and how it affects people is able to say to their government: No, this is something that is protected by the Constitution. It is protected by the first amendment. You cannot require me to provide a service—through a faith-based institution—that I do not agree with or you cannot require me as a health care provider to provide a service that I do not agree with because of my faith.

It doesn't mean you cannot get it somewhere else if it is something that can legally be done. It just means people of faith or institutions of faith do not have to do it. That is why in almost every Catholic church in America, the last two weekends, a letter has been read from the bishop or the archbishop that said this is unacceptable, it should not be complied with.

That is why the Chaplain to the Army, the Chief Archbishop to the Army, Bishop Broglio, sent out a letter to be read at Catholic mass at Army posts all over the country. Initially that letter was not going to be read because it did not agree with the tenets the government was pursuing at the time—which is the violation that people would see most offensive, I think, that the government would actually begin to say to people of faith you cannot even talk about it. You cannot even have that letter read on a military post, from the person who is responsible to the chaplains and the Catholic chaplains in the military.

Maybe it is a faith view of how to deliver health care that somebody in the Christian Science community has or somebody in the Seventh Day Adventist community has or the Southern Baptist community or whatever that might be. The specific thing is not the issue here. The issue here is can government require a faith-based institution to go beyond the tenets of its faith.

I know the Democratic leader, the majority leader, said there is not even a rule yet. The White House said—the administration said there would be a rule. And to make it even more offensive, they said: And, by the way, here is what the rule is going to be and we are going to give you a year to figure out how to adjust your views to accommodate the rule.

I would have been less offended if they said here is the rule and we understand it is in violation of your views but here is what is going to be the rule and you will have to comply with it. The idea they could change your views, your religious views, your religious beliefs, in a year or a lifetime because some Federal regulator says you need to is unbelievably offensive in our country based on the principles that we hold most dear in the Constitution itself.

So this amendment, which is bipartisan in nature and I think easily understood because it is so fundamental to who we are, is an amendment that could be quickly debated, it could be quickly voted on. The Senate of the United States could express its view. I believe that view would be one supportive of institutions of faith.

By the way, also, the administration saying we gave an exemption for the church itself—No. 1, I do not know how long that exemption would last. And, No. 2, I think that shows a lack of understanding of the work of the church or the work of the synagogue or the work of the mosque or the work of people of coming together. If the only thing that matters in their work is what happens within the four walls of the church or whoever works in the four walls of the church every day, these institutions are not what I believe they are.

The great schools, the great hospitals, the great community-providing institutions of America have, so many of them for so long, been based on faith principles. This amendment would say for health care, those faith principles would still be the overriding principle. For health care, if someone does not agree with the direction of the government, they do not have to perform that service. They do not have to provide that specific kind of insurance to their employees.

Remember, the underlying bill here, the underlying rule that has been announced, even though it may not have been officially issued, is one that talks about people who have chosen to go to work for, to get a paycheck for, to work at the direction of a faith-based community. Then to tell that community what your insurance has to look like—that is just one of the many steps. If the government can do that, what can't the government do? If the government can do that, where does the government stop? If the government can do that—when you say this is something I don't believe in so I don't want to be part of this particular health care issue, this health care moment, this health care episode—whatever you want to call it, you say, oh, well, you have to do it because the government says you have to do it and the first amendment does not matter, the protection of conscience doesn't matter, the Jefferson letter to New London Methodist doesn't matter.

Until the enactment of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, this was never an issue and nothing would happen if this amendment was approved and became the law of the land. Nothing would be different tomorrow than it was a year ago, because a year ago people were not doing this. Five years ago nobody would have even thought it was possible, that the Federal Government would tell a faith-based hospital what their insurance plan exactly had to look like, the plan that they offered their employees or would tell faith-based health care providers what they could do and what they could not do or would say if you are not going to do everything the government will pay for, we will not pay you to do anything the government pays for.

This is an issue many people in the country feel strongly about, many people in the Senate, both Democrats and Republicans, feel strongly about. We can let this go on and create the anxiety it creates for the faith community or we can bring this amendment up, debate it—and, frankly, I think it is pretty well understood—debate it, vote on it, and let the country know that we still support the Constitution of the United States.

While I am disappointed I did not get to offer this amendment today, I will be back and I am going to do my best to get this amendment offered at the earliest possible time, and I would be glad to see the Senate join me, and the majority join me, in saying let's get this important issue off the minds of the American people and let them know the Constitution still matters and religious liberty is still the first amendment to the Constitution in the United States.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

(The remarks of Mr. ENZI pertaining to the introduction of S. 2091 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. ENZI. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

STOCK ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, 1 week ago we passed a very important good government bill, the one that would make sure Members of Congress cannot benefit from insider trading information. I added to that an amendment that I think is a good government amendment. It calls for people who are involved in political intelligence gathering—we don't hear much about that profession, but it is quite a business. I asked that they be registered just like lobbyists are registered, and I would like to speak to the point of why that is very important and why it is important to bring it to the Senate's attention, even though it passed by a vote of 60 to 39 just a few days ago.

In the dark of night on Tuesday of this week, the House released its version of the insider trading bill that goes by the acronym STOCK, which wiped out any chance of meaningful transparency for the political intelligence industry. Think about the chutzpah of the people in the House of Representatives—a small group of people—taking out the language I put in that bill when similar language is cosponsored by 288 Members of the House of Representatives, but it happened. So that bill is coming back without the Grassley amendment on it, and we need to think about what we are going to do if we believe in good government, and if we believe there ought to be more transparency in government.

What we are faced with is a powerful industry that works in the shadows—

economic espionage. They don't want people to know what they do or whom they work for. They are basically afraid of sunlight, I would guess. My amendment was adopted in the Senate on a very bipartisan basis, kind of a rare occurrence today. It simply requires registration for lobbyists who seek information from Congress in order to trade on that information.

So isn't it very straightforward if trades are taking place based upon ''political intelligence''—that is their word, ''economic espionage'' is my word—obtained from Congress or the executive branch, people in this country should know who is gathering such information. Not requiring political intelligence professionals to register and disclose their contacts with government officials is a very gaping loophole that my amendment fixes. In fact, political intelligence firms actually brag about this loophole, and I will give an example about that bragging. This is on the Web site of an organization called the Open Source Intelligence Group, a political intelligence firm:

Our political intelligence operation differs from standard 'lobbying' in that the OSINT Group is not looking to influence legislation on behalf of clients, but rather provide unique 'monitoring' of information through our personal relationships between lawmakers, staffers, and lobbyists.

Providing this service for clients who do not want their interest in an issue publicly known is an activity that does not need to be reported under the Lobbying Disclosure Act, thus providing an additional layer of confidentially for our clients.

This service is ideal for companies seeking competitive advantage by allowing a client's interest to remain confidential . . .

Think about the words ''personal relationships,'' ''confidentiality.'' Basically, what they are saying is do all this under the radar.

I wish to go back, if you didn't hear it the first time, let me repeat some of this for you, a much shorter quote:

Providing this service for clients who do not want their interests in an issue publicly known is an activity that does not need to be reported under the Lobbying Disclosure Act, thus providing an additional layer of confidentiality for our clients.

We have it here on paper, and I just read it to you. This firm—probably one of many firms; I don't know how many firms are doing this—is telling potential clients: If you don't want anybody to know what you are asking of Federal officials, hire us. That is wrong, but that is why firms such as this don't want to register. If someone on Wall Street is trying to make money off conversations they had with Senators or staff, we should know who they are. It is that plain and simple.

Since the passage of my amendment, which would require political intelligence lobbyists to register as lobbyists, I have heard a great deal of ''concern'' from the lobbying community. Political intelligence professionals have claimed they should do their business in secret for several reasons.

Now, this is the explanation of why they need secrecy. First, they have said if they are required to register, they will no longer be able to sell information to their clients because people will not want to hire them. That makes me wonder, what do they have to hide?

Second, they have said many of them have large numbers of clients, and it would take them a lot of time to register these large numbers of secret clients. Again, that makes me think we actually need more transparency to find out who are all of these people buying intelligence information.

Third, they have claimed it would not address the so-called ''20-percent loophole'' that allows people who spend less than 20 percent of their time lobbying from having to register under existing laws as lobbyists. Not too many people know of that 20-percent loophole, but that is a pretty big loophole. A person can lobby, but they don't have to register if they don't spend more than 20 percent of their time on it. Well, on this issue I have some good news for these people. We don't make the mistake that caused the 20-percent loophole. My amendment requires anyone who makes a political intelligence contact to have to register. No loopholes, no deals, no special treatment, just everyone registers.

Finally, I just want to assure people, particularly journalists, that they would not have to register. Now, that information has been floating around, and it has been floating around that some constituents looking for information in order to make a business decision might have to register. Not so. Only political intelligence brokers, people who seek information so others can trade securities, would have to register.

As I said before, if people want to trade stocks from what we do in Congress, we should know who they are. After all, the basic underlying piece of legislation prohibits Members of Congress from having insider trading information and profiting from it. We ought to know with whom we are dealing. The American people deserve a little sunshine from this industry and on this industry.

Last night, the House turned away from transparency. They supported the status quo. What we need is a full and open conference process so we can take up this very important issue once again that the House believes was somehow not very important, even though 288 Members of the House of Representatives—that is two-thirds of the House of Representatives—have signed on to this principle that these people ought to register. We can take that up then in conference, both the House and Senate, working together.

Is every word in this bill the way it ought to be? If somebody wants to point out some things that ought to be changed, I am open to that. But don't forget, 288 people in the House have signed on. It can't be too bad.

So if we don't get to conference or if we have to debate this again on the floor of the Senate, we might not get 60 votes again. So I worry we will miss the best opportunity we have had for openness and transparency in years.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. WYDEN pertaining to the introduction of S. 2098 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRANKEN). The Senator from Minnesota.

NEW ENERGY AGENDA

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I am on the floor today to discuss something that has been a top priority for me in the Senate; that is, the critical need to get serious about building a new energy agenda for America, one that keeps our businesses competitive in the global economy, preserves the integrity of our environment, and restarts the engine that has always kept our country moving forward—and that is innovation. I am specifically focused on the energy tax extenders, those that are so necessary for us to keep going in the area of homegrown and renewable energy.

We all know there is no single solution for getting us there. What we need is not a silver bullet; we need a silver buckshot, as we like to say in Minnesota.

I have talked about the need with many of my colleagues to continue developing alternative resources such as hydro, geothermal, biofuels, solar, wind, and we have also talked about how we need to continue to develop existing technologies such as domestic oil and gas production while enforcing appropriate safeguards. This is the very ''all-of-the-above'' approach we need to take in order to keep all options on the table.

This means exploring some of the new proposals we have seen with promising technologies such as the smart grid. But it also means extending the critical tax incentives that have been so important in advancing the development of the next generation of biofuels and the next generation of renewable energy. That is why I have pushed to ensure that we have the right policies in place for encouraging clean energy innovation, including the biodiesel tax credit which supports over 31,000 jobs and has allowed domestic production to more than double since 2011. It means the production tax credit, which made it possible for wind power to represent over one-third of all new electricity generation capacity in the United States last year.

Think of that figure. Think of the strides we have made and where we can go in the future. The advanced energy manufacturing tax credit has leveraged