he and the senior Senator from Oregon believe the Senate should be able to finish the bill ''in a couple of days . . . at the most.'' And just today he said the Democrats remain willing to proceed to this bipartisan bill if allowed to offer some relevant amendments. The senior Senator from New York has also said that Democrats want to get to the bill and that they want to get a few amendments too.

Our friends across the aisle will be glad to know that the UC I am about to offer would allow 10 relevant amendments per side to be offered and made pending. That is a good and fair start that exceeds the request from our friends across the aisle.

Now that we have a path forward that gives both sides what they said they need, I would invite our colleagues to join us now in moving forward on this bill. I invite our colleagues to allow the Senate to cooperate in a spirit of good faith to pass a bill this week so we can help protect the American people from more devastating cyber attacks.

I notified the Democratic leader that I would propound the following consent request: I ask unanimous consent that the cloture motion on the motion to proceed to calendar No. 28, S. 754, be withdrawn and that the Senate immediately proceed to its consideration. I further ask that Senator BURR then be recognized to offer the Burr-Feinstein substitute amendment and that it be in order during today's session of the Senate for the bill managers, or their designees, to offer up to 10 first-degree amendments relevant to the substitute per side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. REID. The Republican leader is my friend, and I don't mean in any way to disparage him, other than to bring out a little bit of history. I can't imagine how he can make this offer with a straight face. Have amendments pending? That is like nothing. We tried that before, as recently as the highway bill. Having amendments pending doesn't mean anything.

We want to pass a good cyber security bill. We have a bill that has been crafted in the intelligence committee. Other committees have been interested in participating in what we have here on the floor, but they are willing to say: OK. We have a bill from the intelligence committee.

There have been no public committee hearings, no public markups. There has been nothing done other than a rule XIV which, of course, my friend said he would not do if he got to be the leader and there would be a robust amendment process. Having a robust amendment process has nothing to do with having amendments pending.

We want to pass a good bill. But we want to have a reasonable number of amendments, and there will be votes on those amendments. We are not asking for longtime agreements. The Republican leader's proposal would not lead to votes on the amendments. He would allow the amendments to be pending, but if the Republican leader were to file cloture, as he has done repeatedly the last few months—and an example is what he did with the recent highway bill—all amendments that were not strictly germane would fall.

Remember, we are not asking for germane amendments. We are asking for relevant amendments. We are willing to enter into an agreement that provides votes on a reasonable number of amendments that would be germane in nature, and we should be working on that agreement.

In contrast, if we fail to get that agreement, we are going to have a cloture vote an hour after we come in in the morning, and 30 hours after that—sometime late Thursday afternoon or early Thursday evening—he would have to file cloture on that. That puts us right into the work period when we get back on September 8.

When we get back, we have the 8th to the 17th, including weekends and a holiday that is celebrated every year that we always take off, which includes 2 days. It is a Jewish holiday. I can't imagine why we would want this to interfere with what we are trying to do in the month of September.

We are willing to do this bill. We can start working on these amendments right now if we can have votes on them, but we are not going to agree to some arrangement like this. If the Republicans are going to push this, we can come in here tomorrow, and we will vote. The 30 hours of time will go by—and we know how to use 30 hours; we were taught how to do that—30 hours of postcloture time. And Thursday afternoon, the leader can make whatever decision is necessary.

We want a cyber bill. This bill is not the phoenix of all cyber bills, but it certainly is better than nothing. We should—following the recommendation and the suggestion and what the Republican leader has said he would do—be allowed some amendments to vote on. We can start that today. Today is Tuesday. We can finish these amendments—I would hope on the Democratic side—in a fairly short order of time.

As for the Republicans, I don't know. All I heard following the caucus is one Republican Senator wanted to offer an amendment on the cyber bill dealing with auditing the Fed. I can't imagine why that has anything to do with this bill.

We are serious about legislating. We want to do something that is good, we believe, for the country, good for the order of the Senate. Otherwise, we will look at each other around here until Thursday afternoon, and the Republican leader can look forward to this being the first thing we take up when we get back in September. We are willing to be fair and reasonable to finish this, with our amendments, in a very short period of time. So I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, let me say, I think there may well be a way forward here. What I thought I heard the Democratic leader say is that they are interested in passing a bill. That is important. He said when it was offered on the defense authorization bill that it was a 2-day bill, and we could agree to a limited number of amendments.

I think we both agree this is an important subject. I can't imagine that either the Democrats or the Republicans want to leave here for a month and not pass the cyber security bill. I think there is enough interest on both sides to try to continue to discuss the matter and see if there is a way forward. That would be in the best interest of the country if we could come together and do this. This bill came out of the intelligence committee 14 to 1.

Chairman BURR and Vice Chair FEINSTEIN have been asking for floor time. They are anxious to move this bill

across the floor. I am hoping the Democratic leader and I can continue to discuss the matter and that we can find a way forward.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I look forward to that discussion. Keep in mind, being reported out of committee—this is a committee that holds everything in secret. They do nothing public. So having a 14 to 1 vote in a meeting that takes place in secret doesn't give the other Senators who are not on that committee a lot of solace.

I look forward to the Republican leader and me and our staffs working together to try to come up with some way to move forward on this legislation. We want to do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, as my good friend the Democratic leader used to remind me, the majority leader always gets the last word.

This is not a new issue. It was around during the previous Congress. Other committees acted—other committee chairmen like what Chairman BURR and Vice Chair FEINSTEIN have done. Hopefully, we can minimize sort of manufacturing problems here that keep us from going forward when it appears to me that both sides really would like to get an outcome and believe it would be best for the country to get an outcome before we go into the recess. We will continue to discuss the matter and hope that we can find a way forward.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I will be very brief. I understand there has already been an objection.

I will speak later in the afternoon or early evening in some detail about why I have significant reservations with respect to this legislation.

To say—as we heard again and again throughout the day—that this is about voluntary information sharing is essentially only half true. The fact is, companies could volunteer to share their customers' information with the government, but they wouldn't have to ask for permission from their customers before handing it over. That is one reason every major organization with expertise and interest on privacy issues has had reservations about the bill. It may be voluntary for companies, but it is mandatory for their customers and their consumers. They are not given the opportunity to opt out.

The legislation has been public for months, and dozens of cyber security experts have said it wouldn't do much to stop sophisticated, large-scale attacks such as the horrendous attack at the Office of Personnel Management.

On Friday, the Department of Homeland Security—an absolutely essential agency as it relates to this bill—wrote a letter to our colleague, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, Mr. FRANKEN, and said if this bill's approach is adopted, ''the complexity and inefficiency of any information sharing program will markedly increase.'' The Department of Homeland Security added that the bill ''could sweep away important privacy protections.'' That is a pretty strong indictment from the agency that would be in charge of implementing the legislation.

As I have indicated a couple of times in the last day or so, I think the managers, Senator FEINSTEIN and Senator BURR, have made several positive changes, but the bottom line is it doesn't address the very substantial privacy concerns that relate to this bill. The fact is, cyber security is a very serious problem in America.

Oregonians know a lot about it because one of our large employers was hacked by the Chinese. SolarWorld was hacked by the Chinese because they insisted on enforcing their rights under trade law. In fact, our government indicted the Chinese for the hack of my constituents and others.

So cyber security is a serious problem. Information sharing can play a constructive role, but information sharing without robust privacy safeguards is really not a cyber security bill. It is going to be seen by millions of Americans as a surveillance bill, and that is why it is so important that there be strong privacy guidelines.

The fact is, in the managers' legislation, the section allowing companies to hand over large volumes of information with only a cursory review would be essentially unmodified. The Department of Homeland Security asked for some specific changes to the language, which the managers' amendment does not include. So my hope is, we are going to have a chance to have a real debate on this issue. Personally, I would rather go down a different route with respect to cyber security legislation. In particular, I recommend the very fine data breach bill of our colleague from Vermont Senator LEAHY, but if Senators have their hearts set on doing the bill before us, it is going to need some very substantial amendments, both to ensure that we show the American people that security and privacy are not mutually exclusive, that we can do both, and to address the very serious operational reservations the Department of Homeland Security has raised. Neither set of concerns is thoroughly addressed by the managers' amendment.

So my hope is that we are going to have a chance to make some very significant reforms in this legislation. After seeing what has happened over the last few weeks, where the government isn't exactly doing an ideal job of securing the data it has, and now we are going to propose legislation that has private companies, without the permission of their customers, for example, to dump large quantities of their customers' data over to the government with only a cursory review—this legislation is not going to be real attractive to the millions of Americans who sent us to represent them.

In fact, in just the last few days, I read in the media that some of the opponents of this legislation have sent something like 6 million faxes to the Senate—and people wonder if there are still fax machines. I guess the point is to demonstrate it is important that we understand, as we look at digital communications, what the challenge is.

I will have more to say about this later in the afternoon and in the evening, but I wanted to take this opportunity, since we have just gotten out of the party caucuses, to make some corrections with respect to what we were told this morning and particularly on this question about how this is a voluntary bill. Ask millions of Americans whether it is voluntary when companies can hand over their private information to the government without their permission.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized as in morning business.

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

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, cyber security is an important issue, but I come to the floor to talk for a bit about one of the most consequential decisions that I, as a Member of the U.S. Senate, and my colleagues will make, and that concerns the negotiated agreement between the P5+1 and Iran—the proposed Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action with Iran. In my view, it provides too much relief in return for too few concessions. The deal implicitly concedes that Iran will become a nuclear power and will gain the ability and legitimacy to produce a weapon in a matter of years while gaining wealth and power in the meantime.

I serve on the Senate Banking Committee. The sanctions that were created by Congress originate from that committee. Those sanctions were put in place to prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear power—a country capable of delivering a nuclear weapon across their border. Those sanctions were not put in place to give Iran a path or a guideline to become a nuclear-weapon-capable country. The key is to keep nuclear weapons out of the hands of Iran's Government. The key to that is to permanently disable Iran from nuclear capability and remove the technology used to produce nuclear materials. This deal fails to achieve this goal by allowing Iran to retain nuclear facilities. Though some of it will be limited in use in the near term, the centrifuges used to enrich nuclear matter will not be destroyed or removed from the country. This deal allows Iran's nuclear infrastructure to remain on standby for nuclear development when the restrictions expire.

Also troubling is the agreement's lack of restrictions on nuclear research and development. Iran seeks to replace its current enrichment technology

with a more advanced centrifuge that more efficiently enriches nuclear material. By failing to restrict research and development now, we are priming Iran's nuclear program to hit the ground running toward a bomb once the restrictions are lifted in a matter of years.

Also, the inspection regime agreed to in this negotiation is dangerously accommodating. The agreement provides Iran a great deal of flexibility regarding the inspection of military sites just like those where Iran's past covert nuclear development work took place. The deal allows Iran to hold concerned international inspectors at bay for weeks, if not months, before granting access to a location suspected of being a site for nuclear development.

The value of any access to suspected Iranian nuclear sites that international inspectors ultimately do receive will depend upon their understanding of Iran's past nuclear weapons research. A comprehensive disclosure of possible military dimensions to Iran's nuclear research is necessary for inspectors to fully understand Iran's current infrastructure and is critical to their ability to rule out any future efforts to produce nuclear weapons.

The International Atomic Energy Agency, IAEA, has not made public its site agreement with Iran about their previous nuclear developments. This is an aside, but I would say none of us should agree to this negotiated agreement without seeing, reading, and knowing the content of that agreement. Under the proposed deal, that vital full disclosure of Iran's nuclear past may not occur, diminishing the value of inspections and increasing the risk that another covert weaponization of Iran will take place.

Painfully absent from the agreement's requirements is Iran's release of American hostages: Saeed Abedini, Jason Rezaian, Robert Levinson, and Amir Hekmati. The freedom of Americans unjustly held in Iran should have been a strict precondition for sanctions relief instead of an afterthought.

In return for very limited concessions, this deal gives Iran way too much. If implemented, the agreement would give Iran near complete sanctions relief up front. This isn't a Republican or Democratic issue. Common sense tells us that you don't give away a leverage until you get the result that you are looking for, and this agreement provides sanctions relief upfront, delivering billions in frozen assets to the Iranian Government and boosting the Iranian economy. Included in this relief are sanctions related to Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps, which were to be lifted only when Iran ceased providing support for international terrorism.

The sanctions relief in this proposal not only fails to require preconditions and cooperation regarding nuclear disarmament but will remove sanctions from the Iranian Guard, despite their status as a top supporter of terrorist groups around the Middle East and globe.

This type of gratuitous flexibility for Iran is found elsewhere in the agreement. The P5+1 acceptance of Iranian demands for a relaxed U.N. arms embargo is both perplexing and scary. This deal would relax trade restrictions on missiles after 8 years, while immediately erasing limits on missile research and development. It would also lift restrictions on Iranian centrifuge use and development after just 8 to 10 years. The deal grants Iran the ability to more efficiently produce nuclear material just as it gains the ability to access the delivery weapons system.

Earlier this month, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, GEN Martin Dempsey, said: ''Under no circumstances should we relieve pressure on Iran relative to ballistic missile capabilities and arms trafficking.'' Lifting the U.N. arms embargo was ''out of the question.'' Yet, just 1 week later, negotiators announced the lifting of the embargo in 5 to 8 years or less. I wonder what has changed. Unless the menace of an increased flow of weapons in and out of Iran somehow substantially decreased during the intervening week, the consequence of this sudden capitulation should have us all greatly concerned.

This fear of increased money flow to terror organizations linked to the Iranian Government is not based upon merely an outside possibility; it is a likelihood. Last week Iran's Deputy Foreign Minister stated: ''Whenever it's needed to send arms to our allies in the region, we will do so.'' More money and more weapons in the hands of terrorist organizations are the fuel for increased violence and further destabilization in the conflict-torn Middle East.

We have little reason to believe Iran's behavior will change as a result of this agreement. In fact, their chants of ''Death to America'' become more real.

Since the announcement of the agreement, the leader of Iran has been openly antagonistic to the United States. Ayatollah Ali Khamenei has promised to continue to incite unrest and said Iran's ''policy towards the arrogant U.S. will not change.'' These anti-American statements come from an Iranian leader whose commitment the Obama administration is relying on for the nuclear accord to work. It should trouble every American that the Obama administration is asking us to support a deal that relies on the total cooperation of those who, as I say, strongly state their commitment to bringing about ''death to America.''

Given the Obama administration's troubling efforts to push through this deal to the United Nations and restrict the influence of the American people through this Congress in the decision, it is all the more important that we follow through with a serious assessment of this nuclear agreement. We are faced with a circumstance that, by the administration's own previous standards, concedes too much and secures too little.

I strongly oppose this nuclear deal. It is intolerably risky, and the result will be a new Iran—a legitimized nuclear power with a growing economy and enhanced means to finance terror, to antagonize, and to ultimately pursue a nuclear weapons program. I will support the congressional resolution to express Congress's explicit disapproval.

President Obama has used fear in his agenda in seeking our support for this agreement. The warning has been that a vote against his policy is a vote for war with Iran. The President's political scare tactics are not only untrue but also illogical.

Incidentally, we were not at war with Iran when the agreements were in place before the negotiation. The absence of agreeing to the negotiated agreement would not mean we will be at war thereafter.

The President's claims undermine numerous statements his own administration has made about the negotiation process, the nature of the Iranian nuclear program, and the proposed agreement's prospects for success. If true, the President's words concede that his foreign policy has led America into a dangerous position.

We would expect a President to provide the American people as many alternatives to war as possible, not just a single narrow and risky one such as this. According to the President, the only alternative to war is this agreement—a deal that results in better financed terrorists, a weakened arms embargo, and the need for boosting U.S. weapons sales to Iran's regional rivals. If this prospect of war is his concern, the President would benefit by reevaluating the geopolitical consequences of the deal and seeking out much better options.

I had hoped these negotiations would result in a strong but fair deal to dismantle Iran's nuclear infrastructure. Again, the purpose of placing sanctions on Iran was to get rid of their nuclear capability as far as delivery of nuclear material across their borders. Yet this agreement leaves that infrastructure in place and puts them on a promising path toward that nuclear capability.

Regrettably, that kind of deal was not reached. Now my hope is a simple one: that we are able to reverse some of the damage that is already done and that this agreement is rejected.

I would say that there are those who argue that we would be isolated by rejection of this agreement, that other countries would approve and the United Nations may approve. This is an issue of such importance that we need to do everything possible to see that Iran does not become a nuclear power, and we need to have the moral character and fiber to say no to this agreement.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

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

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

ECONOMIC SECURITY FOR OUR COUNTRY'S WORKERS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, across our country today, so many of our workers clock in 40 hours a week. They work very hard, and yet they are unable to provide for their families.

Just last fall, NBC News interviewed a woman named Latoya who worked in a fast food restaurant. She was protesting as part of a fast food workers strike. Latoya is raising four children alone on $7.25 an hour. That is less than $300 a week and is well below the poverty line for her and her family. For part of last year, she was living in a homeless shelter. She told the reporter: ''Nobody should work 40 hours a week and find themselves homeless.'' On top of rock-bottom wages, Latoya said she and her colleagues experienced unpaid wages, unpredictable scheduling, and having to make do with broken equipment on the job.

In today's economy, too many of our workers across the country face the same challenges as Latoya. They are underpaid, they are overworked, and they are treated unfairly on the job. In short, they lack fundamental economic security.

Several places around the country and in my home State of Washington are working to address this at the local level. This Senator believes we need to bring the Washington State way here to Washington, DC. In Congress, I believe we need to act to give workers some much needed relief. We need to grow our economy from the middle out, not the top down, and we should make sure our country works for all Americans, not just the wealthiest few.

There is no reason we can't get to work today on legislation to do just that. That is why I have joined with my colleagues over the past few months in introducing several bills that will help restore some much needed economic security and stability to millions of workers. That is why I am hoping we can move some of these bills forward before we all go back home to our States.

For too long we have heard from some Republicans the theory—a deeply flawed theory—that if we would only grant more tax cuts to the wealthiest Americans and if we would just keep rolling back regulations on the biggest corporations, those benefits would eventually trickle down and reach working families in our country. Not only does that theory not work, as we have seen over the past few decades, that trickle-down system has done real damage to our Nation's middle class and our working families. While worker productivity has actually reached new heights, workers have lost basic protections they once had.

While trickle-down economics allows corporations to post big profits, too many of our workers are paying the price. Let me give some examples. Today the Federal minimum wage can leave a family in poverty even after working full time and even without taking a single day off. Not only that, today some businesses are using unfair scheduling practices to keep workers guessing about when they are going to be called in to work, with no guarantee of how much money they will earn in a given week. Those types of scheduling abuses take a real toll on workers' lives and prevent them from getting ahead. Attending college classes is not an option when someone's work schedule is always in flux. Taking on a second job to earn more money is nearly impossible when you can't plan around your first job. And that is not all. Today, 43 million workers in this country don't have paid sick leave. When they get sick, they have to choose between toughing it out at work and passing that illness on to others or staying at home and potentially losing their job. When their child is sick, they have to choose between losing money on their paycheck or missing out on caring for their son or daughter. If that is not enough, in our country women are paid just 78 cents for every dollar a man makes. That is not just unfair to women, by the way; it is bad for families and it hurts our economy.

Many businesses are doing the right thing and are supporting their workers, but other corporations that don't, put those businesses that are doing the right thing at a competitive disadvantage by running a race to the bottom and pulling their workers down with them.

This worker insecurity isn't just devastating for the millions of workers and their families who are impacted by it, it is also hurting our economy. Truly robust and strong economic growth comes from the middle out, not the top down. When our workers lack security, when they are not treated fairly, they can't invest in themselves and their children or spend money in their communities or move their families into a middle-class life.

I believe we have to address this challenge on multiple fronts. We can start by making sure our workers are treated fairly so they can earn their way toward rising wages and increased economic security.

There are important things we can do here in Congress to expand economic security and stability for millions of our working families today. For starters, we should pass the Paycheck Fairness Act that the senior Senator from Maryland has championed for so many years to finally close the pay gap between men and women. The Paycheck Fairness Act would tackle pay discrimination head-on. This Senator hopes we can all agree that in the 21st century, workers should be paid fairly for the work they do, regardless of their gender.

We should also raise the minimum wage to make sure hard work does pay off. My Raise the Wage Act increases the minimum wage to $12 by 2020 and is enough to lift a family of three out of poverty. It will put more money in workers' pockets so they can spend it in their local communities. It will help to build a strong floor—a Federal minimum—that workers and cities can build off of and go even higher where it makes sense, like in Seattle in my home State in Washington. It is a level that Republicans should be able to agree with and start moving toward right now.

I have also worked on a bill, along with Senators WARREN and MURPHY, to crack down on the scheduling abuses I just talked about, so businesses would no longer keep their workers guessing on when they would be called in or how many hours they might get in a given week.

In February I introduced the Healthy Families Act to allow workers to earn up to 7 paid sick days. I want to move forward on that legislation to give our workers some much needed economic security because no one should have to sacrifice a day of pay or their job altogether just to take care of themselves or their sick child.

We as a nation should not turn our backs on empowering our workers through collective bargaining, especially since strong unions ensure workers have a strong voice at the table. It is the very thing that helped so many workers climb into the middle class in this country.

Enacting these critical policies won't solve every problem facing our workers and their families today. It is not the only way that I and Senate Democrats will be fighting to protect workers and making sure the economy is growing from the middle out, not the top down. But these policies would be very strong steps in the right direction to bring back that American dream of economic security and a stable middle-class life for millions of workers who have seen it slip away.

When workers succeed, businesses succeed and thus the economy succeeds. We know this works. I have seen it in my home State of Washington where State and local governments have taken the lead on proposals such as raising the minimum wage and paid sick days. I think it is time to bring some of that Washington State way right here to Washington, DC.

I recently heard from a small business owner by the name of Laura. She owns a small auto repair shop in Renton, WA. She shared something that I hear all the time from business owners: Doing the right thing by workers starts a virtuous cycle. Laura said, ''When workers have more money, businesses have more customers. With more customers, businesses can hire more workers, which in turn generates more customers.''

Working families in our country have been waiting long enough for some relief from the trickle-down system that hurts the middle class. That is why I

am going to be asking for unanimous consent to work on the policies that would restore economic security and stability to more workers.

Let's finally restore some stability and security for workers across our country. Let's make sure hard work pays off. Let's help more families make ends meet, expand economic opportunity, and grow our economy from the middle out.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for 3 minutes and that I be followed immediately by the Senator from Idaho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, is the parliamentary procedure that there was an objection to the Senate moving forward with the consideration of the cyber bill? Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There was an objection that was heard to the request of the majority leader.

Mrs. MURRAY addressed the Chair.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, do I have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona has the floor.

Mr. MCCAIN. I have the floor, I tell the Senator from Washington.

This is unbelievable. It is unbelievable that this body would not move forward with a cyber bill with the situation of dire consequences and dire threats to the United States of America. Admiral Rogers, the commander of U.S. Cyber Command, told listeners at the Aspen Security Forum that ''to date there is little price to pay for engaging in some pretty aggressive behaviors.''

According to James Clapper, the Director of National Intelligence, ''we will see a progression or expansion of that envelope until such time as we create both the substance and psychology of deterrence. And today we don't have that.''

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Dempsey, our military enjoys ''significant military advantage'' in every domain except for one—cyber space. General Dempsey said cyber ''is a level playing field. And that makes this chairman very uncomfortable.'' The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is uncomfortable about the cyber threats to this Nation.

What just took place is millions of Americans had their privacy hacked into. God only knows what the consequences of that are. The other side has decided to object to proceeding with a bill that passed through the Intelligence Committee by a vote of 14 to 1. This is disgraceful—this is disgraceful. I tell my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, by blocking this legislation, you are putting this Nation in danger. By blocking this legislation, you are putting this Nation in danger by not allowing the Senate of the United States to act against a very real threat to our very existence.

I say this is a shameful day in the Senate. I urge the Democratic leader to come to the floor and allow us to consider amendments, move forward with this legislation because the security of the United States of America is in danger.

I thank my colleagues.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

SAWTOOTH NATIONAL RECREATION AREA AND JERRY PEAK WILDERNESS ADDITIONS ACT

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, is H.R. 1138 at the desk?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 1138, which has been received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1138) to establish certain wilderness areas in central Idaho and to authorize various land conveyances involving National Forest System land and Bureau of Land Management land in central Idaho, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (H.R. 1138) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President and fellow Senators, today is a historic day for the State of Idaho. This is the creation of a wilderness area in the Sawtooth area of Idaho, the Boulder-White Clouds area, and the Jerry Peak area. These two mountain ranges and one mountain peak area have been under consideration for about 10 years.

I want to talk very briefly about what we are dealing with. These are some of the most magnificent pieces of land, not only in Idaho but in the United States. Before anyone goes abroad to see the Champs-Elysees or to see the magnificent works of art in Italy, you need to put on your list seeing the Boulder-White Clouds area. It is truly a magnificent area.

What we just did was we created a wilderness of about 275,000 acres that creates these three wilderness areas, plus a buffer zone around them. It is a great day for Idaho. This is an Idaho solution to an issue that has been pending for some time.

I conclude by simply stating that all credit for this goes to Congressman MIKE SIMPSON. Congressman SIMPSON started working on this about 10 years ago and wanted to put together, in a collaborative fashion, a wilderness bill for this particular area. He did that. He brought it back to Washington, DC. Because of the situation in DC at the time, the bill was changed greatly and was no longer an Idaho solution to the Idaho problem.

Congressman SIMPSON did not give up. He worked and he worked and he worked at it. It is truly his long-term commitment to this and his long work on this that got us to this point. What he did was take this land that there was virtually unanimous agreement should be in wilderness; that is, the heart of this area, the Boulder Range, the White Cloud Range, and the Jerry Peaks area.

There was unanimous agreement that this is the kind of land that needs to be in wilderness. Indeed, when I was Governor, I wrote this rule for several million acres. This was included in it. It was protected as wilderness. This is not changing the character of it in that regard. What it does is put it in statute instead of in rule.

The difficulty was, as always with these kinds of areas, the buffer area around what everybody agrees is truly unique ground that should be handled as wilderness. Obviously, it is an area that ingrains passion in people. It causes people to have strong feelings about the area. As a result of that, people fight to protect what they think should be protected, and just as much, people who use the buffer zones for different reasons feel just as passionately the other way.

What Congressman SIMPSON was able to do was get everybody to the table in a very collaborative fashion, to where he got the wilderness preservationists, the hikers, the backpackers, the horse people, the motorized users, including snowmobile, ATV, and motorcycle people, to all agree to a management plan for everything that is included in this bill.

Congressman SIMPSON was tenacious on this. He gets the full credit for this. I think Idahoans will truly appreciate this for many years. There is no doubt in my mind that the efforts Congressman SIMPSON put into this will be greatly appreciated for years and years to come.

With that, I yield the remainder of my time to my colleague, my good friend, Senator MIKE CRAPO.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. I thank Senator RISCH.

Mr. President, it is an honor for me to rise with my colleague JIM RISCH to celebrate the passage of this legislation. It has been years and years in the making. This legislation culminates from the hard work by people all over Idaho. As Senator RISCH has indicated, the credit for making this all finally come together goes to Representative MIKE SIMPSON. I wholeheartedly agree with that.