

S. 2527

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2527, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to improve the efficiency of summer meals.

S. 2543

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2543, a bill to support afterschool and out-of-school-time science, technology, engineering, and mathematics programs, and for other purposes.

S. 2599

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2599, a bill to stop exploitation through trafficking.

S. 2621

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2621, a bill to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamp Act to increase the price of Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamps to fund the acquisition of conservation easements for migratory birds, and for other purposes.

S. 2646

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 2646, a bill to reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, and for other purposes.

S. 2714

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2714, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of World War I.

S. 2746

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 2746, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the health of children and help better understand and enhance awareness about unexpected sudden death in early life.

S. 2782

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) were added as cosponsors of S. 2782, a bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to improve the Federal charter for the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 2793

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) were added as cosponsors of S. 2793, a bill to authorize the award of the Medal of Honor to Henry Johnson.

S. 2796

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2796, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to increase the income protection allowances.

S. 2802

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2802, a bill to amend the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002 and the Educational Technical Assistance Act of 2002 to strengthen research in adult education.

S. 2809

At the request of Mr. JOHANNES, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2809, a bill to require the Environmental Protection Agency to obtain a court order to garnish wages to pay a nontax debt.

S. RES. 541

At the request of Mr. COONS, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 541, a resolution recognizing the severe threat that the Ebola outbreak in West Africa poses to populations, governments, and economies across Africa and, if not properly contained, to regions across the globe, and expressing support for those affected by this epidemic.

S. RES. 543

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 543, a resolution designating November 1, 2014, as National Bison Day.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mr. SESSIONS):

S. 2813. A bill to establish the National Prostate Cancer Council for improved screening, early detection, assessment, and monitoring of prostate cancer, and to direct the development and implementation of a national strategic plan to expedite advancement of diagnostic tools and the transfer of such tools to patients; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, today I am proud to introduce the National Prostate Cancer Council Act with my colleague, Senator SESSIONS. This bipartisan legislation addresses the urgent need for a national strategy for the accelerated creation, advancement, and testing of diagnostic tools to be used in the fight against prostate cancer.

Prostate cancer is the second most common cancer in the United States, and the second-leading cause of cancer-related death in men. The American Cancer Society estimates that in 2014, 233,000 new cases of prostate cancer will be diagnosed and almost 30,000 men will die from the disease.

Early detection of prostate cancer saves lives. Unfortunately, current screening techniques result in numerous false-negatives, leaving men at risk to wrongly believe they are cancer-free, and false-positive alarms, which often lead to painful, costly, and unnecessary procedures. In addition, the prostate is one of the few organs in the human body where biopsies are performed blindly, which can miss cancer even when multiple samples are taken.

The National Prostate Cancer Council Act mirrors the commitment the Federal government has made to fight Alzheimer's disease under the National Alzheimer's Project Act, which was signed into law in 2011. Similarly, this bill will bring together federal agencies, medical and scientific experts, advocacy organizations, and patient survivors to create a clear national plan for achieving the ultimate goal developing reliable tests that can detect prostate cancer and diagnose its severity.

The National Prostate Cancer Council will evaluate our current efforts across all Federal agencies, and it will coordinate those efforts to be more effective. Congress and the Department of Health and Human Services will receive a report from the Council each year detailing the progress made toward fulfilling the national plan.

A national strategy and commitment can be the key to diagnosing prostate cancer earlier and more accurately. It will help us identify the best use of our resources and focus on the most pressing needs, ultimately saving lives and reducing unnecessary procedures. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this effort, and to cosponsor this legislation.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL):

S. 2814. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to reform the National Labor Relations Board, the Office of the General Counsel, and the process for appellate review, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, today I am introducing the NLRB Reform Act with Senator MCCONNELL. Our legislation is very simple. It will change the NLRB from an advocate to an umpire. That is the role the National Labor Relations Board was always supposed to have. The Board was created 79 years ago to act as an impartial umpire in labor disputes that threaten the free flow of commerce. The Board's decisions affect millions of private sector workers. But over time the Board has become an advocate for one interest group or the other, changing positions with each new administration.

There are three significant problems the Board faces today:

No. 1, the biggest problem is partisan advocacy. Today the majority of the five-member Board is made up of appointees who follow President Obama's political leanings. President Obama has appointed three labor union leaders to the Board.

No. 2, the Board also has a free-wheeling advocate for its general counsel. The Board's most recent general counsels have been exceeding their statutory authority and bringing questionable cases that threaten American jobs and threaten sending overseas manufacturing jobs that we need to keep here.

No. 3, the National Labor Relations Board has been slow to resolve disputes. Last year 109 cases—that is 30 percent of the Board's caseload—were pending for more than a year.

Occasionally someone will say to me: If Republicans were to win the Senate, what would Republicans do?

What we would do is try to come up with sensible proposals that lead us in the right direction, proposals that have so much commonsense that they attract the support of enough Democrats and the House of Representatives and the President to become law. This is one such proposal.

Our bill provides three solutions to the problems I identified:

No. 1, it would end partisan advocacy on the National Labor Relations Board. The Board would become a six-member board of three Republicans and three Democrats, and a required majority of four will force both sides to find a middle ground.

No. 2, it reins in the general counsel. Businesses and unions would be able to challenge complaints filed by the general counsel by taking them to the Federal district court, and they will have greater transparency about the basis and legal reasoning for the charges brought by the general counsel.

No. 3, our legislation would encourage timely decisions. First, either party in a case before the Board may appeal to a Federal court of appeals if the Board fails to reach a decision in 1 year. Second, funding for the entire NLRB would be reduced by 20 percent if the Board is not able to decide 90 percent of its cases within 1 year over the first 2-year period following reform.

Our bill would offer these solutions without taking away one single right, one single remedy from any employee, business, or union.

With each new administration, the pendulum at the NLRB has swung further from the middle, further away from being an umpire. The result is that labor policy whipsaws back and forth, taking employees and employers for a wild ride. This has happened under most administrations, but it has been worse under the current administration. The minority leader mentioned several of those examples.

Under the partisan advocacy of today's National Labor Relations Board, workers are losing their right to privacy. The Board is embarking on a regulatory effort to expand requirements that employers give employees' names and addresses to union organizers. The Board wants more personal information about these employees to be given to the organizing union, including telephone numbers, email addresses, the employee's work location, the employee's shift, the job classifications. They propose doing everything but attaching a GPS to the lapel of each employee.

In my State of Tennessee, for example, we have had an ongoing organizing effort in the Volkswagen plant in Chattanooga. In a secret ballot election last February, employees at the Volkswagen plant said: We don't want a union; we don't need a union. So 712 to 626 they rejected the United Auto Workers' bid to unionize the plant. Imagine if you were one of those 712 employees who voted against unionizing. Now organizers can get your private email address and all of this other personal information.

Here is another example. Factions of employees within single stores now have a path to forming their own unions. In 2011 the Board suddenly adopted a new way to define what makes a local union bargaining unit. The Board changed the law so that any group of employees with an overwhelming community of interest could become a bargaining unit and therefore a union. At the same time, the Board is moving a regulation to limit the employer's ability to question which employees should be in a bargaining unit. This allows a union to cherry-pick employees who will be most likely to support forming a union.

How has this worked in the real world? Here is an example. The Board just approved a bargaining unit for cosmetic and fragrance employees in a Macy's department store—not the shoe salespeople, not the lady's fashion employees, not the junior's department,

just cosmetic and fragrance. Imagine if every department of Macy's decided to form a union. The employer would have dozens of different groups to negotiate with, and the different unions would be fighting each other over who got the better raises and break rooms in terms of employment.

During this administration the NLRB has ruled that common employment policies are unfair labor practices, such as—and Senator SCOTT brought this up at a hearing the other day—the NLRB has said that an employer may not have a policy that requires employees to be courteous to customers and fellow employees, or prohibiting employees from making negative comments about the business that employs them on social media or selecting arbitration for employment disputes.

Our solution: Senator MCCONNELL and I would solve this by requiring a six-member board of three Republicans and three Democrats. Like the Federal Election Commission, a majority of four will require both sides to find a middle ground.

Here is the second problem. The Board's general counsel is acting like a free-wheeling advocate, stretching labor law to its limits and sometimes beyond its limits. For example, in 2011 the general counsel moved to stop Boeing from building new airplanes at a nonunion plant in South Carolina. The general counsel to the NLRB jeopardized a \$1 billion factory and hundreds of jobs with this move, but even worse, he tried to make the case that a unionized American company can't expand its operations into one of the 24 States, such as Tennessee, with right-to-work laws which protect a worker's right to join or not to join a union. The general counsel eventually withdrew this outrageous complaint against Boeing, but if it had set a precedent, jobs would have fled overseas as manufacturers look to find a competitive environment in which to make and sell cars around the world.

We want to make sure manufacturers such as Boeing, Nissan, and General Motors can have a competitive environment in the United States in which they can make airplanes and cars and other goods and sell them around the world. We do not want them making them in Mexico or Japan or Europe or somewhere else because we have undermined right-to-work laws. Our solution would allow employers and unions to challenge complaints filed against them by the general counsel in Federal court and give employers and unions new rights to learn the basis and legal reasoning of charges filed against them by the general counsel.

Finally, the NLRB is taking too long to resolve cases. For example, one case has been pending at the Board for more than 7 years. The case involves the question of whether an employer has to allow labor union organizers access to private property.

Our solution—Senator MCCONNELL and I encourage a timely resolution of

cases, first, by allowing either party to appeal to a Federal court of appeals for a de novo, or fresh, review if the Board fails to reach a decision on the case within 1 year. To further incentivize timely resolution, we include the threat of a 20-percent budget cut with the Board if 90 percent of the cases are not decided within a year.

In conclusion, while the increasing partisanship of the Board has appeared in Republican administrations as well as Democratic administrations, it has reached a climax in this administration. Three of this President's recent nominees came from major labor unions' leadership. One law professor at a major university said she can't use the most recent labor law textbook. The decisions changing the law are coming out so rapidly and the NLRB is venturing into new territory with these efforts at rulemaking. This is no way to maintain a national labor law policy.

Our plan, the NLRB Reform Act, will, first, end partisan advocacy; second, rein in the general counsel; third, it will encourage timely decisions. Our bill would offer these solutions without taking away one right or one remedy from one employee, one business, or one union. I hope my colleagues will carefully review this proposal and consider cosponsoring the NLRB Reform Act.

By Mrs. FISCHER:

S. 2817. A bill to assign the Office of Strategic Planning and Policy Analysis of the Federal Communications Commission the responsibility of bringing institutional focus to the important function of approving new technologies and improving regulatory certainty at the Commission; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, today I introduced the Helping Innovation and Revitalizing Innovation Act. It is a Federal Communications Commission, FCC, process reform idea called the HIRE Act. This measure seeks to make the FCC more efficient and accountable in processing new technology applications.

Section 7 of the Communications Act requires the FCC to review new technologies and determine whether or not approval is in the public interest within one year of application—a deadline Congress imposed on the FCC in 1982. Part of Section 7 reads, “The Commission shall determine whether any new technology or service proposed in a petition or application is in the public interest within one year after such petition or application is filed.”

The HIRE Act would complement Section 7. Specifically, it would: require the FCC Office of Strategic Planning and Policy Analysis to help facilitate attention and response to pending technology applications and licenses and it would require the FCC to report to Congress any time it fails to comply with the 1-year deadline for review of such applications.

Right now when the FCC misses its 1 year deadline nothing happens. The notification clause in this bill would provide a backstop for the FCC to enhance regulatory certainty for innovators and consumers alike.

Specifically, the HIRE Act would bring institutional focus to the important function of approving new technologies. FCC delays stall new opportunities for investment and job creation that are critical at this time in our Nation's history. FCC delays also deprive consumers from the benefits of accessing new technologies at lower prices.

The senior Republican Commissioner at the FCC, Ajit Pai, has identified assisting new technology applications as a high priority. In a July 18, 2012, speech at Carnegie Mellon University, he said, “Bureaucratic inertia should not be a barrier to the deployment of new services or capital investment. Rather, the Commission should facilitate economic growth and job creation by making decisions in a timely manner . . . Entrepreneurs need an advocate at the FCC—one that will hold us accountable if we delay, rather than decide.” Additionally, the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, IEEE, has encouraged the FCC improve its decision-making process for spectrum management.

The HIRE Act is about improving the FCC's decision-making process and supporting job creation. It is a small, common-sense reform that increases government efficiency without increasing spending. I look forward to working with consumers, businesses, and those in the Federal Government who want to make our government more effective, efficient, and responsive. The HIRE Act is one proposal that would do that, and I welcome a conversation with others about this important issue.

By Mr. REID:

S. 2820. A bill to provide for the withdrawal of certain Federal land in Garden Valley, Nevada; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

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. 2820

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 “Garden Valley Withdrawal Act”.

SEC. 2. GARDEN VALLEY, NEVADA, WITHDRAWAL.

Subject to valid existing rights in existence on the date of enactment of this Act, the approximately 805,100 acres of Federal land generally depicted on the map entitled “Garden Valley Withdrawal Area” and dated July 11, 2014, is withdrawn from—

- (1) entry, appropriation, and disposal under the public land laws;
- (2) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and
- (3) operation of the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 2823. A bill to require approval for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of oil or natural gas pipelines or electric transmission facilities at the national boundary of the United States for the import or export of oil, natural gas, or electricity to or from Canada or Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I rise today to present the North American Energy Infrastructure Act. It is a bipartisan piece of legislation that I think is very important to helping our country build the infrastructure we need to truly become energy independent or energy self-sufficient—energy secure, if you will.

This is bipartisan legislation. It is legislation that has already passed the House. It was sponsored in the House by Representative FRED UPTON, who is the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee. It was cosponsored on the Democratic side by GENE GREEN, a Congressman from Texas. I have bipartisan sponsors for this legislation in the Senate as well—on the Republican side, Senator LISA MURKOWSKI, who is the ranking member on the energy committee; and then I have two other members of the energy committee who are Democrats cosponsoring this legislation as well, Senator JOE DONNELLY from Indiana and Senator JOE MANCHIN from West Virginia. Certainly Senator MANCHIN is recognized as one of the leaders in the Senate on important energy issues. I am very appreciative of having him join me on this legislation as well. I am introducing this legislation now.

This is the sixth anniversary of the application by TransCanada for a permit to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline. They applied for approval of a pipeline project—the Keystone XL Pipeline project—6 years ago as of Friday of this week. Can you imagine that? Americans fought and won World War II in less time than this application has been pending before the President of the United States, yet still no decision from this administration after 6 years.

This is vital infrastructure we need to truly make this country energy secure. Working with Canada, we can truly produce more energy than we consume and make our country energy secure, but we cannot do it without the necessary infrastructure—the roads, the pipelines, the rail, the transmission lines—the energy infrastructure we need to get energy from where it is produced, places such as my State of North Dakota, which is now the second largest producer of oil in this country, second only to Texas. We produce more than 1 million barrels a day of oil, but we have to get it to market. It is getting loaded and overloaded on rail. We have tremendous congestion on rail. Our farmers cannot get their ag products to market anymore because we

have so much congestion on the rail. Yet here we have an application that has been held for 6 years by the President of the United States without a decision. That is after last year when he came to the Republican caucus and told us point blank that he would have a decision before the end of 2013. No decision. Here we are in 2014, the sixth anniversary.

Well, look, we cannot continue to have that problem.

We have to find a way to build this infrastructure. Even though we are working on Keystone on a separate track—and I believe we will have the votes next year to pass it. We will have the 60 votes in the Senate we need to pass it. We are at 57 right now. We are very close. I think by next year we will have those 60 votes to pass Keystone, and we will work to do that and attach it to legislation the President will not veto. So we will continue to work on Keystone on that track, but at the same time we have to avoid this problem in the future with oil pipelines, with gas pipelines, and with transmission lines.

We have to be able to build that infrastructure not only in this country, but we have to be able to cross the border with Canada. Canada is a huge producer of energy. So working together, we have this incredible opportunity if we can build the infrastructure to do it. It is not just for fossil fuels. It is not just for oil. It is not just for gas. It is for renewables as well. Canada produces an incredible amount of hydro, which, of course, is electricity. We need transmission lines to bring that renewable hydro across the border.

So this is about all forms of energy, and this is about working with our closest friend and ally to truly address that energy issue. It is a job-creation issue. It is a national security issue.

What does this legislation do, the North American Energy Infrastructure Act? What it does is it expedites, streamlines the approval process for cross-border construction of oil pipelines, gas pipelines, and electric transmission lines.

How does it work? First, oil pipelines. Right now, a Presidential national interest determination is needed for approval or authority to build an oil pipeline across the Canadian border. Of course, that is the problem we see with Keystone. That has been held up now for 6 years. So this changes that process for future projects. As I said, it has already passed the House overwhelmingly—overwhelmingly. I think it had pretty much all of the Republican votes and I think more than 50 votes on the Democratic side. They had very strong bipartisan support in the House.

What it does is it changes that approval process for crossing the border with an oil pipeline, moving it to the State Department. So the State Department will make that determination approving a cross-border transfer. It will still be subject to the NEPA

process. You will still have to do an environmental impact statement. But the focus of that EIS—environmental impact statement—or the NEPA process, will be on the border section, not on the entire length of the project throughout all the States that pipeline may cross. It will focus on the border section. And the State Department has to come up with reasonable rules to determine what that distance is that constitutes crossing the border with Canada.

Then the rest of the NEPA process will continue just as it does today for any other project that does not come across the border. Right now States have their jurisdiction in some cases and the Federal Government has its jurisdiction in some cases, depending on whether it is private land or it is public land or Federal land. Maybe it is a body of water. Whatever. So the NEPA process continues as before, driven by the States or the Federal Government depending on what particular part of the country or the type of land or the body of water you are crossing.

I think that is why it garnered such strong bipartisan support. We continue that process and those protections, but we do not allow the determination on the cross-border process or the cross-border piece to be held up by all of the NEPA process and all of the sitings that may be covered in all the respective States that pipeline crosses. Those processes are already in place. Do not use crossing the border as an excuse to tie up all these other processes and basically usurp the authority of the States that are affected by that project.

I think it is a very reasonable process, and it is one that I think we should be able to come together on in a bipartisan way to say: It is open. It is fair. That is why we have bipartisan support in the sponsorship—Senator DONNELLY, Senator MANCHIN, Senator MURKOWSKI, myself, all people who work on energy—because we have struck that balance. It is about creating a good business climate that will encourage that investment to create the infrastructure we need to move the energy from where it is produced to where it is consumed in the safest way possible—in the most economic way possible.

That is what it is about, the best environmental stewardship. Isn't that what we all want? Obviously it is. But if we don't do this, where are we? Well, right now we are waiting 6 years for a determination on the Keystone XL Pipeline.

Here is another example I will give, the Bakken North pipeline, a pipeline that goes from North Dakota to Cushing, and they have been waiting for 1½ years on an ownership name change from the Department of State, 1½ years to change the name. Really? Does that make sense to anybody? If it takes that long for something that simple, what do we do when we actually need to build this infrastructure

that is so important to the energy future of our country?

What about gas pipelines? Gas pipelines will be covered by FERC, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. What we say is: Look, they will go through the NEPA process too. Just as we describe with the Department of State on an oil pipeline, they will take that cross-border piece and do the same thing, do a NEPA process so you have an environmental impact statement and cover all the bases. But then 30 days after, they have to make a decision. They can't just sit on it, and the rest of the NEPA process continues as we described on an oil pipeline. Again, very simple, very straightforward, and it comports with the free trade agreements we have with Canada and with Mexico.

On the third piece, electric transmission lines, that process will be overseen by the Department of Energy. We simply streamline the process. Right now there are two permits required, one that is driven by the administration, one that is congressionally driven. We combine those and make it one process; again, cover all the bases, as I have described, with an oil pipeline or a gas pipeline, but we make it one process instead of a duplicative process.

When we look at what is going on in the world today, we see why this legislation is so important. Look at ISIL. Look at ISIL in the Middle East and what is happening there. We are right now confronting how we need to address this very significant challenge, how we need to work with allies in the region to take out ISIL. Do we really want to continue to be dependent on oil from the Middle East? I think we could ask every single American that question and the answer would be a resounding no. There is no way we want to have to get oil from the Middle East. But we still are today. Yet we can produce more oil and gas in this country, particularly with Canada, than we can consume.

Why would we continue to want to be dependent on the Middle East or Venezuela or any other place that is antagonistic or hostile toward our interests? We don't. This is a national security issue. It is an energy issue. It is a job creation issue. It is an economic growth issue. And it is for darned sure a national security issue. Which is why every time we ask the public about it, more than two-thirds say: Yes, build that infrastructure. Build that Keystone Pipeline. Let's work with Canada, our closest friend and ally in the world, to get our energy.

Look what is going on in Europe. Look what is going on with Russia and Ukraine. Look at the situation a country such as Ukraine or the European Union is in because of Russian aggression. Where do they get their energy? Where does Ukraine get its energy? Where does the European Union get their energy? They get a third or more—from? Russia. Russia, the same

country that is invading Ukraine, the same country occupying Crimea and the eastern part of Ukraine.

Then when we try to get the European Union to join with us to push back, what do they say? Geez, I don't know. We can't, because Russia is going to cut off the gas and it is fall and it is getting colder.

Does that make sense to anybody? Is that the situation we want to be in? I think it is pretty compelling. Do we want to be in a situation where we have to try to get oil out of the Middle East with ISIL over there operating the way they are? I don't think so.

These issues are all interrelated, and they are not short-term issues. We can't start building that infrastructure today and have it done tomorrow. These are billion-dollar investments. They don't cost the government a single penny, but they are billion-dollar investments that private enterprise is willing to make and put people to work, provide that energy more safely, more securely, with better environmental stewardship, and address our national security challenges. That type of energy plan is a long-term plan for this country, and it is one we need to start now.

For six years we have been waiting for a decision from the President on a multibillion dollar pipeline project that will not only bring oil from Canada to the United States but will move 100,000 barrels a day of oil from my home State to refineries in this country, that by the State Department's own admission will create more than 40,000 jobs, that will create hundreds of millions in tax revenue, that will help us create energy security for our country, that will allow us to work with our closest friend and ally, Canada, rather than telling them: No, we are not going to work with you. Send that oil to China. It is something the American people overwhelmingly want by about 70 percent in most of the polls that I guess is being held up by special interest groups.

This is about how we run this country. This is about who we work for. This is about having a long-term plan to build the kind of energy future for America that I believe the American people very much want.

Let's go to work and pass this bipartisan legislation.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 2832. A bill to provide for youth jobs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, if you talk to the people in Vermont, and I suspect in any other State in America, they will say the most serious crisis facing this country is the lack of decent-paying jobs, particularly when it comes to young Americans. This is an issue we do not talk enough about, and this is an issue on which we have to focus.

Yes, we are better off today than we were 6 years ago when we were hemorrhaging 700,000 jobs a month and the Nation's financial system was on the verge of collapse, but the truth is that the economy for working families and lower income families today remains in very difficult straits. The middle class of this country—the backbone of this country—continues to disappear and more and more people are living in poverty. In fact, we have almost more people living in poverty today than at any time in the history of this country, and all the while we are seeing more wealth and income inequality, such that 95 percent of all new income generated in America since the Wall Street crash is going to the top 1 percent.

The fact is that real unemployment in this country is not the “official” 6.1 percent we see on the front pages of newspapers. The truth is that if you count those people who have given up looking for work because they live in high-unemployment areas or the people—and there are many of these—who are working part time when they want to work full time, real unemployment is 12 percent. That is a crisis situation.

As bad as that is, the unemployment rate is far worse for young Americans. Today the youth unemployment rate is 20 percent—20 percent. We all paid a lot of attention to the tragedy in Ferguson, MO, a few weeks ago, but what was not discussed is that African-American youth unemployment is 33 percent, and in many areas of the country it is even higher than that. Today over 5.5 million young people have either dropped out of high school or have graduated high school. And do you know what they are doing? Nothing. They have no jobs. Many of them in Vermont and throughout this country are hanging out on street corners and many of them are getting into trouble. Maybe they are doing drugs, maybe they are involved in crime, but this I will tell you, and the statistics are very clear on this: If you leave school—either you drop out or you graduate high school—and you don't get a job in your first year, you don't get a job in your second year, you don't get a job in your third year, there is a strong likelihood you will never get a job, never get a career, never make it to the middle class, never be part of mainstream America.

Youth unemployment at 20 percent is clearly one of the reasons why in the United States of America we have more people in jail today than any other country on Earth. A lot of people don't know that. China's a great big country, a Communist authoritarian country. Doesn't China have more people in jail than we do? No. We have more people in jail than China.

I think the time is long overdue for us to start investing in our young people, helping them get the jobs they need, helping them get the education they need, helping them get the job training they need so they can be part

of our economy, part of the middle class, and not end up in jail or dead from overdoses of drugs. The situation is so dire that there are studies out there that tell us now that one out of every three African-American males born today, if we do not change this, will go to prison in his lifetime—one out of three. This is a crisis situation, and it is one that cannot be ignored.

The legislation I have introduced today, along with Congressman JOHN CONYERS of Michigan, is called the Employ Young Americans Now Act. This legislation will provide \$5.5 billion in immediate funding to States and localities throughout the country to employ 1 million young Americans between the ages of 16 and 24 and provide job training to hundreds of thousands of other young Americans. Under our bill the U.S. Department of Labor would provide \$4 billion in grants to States and local governments to provide summer jobs and year-round employment opportunities for economically disadvantaged youth, with direct links to academic and occupational learning. There is another \$1.5 billion in there to provide such services as transportation or childcare, which would be necessary to enable young Americans to participate in job opportunities.

I am very grateful this legislation has already been endorsed by the AFL-CIO, which is the largest labor union in the country, representing some 13 million workers; the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees; the United Auto Workers; the United Steel Workers of America; the Campaign for America's Future; and the National Employment Law Project.

I thank Senator DEBBIE STABENOW of Michigan for her support on this legislation as well.

We cannot continue to ignore the crisis of youth unemployment in America. We are talking about the future of an entire generation. We are talking about the future of the United States of America. Let's start focusing on this issue. Let's give millions of young people the opportunity to earn a paycheck and to make it into the middle class.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 546—CONGRATULATING INDONESIA'S PRESIDENT-ELECT JOKO WIDODO ON HIS ELECTORAL VICTORY AND COMMENDING THE PEOPLE OF INDONESIA ON THEIR COMMITMENT TO DEMOCRACY AND FREE AND FAIR ELECTIONS

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

S. RES. 546

Whereas the United States and Indonesia are the world's second and third largest democracies, respectively;

Whereas the United States and Indonesia share many common values, including respect for human rights and the rule of law;