

bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

AMENDMENT NO. 1273

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1273 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

AMENDMENT NO. 1299

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1299 proposed to H.R. 1314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

AMENDMENT NO. 1343

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1343 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

AMENDMENT NO. 1371

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1371 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

At the request of Ms. WARREN, her name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1371 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1314, *supra*.

AMENDMENT NO. 1387

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1387 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED
BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. REED (for himself and
Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 1414. A bill to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to add Rhode Island to the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Manage-

ment Council; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today, along with my colleague Senator WHITEHOUSE, I am introducing the Rhode Island Fishermen's Fairness Act of 2015.

This legislation seeks to extend simple fairness to our State's fishermen by giving Rhode Island voting representation on the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council MAFMC. The council manages stocks, like squid, which are critically important to the fishing industry in my State. Rhode Island's commercial fishing industry depends more on MAFMC-managed stocks than those managed by the New England Fisheries Management Council, where Rhode Island is a member. More than that, Rhode Island has a larger stake in the Mid-Atlantic fishery than many of the states that currently hold seats on the MAFMC.

This is not a new proposal, nor is it unprecedented. North Carolina was added to the MAFMC through an amendment to the Sustainable Fisheries Act in 1996. In addition, the last reauthorization of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act required a report on this issue. Now it is time to make this change.

I was pleased in the last Congress that this legislation was included in the Commerce Committee's discussion draft for the reauthorization of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, as well as in the reauthorization bill introduced by then-Oceans Subcommittee Chairman Mark Begich at the end of last year. I hope that in this Congress we can take this commonsense step to bring fairness to Rhode Island's fishermen.

By Mr. GRASSLEY:

S. 1418. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide an Inspector General for the judicial branch, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today I am reintroducing the Judicial Transparency and Ethics Enhancement Act, a bill that would establish within the judicial branch an Office of Inspector General to assist the Judiciary with its ethical obligations as well as to ensure taxpayer dollars are not lost to waste, fraud, or abuse. This bill will help ensure that our Federal judicial system remains free of corruption, bias, and hypocrisy.

The facts demonstrate that the institution of the Inspector General has been crucial in detecting, exposing and deterring problems within our government. The job of the Inspector General is to be the first line of defense against fraud, waste and abuse. In collaboration with whistleblowers, Inspectors General have been extremely effective in their efforts to expose and help correct these wrongs.

That is why, during my many years in Congress, I have worked hard to

strengthen the oversight role of Inspectors General throughout the Federal government. I have come to rely on IGs and whistleblowers, to ensure that our tax dollars are spent according to the letter and spirit of the law. When that doesn't happen, we in Congress need to know about it and take corrective action.

During the past fiscal year, Congress appropriated nearly \$7 billion in taxpayer money to the Federal judiciary. To put this in context, the Small Business Administration and the Corporation for National and Community Service each received a similar or less amount than the judiciary. Yet both of these entities have an Office of Inspector General. If we in Congress believed that these entities could use an Inspector General, I cannot see why the Judiciary wouldn't deserve the same assistance.

But there is an additional reason why the Judiciary needs an Inspector General. The fact remains that the current practice of self-regulation of judges with respect to ethics and the judicial code of conduct has time and time again proven inadequate. I would point out to my colleagues two recent events here in the Senate that support this conclusion.

In the past 6 years, the Senate received articles of impeachment for not one but two Federal judges. In the first case, former Judge Samuel B. Kent, although charged with multiple counts of sexual assault, pled guilty to obstruction of justice. Who did he obstruct? Who did he lie to? He did this to his fellow judges, who were assembled to investigate the allegations of his obscene and criminal behavior. But it took a criminal investigation by the Department of Justice to uncover his false statements to his colleagues as well as substantiate the horrendous claims made against him.

In the second case, the Senate found former Judge G. Thomas Porteous, Jr. guilty on multiple articles of impeachment, including accepting money from attorneys who had a case pending before him in his court and committing perjury by falsifying his name on bankruptcy filings. Once again, this Judge's misbehavior came to light through a Federal criminal investigation, after which another judicial committee had to be organized to investigate their fellow judge.

What's more, in each case the disgraced judge tried to game the system in order to retain his \$174,000 salary. Rather than resign their commissions, each first tried to claim disability status that would allow each to continue to receive payment, even if in prison. Then both played chicken with Congress daring us to strip them of their pay by impeaching and convicting them. I am pleased that we put our foot down and said "No."

This bill would establish an Office of Inspector General for the judicial branch. The IG's responsibilities would include conducting investigations of

possible judicial misconduct, investigating waste fraud and abuse, and recommending changes in laws and regulations governing the federal judiciary. The bill would require the IG to provide the Chief Justice and Congress with an annual report on its activities, as well as refer matters that may constitute a criminal violation to the Department of Justice. In addition, the bill establishes whistleblower protections for judicial branch employees.

Ensuring a fair and independent judiciary is critical to our Constitutional checks and balances. Judges are supposed to maintain impartiality. They are supposed to be free from conflicts of interest. An independent watchdog for the federal judiciary will help its members comply with the ethics rules and promote credibility within the judicial branch of government. Whistleblower protections for judiciary branch employees will help keep the judiciary accountable. The Judicial Transparency and Ethics Enhancement Act will not only help ensure continued public confidence in our Federal courts and keep them beyond reproach, it will strengthen our judicial branch.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1418

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Judicial Transparency and Ethics Enhancement Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR THE JUDICIAL BRANCH.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT AND DUTIES.—Part III of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“CHAPTER 60—INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR THE JUDICIAL BRANCH

“Sec.

“1021. Establishment.

“1022. Appointment, term, and removal of Inspector General.

“1023. Duties.

“1024. Powers.

“1025. Reports.

“1026. Whistleblower protection.

“§ 1021. Establishment

“There is established for the judicial branch of the Government the Office of Inspector General for the Judicial Branch (in this chapter referred to as the ‘Office’).

“§ 1022. Appointment, term, and removal of Inspector General

“(a) APPOINTMENT.—The head of the Office shall be the Inspector General, who shall be appointed by the Chief Justice of the United States after consultation with the majority and minority leaders of the Senate and the Speaker and minority leader of the House of Representatives.

“(b) TERM.—The Inspector General shall serve for a term of 4 years and may be reappointed by the Chief Justice of the United States for any number of additional terms.

“(c) REMOVAL.—The Inspector General may be removed from office by the Chief Justice of the United States. The Chief Justice shall communicate the reasons for any such removal to both Houses of Congress.

“§ 1023. Duties

“With respect to the judicial branch, the Office shall—

“(1) conduct investigations of alleged misconduct in the judicial branch (other than the United States Supreme Court) under chapter 16 that may require oversight or other action within the judicial branch or by Congress;

“(2) conduct investigations of alleged misconduct in the United States Supreme Court that may require oversight or other action within the judicial branch or by Congress;

“(3) conduct and supervise audits and investigations;

“(4) prevent and detect waste, fraud, and abuse; and

“(5) recommend changes in laws or regulations governing the judicial branch.

“§ 1024. Powers

“(a) POWERS.—In carrying out the duties of the Office, the Inspector General shall have the power to—

“(1) make investigations and reports;

“(2) obtain information or assistance from any Federal, State, or local governmental agency, or other entity, or unit thereof, including all information kept in the course of business by the Judicial Conference of the United States, the judicial councils of circuits, the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, and the United States Sentencing Commission;

“(3) require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses, and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, which subpoena, in the case of contumacy or refusal to obey, shall be enforceable by civil action;

“(4) administer to or take from any person an oath, affirmation, or affidavit;

“(5) employ such officers and employees, subject to the provisions of title 5, governing appointments in the competitive service, and the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates;

“(6) obtain services as authorized by section 3109 of title 5 at daily rates not to exceed the equivalent rate for a position at level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of such title; and

“(7) the extent and in such amounts as may be provided in advance by appropriations Acts, to enter into contracts and other arrangements for audits, studies, analyses, and other services with public agencies and with private persons, and to make such payments as may be necessary to carry out the duties of the Office.

“(b) CHAPTER 16 MATTERS.—The Inspector General shall not commence an investigation under section 1023(1) until the denial of a petition for review by the judicial council of the circuit under section 352(c) of this title or upon referral or certification to the Judicial Conference of the United States of any matter under section 354(b) of this title.

“(c) LIMITATION.—The Inspector General shall not have the authority to—

“(1) investigate or review any matter that is directly related to the merits of a decision or procedural ruling by any judge, justice, or court; or

“(2) punish or discipline any judge, justice, or court.

“§ 1025. Reports

“(a) WHEN TO BE MADE.—The Inspector General shall—

“(1) make an annual report to the Chief Justice and to Congress relating to the activities of the Office; and

“(2) make prompt reports to the Chief Justice and to Congress on matters that may require action by the Chief Justice or Congress.

“(b) SENSITIVE MATTER.—If a report contains sensitive matter, the Inspector General may so indicate and Congress may receive that report in closed session.

“(c) DUTY TO INFORM ATTORNEY GENERAL.—In carrying out the duties of the Office, the Inspector General shall report expeditiously to the Attorney General whenever the Inspector General has reasonable grounds to believe there has been a violation of Federal criminal law.

“§ 1026. Whistleblower protection

“(a) IN GENERAL.—No officer, employee, agent, contractor, or subcontractor in the judicial branch may discharge, demote, threaten, suspend, harass, or in any other manner discriminate against an employee in the terms and conditions of employment because of any lawful act done by the employee to provide information, cause information to be provided, or otherwise assist in an investigation regarding any possible violation of Federal law or regulation, or misconduct, by a judge, justice, or any other employee in the judicial branch, which may assist the Inspector General in the performance of duties under this chapter.

“(b) CIVIL ACTION.—An employee injured by a violation of subsection (a) may, in a civil action, obtain appropriate relief.”

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters for part III of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“60. Inspector General for the judicial branch 1021”.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 1430. A bill to improve the ability of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Coast Guard, and coastal States to sustain healthy ocean and coastal ecosystems by maintaining and sustaining their capabilities relating to oil spill preparedness, prevention, response, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, today the U.S. Coast Guard and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration are responding to yet another oil spill in the water. In a moment, I will bring out a photograph which shows the fresh crude oil on the beach of Refugio State Park in California. This oil spill brings back the images from 5 years ago of the oil-coated pelicans and tar-stained beaches, which were once sugar white, covered with gooey mats of oil from the Deepwater Horizon oil spill. Although the spill happened in 2010, a lot of that oil is still sloshing around out there in the gulf.

Last week, the Department of the Interior told us that the oil leaking in the gulf since 2004 from Taylor Energy wells could continue for a century or more “if left unchecked.”

This is the oil spill that just happened in the last few days. It is fresh crude, and it is on the beach in California. Of course, when I see this kind of picture, it brings me back to that experience all of us on the gulf coast had 5 years ago, and we wouldn’t wish that upon anybody. Remember, to begin with, they said, Oh, it is just a few hundred barrels of oil, even though it was ruptured 1 mile beneath the surface of the water.

Then we got the streaming video. We actually put that video on my Web site. The chairman of the environment committee, Senator BOXER, put it up on her committee Web site. Once scientists could see how much was flowing, they could calculate, and then they saw that it wasn't going to be a few hundred or even a thousand barrels of oil a day; it was approaching something like 50 times that.

We know what, in fact, happened. Almost 5 million barrels of oil was spilled. The court in Louisiana—the Federal court that is hearing this case against BP—indeed has concluded that those who are going to be held responsible under the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 will be responsible for somewhere around 4 million barrels. That is court-decided.

A lot of that oil is still out there. Yet, appallingly, today the economy and the environment of the State of Florida are again under attack. I have just been informed that Senators from Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas are seeking to invite oil rigs within 50 miles of Florida's coastline.

Now, of course, that goes against all logic. It is certainly not what the people of Florida want and it is not what the Department of the Interior has said is appropriate or necessary under the next 5-year leasing plan.

Florida is a unique State. This is a photo of a dead dolphin covered with oil that is just another casualty of what we are seeing that is happening this week.

The reason I am here today with these Senators who are threatening Florida is because in 2006, in a bipartisan way, the other Senator from Florida, Mr. Martinez, a Republican, and I, a Democrat, joined together to put in law that the Outer Continental Shelf off Florida is off-limits to oil drilling. We were successful in doing that, even though no other Outer Continental Shelf off the United States is off-limits. In the administration's 5-year plans, they have complied with that because the off-limits to oil drilling is until the year 2022. Therefore, in the next 5-year plan, from 2017 to 2022, the administration honored that. It is, after all, the law.

But why is Florida different than others? Well, in the first place, there is no oil off of Florida. People think of where the oil is. It is off of Louisiana. The sediment came down the Mississippi River for millions of years and was compacted by the Earth's crust, and that formed these oil deposits. There is a lot of oil in the central Gulf of Mexico and, indeed, that is what is happening. A lot of oil is being produced there. That is the first reason. There is not oil off of Florida.

But there are other reasons, not the least of which is of all the Gulf Coast States, Florida has the most beaches and, therefore, the economy is directly charged with the fact of having those pristine, sugary white beaches as such an attraction for our guests to come to Florida and enjoy nature's seaside.

Well, we found out, as a result of the gulf oilspill, that even though just a little oil reached Florida—Pensacola Beach was blackened, tar mats came into Pensacola Bay, Destin got oil on the beach, and some tar balls got as far east as Panama City Beach. So people saw those pictures of oil covering the beach and they thought that was the entire State of Florida and they didn't come. For a whole season, the guests, the visitors, the tourists did not come. So the motels were not filled and the restaurants were not filled and the dry-cleaners, and all the ancillary businesses associated with a tourism economy on the coast, they did not come.

Now, there is also, obviously, the environmental interests because we do have a lot of the bays and estuaries and marsh grasses where critters spawn so much of the marine life in the Gulf of Mexico, and it starts in these bays and estuaries. That is obviously a reason as well. But there is a special reason why we have kept oil off our shores. Bottlenose dolphins in the gulf have been dying at unprecedented rates over the last 5 years. This is one of those sick dolphins. So from the BP spill, science is showing, in fact, what we intuitively knew. And just yesterday, a team of scientists confirmed the Deepwater Horizon oilspill contributed to the highest number of dead bottlenose dolphin strandings on record in the northern Gulf of Mexico.

So it certainly makes little sense that we would seek more drilling in even riskier areas when we are still picking up the pieces from the last major oilspill.

Today, I am introducing legislation that implements many of the hard lessons learned in the wake of the Deepwater Horizon BP oilspill. This legislation is going to make sure that NOAA and the Coast Guard have the tools to prevent, to prepare for, and to respond to marine oilspills.

The bill is going to give gulf coast communities a seat at the table in the decisions about oil drilling that affects their way of life. It will strengthen State-level planning for oilspills or seismic exploration. But, most importantly, the bill will protect Florida from Big Oil's reach by keeping the eastern Gulf of Mexico off-limits beyond 2022 and in statute until 2027.

Back in 2006, we passed the bipartisan Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act. In that act, that is what we did in establishing this off-limits in law. But now, some of our neighboring States, at the behest of Big Oil, are trying to drill again and to drill off of Florida.

We are going to do everything we can to make sure we don't lose another tourism season. We are going to do everything we can to make sure we don't lose an entire year for our recreational fishermen, charter boat fishermen, as well as the commercial fishermen. Drilling off the coast is not what the people of Florida want. We want fishing vessels hauling in prize catches, not Coast Guard vessels skimming oil.

We want dolphins rolling in the waves, not washing ashore, and we want sunbathers on the beaches, not HAZMAT workers.

By Mr. REID (for himself and Mr. HELLER):

S. 1436. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for certain Indian tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1436

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Nevada Native Nations Land Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITION OF SECRETARY.

In this Act, the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO BE HELD IN TRUST FOR CERTAIN INDIAN TRIBES.

(a) CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO BE HELD IN TRUST FOR THE FORT McDERMITT PAIUTE AND SHOSHONE TRIBE.—

(1) DEFINITION OF MAP.—In this subsection, the term "map" means the map entitled "Fort McDermitt Indian Reservation Expansion Act", dated February 21, 2013, and on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(2) CONVEYANCE OF LAND.—Subject to valid existing rights, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in paragraph (3)—

(A) is held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Fort McDermitt Paiute and Shoshone Tribe; and

(B) shall be part of the reservation of the Fort McDermitt Paiute and Shoshone Tribe.

(3) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The land referred to in paragraph (2) is the approximately 19,094 acres of land administered by the Bureau of Land Management as generally depicted on the map as "Reservation Expansion Lands".

(b) CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO BE HELD IN TRUST FOR THE SHOSHONE PAIUTE TRIBES.—

(1) DEFINITION OF MAP.—In this subsection, the term "map" means the map entitled "Mountain City Administrative Site Proposed Acquisition", dated July 29, 2013, and on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Forest Service.

(2) CONVEYANCE OF LAND.—Subject to valid existing rights, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in paragraph (3)—

(A) is held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Shoshone Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Indian Reservation; and

(B) shall be part of the reservation of the Shoshone Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Indian Reservation.

(3) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The land referred to in paragraph (2) is the approximately 82 acres of land administered by the Forest Service as generally depicted on the map as "Proposed Acquisition Site".

(c) CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO BE HELD IN TRUST FOR THE SUMMIT LAKE PAIUTE TRIBE.—

(1) DEFINITION OF MAP.—In this section, the term "map" means the map entitled "Summit Lake Indian Reservation Conveyance",

dated February 28, 2013, and on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(2) CONVEYANCE OF LAND.—Subject to valid existing rights, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in paragraph (3)—

(A) is held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Summit Lake Paiute Tribe; and

(B) shall be part of the reservation of the Summit Lake Paiute Tribe.

(3) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The land referred to in paragraph (2) is the approximately 941 acres of land administered by the Bureau of Land Management as generally depicted on the map as “Reservation Conveyance Lands”.

(d) CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO BE HELD IN TRUST FOR THE RENO-SPARKS INDIAN COLONY.—

(1) DEFINITION OF MAP.—In this subsection, the term “map” means the map entitled “Reno-Sparks Indian Colony Expansion”, dated June 11, 2014, and on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(2) CONVEYANCE OF LAND.—Subject to valid existing rights, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in paragraph (3)—

(A) is held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Reno-Sparks Indian Colony; and

(B) shall be part of the reservation of the Reno-Sparks Indian Colony.

(3) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The land referred to in paragraph (2) is the approximately 13,434 acres of land administered by the Bureau of Land Management as generally depicted on the map as “RSIC Amended Boundary”.

(e) CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO BE HELD IN TRUST FOR THE PYRAMID LAKE PAIUTE TRIBE.—

(1) MAP.—In this subsection, the term “map” means the map entitled “Pyramid Lake Indian Reservation Expansion”, dated April 13, 2015, and on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(2) CONVEYANCE OF LAND.—Subject to valid existing rights, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in paragraph (3)—

(A) is held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe; and

(B) shall be part of the reservation of the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe.

(3) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The land referred to in paragraph (2) is the approximately 6,357 acres of land administered by the Bureau of Land Management as generally depicted on the map as “Reservation Expansion Lands”.

(f) CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO BE HELD IN TRUST FOR THE DUCKWATER SHOSHONE TRIBE.—

(1) MAP.—In this subsection, the term “map” means the map entitled “Duckwater Reservation Expansion”, dated January 12, 2015, and on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(2) CONVEYANCE OF LAND.—Subject to valid existing rights, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in paragraph (3)—

(A) is held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Duckwater Shoshone Tribe; and

(B) shall be part of the reservation of the Duckwater Shoshone Tribe.

(3) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The land referred to in paragraph (2) is the approximately 31,269 acres of land administered by the Bureau of Land Management as gen-

erally depicted on the map as “Reservation Expansion Lands”.

SEC. 4. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) SURVEY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete a survey of the boundary lines to establish the boundaries of the land taken into trust for each Indian tribe under section 3.

(b) USE OF TRUST LAND.—

(1) GAMING.—Land taken into trust under section 3 shall not be eligible, or considered to have been taken into trust, for class II gaming or class III gaming (as those terms are defined in section 4 of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2703)).

(2) THINNING; LANDSCAPE RESTORATION.—With respect to the land taken into trust under section 3, the Secretary, in consultation and coordination with the applicable Indian tribe, may carry out any fuel reduction and other landscape restoration activities, including restoration of sage grouse habitat, on the land that is beneficial to the Indian tribe and the Bureau of Land Management.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 1440. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to exclude a loan secured by a non-owner occupied 1- to 4-family dwelling from the definition of a member business loan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, most of us have heard the metaphor that small businesses are the engines that power our economy. What we don't hear people talk about as much is the fuel that feeds the engines: capital. Without capital, entrepreneurs cannot see their ideas to fruition, successful business owners cannot expand to meet the needs of the market, and eager job seekers must take their skills elsewhere. Without capital, Main Street falters.

Today, more than 7 years after the start of the Great Recession and many policy reforms later, access to capital remains a challenge that stands in the way of small business growth, economic development and job creation in Oregon and across the country. Despite this, government regulation continues to tie the hands of many potential lenders; namely, credit unions. According to some estimates, credit unions could lend an additional \$16 billion to small businesses, helping them create nearly 150,000 new jobs in just 1 year if Congress loosened restraints on credit union business lending.

With this in mind, I am pleased to introduce today the Credit Union Residential Loan Parity Act, which would increase access to capital by exempting certain loans from the member business lending cap imposed on credit unions. Currently, loans made for one- to four-person, non-owner occupied housing are treated as business loans when they are made by credit unions. As such, these types of loans count against a credit union's business lending cap, and thereby limit a credit union's ability to provide loans to small businesses. My legislation would address this issue by allowing credit unions to treat these types of loans as residential loans—as they are when

they are made by other financial institutions—therefore exempting these loans from the business lending cap. In doing so, this legislation would increase the availability of business capital, providing greater opportunities for small businesses to receive credit union loans to help them continue to grow and expand, create jobs and support our local economies.

I am hopeful that this legislation will be received by colleagues for what it is: a simple step to help ensure America's small businesses have access to the fuel they need to power our economy. It is my hope that the Senate will pass this legislation swiftly.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1440

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Credit Union Residential Loan Parity Act”.

SEC. 2. TREATMENT OF A NON-OWNER OCCUPIED 1- TO 4-FAMILY DWELLING.

(a) REMOVAL FROM MEMBER BUSINESS LOAN LIMITATION.—Section 107A(c)(1)(B)(i) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1757a(c)(1)(B)(i)) is amended by striking “that is the primary residence of a member”.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act or the amendment made by this Act shall preclude the National Credit Union Administration from treating an extension of credit that is fully secured by a lien on a 1- to 4-family dwelling that is not the primary residence of a member as a member business loan for purposes other than the member business loan limitation requirements under section 107A of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1757a).

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1448. A bill to designate the Frank Moore Wild Steelhead Sanctuary in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill to honor my friend Frank Moore, an Oregonian, World War II veteran, husband to Jeanne, father, avid fly fisherman, and tireless conservationist.

Frank Moore can be found standing in the North Umpqua River in Oregon, wearing waders and casting his fly fishing reel, for hours. He is a legendary presence on the River, even at 91 years young. A pastime he picked up from his father, fly fishing has been a business and a hobby for Frank for nearly his entire life. Not only has he enjoyed the fishing and scenery on Oregon's rivers for decades, Frank's love of Oregon and his tireless work to conserve our state's fish habitats and rivers adds up to a rich legacy that sets the standard for generations to come. Frank served on the State of Oregon Fish and Wildlife Commission and has received the National Wildlife Federation Conservationist of the Year award and the Wild

Steelhead Coalition Conservation Award.

Frank's commitment to the health and vitality of Oregon's rivers and fish habitat over the years is inspiring and he deserves countless thanks for his work and dedication. The Frank Moore Wild Steelhead Sanctuary will serve as a tribute to the many outstanding accomplishments of Frank, both on and off the river.

It is my honor to introduce this bill today with my colleague from Oregon Senator MERKLEY on behalf of this extraordinary Oregonian.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1448

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Frank Moore Wild Steelhead Sanctuary Designation Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) Frank Moore has committed his life to family, friends, his country, and fly fishing;

(2) Frank Moore is a World War II veteran who stormed the beaches of Normandy along with 150,000 troops during the D-Day Allied invasion and was awarded the Chevalier of the French Legion of Honor for his bravery;

(3) Frank Moore returned home after the war, started a family, and pursued his passion of fishing on the winding rivers in Oregon;

(4) as the proprietor of the Steamboat Inn along the North Umpqua River in Oregon for nearly 20 years, Frank Moore, along with his wife Jeanne, shared his love of fishing, the flowing river, and the great outdoors, with visitors from all over the United States and the world;

(5) Frank Moore has spent most of his life fishing the vast rivers of Oregon, during which time he has contributed significantly to efforts to conserve fish habitats and protect river health, including serving on the State of Oregon Fish and Wildlife Commission;

(6) Frank Moore has been recognized for his conservation work with the National Wildlife Federation Conservationist of the Year award, the Wild Steelhead Coalition Conservation Award, and his 2010 induction into the Fresh Water Fishing Hall of Fame; and

(7) in honor of the many accomplishments of Frank Moore, both on and off the river, approximately 104,000 acres of Forest Service land in Oregon should be designated as the "Frank Moore Wild Steelhead Sanctuary".

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) MAP.—The term "Map" means the map entitled "O&C Land Grant Act of 2014: Frank Moore Wild Steelhead Sanctuary" and dated November 3, 2014.

(2) SANCTUARY.—The term "Sanctuary" means the Frank Moore Wild Steelhead Sanctuary designated by section 4(a).

(3) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service.

(4) STATE.—The term "State" means the State of Oregon.

SEC. 4. FRANK MOORE WILD STEELHEAD SANCTUARY, OREGON.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The approximately 104,000 acres of Forest Service land in the State, as generally depicted on the Map, is designated as the "Frank Moore Wild Steelhead Sanctuary".

(b) MAP; LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall prepare a map and legal description of the Sanctuary.

(2) FORCE OF LAW.—The map and legal description prepared under paragraph (1) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act, except that the Secretary may correct clerical and typographical errors in the map and legal description.

(3) AVAILABILITY.—The map and legal description prepared under paragraph (1) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Forest Service.

(c) ADMINISTRATION.—Subject to valid existing rights, the Sanctuary shall be administered by the Secretary—

(1) in accordance with all laws (including regulations) applicable to the National Forest System; and

(2) in a manner that—

(A) protects, preserves, and enhances the natural character, scientific use, and the botanical, recreational, ecological, fish and wildlife, scenic, drinking water, and cultural values of the Sanctuary;

(B) protects and seeks to enhance the wild salmonid resources of the Sanctuary;

(C) maintains or enhances the watershed as a thermal refuge for wild salmonids; and

(D) preserves opportunities for primitive recreation.

(d) FISH AND WILDLIFE.—Nothing in this section affects the jurisdiction or responsibilities of the State with respect to fish and wildlife in the State.

(e) ADJACENT MANAGEMENT.—Nothing in this section creates any protective perimeter or buffer zone around the Sanctuary.

(f) PROTECTION OF TRIBAL RIGHTS.—Nothing in this section diminishes any treaty rights of an Indian tribe.

(g) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, the Federal land within the boundaries of the Sanctuary river segments designated by subsection (a) is withdrawn from all forms of—

(1) entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(3) disposition under all laws relating to mineral and geothermal leasing or mineral materials.

(h) USES.—The Secretary shall only allow uses of the Sanctuary that are consistent with the purposes and values for which the Sanctuary is established.

(i) USE OF MOTORIZED VEHICLES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the use of motorized vehicles within the Sanctuary shall be limited to roads allowed by the Secretary for the use of motorized vehicles.

(2) OFF-ROAD VEHICLE USE.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the Secretary may allow off-road vehicle use in designated portions within the Sanctuary if the use is consistent with the purposes and values for which the Sanctuary was designated.

(j) ROADS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, to the maximum extent practicable, shall decrease the total mileage of system roads that are operational in the Sanctuary to a quantity less than the quantity of mileage in existence on the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) PRIORITY.—The Secretary shall prioritize decreasing the mileage of the road

network in the Sanctuary to reduce impacts to water quality from sediment delivered to streams by forest roads.

(3) TEMPORARY ROADS.—If the Secretary constructs a temporary road as part of a vegetation management project, the Secretary shall close and decommission the temporary road not later than the earlier of—

(A) the date that is 2 years after the date on which the activity for which the temporary road was constructed is completed; and

(B) the date that is 1 year after the date on which the vegetation management project is completed.

(4) NO NEW ROADS.—The Secretary shall prohibit—

(A) any new system or nonsystem road within the Sanctuary and key watersheds under the plan entitled "Northwest Forest Plan 1994 Record of Decision for Amendments to Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management Planning Documents Within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl" after the date of enactment of this Act, except as the Secretary determines to be necessary, if the Secretary determines that no practicable alternative exists, and subject to the availability of appropriations; and

(B) the construction of any new road in any roadless area in the Sanctuary.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 183—CALLING FOR SUSPENSION OF CONSTRUCTION OF ARTIFICIAL LAND FORMATIONS ON ISLANDS, REEFS, SHOALS, AND OTHER FEATURES OF THE SPRATLY ISLANDS AND FOR A PEACEFUL AND MULTILATERAL RESOLUTION TO THE SOUTH CHINA SEA TERRITORIAL DISPUTE

Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. SULLIVAN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 183

Whereas the United States Government strongly supports the peaceful resolution of territorial, sovereignty, and jurisdictional disputes in the South China Sea;

Whereas the South China Sea includes critical sea lines of communication and commerce between the Pacific and Indian oceans;

Whereas the United States Government has a national interest in freedom of navigation and overflight in the South China Sea, as provided for by customary principles of international law;

Whereas the United States Government is also committed to upholding internationally lawful uses of the high seas and the Exclusive Economic Zones as well as to the related rights and freedoms in other maritime zones, including the rights of innocent passage, transit passage, and archipelagic sea lanes passage consistent with customary international law;

Whereas the United States has an interest in encouraging and supporting the nations of the region to work collaboratively and diplomatically to resolve disputes without coercion, intimidation, threats, or the use of force;

Whereas the United States further supports the efforts of states to resolve their disputes in accordance with international