

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, what we are doing here is we are cutting defense spending, we are increasing nondefense spending, and we are locking in the legitimacy of the nondefense spending according to the Budget Control Act. So what we are doing by passing a continuing resolution is putting in sequestration again, while even reducing defense spending.

In the words of the four uniformed chiefs of our military, you are—and I quote them directly—“putting the lives of the men and women serving this Nation in uniform at greater risk”—at greater risk. You are putting the lives of the men and women who are serving in the military at greater risk because we want to get out of here for Christmas. Shame on you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. For tonight's schedule, we hope to have the WRDA vote around midnight, and we will seek to get a limited time agreement during the vote that is about to occur.

VOTE ON MOTION TO CONCUR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

If not, the question is on agreeing to the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2028.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 63, nays 36, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 161 Leg.]

YEAS—63

Alexander	Feinstein	Nelson
Ayotte	Fischer	Peters
Baldwin	Gardner	Portman
Barrasso	Grassley	Reed
Bennet	Hatch	Roberts
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Rounds
Blunt	Hoeven	Rubio
Boozman	Inhofe	Scott
Burr	Isakson	Sessions
Cantwell	Johnson	Shaheen
Capito	Kaine	Shelby
Cardin	King	Stabenow
Cassidy	Kirk	Sullivan
Coats	Klobuchar	Tester
Cochran	Markey	Thune
Collins	McConnell	Tillis
Cornyn	Mikulski	Toomey
Daines	Moran	Udall
Donnelly	Murkowski	Vitter
Enzi	Murphy	Whitehouse
Ernst	Murray	Wicker

NAYS—36

Booker	Casey	Cruz
Boxer	Coons	Durbin
Brown	Corker	Flake
Carper	Crapo	Franken

Gillibrand	Manchin	Risch
Graham	McCain	Sanders
Heitkamp	McCaskill	Sasse
Heller	Menendez	Schatz
Hirono	Merkley	Schumer
Lankford	Paul	Warner
Leahy	Perdue	Warren
Lee	Reid	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Cotton

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MCCONNELL. For the information of all colleagues, I think we are headed toward completion here. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that there now be 80 minutes of debate on the House message to accompany S. 612; that following the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote on the cloture motion with respect to the House message. I further ask that if cloture is invoked, all time postcloture be considered expired, the motion to concur with further amendment then be withdrawn, and the Senate vote on the motion to concur in the House amendment. I further ask that following adoption of the House message, H. Con Res. 183 be considered and agreed to. Further, I ask that 60 minutes be under the control of Senator BOXER or her designee and that the mandatory quorum call be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Reserving the right to object, I am not going to object, but you said 80 minutes. Who has the other—the reason I am asking is, I didn't know if I needed to yield time to the other side, which I prefer not to since you have your own time, right? That is fine with me.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I modify that to designate 20 minutes under the control of Senator INHOFE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Let me say that hopefully the 80 minutes will not be used. Hopefully, much of it will be yielded back. A lot has already been said. The night is late, but if all the time is used, it is going to occur around 12:30 a.m.

GEORGE P. KAZEN FEDERAL BUILDING AND UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume consideration of the House message to accompany S. 612, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

House message to accompany S. 612, a bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 1300 Victoria Street in Laredo, Texas, as the “George P. Kazen Federal Building and United States Courthouse.”

Pending:

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the bill.

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the bill, with McConnell amendment No. 5144, to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 5145 (to amendment No. 5144), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell motion to refer the message of the House on the bill to the Committee on Environment and Public Works, with instructions, McConnell amendment No. 5146, to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 5147 (the instructions (amendment No. 5146) of the motion to refer), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell amendment No. 5148 (to amendment No. 5147), of a perfecting nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I want to say to my friends, this is my last moment on the floor of the U.S. Senate. I already gave my farewell, and I thought that was the end of it. I find myself filibustering my own bill, which is really a bizarre way to end my career here. As I said, I always came in defending the environment, and I guess I will go out the door in the same way. I feel that this is something I have to do.

The Water Resources Development Act is a beautiful bill. We are going to be voting on it. But, very sadly, at the last minute, a midnight rider was added in the House by KEVIN MCCARTHY, which essentially, according to every fishing group in my State—and I mean every single fishing group and every single fishing group on the west coast, and that covers Oregon, Washington, California—is a major threat to their livelihood, to their future.

As everybody talks about the message of this election being the protection of hard-working people, here we have a rider that is slipped in. No one even saw it but 2 hours before, and it turns out that the water the fishermen need to have a thriving business is going to be diverted away from them and done in such a way that it goes against the Endangered Species Act.

You will hear people stand up and say: No, it is not true. There is a savings clause; we say no way. The fact is, when you dictate what kind of operations you are going to have in terms of moving water and you say you shall move this water and the other side has to prove it is dangerous, everybody knows where this is going. Everybody knows it is going to be impossible to save the salmon.

Here we have the salmon fisheries on the west coast up in arms. Here we have a rider that doesn't even belong in the Environment and Public Works Committee. It should have been discussed with the Energy Committee. It is out of order.

The question is, Are we going to vote for a beautiful bill? I just said today that I got more things in here for California than I probably should even talk about because I got so much. There are 26 different provisions for my State, from Lake Tahoe to the Salton Sea,

from the L.A. River to the Sacramento Flood Control, to Orange County, to the Inland Empire.

The entire State benefits from this bill, and here I stand saying to vote no, but it is because I think we have no right to put this kind of language in at the last minute and destroy an entire industry. It is not right.

In addition, this particular rider takes away the right of Congress to authorize dams in all of the Western States. So, people, understand what this does. KEVIN MCCARTHY, I guess, doesn't trust the Members of Congress to authorize new dams and says the President—whoever it is because this bill lasts 5 years—can determine where to put a dam. I don't get it. Don't we trust each other to hold hearings and decide these issues?

This is what the rider does; it is devastating to the fishery. Every environmental group that I know of is strongly against it. This vote is being rated by the League of Conservation Voters, and there are chills running up and down the spine of the fishing industry. I have never seen so many editorials against any rider. They have asked me: Please, please bring this down.

I am not naive, and I know votes. I know how cynical this whole thing is. Here we have a rider that does not belong on this bill. The jurisdiction was the Energy Committee. They weren't consulted. This rider never had a hearing, never saw the light of day, and was stuck on a bill that I have worked on for about 2 years. It is a beautiful bill, a terrible rider.

For me to stand here, in the last breath as a Senator—not in life, I feel very strong, but as a Senator—to say to people that I worked so hard on this bill with Senator INHOFE, it is a beautiful bill; vote no on cloture. It is almost like an out-of-body experience for me, but still, I am asking you to do that.

What is going to happen next year? What are they going to hold hostage next year? The people of Flint? No one worked harder for the people of Flint than MARIA CANTWELL and BARBARA BOXER. We held up our bills until they were taken care of.

We have a beautiful WRDA bill. It is not perfect, I admit it, but it is excellent. It will create a lot of jobs, and it will make sure that our water infrastructure is up to date. It has ecosystem restoration. By the way, it has a lot of drought-related, important authorizations for desalination, water recharging, water recycling, high technology to bring more water to really take care of the drought. It has it in the base bill. All of that is in the base bill.

And in the dead of night comes a midnight rider, and there it sits. It is wrong. It is absolutely wrong.

It is very late. We are all very tired. I am very grateful that MARIA CANTWELL and I, JEFF MERKLEY and RON WYDEN were able to have some time earlier in the day to present the facts,

but we wanted to go over it one more time. I know Senator CANTWELL has laryngitis and is struggling with her voice, but at this time I would like to yield to her as much time as she might consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, as my colleague said, I definitely have a voice challenge so I am not going to speak long. I do want to join my colleague in urging Members of the Senate to vote no on this legislation.

As she just described, it is a bill that has some great attributes, but it has one major fatal flaw, and that fatal flaw is that the U.S. Senate is being asked tonight to negotiate and decide a water settlement for the State of California that has been fought over, litigated, and is still in discussion of how to resolve it in a balanced way among all of the interests, not just in California but in the region. Oh, no, because someone has a mighty pen and can in the House of Representatives drop an earmark of over half a billion dollars into a bill as a poison pill—I think the newspapers had it right: Stop the midnight rider. How ironic that it is almost midnight, and we are going to be voting on such legislation.

My colleagues who bring us decided-upon water agreements that have been worked out and want us to bless them so that the agencies can fund them—I have no problems with that. We have tried to move similar legislation in regular order, but this is usurping the individuals who are trying to balance water and fish and river rights and community issues and regional issues and saying that we are going to kill fish as a way to balance the water and drought of the future. If we are going to decide to kill fish tonight for California, for Delta almond growers, are you going to show up tomorrow and say let's kill northwest salmon because someone else in California wants our water? I can tell you the answer to that is hell no; we are not going to let you attack northwest salmon for California water. It is not going to happen.

To our colleagues who are facing the same issue in Arizona, which didn't get a fair hearing, or our colleagues from Florida, Alabama, or in a dispute with Georgia, tonight is about whether you are going to say we are going to have collaborative stewardship to solve our water issues or whether we are going to let the interest of political groups come and lobby here and have us decide based on poison pill riders.

Our colleagues over here are frustrated that the other side of the aisle would never live up to a Flint agreement, and the consequence is they are cynical enough to put Flint in this bill as a way to get votes for something they know they should not bring to the floor of the U.S. Senate. And to boot, they think the only bill I could come up with to get this deal passed is one in which individual Members have individual projects that are important to

clean water in their States, and that is how they are going to get this poison pill rider passed.

It is no surprise that within 24 hours of this passing the House, the L.A. Times editorialized it as a bad deal. The San Jose Mercury News calls it a sellout. The San Francisco Chronicle says stop the rider. Do not think for 1 second that people are not watching because they are watching. The unfortunate situation for everyone involved who wants water is this. You are going to get litigation. You are going to get litigation because you cannot do water deals this way.

For the San Joaquin, which argued and litigated for 18 years and then came to the table, this is the same situation. You are not going to get water for your growers, you are going to get litigation. As a country that has already spent billions of dollars dealing with drought—and I have news for you, we are going to be spending more because the climate is going to continue to change. This is an issue whose day has come to the United States Senate. It is not going to go away.

We can deal with it in regular order, we can deal with it without jamming people with earmarks, and we can deal with it without giving away a sweetheart deal to the builders of dams. Oh, yes. I forgot to mention, the bill authorizes dams to be built in 17 States without any further action by us as a body. I hope you don't have a river in your State where you would like to see the wild and scenic nature of it or go trout fishing because it may not be there if it is all dammed up due to this legislation.

I hope our colleagues realize the way to solve our drought problems is to work together in a fair and open manner, a manner in which everyone can see the transparency and not the dark of night at midnight right before we adjourn for the rest of the year. We will not solve these problems nor will we provide the collaborative stewardship this issue needs. Instead, we are going to put a cynical stamp of a political gamesmanship on an issue that is important to every community in the West.

I thank the Presiding Officer and the Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, how much time do we have remaining on our inside?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 45 minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I call on Senator MERKLEY for as much time as he wishes.

Before MARIA CANTWELL leaves the floor, who is suffering mightily from laryngitis, I have another editorial hot off the press from the Los Angeles Times: "A water deal that's bad for California's environment." I can't tell you how proud this makes me because this means, essentially, every major paper in my State that has really

stayed out of this is going in. This is a very long editorial. I will save my comments on it until later.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have the Los Angeles Times editorial printed in the RECORD.

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

[Dec. 9, 2016]

A WATER DEAL THAT'S BAD FOR CALIFORNIA'S ENVIRONMENT

(By the LA Times Editorial Board)

There is much for Southern Californians to like in departing U.S. Sen. Barbara Boxer's final bill—to authorize federal water projects—including funding to restore the Los Angeles River and to pay for various water storage and groundwater efforts.

And then there are the provisions Boxer's colleague and fellow California Democrat, Sen. Dianne Feinstein, negotiated with Republicans and their supporters in San Joaquin Valley's agriculture industry to squeeze more usable water from the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta for farmers in drought years.

At issue in the delta and the rivers that feed it are the rules that govern when and how much water can be diverted for farms and homes instead of being allowed to keep flowing through rivers and into the delta to protect endangered salmon.

California's two senators have long approached water issues from different angles but generally managed to agree. Not this time. When Feinstein and Republicans inserted their provisions in Boxer's bill late last week, Boxer threatened to scuttle the whole package. She said the delta provisions would undermine the Endangered Species Act and could irreparably damage the state's salmon and the thousands of jobs that depend on the Pacific salmon fishery, not just off California's coast, but off Oregon's and Washington's as well.

Environmentalists have balked at the Feinstein proposal, just as they opposed a drought bill she proposed earlier this year. That measure also was aimed at making delta rules more flexible to keep water flowing to farms during periods in which it arguably wasn't needed for fish. Notwithstanding the concerns, that bill was a prudent compromise and might have been acceptable had it been an end-point—part of a grand bargain between the various factions to end the long-running California water wars.

So the question now is whether the new provisions that Feinstein has brokered with Republicans are appreciably different from her earlier version, or whether circumstances have changed enough to warrant endangering the entire bill and all the funding it allocates to badly needed water projects.

Circumstances certainly changed with the election of Donald Trump and the climate-change-denying, environmentally challenged cabinet members he is considering or has already appointed. Although the bill's rules governing when delta pumps can operate and how water must be managed are technical and subject to interpretation, they grant Trump's secretaries of Commerce and Interior an important role in determining when to divert less and leave more for endangered fish and the environment. That sort of discretion might have been tolerable if entrusted to cabinet members of an environmentally responsible administration, but it must be seen in a different light with a White House with a decidedly different approach to the environment.

An internal memo from the current White House also notes that since Feinstein's ear-

lier bill, populations of endangered salmon and smelt have significantly declined. Even the current program of scientific findings may be insufficient to protect the fish as required under the Endangered Species Act.

The regrettable conclusion must be that the so-called drought provisions are unacceptable. The proposed drought-year legislation would appear to be directly at odds with current, laudable efforts by the State Water Resources Control Board to ensure the presence of enough water in the lower San Joaquin River—close to the delta pumps—to sustain migrating salmon, which are not merely another fish but integral to California's ecology, culture and history.

All that aside, Feinstein's effort to add some flexibility to delta rules to provide more water for farms and urban areas in times of drought—despite serious concerns that they could weaken species protection—might still be worth the risk if they were part of a final compact between environmental and agricultural interests on delta water.

But there is still no final compact, no grand bargain, and in fact the recent election has only emboldened Republicans who are targeting the Endangered Species Act. House Majority Leader Kevin McCarthy of Bakersfield and other members of Congress who represent the San Joaquin Valley have made it clear that they intend to press further to divert more Sacramento and San Joaquin river water to agricultural use rather than letting it flow into the sea to sustain the state's increasingly fragile environment. The drought language, negotiated in private and inserted into Boxer's bill at close to the last minute, would embolden them further if adopted. Let's hope that Kamala Harris, Boxer's successor, has been paying attention and is prepared to stand up for California's increasingly fragile environment.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I yield such time as he may consume to Senator MERKLEY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, what is at issue here? The core issue is whether we raid the waters of Northern California to provide additional water to the farmers of the Central Valley and in so doing whether we wipe out the salmon which provides jobs for 20,000 fishermen. It is a powerful piece of our economy, a piece of our history, and a piece of our soul. That is what is at issue here—whether we drain these rivers.

It has been said there is nothing in this bill that changes how the biological opinions will be applied or the Endangered Species Act will be applied, and that simply is not the case. I will walk you through the three core provisions that are in this bill.

The first is section 4001. What it does is set up a pilot project, and that pilot project allows circumvention to biological opinions to open up the delta cross-channel gates. What does that mean? It means when the salmon are returning from the ocean to spawn, these gates are kept closed so the salmon do spawn and continue the cycle of life and productivity, but instead this says no and this pilot project will open the gates and then the salmon get diverted from going up the river. They don't spawn, it doesn't continue, and then it says, we will go ahead and

study the impact on the salmon. That is measure No. 1 that bypasses the Endangered Species Act.

The second provision, 4002, says the Bill Jones and Harvey Banks Southern Delta Pumping Plants must operate at the very highest level of the spectrum of the biological opinion. The way these biological opinions work is they say we need to operate somewhere between here and here, and then as the scientists observe what is going on, the amount is adjusted. What this section says is, no, we are not going to operate the normal way, we are going to insist in this bill that you must operate at the highest level, disregarding the scientific information on the impact on the salmon and on the smelt. That is provision No. 2. Then they get to the one that is really the biggest shocker, 4003. This says the Secretary of Interior and the Secretary of Commerce, through an operations plan, may operate at levels—get this—that result in the Old and Middle River flows more negative than the most negative reverse flow prescribed by biological opinion.

Have you ever heard of negative river flow? What does that mean? It means water doesn't flow downstream. It means so much water is drained that the remaining water in the river kind of flows upstream at the point it is being diverted. This says that in the range that is allowed by the biological opinion, the Secretary of Commerce or Interior can take even more, way outside the ban authorized by biological opinion.

Mrs. BOXER. The Senate is not in order. I can't hear.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. MERKLEY. This is clearly a provision that goes completely against the normal framework of a biological opinion, and, indeed, that is not the whole part of 4003. It goes on to say that this section shall not affect the biological opinion unless the Secretary of Commerce finds such applicable requirements may be adjusted. It basically says the Secretary of Commerce can violate the biological opinion. How clear can that get? Then it continues even further, and it says: Water transfers exclusively through the State water project are not required to be consistent with section (a)(1)(H) of the Central Valley Project Improvement Act.

Well, of course you are wondering what that part of the act is, and that part of the act is one that says you can't violate the fish and wildlife obligations in the process of pumping water. OK. That is wiped out by this. Clearly, case after case after case, this bill is a raid on the water of Northern California to basically pump it through in violation of biological opinions and in violation of the Endangered Species Act, and it is an assault on 20,000 fishermen and fisherwomen. That is what is wrong with this airdropped provision that never went through the committee in the Senate, and it didn't get

to the floor of the Senate. We didn't have it offered as an amendment on the floor and have a vote and debate on this floor. It didn't go through the House. It wasn't debated there. It was airdropped in on a conference committee.

Water is a precious resource, and this pits the salmon industry against the Central Valley farmers and says we are ruling for one over the other by violating the biological opinions necessary for the salmon and the smelt to survive. That is just wrong.

It says something else. It says the power of this body to authorize dams is being wiped out because no authorization is needed anymore by this body. Now, a colleague came to the floor and said, well, not really because the Senate would still have to provide some funds in an appropriations bill, but we all know how appropriation bills work. They are massive. They come out of conference at the last second. There are little things tucked in there. Taking away the process of an authorization debate on the merits of a dam nullifies the role of this body in implementing smart decisions about whether dams make sense or don't make sense under a particular set of conditions. Some make sense, some don't, and that is why we come through and we have an authorizing discussion. This guts that.

This is a terrible precedent for legislation that will come in the future, and it is terrible at this moment for the damage to the water in these upper rivers that actually flow backward and is authorized by this bill. It is a terrible provision for the salmon that 20,000 fishermen and fisherwomen depend on, and it is a terrible precedent for every other ecological discussion. That is why every major newspaper in California has written an editorial saying: Don't do this. Don't do this, says the Mercury News editorial board. They proceed to say it "would gut environmental protections and have devastating long-term effects on the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta's ecosystem." It says this last-minute, closed-door provision "allows maximum pumping of water from the Delta to the Central Valley and eliminates important congressional oversight over building dams . . . dramatically roll back the Endangered Species Act . . . perhaps paving the way for its repeal . . . or gutting." It says: "We're not sure whether the Republican sweep in November means Americans no longer care about clean air and water, but we're about to find out. In the interim, the Senate and if necessary president need to protect the Delta. . . ."

That is what the Mercury said.

The Los Angeles Times editorial says: "A water deal that's bad for California's environment," and it goes on. It says: "The regrettable conclusion must be that the so-called drought provisions are unacceptable." It notes that "the proposed drought-year legislation would appear to be directly at

odds with current, laudable efforts by the State Water Resources Control Board to ensure the presence of enough water in the lower San Joaquin River—close to the delta pumps—to sustain migrating salmon, which are not merely another fish but integral to California's ecology, culture, and history" and certainly to Oregon's ecology, culture, and history.

We have the San Francisco Chronicle, which is simply entitled: "Stop . . . water-bill rider." It proceeds to conclude, after a couple of extensive analyses, it says:

Drought and warming temperatures . . . are tipping off mass extinction of the species in the San Francisco Bay and its estuary. We have to work to share water among people, farms and the environment of California—not try to benefit one interest with a midnight rider.

Here we are 15 minutes from midnight. Multiple provisions raid the water, changing the status quo that has been carefully worked out with biological opinions. Multiple newspapers say it is just wrong so let's take a moment and say let's cut this provision out of this bill.

Let's put this bill on hold until it is gotten rid of because it is wrong to have an airdropped provision on a challenge of maintaining a viable salmon industry debated on a midnight rider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I want to thank the Senator from Oregon very much. He gets it. We are united on this. We hope our colleagues hear our plea that if we can get rid of this rider, we will have a magnificent bill that was worked on by so many: my friend JIM INHOFE, myself, Senator MERKLEY in the committee, Senator FISCHER—a beautiful bill. Why? Because we worked together. The bill had hearings, saw the light of day. Then literally, literally at the last second, a special interest rider was added. I know this was not the work of the Senate. I love my colleagues here. They did not want this done. It was done. Once it was done, we have to make a decision.

You know, before I yield to RON WYDEN, what I want to say is, if you ask people on the street "Why do you give Congress such low marks?" people don't like us here. I personally think this is a noble profession. I am so blessed to have a chance to make life better for people. All of us feel that way. But why don't people really appreciate our work? One of the reasons is they put unrelated matters on at the last second, as MARIA CANTWELL said, simply because they can.

This is a bill which is so wonderful for the country. Now they make it so controversial and so difficult for Members to choose. Look at my situation. I have 26 provisions in here for my State. It is magnificent for my people. But yet and still, this rider threatens the entire fishing industry of my State and thousands of jobs all up and down the west coast.

For people like my friends from Michigan—they know how hard I worked. They know how hard MARIA CANTWELL worked to fix the problem in Flint, to replace those pipes. Yet it is in this bill. So it makes it even more cynical that such a thing was added at the end and force people to choose between helping the people of Flint and preserving the tens of thousand of fisherman jobs. This is not right. This is ridiculous and not necessary.

If Mr. MCCARTHY is so powerful, why does he just not introduce the bill as freestanding legislation next year and let it go? But, no, it had to be done on this bill. Why? Because he could do it. I tell you, if he reads the newspaper articles and op-eds that are in every paper in my State, from Republican areas, from Democratic areas, he is not that well thought of for this. It was a big mistake.

At this time, I want to yield to my colleague and friend, who, with Senator MERKLEY, has been an outstanding voice protecting the fishing industry in his State and the beauty of his State, RON WYDEN.

Mr. WYDEN. I thank my colleague. I would be happy to yield to our colleague from Oklahoma.

REMOVAL OF INJUNCTIONS OF SECRECY—TREATY DOCUMENT NOS. 114-13, 114-14, AND 114-15

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the following treaties transmitted to the Senate on December 9, 2016, by the President of the United States: The Treaties with the Republic of Kiribati and the Government of the Federated States of Micronesia on the Delimitation of Maritime Boundaries, Treaty Document No. 114-13; the Arms Trade Treaty, Treaty Document No. 114-14; and United Nations Convention on Transparency in Treaty-Based Investor-State Arbitration, Treaty Document No. 114-15. I further ask that the treaties be considered as having been read the first time; that they be referred, with accompanying papers, to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed; and that the President's messages be printed in the RECORD.

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

The messages of the President are as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the advice and consent of the Senate to their ratification, two bilateral maritime boundary treaties: the Treaty between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Kiribati on the Delimitation of Maritime Boundaries, signed at Majuro on September 6, 2013; and the Treaty between the Government of the