

LATEST ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STUDY FROM
STATE DEPARTMENT

The EIS finds that there will be no significant impact on the environment from the project.

State Department finds that crude oil from the pipeline is unlikely to be exported, because the transport cost of getting it to the U.S. combined with transport overseas would be uneconomical.

The study also finds that the failure to construct the pipeline will not negatively affect the rate at which oil is extracted from the oil sands—that is, State Department predicts that rail transport expansion will be able to support additional production.

Ms. LANDRIEU. The path today is crystal clear. Today it is crystal clear. There is no guarantee that next week or next month or when the Republicans take the majority that the path could be as clear as it is today. Let us not miss this opportunity. Let us get our work done on the Keystone XL Pipeline, an important project in this country, and send a message that we have heard the voters and show that trust with us begins today on their behalf.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thank the Presiding Officer and the Senator from Louisiana.

CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT
BLOCK GRANT

Mr. ALEXANDER. Tomorrow at 2:15 we will have a vote on the Child Care and Development Block Grant of 2014.

I want to take a few minutes and explain why it is important to end the debate on the Child Care and Development Block Grant and vote on whether we want to turn it into a law.

When I talk about why it is important, I think of a young woman from Memphis who attended LeMoyne College. This woman had a young child and was able to qualify for a child care voucher from the State of Tennessee. There are about 900,000 families across the country that take advantage of this Federal voucher program. She was able to get \$500 or \$600 a month in order to provide daycare for her child while she pursued a business degree from LeMoyne-Owen College. With the help of this program she graduated with her degree and earned a position as an assistant manager at Walmart. With her new position, she is now able to pay for the child care for her second child without help from the Federal Government. This is exactly the kind of legislating we should be doing at the Federal level.

What is the appropriate role of the Federal Government on an issue such as childcare? The answer this bill gives is that we should enable this young mother and 21,000 other families in Tennessee to take a Federal voucher, choose their own childcare center, and help them to financial independence through work or continued education or training programs. It has been an enormously successful program. The

program has worked for over 20 years and was inaugurated in the administration of George H.W. Bush and was a bipartisan product of Congress. It follows the example of other successful Federal programs by enabling American families to help themselves.

We follow the same model when we deal with Federal Pell grants and loans that help students pay for college. Last year the Presiding Officer will remember we had an agreement in this body on huge changes to the student loan program. President Obama became involved and Secretary Arne Duncan led a bipartisan working group to develop a solution. The Republican House of Representatives came along, and we created new rules for the \$100 billion of loans the Federal Government makes to students every year. The result was a market-based system that is revenue-neutral for the taxpayers, and lowered the interest rates on student loans to undergraduates by about one-half that year. We first used the idea of Federal vouchers for education with the passage of the GI bill in 1944. Recipients can take a voucher and then choose among educational institutions of their choice, such as the University of Notre Dame, University of New Mexico, University of Tennessee, Vanderbilt University, Yeshiva College, or whichever accredited college they so choose. This idea has worked very well and the GI bill may be the most successful piece of social legislation ever passed.

The Child Care and Development Block Grant is a good example of the government working as an enabler rather than simply prescribing mandates. The program provides \$5.3 billion for childcare services for children under the age of 13, with plenty of flexibility. While it has broad bipartisan support, Republican particularly appreciate the flexibility the act provides to States through block grants. States are then able to provide parents with vouchers so that they can select a provider that best meets their needs. It is a model that has proven successful since 1944 and one I hope we continue.

Now we have the chance to move this bill forward by voting to end debate. The cloture vote that we will have tomorrow will reflect that we debated the bill fully and that at least 60 of us believe it is time to move forward and vote yes or no.

Have we all had our say? I believe so. Senator HARKIN, Senator MIKULSKI, and Senator BURR, have worked on this for several years as well as several others of us. It was approved 1 year ago by the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee on a bipartisan basis. Then in March of this year, 2014, the bill was debated and discussed in this very chamber over a 2-day period.

We have had a lot of discussion in the Senate about whether we get to offer amendments. That concern has come from the Senator who is presiding today, that concern has come from me, it has come from the Senator from

Oklahoma, who is here. It is not easy to be elected to the Senate and it is not easy to stay in office. And once elected, senators want their voices to be heard, whether it is on the Keystone Pipeline or the Child Care and Development Block Grant. The Child Care and Development Block Grant went through a model process that began with the Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee, then to the Senate floor on March 12 through unanimous consent. There was no motion for cloture, no filling of the tree, and anyone who offered a relevant amendment was able to share and debate that amendment.

Senators offered 50 different amendments. Then we considered and agreed to 18 of those amendments. This body approved 4 by recorded vote and 14 by voice vote. Senators ENZI, LANDRIEU, FRANKEN, COBURN, BOXER, LEE, PORTMAN, TESTER, SCOTT, THUNE, BENNET, WARREN, VITTER, and SANDERS all had amendments to this bill. They were allowed to offer them, speak on them, and they were either voted on or accepted, and then the bill was passed by the Senate.

The bill then went to the House of Representatives, was amended and approved and then sent back to us. Again, here we have an example of a good process.

I think part of the reason for the quality of the process is the bipartisan appreciation for early childhood education. I think it is time to stop talking and vote on the Child Care and Development Block Grant.

I ask our colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote for it.

I think all of us can support the idea of early childhood education. I am the product of one of the first early learning programs in the State of Tennessee. When I was a child, my mother started one of the two early preschool education programs in our county. She held class in a converted garage in our back yard with 24 3-year-olds in the morning and 25 5-year-olds in the afternoon. It is hard to imagine a single mother dealing with that many children all at one time, but she did. As her son, I was able to experience kindergarten for 5 years. I may be the only U.S. Senator who can say that.

I had an appreciation for early childhood education instilled in me by both my mother and father. Many of us in this chamber have a very similar appreciation. We may have different ways of trying to get to that goal, but this legislation, the Child Care and Development Block Grant, provides \$5.3 billion to families across the country, namely mothers, who are going to school so they can get a job, or who are working so like the young woman in Memphis I mentioned earlier, can stand on their own two feet. This program helps them get started.

It is an important bill. I congratulate Senators HARKIN and BURR and MIKULSKI for their hard work on this. I urge my colleagues tomorrow afternoon to

vote yes on ending debate on cloture for the Child Care and Development Block Grant.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I have been on the floor now for a couple of hours urging some of our colleagues to take heed of one of the clear messages from this election. People all over the country voted and spoke, and spoke clearly and loudly to say let's get to work, let's work together, let's stop the gridlock and let's find common ground to move our country forward.

Two hours ago I came to the floor to see about one of the most important pieces of legislation, the Keystone Pipeline, as Chair of the Energy Committee in the Senate. I have had the great privilege of working in a bipartisan manner with the Members of the Republican Caucus on this bill led by Senator HOEVEN. I am the lead sponsor on the Democratic side and there is a large group of my colleagues trying to convince this body to have a vote, and a strong 60-vote margin, which is required for passage on the Keystone Pipeline. The Senator from West Virginia has come down and the Senator from North Dakota came down to speak and the Senator from Montana joined me, and I want to announce we have just gotten great word from the House of Representatives. Evidently they heard us speaking, and they have introduced our bill in the House.

They have introduced our bill in the House, and the information we have gotten is that they plan to pass it tomorrow. Let me just say hallelujah. I will say it again—hallelujah—because their bill would never have passed this body and their bill would not have any chance of getting the President's signature because it is Keystone Pipeline plus—or it was—but now the House has introduced the exact same bill as the Hoeven-Landrieu bill. We now have an even clearer path to victory. I started 2 hours ago saying that I could see the path. I am not sure everybody else could, but it is clear to me now that everybody is starting to see it, and I could not be happier.

I don't have the actual number of the House bill. I was just told they introduced an identical bill, including the private property language, which is absolutely essential to secure the 60 votes required. That is why I drafted it in the bill, that is why Senator HOEVEN insisted it be in the bill, and that is why we have it in the bill. I thank the House for keeping that language, which is important for its ultimate passage. To me, it looks as though just in the last 2 hours lots of people are paying attention, and this is wonderful because this is an important step.

I believe I am also a cosponsor of Senator ALEXANDER's bill. No Senator

has worked harder in either party, and that is saying a lot because Senator MURRAY and Senator MIKULSKI have worked hard on this issue. Senator ALEXANDER—a former Secretary of Education—has been ceaseless and tireless in his effort on behalf of early childhood education. He and I worked together when President Bush was President. I believe and I hope I am a cosponsor of his bill, and I look forward to helping him move that piece of legislation forward for a vote. There might be a few things in there other Members disagree with, but that is our process. This is a critical issue for education and job creation as well. We have the Keystone Pipeline on one end, which is as concrete as steel, and then we have the soft issues, which are also important issues, such as economic development, which begins with early childhood education. I am so proud to be an advocate of both bills, and I thank the Senator for his leadership.

I urge my Members, who I believe have been very supportive on this issue—as have the Republican Members—to give cloture on his bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Mr. INHOFE. I read with a lot of interest about the trip President Obama made to China and his meeting with President Xi over what they characterized as an agreement on greenhouse gas emissions. I didn't hear any kind of agreement or anything that was said by the President of China, and they have been talking about this as a historic breakthrough. That is exactly what they said in 2009, back when Copenhagen was center stage for the big annual party.

Just so people are aware of what goes on, the United Nations throws a big party to get countries to agree to reduce greenhouse gases by a certain amount. It is kind of interesting since at one of the first ones I went to, I saw a good friend of mine from Benin in West Africa, and I said: You guys are not sucked into this thing—I know that for a fact—in terms of any kind of reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. What would happen to the economy of West Africa if you did that?

He said: This is the biggest party of the year, so we are all going to be here.

The same thing was true in Copenhagen.

Before I go into that, let's take a look at what they called a major historic breakthrough between the United States and China where the President pledged to reduce the emissions in the United States between 26 and 28 percent by 2025. What did China agree to? First of all, even if they did agree to reduce emissions, we would not believe them because they don't end up doing what they say they are going to do in these agreements. But China says that what they are going to do is stop in-

creasing their CO₂ emissions by 2030. In other words, between now and 2030 they are going to continue to increase their levels of CO₂ emissions, which I agree they are going to do that.

Next year—that is, a year from December—there is going to be another big party that will be in Paris, and it will be the one where President Obama says he and President Xi from China have an agreement. But, of course, that is going to be kind of like it was in Copenhagen back in 2009.

I remember 2009 so well. At that time I was—and I still am—on the Environment and Public Works Committee. We had a wonderful lady who was President Obama's appointee to be the Director of the EPA, and at that time in Copenhagen they already had Congresswoman PELOSI, Senator BOXER, President Obama, and then-Senator John Kerry. All of them were over there promising the 191 countries that were in Copenhagen that we were going to pass some kind of cap and trade.

After that was over, I went on a quick roundtrip to Copenhagen. I always remember that trip because I was on the ground, after all that travel, all of 3 hours, but I think it was the most enjoyable 3 hours I ever had because I was able to be over there as a one-man truth squad and to say to the people attending that great meeting there that the United States was not going to pass any kind of cap and trade. In fact, the most votes they could have gotten in the Senate at that time—and the Senate is changing, as we all know—was 30 votes. Obviously it took a lot more than that to do that.

I went over as the one-man truth squad to tell them that they were not telling the truth and that there is no way in the world we are going to pass it, and the same is true this time.

I will tell you what that meeting reminds me of. It reminds me of the meeting that took place in China a couple of days ago with our President. It reminded me of the meeting that took place in Rio de Janeiro. This would have been in 1998, which was during the Clinton White House. They went over there and agreed and signed the Kyoto Treaty. They signed the treaty knowing for a fact that it would not be ratified on this end. We know it takes a supermajority to ratify a treaty in the Senate.

We had a resolution that was passed at that time called the Byrd-Hagel resolution. It said that we would not ratify any agreement, such as Kyoto or anything like that, that didn't do two things—that were either harmful to the economy or didn't treat all countries the same. In other words, we have to treat the reductions in China the same as they would be in the United States. Of course the Kyoto Treaty didn't do that. They knew at the time it was not going to be ratified. In fact, they were not even going to submit it for ratification to this body, and that is exactly what did happen.

Let's look at what is happening in China right now. China is doing pretty