

**SENATE RESOLUTION 210—RECOGNIZING AND HONORING ROBERT S. MUELLER, III, DIRECTOR OF THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION**

Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Ms. HIRONO) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 210

Whereas Robert S. Mueller, III has enjoyed a long and distinguished career in public service as a military officer, as a prosecutor, and as the sixth Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (referred to in this preamble as the “FBI”);

Whereas Director Mueller received his undergraduate degree from Princeton University, a master’s degree in International Relations from New York University, and a juris doctor from the University of Virginia;

Whereas Director Mueller served with bravery in the United States Marine Corps during the Vietnam War, leading a rifle platoon of the 3rd Marine Division and earning the Bronze Star, 2 Navy Commendation Medals, the Purple Heart, and the Vietnamese Cross of Gallantry;

Whereas Director Mueller began his career in law enforcement in 1976 as an Assistant United States Attorney in the United States Attorney’s Office for the Northern District of California in San Francisco, and then served as an Assistant United States Attorney for the District of Massachusetts in Boston;

Whereas Director Mueller later served in a variety of other positions in the Department of Justice, including as a senior litigator in the Homicide Section of the United States Attorney’s Office for the District of Columbia, assistant to Attorney General Richard L. Thornburgh, and Assistant Attorney General for the Criminal Division;

Whereas, in 1998, Director Mueller was nominated by President William J. Clinton and confirmed by the Senate to be the United States Attorney for the Northern District of California in San Francisco;

Whereas, in 2001, Director Mueller was nominated by President George W. Bush and confirmed by the Senate to be the Director of the FBI;

Whereas Director Mueller took office as Director of the FBI on September 4, 2001, just 1 week before the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001;

Whereas Director Mueller led the FBI in the wake of the September 11 attacks and helped transform the FBI into an intelligence-driven organization with a primary focus on national security threats;

Whereas, in 2011, Director Mueller again answered the call to public service by agreeing to serve for an additional 2 years beyond his original 10-year term as Director of the FBI;

Whereas, in 2011, Congress enacted legislation creating a special 2-year term that enabled Director Mueller to continue serving as Director of the FBI;

Whereas Director Mueller has earned the trust and respect of Senators from both parties as a result of his candor, integrity, and unwavering commitment to the rule of law; and

Whereas, throughout the past 12 years, Director Mueller has embodied the principles of fidelity, bravery, and integrity that are at the core of the FBI: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes and honors the distinguished service of Robert S. Mueller, III as the sixth

Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; and

(2) expresses, on behalf of the United States, its deep appreciation to Director Mueller for his dedication, sacrifice, and outstanding service to his country.

**SENATE RESOLUTION 211—DESIGNATING SEPTEMBER 2013 AS “NATIONAL SPINAL CORD INJURY AWARENESS MONTH”**

Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. NELSON) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 211

Whereas the estimated 1,275,000 individuals in the United States who live with a spinal cord injury cost society billions of dollars in health care costs and lost wages;

Whereas an estimated 100,000 of those people are veterans who suffered the spinal cord injury while serving as members of the Armed Forces of the United States;

Whereas accidents are the leading cause of spinal cord injuries;

Whereas motor vehicle crashes are the second leading cause of spinal cord and traumatic brain injuries;

Whereas 70 percent of all spinal cord injuries that occur in children under the age of 18 are a result of motor vehicle accidents;

Whereas every 48 minutes a person will become paralyzed, underscoring the urgent need to develop new neuroprotection, pharmacological, and regeneration treatments to reduce, prevent, and reverse paralysis; and

Whereas increased education and investment in research are key factors in improving outcomes for victims of spinal cord injuries, improving the quality of life of victims, and ultimately curing paralysis: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) designates September 2013 as “National Spinal Cord Injury Awareness Month”;

(2) supports the goals and ideals of National Spinal Cord Injury Awareness Month;

(3) continues to support research to find better treatments, therapies, and a cure for paralysis;

(4) supports clinical trials for new therapies that offer promise and hope to those persons living with paralysis; and

(5) commends the dedication of local, regional, and national organizations, researchers, doctors, volunteers, and people across the United States that are working to improve the quality of life of people living with paralysis and their families.

**SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 21—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT CONSTRUCTION OF THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE AND THE FEDERAL APPROVALS REQUIRED FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE ARE IN THE NATIONAL INTEREST OF THE UNITED STATES**

Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. BEGICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. THUNE, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. JOHANNES, and Mr. BARRASSO) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

S. CON. RES. 21

Whereas safe and responsible production, transportation, and use of oil and petroleum

products provide the foundation of the energy economy of the United States, helping to secure and advance the economic prosperity, national security, and overall quality of life in the United States;

Whereas the Keystone XL pipeline would provide short- and long-term employment opportunities and related labor income benefits, such as government revenues associated with taxes;

Whereas the State of Nebraska has thoroughly reviewed and approved the proposed Keystone XL pipeline reroute, concluding that the concerns of Nebraskans have had a major influence on the pipeline reroute and that the reroute will have minimal environmental impacts;

Whereas the Department of State and other Federal agencies have conducted extensive studies and analysis over a long period of time on the technical, environmental, social, and economic impact of the proposed Keystone XL pipeline;

Whereas assessments by the Department of State found that the Keystone XL pipeline is “not likely to impact the amount of crude oil produced from the oil sands” and that “approval or denial of the proposed Project is unlikely to have a substantial impact on the rate of development in the oil sands”;

Whereas the Department of State found that the incremental life cycle greenhouse gas emissions associated with the Keystone XL project are estimated in the range of 0.07 to 0.83 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents, with the upper end of this range representing 121,000 of 1 percent of the 6,702,000,000 metric tons of carbon dioxide emitted in the United States in 2011;

Whereas after extensive evaluation of potential impact to land and water resources along the 875-mile proposed route of the Keystone XL pipeline, the Department of State found, “The analyses of potential impacts associated with construction and normal operation of the proposed Project suggest that there would be no significant impacts to most resources along the proposed Project route (assuming Keystone complies with all laws and required conditions and measures).”;

Whereas the Department of State found that “[s]pills associated with the proposed Project that enter the environment are expected to be rare and relatively small” and that “there is no evidence of increased corrosion or other pipeline threat due to viscosity” of diluted bitumen oil that will be transported by the Keystone XL pipeline;

Whereas, the National Research Council convened a special expert panel to review the risk of transporting diluted bitumen by pipeline and issued a report in June 2013 to the Department of Transportation in which the National Research Council found that existing literature indicates that transportation of diluted bitumen poses no increased risk of pipeline failure;

Whereas plans to incorporate 57 project-specific special conditions relating to the design, construction, and operations of the Keystone XL pipeline led the Department of State to find that the pipeline will have “a degree of safety over any other typically constructed domestic oil pipeline”; and

Whereas, the Department of State found that oil destined to be shipped through the pipeline from the oil sands region of Canada and oil shale deposits in the United States would otherwise move by other modes of transportation if the Keystone XL pipeline is not built; Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That it is the sense of Congress that—

(1) construction of the Keystone XL pipeline will promote sound investment in the infrastructure of the United States;

(2) construction of the Keystone XL pipeline will promote energy security in North America and will generate an increase in private sector jobs that will benefit both the region surrounding the Keystone XL pipeline and the United States as a whole; and

(3) completion of the Keystone XL pipeline is in the national interest of the United States.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to talk about the Keystone XL Pipeline. I am going to submit a concurrent resolution that I am sponsoring with MARY LANDRIEU of Louisiana, but before I do that, I want to talk specifically in terms of the Keystone XL Pipeline and correcting the record. I am correcting the record relative to statements the administration has made recently about the project.

As we all know, the Obama administration has been reviewing this project for 5 years. The initial application was submitted by TransCanada, the parent company, in September of 2008, and we are now almost in August of 2013. So in addition to delaying the project, they are also putting out false information. President Obama and Treasury Secretary Lew presented information this week on the Keystone Pipeline that is wrong, and today I want to correct the record.

I want to quote directly from an interview President Obama conducted and reported in the New York Times on Saturday. I am going to read from that transcript because it goes to a number of issues in terms of jobs and energy development as well as the requirements the administration says need to be addressed for the Keystone Pipeline. However, I think the company has addressed those issues in great detail.

Again, this is the transcript from the New York Times. Also, the interview was conducted last week when the President was on his jobs tour.

The interviewer said:

A couple of other quick subjects that are economic-related. Keystone pipeline—Republicans especially talked about that as a big job creator. You've said that you would approve it only if you could be assured it would not significantly exacerbate carbon in the atmosphere. Is there anything that Canada could do or the oil companies could do to offset that as a way of helping you reaching that decision?

That was the question asked of the President. The President responded:

Well, first of all, Michael, [the interviewer] Republicans have said that this would be a big jobs generator. There is no evidence that that's true. And my hope would be that any reporter who is looking at the facts would take the time to confirm that the most realistic estimates are this might create maybe 2,000 jobs during the construction of the pipeline—

That is the Keystone Pipeline.

which might take a year or two—and then after that we're talking somewhere between 50 and 100 [chuckles] jobs in an economy of 150 million working people.

The interviewer goes on:

Yet there are a number of unions who want you to approve this.

Mr. Obama:

Well, look, they might like to see 2,000 jobs initially. But that is a blip relative to the need.

So what we also know is, is that that oil is going to be piped down to the Gulf to be sold on the world oil markets, so it does not bring down gas prices here in the United States. In fact, it might actually cause some gas prices in the Midwest to go up where currently they can't ship some of that oil to world markets.

Now, having said that, there is a potential benefit for us integrating further with a reliable ally to the north our energy supplies.

But I meant what I said; I will evaluate this based on whether or not this is going to significantly contribute to carbon in our atmosphere. And there is no doubt that Canada at the source in those tar sands could potentially be doing more to mitigate carbon releases.

The interviewer asked:

And if they did, could that offset concerns about the pipeline itself?

To which the President responded:

We haven't seen specific ideas or plans. But all of that will go into the mix in terms of John Kerry's decision or recommendation on this issue.

That was the key part of the interview I want to address in my comments.

There are three points I would like to make. The first one is jobs. President Obama says the project will create 2,000 jobs during construction. Then he says maybe 50 or so after that, and he kind of chuckles as he says that.

The first question is: Where does that number come from? Where is he getting his number? His own State Department has a very different number. They say it is going to create more than 42,000 jobs during construction. They didn't say 2,000 jobs during construction, but more than 42,000 jobs during construction.

I will read from the State Department report. It is a draft from the environmental impact statement which came out on March 1, 2013. The State Department report says:

Including direct, indirect, and induced effects, the proposed Project would potentially support approximately 42,100 average annual jobs across the United States over a 1-to 2-year construction period.

That is right out of the report. The State Department goes on to talk about some of the other employment benefits created by the Keystone project.

This employment would potentially translate into approximately \$2.05 billion in earnings. Direct expenditures such as construction and material costs . . . would total approximately \$3.3 billion. Short-term revenues from sources such as sales and use taxes would total approximately \$65 million in states that levy such a tax.

So you are getting tax revenues and \$65 million as well.

Yields from fuel and other taxes could not be calculated, but would provide some additional economic benefit to host countries and states.

There is the environmental impact as to the employment right out of the State Department report. We have to ask: Why is President Obama talking about a number like 2,000? It appears

the number he is quoting comes from opponents of the projects. Rather than taking his own State Department numbers—done after 5 years of study—he is quoting numbers which are wrong from opponents of the project. Again, don't take my word for it.

Recently the Washington Post—in their fact-check article—stated that President Obama appeared to be using numbers from opponents of the project rather than from his own State Department.

So why would he do that? Why would he take numbers from opponents rather than the State Department?

Well, here is what Sean McGarvey, president of North America's Building Trades Unions, had to say about it in a statement he issued several days ago. According to Sean McGarvey, president of North America's Building Trade Unions:

America's Building Trade Unions were disappointed to see that the President chose to minimize the importance of jobs for construction workers and to use employment figures promulgated by special interests and activist billionaires rather than his own Department of State's findings that the proposed Keystone XL Pipeline would support approximately 42,100 average annual jobs across the United States over a 1- to 2-year construction period.

But the President goes on—it is not just the jobs number that is incorrect. The President also stated this in that New York Times interview:

What we also know is, is that that oil is going to be piped down to the Gulf to be sold on the world oil markets, so it does not bring down gas prices here in the United States. In fact, it might actually cause some gas prices in the Midwest to go up where currently they can't ship some of that oil to world markets.

So he is saying the oil won't be used in the United States and, in fact, it might cause gas prices to go up. But now he is contradicting a report from his own Department of Energy. His own Department of Energy addressed those very issues back in June of 2011. They issued a report, and that report forecasted that the oil will be used in the United States and, further, that it will reduce the price of fuel at the pump for Midwest consumers. I will quote from that report. Again, this is a report from the Department of Energy that was provided in June of 2011.

Without a surplus of heavy oil in (the Gulf Coast), there would be no economic incentive to ship Canadian oil sands to Asia via Port Arthur (in Texas). Many of these (Gulf Coast) refineries rely on declining supplies of Mexican and Venezuelan heavy crudes. . . . They would be natural customers for increased supplies of Canadian dilbit (oil sands oil). . . . The Gulf Coast appetite for Canadian oil sands . . . will be much higher than can be supplied by just the Keystone XL Pipeline.

So they are saying it will be used in the United States.

Concerning the cost of fuel to customers, DOE said:

With substantial additional volumes of light-sweet and other crudes accessible to Gulf Coast refineries, (West Texas Intermediate) prices would increase, Brent, Argus

and other market crude prices would decline. Crude costs to (East Coast) and (Gulf Coast) refineries would be lower.

Here is the key sentence from this section:

Gasoline prices in all markets served by (East and Gulf Coast) refineries would be lower, including the Midwest.

So the Department of Energy in its report specifically states that the oil will be used in the United States—we are a net importer of crude oil—and that gas prices would be lower, not higher. As I said earlier, the State Department in the EIS said the job number will be 42,000, not 2,000.

The President then concludes the interview by essentially telling Canada what they should do in terms of their regulatory requirements. He says:

And there is no doubt that Canada at the source in those tar sands could potentially be doing more to mitigate carbon release.

The interviewer then asks:

And if they did, could that offset the concerns about the pipeline itself?

President Obama declines to indicate any specifics, but he says essentially all of that will go into the mix for the decision on whether to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

So here we are. After 5 years—after 5 years of delay, the President is talking about adding new requirements to the project. He is talking about adding those requirements in another country—our closest friend and ally, Canada—or I guess he is essentially saying he would turn down the project—a project that actually reduces greenhouse gas because there is less greenhouse gas if we move that oil by pipeline than if it is moved by truck, by train, or by tanker.

Furthermore, perhaps the biggest irony is that he is imposing this type of regulatory barrier at the same time he is on a jobs tour, which created some problems for his Cabinet members as well. For example, Jack Lew was on “Fox News Sunday” with Chris Wallace, and he got it wrong on Keystone as well last Sunday. The following is part of that transcript. Again, this was “Fox News Sunday” with Chris Wallace and Jack Lew. Wallace asked this question:

Let me ask you one question. If you're so interested in creating more jobs, why not approve the Keystone Pipeline which would create tens of thousands of jobs, sir?

Lew responds:

Chris, I think, as you know, the Keystone Pipeline is being reviewed. It's been in the process that was slowed down because—

Wallace then says:

Several years it's being reviewed. I think what, three, four years.

Lew responds:

It was—there were some political games that were played that took it off the trail, past its completion. When Republicans put it out there as something that was put on a timetable where it could not be resolved, it caused a delay. We are getting to the end of the review and we'll have to see where that review is. But I think playing political games with something like this is a mistake.

So he is saying that somehow the Republicans were playing political games and that slowed down the project and that is why it has been in review for 5 years. Five years it has been in review.

Well, as for Secretary Lew's remarks on “Fox News Sunday,” we need only to let the facts—especially the dates—speak for themselves. Secretary Lew claimed that the Keystone XL project was delayed because Republicans politicized it. I would be happy to share with them a letter I received in the summer of 2011 from Secretary of State Hillary Clinton. In that letter the Secretary assured me that the Department was poised to make a permitting decision on the Keystone XL project by December of that year—December of 2011.

I have the letter here. It is dated July 26, 2011. It is addressed to Senator HOEVEN. It says: “Thank you for your letter regarding the proposed Keystone XL Pipeline.” It goes on to make various comments. The key line in the letter is this: “We expect to make a decision on whether to grant or deny the permit before the end of the year.” This is for the Keystone XL Pipeline project from, at that time, Secretary of State Clinton. Instead, however, during the 2012 Presidential election—less than a year away in November—President Obama intervened to postpone that decision until after the election. Then and only then did I press to seek legislatively for a timely decision on the Keystone XL Pipeline and introduced legislation, which we passed, calling for a decision within 60 days, which the President declined to make. So clearly the delay of 5 years is because the administration has refused to make a decision and not for any other reason.

It is not only time to make a decision on the Keystone Pipeline, it is far past time. That is exactly what the American people want. As a matter of fact, in a recent—the most recent poll on the Keystone Pipeline project, Harris Interactive Poll, 82 percent of Americans support approving the Keystone XL Pipeline—82 percent. The President has continued to review it and talk about more requirements. He has provided incorrect information on the jobs and whether the oil will be used here and the impact on gas prices. But 82 percent of Americans want this project approved.

It is about energy. It is about jobs. It is about economic activity. It is about energy security for our country. That is why, as I conclude here today, I wish to submit for the Senate RECORD today, along with Senator MARY LANDRIEU of Louisiana, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline and the Federal approvals required for construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline are in the national interests of the United States. Essentially, with this concurrent resolution, what we are saying is that the Keystone XL Pipeline is in the national interests of the United States and that the administra-

tion needs to approve it. It is a bipartisan resolution, and we will seek to have it approved here in the Senate and approved in the House as well. This is in addition to bipartisan legislation I have already introduced which would approve the project congressionally.

The simple point is this: We need to keep the push on to get this project approved, whether it is with a joint resolution of Congress in support of the project, getting the President to make a decision and to make a favorable decision and to do it now instead of continuing to postpone after 5 years or whether Congress steps forward and approves the project directly through legislation I have already submitted.

We need to get this project done for the American people. It really is about jobs. It is about economic growth and activity. It is about energy for our country and getting this country to the point where we are energy independent, energy secure, where we don't need to rely on oil from the Middle East. That is why 82 percent of Americans in the most recent poll across this country are saying this is the kind of project we need. Mr. President, step up and get it done for the American people.

#### AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1832. Mr. KING (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1833. Ms. HEITKAMP submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1834. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1835. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1836. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1837. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1838. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1839. Mr. PRYOR (for himself and Mr. BOOZMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

#### TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1832. Mr. KING (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the