

[Rollcall Vote No. 273 Ex.]

YEAS—54

Baldwin	Hagan	Murray
Begich	Harkin	Nelson
Bennet	Heinrich	Pryor
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Reed
Booker	Hirono	Reid
Boxer	Johnson (SD)	Sanders
Brown	Kaine	Schatz
Cantwell	King	Schumer
Cardin	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Carper	Landrieu	Stabenow
Casey	Leahy	Tester
Collins	Levin	Udall (CO)
Coons	Markey	Udall (NM)
Donnelly	McCaskill	Walsh
Durbin	Menendez	Warner
Feinstein	Merkley	Warren
Franken	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murphy	Wyden

NAYS—45

Alexander	Fischer	McConnell
Ayotte	Flake	Moran
Barrasso	Graham	Murkowski
Blunt	Grassley	Paul
Boozman	Hatch	Portman
Burr	Heller	Risch
Chambliss	Hoeven	Roberts
Coats	Inhofe	Rubio
Coburn	Isakson	Scott
Cochran	Johanns	Sessions
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Cornyn	Kirk	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Toomey
Cruz	Manchin	Vitter
Enzi	McCain	Wicker

NOT VOTING—1

Rockefeller

The nomination was confirmed.

MAY NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided before a vote on the May nomination.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I yield my time to the Senator from Georgia, Mr. CHAMBLISS.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. I thank Senator LEAHY for yielding time.

It is important that we work through the process so we can get several Georgia judges to the floor of the Senate for a vote. We have some emergency positions that need to be filled, and Senator LEAHY has been very cooperative in helping us do that. On behalf of my colleague Senator ISAKSON and myself, I encourage all of my colleagues to support the nomination of Leigh May to be a judge for the District Court for the Northern District of Georgia.

Ms. May is a graduate of our two flagship institutions—Georgia Tech and the University of Georgia Law School. She practiced law with the Butler Wooten firm for many years and has been involved in many high-profile cases. She brings intellect and integrity to the bench. She will be a great addition to the Northern District of Georgia, and I encourage my colleagues to vote in support of this nominee.

I thank the Presiding Officer and yield back.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HIRONO). Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Leigh Martin May, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia?

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 99, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 274 Ex.]

YEAS—99

Alexander	Franken	Moran
Ayotte	Gillibrand	Murkowski
Baldwin	Graham	Murphy
Barrasso	Grassley	Murray
Begich	Hagan	Nelson
Bennet	Harkin	Paul
Blumenthal	Hatch	Portman
Blunt	Heinrich	Pryor
Booker	Heitkamp	Reed
Boozman	Heller	Reid
Boxer	Hirono	Risch
Brown	Hoeven	Roberts
Burr	Inhofe	Rubio
Cantwell	Isakson	Sanders
Cardin	Johanns	Schatz
Carper	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Casey	Johnson (WI)	Scott
Chambliss	Kaine	Sessions
Coats	King	Shaheen
Coburn	Kirk	Shelby
Cochran	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Collins	Landrieu	Tester
Coons	Leahy	Thune
Corker	Lee	Toomey
Cornyn	Levin	Udall (CO)
Crapo	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Cruz	Markey	Vitter
Donnelly	McCain	Walsh
Durbin	McCaskill	Warner
Enzi	McConnell	Warren
Feinstein	Menendez	Whitehouse
Fischer	Merkley	Wicker
Flake	Mikulski	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Rockefeller

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, very quickly, I ask unanimous consent that the next vote be 10 minutes in duration, and it will be the last vote prior to a 5:30 p.m. vote on Monday.

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

Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table. The President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to concur in the House amendment to S. 1086, an Act to reauthorize and improve the Child

Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990, and for other purposes.

Harry Reid, Tom Harkin, Barbara A. Mikulski, Mazie Hirono, Richard J. Durbin, Angus S. King, Jr., Jon Tester, Richard Blumenthal, Bill Nelson, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Elizabeth Warren, Brian Schatz, Patrick J. Leahy, Al Franken, Sheldon Whitehouse, Benjamin L. Cardin, Tim Kaine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate on the motion to concur in the House amendment to S. 1086, an act to reauthorize and improve the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) would have voted "no."

The yeas and nays resulted —yeas 96, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 275 Leg.]

YEAS—96

Alexander	Gillibrand	Murkowski
Ayotte	Graham	Murphy
Baldwin	Grassley	Murray
Barrasso	Hagan	Nelson
Begich	Harkin	Paul
Bennet	Hatch	Portman
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Pryor
Blunt	Heitkamp	Reed
Booker	Heller	Reid
Boozman	Hirono	Risch
Boxer	Hoeven	Roberts
Brown	Inhofe	Rubio
Burr	Isakson	Sanders
Cantwell	Johanns	Schatz
Cardin	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Carper	Johnson (WI)	Scott
Casey	Kaine	Sessions
Coats	King	Shaheen
Cochran	Kirk	Shelby
Collins	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Coons	Landrieu	Tester
Corker	Leahy	Thune
Cornyn	Levin	Toomey
Crapo	Manchin	Udall (CO)
Cruz	Markey	Udall (NM)
Donnelly	McCain	Vitter
Durbin	McCaskill	Walsh
Enzi	McConnell	Warner
Feinstein	Menendez	Warren
Fischer	Merkley	Whitehouse
Flake	Mikulski	Wicker
Franken	Moran	Wyden

NAYS—1

Lee

NOT VOTING—3

Chambliss Coburn Rockefeller

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH). On this vote the yeas are 96, the nays are 1. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT OF 2014—Resumed

Pending:

Reid motion to concur in the House amendment to the bill.

Reid motion to concur in the House amendment to the bill, with Reid Amendment No. 3923 (to the motion to concur in the House amendment), to change the enactment date.

Reid Amendment No. 3924 (to Amendment No. 3923), of a perfecting nature.

Reid motion to refer the House Message on the bill to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, with instructions, Reid Amendment No. 3925, to change the enactment date.

Reid Amendment No. 3926 (to (the instructions) Amendment No. 3925), of a perfecting nature.

Reid Amendment No. 3927 (to Amendment No. 3926), of a perfecting nature.

MOTION TO CONCUR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for up to 10 minutes; that following my remarks Senator WARREN be recognized for 2 minutes; that Senator LANDRIEU then be recognized to speak for up to 10 minutes.

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

TRIBUTE TO FORMER CONGRESSMAN LANE EVANS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, in this week of Veterans Day, I would like to take a few moments to speak about a very brave marine who was a great friend of mine and a true champion of America's veterans. Congressman Lane Evans of Illinois passed away last Wednesday. He was only 63 years old. Lane had been battling Parkinson's disease for nearly 20 years. A few years ago, another illness, Lewy body disease, began attacking his memory. One cruel disease ravaged his body as the other assaulted his brain. But his spirit and his quiet courage remained unbroken to the end.

Lane Evans and I were both elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1982, two surprised Democrats who were elected in traditionally Republican, conservative, downstate congressional districts. We were both sons of blue-collar families. We both learned our values from our parents, our neighbors, the nuns and priests at school. We both learned from politicians who were leaders in our State, such as Senator Paul Simon.

Lane and I worked closely together in Congress. Parkinson's forced Lane Evans to retire from Congress in 2007, long before his time. We remained friends. I used to visit him. When I did, we would share our favorite stories about political adventures. Lane Evans was a kind and good person. He was funny, with a razor-sharp intellect, and he was courageous.

He joined the Marines 2 weeks after graduating from high school. It was 1969. Lane was 17 years old. Military service was a tradition in the Evans family. Lane's dad had served in the Navy. One of Lane's brothers was already serving in Vietnam so Lane was stationed stateside and then in Okinawa. After 2 years in the Marines, he

came home and used the GI bill to earn a college degree, graduating magna cum laude from Augustana College in Rock Island. Then he earned a law degree from Georgetown. He came home again and started a successful law practice in Rock Island serving children, the poor, and working families.

In 1982, Lane Evans decided to make a run for Congress. He may have been the only person in the beginning who thought he had a prayer of winning. He had never run for office before. He was all of 31 years of age. He looked as though he was 21 on a good day. History was against him. Voters in that district had only elected a Democratic Congressman once in the previous century. That had been only for 2 years.

Lane Evans worked hard. He got lucky when the incumbent Congressman, a lifelong Republican and moderate, lost to a hard-right challenger. On election night in 1982, Lane Evans and I were both elected to the U.S. House of Representatives for the first time. It was my third try to get elected. It was Lane's first. He never lost after that. He served 24 years in the House. His voting record was often to the left of many of his constituents, but he was unapologetic. Voters re-elected Lane over and over because they knew he was honest, forthright, and he cared about them. He was straightforward and sincere. People knew he was a man of principle who would always vote his conscience no matter what.

When it came to constituent service, Lane Evans set the standard. Lane and his staff were so good at cutting through bureaucratic redtape that the chairman of the National Republican Congressional Committee once joked that "two-thirds of the people in his district think that he signs their Social Security checks."

Lane's speeches were always packed and not because he was a great speaker. People came to Lane's speeches because of what happened after. He never left a speech until everyone in the audience who wanted to speak to him had their chance. Lane's dad was a firefighter, his mom a nurse.

In the blue-collar neighborhood where he grew up, their steady incomes made the Evans family better off than most of their neighbors. As a young lawyer and Member of Congress, Lane Evans fought for people such as the parents of his childhood friends who worked shifts in factories and fire houses. He was a champion of blue-collar workers and senior citizens.

Lane fought for fair trade, a fair minimum wage, and the right to collectively bargain. He worked for a cleaner environment and protection of family farmers. He fought to give students from working-class families the same chance he had to get a good college education. He was a giant on the House Armed Services Committee. He understood the Rock Island Arsenal was more than just an arsenal for our Nation's defense, it was a major, impor-

tant employer in his district. Most of all—most of all—Lane Evans fought for veterans. This week of Veterans Day is a good time to remember how much Lane Evans of Illinois meant to America's veterans and their families. He made veterans's concerns the cornerstone of his congressional career. He was the first chairman of the Vietnam-era Veterans Congressional Caucus and the first Vietnam-era veteran to serve as ranking member of the House Veteran's Affairs Committee.

He was also the ranking member of the House Armed Services Committee. During his time in Congress, there was no Federal program for veterans that did not bear Lane Evans' mark. Veterans today enjoy increased education benefits, improved health care, strengthened home loans, judicial review of their benefits, additional opportunities for veteran-owned businesses, and a host of other improved benefits because of the leadership, determination, and heart of Lane Evans.

From his earliest days in Congress, Lane Evans pushed for action on issues helping Vietnam veterans. He was an outspoken advocate to address the problems and embarrassment of the homeless and substance abuse among Vietnam veterans. In his first term he led the effort to create a pilot tram establishing community-based veterans centers to help with job and marriage counseling and post-traumatic stress syndrome long before it was a popular term.

The program has since grown to include veterans centers all across America. Lane Evans led the fight to give compensation for Vietnam veterans exposed to Agent Orange and for their kids born with spina bifida as a result of that exposure. It was not just his war that concerned him. He was one of the first Members of Congress to push for more information about the Gulf War Syndrome. He supported increased opportunities for women in the military, an early supporter for full civil rights for gays in the military.

Paul Rieckhoff, the CEO of Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America, here is what he said about Lane:

In the early days of the Iraq and Afghanistan wars, Lane was one of the first members of Congress to take on issues like PTSD and TBI.

Traumatic brain injury.

He helped put our issues on the map.

Lane Evans worked to include Parkinson's research as part of funding for the VA, to make sure veterans suffering from this disease received the best possible care. He worked with Senator LEAHY, then-Senator Hagel, and the Vietnam Veterans of America to push for a U.S. and international ban on the production of antipersonnel landmines.

He was awarded the Vietnam Veterans of America's first annual President's Award for Outstanding Achievement in 1990. In 1994, the AMVETs gave him the Silver Helmet Award, known as the "Oscar" of veterans' honors.

This is how Lane explained his commitment to veterans. He said:

Our veterans—those returning from Iraq, those who scaled the cliffs above the beaches of Normandy, those who walked point in the jungles of Vietnam, those who survived the brutality of Korea and other battlefields, all who honorably served or who are now serving, have earned the assurance that VA—their system—will be there when they need it. “Just as we practice on the battlefield that we leave no one behind, we should not slam the door on any veteran who needs the VA system.”

The best way we can honor Lane Evans’ memory is by more than just a speech on the floor of the Senate, it is to continue his work on behalf of America’s veterans, continue to work to make the VA responsive to the massive number of disability claims that have been filed since Iraq and Afghanistan, and make sure every veteran receives respect, health care, job training, and the opportunities they have earned.

There is another way we can honor this champion of veterans; that is, by naming the year-old VA medical center in Galesburg, IL, the Lane A. Evans VA Community-Based Outpatient Clinic. This center is in the heart of what was Congressman Lane Evans’ congressional district for so many years.

Nearly 4,000 veterans a year seek services there. I am honored it is a bipartisan effort to name this center after Congressman Evans, led in the House by Congresswoman CHERI BUSTOS. Lane used to say he loved the Marines because the Marines salute their lowest members. I hope my colleagues will join me in honoring one of the Marines’ finest members by supporting this proposal to name the VA outpatient clinic in Galesburg, IL, in honor of Congressman Lane Evans.

Lane Evans was laid to rest at the Rock Island Arsenal on the date of the 239th anniversary of the Marine Corps. I remember so many years ago—18 years ago—when Lane and I were in a Labor Day parade in Galesburg, IL. I did not think much of it at the time. It was just another parade in another campaign. Lane told me later that he noticed something was wrong on that date. As he was waving his left hand, he realized it was numb and he had no feeling.

He continued to work even after he had been diagnosed with early Parkinson’s. It made it difficult for him to stand without pain or to even smile easily. He never, ever complained. When his legs locked up when he was in terrible pain, he would tell his closest friends: I am so lucky. I couldn’t carry mail, I couldn’t be a meat cutter, but I can still do my job as a Congressman.

As we say in Illinois, thank heavens for Lane Evans, and I thank the good Lord he devoted so much of his life in Congress to the people he loved in his district and to the veterans of America.

I offer my condolences to Lane’s family, especially his three brothers, to his brothers and sisters in arms, and to all

of us who loved him and were touched by his gentle life.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

REMEMBERING TOM MENINO

Ms. WARREN. I rise today to honor a departed friend and committed public servant, Tom Menino. He was a devoted husband to Angela, loving father to Susan and Tom Junior, and adoring grandfather to six grandchildren.

For 20 years Tom served as mayor of Boston and led the resurgence of our city. He believed in economic growth and building communities, fighting for hospitals, scientific research, and innovation, while simultaneously strengthening our neighborhoods, expanding our parks, and knitting diversity into a community of equals.

Mayor Menino succeeded because he knew all along that our fortunes depend on our working together as one people, one community, one Boston, and he did everything he could to create that united Boston.

Reports are that Mayor Menino had personally met more than half the residents of Boston, and we believe it. In our happy moments—Red Sox championships—and in our darkest moments—when smoke arose at Copley Square—we knew we could always count on Tom Menino to be there.

Mayor Menino’s Boston lived up to the vision of its founders: a city that all eyes can see is a model for the country and for the world.

On behalf of a grateful people, I urge my colleagues to come together to pass a resolution that was introduced only yesterday by Senator MARKEY and me celebrating the life of Mayor Tom Menino.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

KEYSTONE PIPELINE

Ms. LANDRIEU. I thank my colleagues for allowing a 10-minute discussion today by unanimous consent on an important issue the Congress is taking up today.

On the House side, debate on the Keystone Pipeline is starting, and I understand there could potentially be a vote as early as tomorrow. I am so pleased to have been one of the spark plugs that helped to get us moving not in the next Congress but in this lame-duck session of this Congress.

The American people spoke loudly and clearly not only in my State of Louisiana but around the country, wanting us to work together to get the job done.

I was very pleased that the Republican leadership brought to the floor the early childhood education bill that Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER has been leading. It is a very important bill. I, frankly, don’t think it is more important than the Keystone Pipeline, however. So I was pleased yesterday to come to the floor and offer, as chair of the energy committee, my own priority list of what I think is most important.

I say that with sincerity because I actually support both very strongly.

I have several amendments to Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER’s bill which have not been adopted and which I understand, unfortunately, will not be allowed for debate. So I don’t know if I will be able to vote for cloture on his bill, although I strongly support it. My record is as strong as anyone’s in this Chamber. So I will be interested to see if amendments to the Lamar Alexander bill will be allowed on the floor. I am hoping they will. If I can get at least a vote on the amendments I have pending to that bill, I will absolutely—whether my amendments pass or fail—vote for it because it is the will of the body and we must do something. We must invest more money. We must have more quality programs for early childhood education. It is an absolute cornerstone of strengthening and building the middle class.

In my State, that is what we are focused on, and I can’t go anywhere without people telling me: Senator, thank you for your fight for education. Senator, thank you for your fight for early childhood education. Senator, thank you for fighting to take student loans down from 11 percent—the rate on student loans—to 3 percent.

On almost every day of this last election cycle, that is what I was talking about at home, and I know Members who were in elections or even not in elections heard clearly from the American people, during the time we were home working, how much what we do in Congress can matter, can make a difference in their lives. They don’t want government intrusion, but they do want government to function so they can get a good college education, so they can get good job training, so they can start businesses that can grow profits for themselves and their communities.

I look forward to that debate, and I am very happy the Republican leadership rushed to the floor to put down a bill on early childhood education because I think they heard from the American people that just talking about tax cuts for the wealthy, tax cuts for people making over \$1 million a year, and tax policy—yes, it is important, but what is very important is fighting for the middle class.

I say congratulations to Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER of Tennessee. That is the first bill the Republicans have put down in this lame-duck, and I look forward to working with him.

But the first bill that we put down and I put down as chair of the energy committee—unusual for Democrats because we don’t have our whole caucus supporting it, but we have a good strong part of our caucus supporting it—is a bill that is going to actually create immediate high-impact jobs for this country today, soon, as it is being built. As soon as this bill passes and as soon as the President signs it into law, there will be an immediate, dramatic push from the oil and gas industry and

from the energy industry broadly—alternative energies, wind, solar, coal, and clean coal technologies—because the vote on Keystone and the President's signature on Keystone is a signal, a strong signal, it is a green light that America is ready to go, that we are following the science, that we are following our process, that we are respecting private property rights. And, yes, we are respecting States in their views of where these pipelines should be sited. No State—not Nebraska, not West Virginia, and not Louisiana—wants to be told by the Federal Government where pipelines are coming through on private property. No State. So Nebraska does have an issue that has to be resolved. They have an issue that has to be resolved about where that pipeline should be laid, and the Republican Party should most certainly respect States rights on where that pipeline should be laid.

The bill Senator HOEVEN and I have acknowledges that process. It also acknowledges private property rights, and it says it is time to build the Keystone Pipeline.

This was not a last-week election wake-up call; I have been working on passing the Keystone Pipeline before I was the chairman, all during my chairmanship, years ago, as a senior member of the committee, and now as chair. I have not stopped and came very close to getting a vote on this floor before the election. Frankly—and the reporters should know this—it was really held up by the politics of both sides. That is not what is said, but that is the actual truth—the politics of both sides. I see Senator MANCHIN on the floor, who is a strong supporter, and he might talk a little bit about that. Both sides have some blame as to why we couldn't get to a vote, but I will let the record speak for itself.

This is the pipeline. This is what has to be built. As you can see, it doesn't come into Louisiana, but it most certainly impacts my State. It impacts the entire country.

These are already pipelines that we have in America. This is just another important pipeline because it connects Canada—our greatest ally and our great economic partner—with the refining strength of America, which is not only in Louisiana and Texas but primarily in Louisiana and Texas. It begins to move a great product, produced with the highest environmental standards in the world, approved by this administration's environmental department saying it meets the environmental standards of transportation, et cetera, and it meets the standards of this administration's State Department when it comes to, is it in America's interests. They said yes, it is in America's interests. That standard has been met. So let's build the pipeline.

I came to the floor yesterday. The Republicans brought their early childhood education bill to the floor. I am so proud they did. I brought Keystone Pipeline. Because I did, it seemed to

have moved lots of things, which I am pleased about, and I think the Senator from West Virginia may wish to comment. But it seemed to have shaken up a few things and moved a few things, and that is good because Senators who are energetic and motivated and can build coalitions—like Senator MANCHIN and I do every day when we are here—can actually get things done.

Mr. MANCHIN. Will the Senator yield?

Ms. LANDRIEU. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Let me say to all of our colleagues and all of my friends on the Republican side and my friends on the Democratic side that this is the greatest opportunity we have had in the 4 years since I have been in the Senate to have truly a jobs bill, a quality jobs bill that pays high wages. Almost every State in the Nation benefits by the Keystone Pipeline.

If you want to take politics out of this, take all of our names off. Senator LANDRIEU says take her name off. Take my name off. Take everybody's name off, and let's find out who really rises to help Americans.

This is one bill that we have been trying to bring to the forefront. Senator LANDRIEU has brought it how many times? She was the first person—I said yesterday—who, 4 years ago when I came to the Senate, explained to me how important it was and how it interconnected all of us. I am very appreciative of that.

Now MARY is in the political fight of her life. I pray to the good Lord that the good people of Louisiana understand the fighter she is and what she produces for America every day.

With all that being said, she is willing to take her name off if this piece of legislation will move forward so that the Presiding Officer in Montana and I in West Virginia can get some high-quality jobs. We all benefit from this.

Next, it makes our Nation secure. If you want to protect your people, have a secure nation and don't go chasing energy all over the world. It takes us places we don't want to be and shouldn't be. This does all of that as far as securing our energy and making us energy independent.

But I just saw after the election—and we accept that. I am on the Democratic side. I heard loud and clear the people of West Virginia and the changes they want. What they really told us is: We want you all to do something. If you have a chance to help us with a good job, do it. Don't argue over your politics. It seems as if you are more concerned about your own status of being a politician or being an elected official than you are about mine, which is basically paying my bills, taking care of my family, and being able to be a good American.

What we are saying, we thought we heard that loud and clear. So I will say to all of my friends on the Republican

side and all of us on the Democratic side, take a moment and listen to what was just told to us. What was told to us is to do our job—that is what Senator LANDRIEU was trying to do—move this important piece of legislation forward and do the job we are supposed to.

The best politics is good government. If we do something good as a Republican and as a Democrat, we all get credit for it. We do something bad, and then we try to blame each other—who did it worse than the other. We all get blamed for it. This is the best thing we have had for the last 4 or 5 years. We have had a hard time getting to this point, to almost get a vote for it, and now they want to say: Well, one-upmanship—we will see if it can come over from the House side with a person who is involved in a race against Senator LANDRIEU. Forget about those people.

Forget about all of us who cosigned and cosponsored this bill, apparently.

Just pass it. Give us a vote and pass it. That is all we are asking for. I think if we do that, the people will say: I think they heard us, and I think they are starting to do something. That is why I am on the floor with Senator LANDRIEU and the people willing to fight for the jobs that Americans need—not just in Louisiana but in West Virginia, too, and also in Montana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has consumed 10 minutes.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I ask unanimous consent for 1 minute to close.

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

Ms. LANDRIEU. I think the Senator pointed out some key points—not only how important this pipeline is for the middle of America but for the economy of the whole country.

The pipeline and the supplies that are coming and the workers to build this pipeline come from all over the country. The businesses that supply the gadgets, the widgets, the steel, the trucks, the forklifts, the equipment, the cranes that come to build this pipeline come from all over the country.

But more important than the pipeline itself, which is going to move hundreds of thousands of barrels of crude oil from Canada—which we would much prefer to deal with and trade with, than, let's say, Venezuela or some other countries that don't share our values. More importantly than that, it is going to transport it in the safest way.

Without this pipeline, this oil will be produced. We cannot stop Canada from producing it. They are going to produce it, and it is going to be moved east and west by rail or moved south by truck. We cannot put any more trucks on our highways, and we can't crowd our rails.

I know there are people, like my good friend from Massachusetts, Senator MARKEY, who is going to surely speak against this pipeline and why, from his perspective, it is not the right thing to

do. And I respect those views. I strongly disagree with him, but I respect him. I strongly disagree with his arguments—and we will have this debate in the coming days—and I respect him.

But the point is this. Whether you support the Senator from Massachusetts' or you support the Senator from Louisiana's views, the point is we need to vote. That is the process. I believe we have the 60 votes on this floor to pass this bill. I believe we have always had the votes to pass this bill, if we can just get it to a vote.

Now, as is the process, the Senate has to pass the bill, it has to go to the House, and then it has to go to the President. He can sign it or he can veto it. I do not have at this date any indication that he will veto this bill. He could issue a veto warning on it in an hour, he could do it tomorrow, he could do it next week. That is not the point.

The point is the Senate must begin to be the Senate again. Let the President worry about being the President. Let the House worry about being the House. Let the Senate be the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent for 30 more seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Let the Senate be the Senate. That is what my voters said. I think that is what voters in Tennessee said. I think that is what voters in North Carolina said, and I think that is what the voters in Massachusetts said. Let the Senate be the Senate.

We are the greatest deliberative body in the world. Let's debate. Let's vote. Let's get the work done. Let the chips fall where they may. The public can accept that. They cannot accept—and they should not have to accept—gridlock, game playing, and raw politics on the great floor of this Senate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 3 minutes.

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I respect the Senator from Louisiana, and there is no more fierce advocate for this pipeline in our country. She has been a relentless advocate for that pipeline. I am not going to speak on this issue today, but I look forward to a much more extensive debate that we will have next week. But there is no one more vulnerable than the Senator from Louisiana in her advocacy.

REMEMBERING TOM MENINO

I rise today to speak about Tom Menino, our great mayor from the city of Boston who just passed in the last month. He always looked out for the little guy. He always stayed true to the people who elected him, and he stuck by his principles.

In every neighborhood across the city, Boston mourns the loss of our

great mayor, Tom Menino. We mourn along with his wife Angela, his family, and everyone who ever was touched by Mayor Menino. But we will fill that void with the love and respect that we have for the life and the legacy of this extraordinary man.

Boston loves Tom Menino because Tom Menino loved Boston with all of his heart. Tom Menino wasn't satisfied with leading the best city in America. He wanted Boston to be the best city in the world. He was an urban architect without equal, attuned to every detail in every neighborhood. He forged a more inclusive Boston, where diversity is embraced. Tom Menino was everyone's mayor.

In a poll a few years back, half of all Bostonians in the poll said they had personally met Tom Menino. That really captures how Tom Menino approached his job, but we all know how he viewed those poll results—that his job was only half done.

Yet Mayor Menino's vision for Boston was global, and he pushed the city into a new era of innovation. He helped our shining city on a hill illuminate its light of innovation across the world, building a beacon of entrepreneurship and ingenuity. He laid the foundation for Boston's economic leadership in the 21st century, including spearheading Boston's Innovation District and developing the seaport area.

The Innovation District is supporting the companies and industries that are creating jobs today, and Mayor Menino has ensured that Boston will continue to be a national leader in biotechnology, clean energy, and health care for generations to come. He did all of this while keeping Boston's historic character alive. Tom knew what potholes needed filling, but he also knew when to leave the cobblestones alone.

So today, if you take a drive around Boston—or, as Tom would want you to do, take a bike ride—you would see there is no place in Boston that hasn't felt the caring imprint of Tom's hand: kids playing on new playgrounds in safer neighborhoods; poor communities with better access to life-saving health care; entrepreneurs and investors collaborating on the next big thing.

Boston will move into the future a stronger, brighter, safer, and healthier city because of Tom Menino. So today we honor his life and his legacy. Tom Menino is a man and a mayor for the ages.

Rest in peace, Mayor Tom Menino.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2650

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I will be asking a unanimous consent request to bring up S. 2650, the Corker-Graham-McCain-Ayotte-Rubio legislation. Senator MURPHY, I think, is going to speak here in a second, but if I may do two things: I wish to reserve 20 minutes of time to be divided between myself, Senator CORKER, and Senator RUBIO to speak about the topic. But I would now

like to make a unanimous consent request.

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

Mr. GRAHAM. I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the two leaders, but no later than November 24, 2014, the Committee on Foreign Relations be discharged from further consideration of S. 2650, that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration, the bill be read a third time, and the Senate proceed to a vote on passage of the bill with no intervening action or debate. Further, if passed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, just to make a few brief comments prior to my colleagues speaking on their request on the underlying bill, it is my understanding that the request is to bring a bill to the floor that would create an extraconstitutional process by which the House and the Senate would convene on a possible statement or resolution of disapproval on an agreement that has heretofore not been negotiated between the United States and our allies and Iran with respect to that country's nuclear program and nuclear ambitions.

I think we are all of one mind in that we are hopeful that these negotiations are concluded successfully, that we are able to stand together and say that we have used diplomacy rather than military might in order to dislodge from Iran any prospect of obtaining a nuclear weapon. But we are at an absolutely critical moment in these negotiations, and I believe the underlying bill which is being asked to be brought to the floor today would undermine those negotiations by sending a message that Congress does not stand with the President as he and his team negotiate these final agreements.

There is going to be a legitimate question as to what Congress's role is, but we won't know that until we see the agreement. We won't know whether it rises to the level of a treaty. We won't know whether we need to pass legislation to immediately repeal sanctions versus having them temporarily suspended. This bill has not gone through the committee process.

While it raises, I think, some legitimate questions of what Congress's role is going to be, if there is ultimately an agreement worked out between the P5+1 and Iran, it is premature at this point to set into law a process by which we would vote an agreement up or down until we understand what the agreement is in the first place.

That is my primary reason for standing here and ultimately registering an objection. I do worry as well that it would send a fairly chilling message to our negotiators and to those who are in the room if the signal is that the Congress is not giving the full authority to

this President under the Constitution in order to negotiate an agreement which is ultimately going to be, we hope, to the benefit of the United States and global security.

I know my colleagues have time constraints and want to speak on this underlying bill. So, with that, I object to the unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). Objection is heard.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I appreciate my colleague very much for speaking in a way so we can all have time on the issue.

No. 1, about the chilling messages, this is a chilling message from the Supreme Leader of Iran about 3 days ago: Nine questions about the elimination of Israel. In this tweet—and I will read some of it later—the Ayatollah, the Supreme Leader in Iran, talks about how to annihilate the State of Israel during the negotiations.

Also, recently an IAEA inspector was talking about elements of the Iranian nuclear program that have been hidden that would make it larger than we all suspect.

What are we trying to do? I would like to bring the Iranian nuclear program to an end through peaceful means, and by an end, I mean the following: I would welcome a deal that would allow the Iranians to produce peaceful nuclear power but without the capability of turning that program into a weapons program.

I fear that we are on the road to a North Korean outcome, where the international community gave a rogue regime a small nuclear program to be monitored by the United Nations—and the rest is history regarding North Korea.

I have asked several times to the administration: Tell me the safeguards that exist in these negotiations with Iran that did not exist in North Korea, and I have yet to get an answer.

It is pretty openly known that the administration and the P5+1 have conceded a right to enrich uranium as part of any deal with Iran. To that I say: Of all the nations on Earth, given their behavior, name one country that you would put in the category ahead of Iran when it comes to denying them the ability to have a centrifuge that one day could be used to make a weapon. The idea of giving an enrichment capability to the Iranians, given 30 years of lying, deceit, American blood on their hands, and recent tweets about annihilating Israel to me is insane.

So all we are asking is that any deal negotiated between the P5+1 come to this body for a discussion and a vote. Senator CORKER is the primary author of this legislation.

Here is what I can tell the world: Nobody wants any more war. But we do not want to allow the Iranians, given their behavior, the capability one day to develop a nuclear weapon, and that is exactly what they have been trying to do. They have lied about their program. They have been deceptive about

their program. They have blood on their hands when it comes to killing Americans in Iraq. They are one of the largest state sponsors of terrorism in the world.

The idea that we would give them an enrichment capability just astounds me. We are telling our allies—South Korea, and the UAE: If you want a nuclear program, fine—don't enrich the uranium.

There are 15 nations in the world that have nuclear programs without an enrichment capability. To concede one to the Iranians is the ultimate act of throwing the Mideast into further chaos, because the Sunni Arabs, the mortal enemy of the Shia Persians, will want a capability of their own of like kind or greater. The worst possible outcome is to give a regime this dangerous the capability or the potential to one day make a bomb. One centrifuge in the hands of people with this mentality is one too many.

To the Iranian people, my beef is not with you. My beef is with your leaders who have taken the world down a dark path.

This legislation is pretty simple. Bring the deal to the Senate. We will have a right to file a motion of disapproval. We will have a vote, we will have a debate, and if it is a good deal, it will be approved. If it is a bad deal, we will stop it.

I cannot imagine the Senate and the House sitting on the sidelines and ignoring something this important.

To Senator CORKER, who will soon be the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, this was his original idea. We have tried to perfect it, but what I really believe is what he tried to do months ago to make sure the Congress would have a check and balance over any deal with the Iranians was smart. It would enhance the administration's hand when it comes to negotiating because they would have to tell the Iranians, it is not just us you have to please, you have to go before the representatives of the American people. That would lead to a better outcome. If it truly is a North Korea in the making, we will have a chance to stop it.

President Obama wants a deal too badly, in my view; but at the end of the day, let's wait and see what happens. I just want to let the Iranians and the administration know beforehand, we will not sit on the sidelines and watch you go it alone. This is one decision the President will make that the Congress has to be read in on and have a say about. This is not the time to let President Obama go it alone. The stakes are too high for Israel, for the United States, for the world at large.

What do I fear the most? I fear that over time we will give the Iranian ayatollahs the capability to develop a nuclear weapon. Name one technology they developed that they haven't shared with terrorists. And it will surely come our way.

To our friends in Israel: No Israeli mother can ever go to sleep at night

thinking her children are safe and the future of that country is secure if the Iranians have a nuclear capability. When the ayatollahs say openly they wish to destroy the State of Israel, to annihilate the State of Israel, I believe they mean it. When the Jewish people say never again, they speak based on past experience.

Of all the scenarios in the world that could throw this world into a chaotic situation beyond what you see today, it would be to allow the ayatollahs a nuclear weapon. The Sunni Arabs will have one of their own. Israel will never know a minute's peace, and I fear that it would come our way.

I would like to now yield to Senator CORKER who can explain the details of the legislation, why we are asking this to be taken up before the end of negotiations.

A week from Monday the deadline comes to an end. I want everybody at the negotiating table to know this deal is so important to the United States and the world that the Congress needs to have a say. Barack Obama should not be able to make any deal with the Iranians that is binding unless the Congress approves, and the Iranians should never be allowed to have a nuclear capability, period, that could be turned into a weapon.

With that, I yield to Senator CORKER.

Mr. CORKER. I thank the Senator. I want to thank the Senator from South Carolina for his distinguished leadership on so many national security issues. I understand his frustration with our inability to actually take a vote on something that is such a commonsense measure. I also respect the committee process, as you could imagine, with the role I play and wished that our committee would actually take up this piece of legislation.

I actually tried to offer something very similar to this in committee, and I actually did offer it, and the bill that was being offered, too, was taken down and no votes taken, because, again, of not wanting to deal with this issue.

So I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for desiring to make something happen on this. As he mentioned, all of us want to ensure a successful negotiation. I cannot imagine there is a person in this body who doesn't want the negotiations between the P5+1 to end up with a good long-term conclusion. I agree based on the signals that are being sent. There are a lot of bipartisan concerns that have been expressed on this floor by people of both sides of the aisle, because people understand that this body, along with working with the House, put in place the sanctions that have actually gotten us to the place where we are in the negotiations. The initial agreement that was put in place was so much weaker than even the U.N. security resolutions that passed over and over and over relative to Iran.

So I agree that by having us making the final say on this negotiation that it gives the administration some added

strength that they were unable to show in the beginning. Obviously Iran is trying to tilt toward those within their own body, their own citizens, who certainly are concerned about negotiations and continue to bring that out throughout the negotiations. It seems to me that Congress would be an outstanding countervailing force. And obviously something of this magnitude—especially when Congress brought us to the table—this is the kind of thing that should be weighed upon.

What the bill would do is obviously give us the opportunity within a defined amount of time to vote up or down on whether we agree that this should be put in place. It also puts in place some enforcement mechanisms. Then it also puts a clock on the negotiations, so, again, we cannot have these continual extensions.

I recently read the newest book Henry Kissinger wrote. It was a great book to read, but it put in place one of the chapters that focused on these Iran negotiations and lays out the fact—and I know the distinguished Presiding Officer today knows this well because he focuses so much on nuclear issues and, like me, is very concerned about proliferation around the world. I have enjoyed working with him on the Foreign Relations Committee. Interestingly, one of the chapters lays out the progression that occurs. And Iran, just by stalling each time these negotiations take place, ends up in a better place. Again, I think all of us were very shocked with the interim agreement that was put in place first. I think this is a very commonsense piece of legislation.

Let me point out something my friend from South Carolina did not point out. Without this, this is what is going to possibly happen—I hope it doesn't, but possibly happen. The administration can enter into a deal. The way we have crafted the sanctions, no permanent—no permanent—arrangement can be made to undo the sanctions. Only Congress can do that. But the way the sanctions regime has been put in place, the President in many cases does have the ability on a temporary basis to do away with the sanctions. It is evident that the administration very much wants something to happen. I want to see something happen, but the way this has gone, it appears they want something to happen that possibly will not stand the test of time.

Let's say they enter into an arrangement by November 24. They undo the sanctions temporarily. If that happens, basically the work that has been done around here for years is over. It is done because it will be impossible from a practical standpoint to ever get those sanctions back in place, especially sanctions with the many other countries that are involved.

So if the President enters into an agreement and temporarily does away with sanctions, I think everybody in this body understands it is going to be

almost impossible for those to be put back in place. So the damage is already done. And that is why it is so important from my perspective, with Congress having played the role that Congress has played to help put us into this position, very important for Congress to have the opportunity to have the congressional review this bill lays out.

Look, I think it is pretty evident with the denying, if you will, of this bill coming to the floor, which was expected, I think it is very evident that Congress is not going to have the opportunity between now and the 24th to weigh in. It is my hope that somehow if these negotiations unfortunately end up putting us in a very bad place—I hope that doesn't happen. I hope the outcome is much better than what is anticipated. But if it ends up unfortunately being something that is not good for our country, I hope what will happen is the next time we ask to bring this bill up—because of time being of the essence, the next time it would be brought up, hopefully Members of this body would agree that Congress would weigh in in a rightful manner. Congress would weigh in to make sure we don't enter into a deal as a nation that puts us in a very bad place in the longer term relative to what Iran is doing.

I thank the Presiding Officer for allowing me to speak. I do not see Senator RUBIO here in the body.

I yield the floor. It is my sense that Senator RUBIO may come down and want to speak to this.

But I do want to say in closing, all of us here hope the administration puts our Nation and the world in a place to know that Iran will not have the capability of developing nuclear weapons. That is what this piece of legislation is about. Without it, I hope the administration still does that, obviously, and that we wake up on November 25 surprised—but happily surprised—that we ended up in a place that will stand the test of time.

I yield the floor and it has been a while, but I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded and that I be allowed to speak for up to 5 minutes.

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

KEYSTONE PIPELINE

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, as you know—and many know—I have come to the floor now on several occasions since we arrived back here at 2 p.m. yesterday to talk about an important piece of legislation I have cosponsored with Senator HOEVEN. I understand Senator HOEVEN is going to be speaking about the Keystone Pipeline in a few moments, and the Republicans have reserved some time to speak this

afternoon. I will only take 5 minutes and will stay as the discussion on the Keystone Pipeline goes forward.

Yesterday at 2 o'clock I came to the floor of the Senate when the Senate opened to say how important I thought it was that we listen and hear what the voters said not only in my State but in Kentucky, Texas, South Dakota, North Dakota, and all over the country. Regardless of whether the people were Democrats, Republicans, left or right or center, they want us to get our job done.

I think one of the most important jobs we have as Senators is to vote, and I have been frustrated, along with many Members on both sides of the aisle, about why we have not been able to vote on some very important pieces of legislation.

This is one of the most important pieces of legislation, and that is why I came down at 2 o'clock to claim time at my seat. I have been here for 18 years. This is Louisiana's seat. One of the things we have to talk about right now—not next year or not next week—is the Keystone Pipeline.

I know the Presiding Officer and other Members of this body, mostly on the Democratic side, are not strong supporters and have expressed that view. I understand it, I respect it, but I don't agree with it. It is time for us to have a vote.

Because of the advocacy yesterday when the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from North Dakota, Senator HETTKAMP—she has been a very strong and effective advocate. I wish to give a shout-out to both of my colleagues from West Virginia and North Dakota. They have been tireless in their effort to try and build a 60-vote margin.

In the old days we could pass bills with just 51 votes, and some people want to go back to that. I have mixed feelings about it, but it would be great if we could pass things by a simple majority. But the rules of the Senate which we operate under—and have not requested to change, and I don't believe will change any time in the near future—requires us to have 60 votes.

We worked and worked and worked to try to get 60 votes. Since May, if we could just get this vote to the floor, I believe we have the 60 votes to pass it. It looks like that is going to happen, and I could not be happier. I could not be more grateful to the House of Representatives for taking up not their bill but Senator HOEVEN's bill and my bill. They are debating it right now, and I believe we will pass it.

I don't know how many Democrats will vote for that bill, but I think there will be some Members who will vote for that bill. I don't know how many, but I believe there are 60 votes in this Senate to pass the Keystone Pipeline bill and send it to the President's desk.

What President Obama does with it, I don't know. I am urging him to sign it. Seventy-five percent of the people in our country want this Keystone Pipeline built. There are jobs at stake. It is

a signal that America is ready to be energy independent.

When I say “energy independent”—to my good friend, the Presiding Officer from Massachusetts—I, of course, mean more oil and gas. I am from an oil-and-gas State. We have coal States, but we also have States that have solar and wind and drop-in fuels and new technologies.

This pipeline is a symbol that America is ready to do what it takes to become energy independent and to use our resources so we can create jobs for the middle class.

I see the Republican leader, and I appreciate that signal. So I will just conclude with my statement, but I do wish to be a part of this colloquy today, if allowed, so I may continue to talk about the importance of this issue.

I am happy the House has taken up the Hoeven-Landrieu bill—the exact language of the bill. We can call it whatever they want. They can put any name they want on the bill as long as it gets passed because that is what we need to do for the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, for 6 long years the Obama administration has been dragging its feet on the Keystone Pipeline. For as long as anyone can remember one Senator has worked harder than any other to ensure that those feet are always held to the fire; that is, our friend the senior Senator from North Dakota.

Senator HOEVEN has been a tireless advocate for the shovel-ready jobs project. The people of North Dakota are lucky to have him in their corner. Similar to the experts, Senator HOEVEN knows the Keystone Pipeline will create literally thousands of jobs, and similar to the experts, Senator HOEVEN knows the Keystone Pipeline would have almost zero net effect on our climate, and similar to the people we represent, he understands that the Keystone Pipeline is just common sense. He has done just about everything possible to make the administration come to grips with that obvious point.

Senator HOEVEN, along with leaders in the House, such as Congressman CASSIDY, succeeded in assembling and leading an impressive Keystone coalition that literally crossed party lines. That is why the opponents of Keystone have been so afraid to allow the Senate to take a free and open vote on it, because they feared Senator HOEVEN and Congressman CASSIDY were right; that there is overwhelming bipartisan support for ending the President’s blockade of these very good jobs.

After so many years of obstruction, we finally get the vote. After 6 years, we finally get the vote. We can credit the people’s choice of a new Senate majority for finally getting these gears turning. But we never would have gotten to this point without the tireless leadership of Senator HOEVEN in the Senate and Congressman CASSIDY over in the House.

I wish to thank Senator HOEVEN for all of his great work on this matter. We hope we can soon celebrate a well-deserved victory for the American people.

I understand we have colleagues on the floor as well, and I will be happy to yield at this time for any thoughts or questions they may have.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I have a question, if I could ask the Republican leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Does the Senator from North Dakota have a question? I believe I have the floor, and I believe Senator HOEVEN is going to ask a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I wish to thank the minority leader, but I ask him to repeat his question.

Mr. MCCONNELL. As the Senator from North Dakota was engaged in conversation, I was talking about his leadership role in this endeavor the last 6 years and the difficulty of getting action here in the Senate. It almost seems to me as if it took an election by the American people to choose a new majority for next year to begin to get the attention of the current majority to go forward on the issue that Senator HOEVEN has been talking to us about on a virtually daily basis here for 6 years.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I wish to respond to the minority leader. That has been the case, that we have worked for some time to get a vote on this important issue. We actually had passed a measure back in 2012 attached to a payroll tax holiday. At that time the President turned down the Keystone XL Pipeline project on the basis of the route in Nebraska. So that work has been done. It has been rerouted.

Some time ago, we put together a bipartisan bill. It is a bill I drafted and wrote. Senator LANDRIEU from Louisiana agreed to cosponsor it. We have all 45 Republicans on the bill, and we have 11 Democrats. We have 56 cosponsors on the legislation, but we have not been able to bring the bill to the floor. So I really had anticipated that we would have to wait until the new Congress in order to get a vote on the bill, because as the minority leader said, the American voters spoke. And particularly with the new Members we have coming, we will have more than 60 Senators who support the legislation. So I had anticipated that we would have to go into the new Congress to get a vote on the bill.

However, the cosponsor on the bill, Senator LANDRIEU, yesterday requested that we call the bill up, and she worked on her side and we have worked on our side to get unanimous consent to get a vote on the bill. So we are certainly happy to vote on this important issue for the American people. We will have a vote in the House on the very same bill. They now have taken up the very same bill. I believe it will pass easily tomorrow in the House. And then on Tuesday, we will have a vote on our

bill here, S. 2280. We will have 45 Republicans, and we hope to have 15 Democrats. And if we do, we will pass the bill and send it to the President for signature.

If we don’t get to the 60 votes, I believe we will still be able to bring the bill back in the new Congress and have the 60 votes. So I believe we will now be able to advance this bill to the President. The question is, What will the President do? The indication was from one of his spokespersons traveling with him yesterday that he may well veto the legislation. If that happens, I still think, again, based on the fact that the American people overwhelmingly support this legislation, that we will be able to come back, work with our colleagues on a bipartisan basis and perhaps make this legislation part of a broader energy bill, or attach it to an appropriations measure. But I think we will be able to find other legislation that we can attach approval of the Keystone XL Pipeline—this bill—to. That makes it very likely that we could either override a veto or maybe the President wouldn’t veto it. Because at the end of the day, what this is all about is more energy for this country, produced here and working with our closest friend and ally, Canada.

This is about jobs. By the State Department’s own environmental impact statement, 42,000 jobs. So it is about energy. It is about jobs. It is about the infrastructure we need to build the right kind of energy plan for our country. Whether one comes from North Dakota or Kentucky or Texas or Louisiana or wherever, we have to have infrastructure as part of our energy plan.

It is also about national security. Americans do not want to have to depend on getting oil from the Middle East. They want to produce it here at home, and they want to work with our closest ally, Canada, and we want the jobs and the economic activity that come with it.

So that is where we are. That is the game plan, to get this important legislation passed, and that is what this is all about. This is about moving forward on approving the Keystone XL Pipeline. When asked, the American people in the polling showed anywhere from 65 up to about 75 percent overwhelmingly support it. So that is what this issue is all about.

Now is our chance to show that we can move forward, and in a bipartisan way, and get this done for the people of this great Nation. We are hopeful that we can get it in the lameduck. That is great. We have cleared the way to get a vote, and if we can’t, then we will be right back to work on it in the new Congress.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if I could, it strikes me that there was some intervening event here between the difficulty of getting a vote over the past few years and the apparent ease of getting a vote now. It strikes me—and I would be interested in the observations of my colleague from North Dakota—it strikes me this intervening

event was the election and it could be that the voices of the American people have already altered the agenda in the Senate even before the Senate officially changes hands in January. Maybe the voices of the American people have finally been heard on this important issue that the Senator from North Dakota has been speaking about week after week after week for a very long time.

I would say to the Senator from North Dakota, when there is a new majority here, if we come up short between now and the end of the year, we will be back and back and back, looking for ways to make sure that the voices of the American people are heard, and all of these new jobs are created.

So I hope—the Senator from North Dakota has indicated we will come to a favorable conclusion sooner, but I assure the Senator from North Dakota that we will come to a favorable conclusion later, if not sooner.

I see the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCONNELL. I will, yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I agree with the Republican leader that our leader on this issue for years now in the Senate has been the Senator from North Dakota, and North Dakota is a big energy-producing State—second, I must point out, to my State of Texas, but they are making some rapid developments in that area, and a lot of Texans have gone temporarily to North Dakota to help them with the technology, and they are doing a great job. Believe me, it is creating a lot of jobs. These aren't minimum wage jobs, these are high-paying jobs. As a matter of fact, there are labor shortages, and what we need to do is train more people to qualify for these good, high-paying jobs.

But I wonder whether the Republican leader—or really I would be interested in anybody's point of view—beyond the election, I think there are going to have to be some changes of heart on the other side of the aisle, because as the distinguished Senator from North Dakota pointed out, we have gotten close, but never quite achieved that 60-vote goal. So if we are going to vote on this now as a result of the intervening election, there are going to have to be some folks on the other side of the aisle who are going to have to have a change of heart and vote for the bill, which I hope they do.

But this has been the main impediment—no opportunity for a vote—because the majority leader, Senator REID, has refused to grant a vote up until this point. He has changed his mind. That represents progress. But I think we have two impediments. One is the need for additional Democratic votes to actually meet that threshold; and then, as the Senator from North Dakota points out, we don't know

whether the President has been chastened or has learned anything from the election, or if he is going to be influenced at all in his decision.

I know the Senator from North Dakota has been a bulldog on this issue. He is not going to let this one get away from him, nor should he, for all the reasons mentioned earlier, including the 42,000 jobs. Also, a lot of this oil, if it doesn't come in this pipeline across from Canada to the United States, most of it is going to be refined in southeast Texas and turned into gasoline and jet fuel, which is going to help bring down prices, because we will see a glut of additional supply. But if we don't use it in the United States, this is going to be shipped to China or other places that are rapidly buying natural resources.

So I would be interested if the Republican leader has a view of how we get over those final hurdles of getting Democratic votes next Tuesday to get to that 60-vote threshold. Then, how do we get the President to sign this, for a President—at least so far—who has refused to listen to the American people?

Mr. McCONNELL. I would say to my friend, we were both in an election this year and there is no question that this jobless recovery is the biggest issue in the country. Here we have had a project which has cleared all of the environmental hurdles, it has been sitting around for literally 6 years, and—I don't know what the latest estimate of job creation is. I would ask my friend from North Dakota, what is the latest estimate on that? How many new people would be put to work constructing this pipeline—ready to go to work?

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, there have been a whole range of numbers offered. But I think to cut through to a number that people should be able to accept and to agree on is to take the number the State Department has put forward in the environmental impact statement. As a matter of fact, I think there have been either four or five environmental impact statements done on this project over a 6-year period, going all the way back to starting in September 2008 when TransCanada initially applied for approval of the Keystone XL Pipeline, which is the sister pipeline to the Keystone Pipeline, which was already built—permitted in 2 years and built in 2 years—and that happened when I was Governor. I actually started working with this project when I was Governor and it continued when I came to the Senate. But TransCanada originally applied for their permit back in September of 2008. So for 6 years this has been going on, and in the final environmental impact statement, which stated the project will have no significant environmental impact—it stated that very clearly—they also said it will create about 42,000 jobs. And these are good-paying jobs, construction jobs and other types of jobs that are good-paying jobs.

So here is a project, when we include Canada, about \$7.9 billion. It is not

going to cost the government one penny—not one penny. By the State Department's own admission, it will create 42,000 jobs. It will generate hundreds of millions in tax revenue to help the States and help with our deficit and debt, and it is to move oil not only from Canada, but from my State of North Dakota and Montana to refineries in Texas and Louisiana and other places that need the crude, and right now that crude is coming from places such as Venezuela or the Middle East.

It is a job creator, and there are all of these other benefits. Again, it is an excellent example of the kind of infrastructure we need to build the energy plan this country needs.

I ask the minority leader if I have answered his question adequately.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if I may, it strikes me what the administration is best at is either destroying jobs or preventing new jobs from being created. In my State, as a direct result of the Environmental Protection Agency, we have lost 7,000 coal-mining jobs during the Obama years. For every coal-mining job, we lose three more jobs. We have a literal depression in eastern Kentucky, largely caused by the Obama Environmental Protection Agency. So you begin to get the picture.

Whether it is preventing 42,000 people from going to work or taking the employment away from up to 21,000 Kentuckians, what this administration seems to be best at is either destroying existing jobs or preventing new jobs from being created. I am happy there was an energy bill in Texas and an energy bill in North Dakota. I am pretty darn unhappy we don't have an energy bill in Kentucky. We have a depression again as a result of this administration and its Environmental Protection Agency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, would the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. McCONNELL. Yes, I would be happy to yield.

Mr. CORNYN. I ask the Senator from Kentucky—I think you described how the administration appears to not just have a war on coal but a war on hydrocarbons, a war on anything other than wind turbines and solar panels.

The President said he is for all of the above. We are a big “all of the above” State. We have a lot of sunshine and wind. We actually produce more electricity from wind energy than any other State in the country, but it is hard to understand this ideological battle against coal and oil and gas from anywhere other than just an ideological perspective.

I think the Senators have pointed out well—both the Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from Kentucky—that these are good, high-paying jobs. One of the biggest problems we have had in the country for the last 30 years has been stagnant wages.

The middle-class wage earners are not seeing their wages go up. One of the surefire ways to make them go up is to develop more domestic energy, whether it is coal or whether it is oil or gas, because these are good, high-paying jobs.

I can tell you not just in North Dakota, where I am sure it is hard for restaurants to find people to work there because there is so much demand in the oil and gas business, but the Permian Basin, in the Midland Odessa area, where I know the Senator from Kentucky visited many times, there is a shortage of labor, and wages skyrocketed because of the demand as a result of taking advantage of this natural resource.

I would just ask—obviously the Members of the Senate who have been vitally interested in this issue under the leadership of our friend, the Senator from North Dakota—it has been acknowledged, but I think it is only fair, wouldn't the Senator say, to acknowledge the leadership in the House of Representatives of Congressman BILL CASSIDY. As a matter of fact, the bill that the House will pass tomorrow and send over here is chiefly the work product of Congressman BILL CASSIDY.

Mr. MCCONNELL. It certainly is. We commend him for his good work and that bill will be headed over this way. I would also make the observation with regard to the President's approach to energy, the announcement in China yesterday which, as I read it, gives the Chinese 16 years to do anything to reduce their carbon emissions while we are going full speed ahead here, visibly destroying American jobs or trying to prevent the creation of new jobs in North Dakota.

My goodness, as I said earlier, it seems to me what this administration is best at is either destroying existing jobs or preventing new jobs from being created because of this obsession, as the Senator from Texas pointed out, with hydrocarbons of any kind.

I see the Senator from South Dakota here as well and wonder if he may have a question.

Mr. THUNE. Yes. I would say to my colleague from Kentucky—and I appreciate the leadership of our colleague from North Dakota in constantly, persistently trying to get this in the Senate for a vote. My State of South Dakota, similar to so many others, stands to benefit enormously from this. We wish we had the direct energy production that the Senator of North Dakota has. We have a lot of indirect benefit from that. In fact, the State Department, the President's own State Department—not the oil companies—the State Department has said that in my State of South Dakota it would create 3,000 to 4,000 jobs, add \$100 million to the economy, and generate \$20 million in property tax revenue.

I happen to come from a county through which the pipeline would pass, a small rural county in South Dakota. My father still lives there. He is 94

years old. The school district there is very concerned about staying open. They know that when this pipeline is built, the easement they will have to get will generate property tax revenue that very well could keep the school district going. So many of the local governments out in my area in the State are very supportive of this important project.

I guess as I have looked at this—we have now had plenty of time to look at it since it has been kicking around here for about 6 years and five now environmental impact statements, all of which came back and said they have minimal impact on the environment.

If we are serious about job creation, and we have all talked on our side about the jobs this would create, the economic activities it would create, and the lessening of the dependence we have on foreign sources of energy—I have to say one other thing about my State; that is, we have a rail crisis. We have been battling now for a long time with the limited capacity in rail and much of the oil moving out is going on rail.

That makes it harder for us to get our agricultural commodities to the marketplace, and so what is happening is that we are consistently stressed. The one thing the pipeline would do in addition to moving Canadian oil down is it would allow for about 100,000 barrels a day of that—what do you call it—sweet light crude—to be put on the pipeline and therefore not on the rail car. That saves about a unit train a day, which is significant.

I guess I would say to my colleague from Kentucky—and I appreciate the arguments he has made not just with respect to this specific issue but also with what the administration's policies are doing to energy production in this country and the cost of energy and what that means for middle-income families, what that means for businesses, and what that means for jobs. It is like an all-out assault.

The Keystone Pipeline is one example of many of policies where this administration is in a position to do something good for the economy, something good for jobs, and something good for energy development in this country, lessening the dangerous dependence we have on foreign oil sources of energy.

I would say to my friend from Kentucky and I would ask him in terms of—the Senator doesn't have the direct and indirect benefit we have in North and South Dakota, but I know he has an awful lot of energy development in his State—what these policies are doing to jobs in a State such as Kentucky.

I know the Senator hears every day from his constituents about this administration's assault on the industries that are so basic and so important to our economy, so important to jobs, and providing a better, stronger, if you will, future for middle-income families in this country.

I would be curious to know if the Senator from Kentucky shares the same concern about the jobs and economy and cost of energy and everything else that I do and that we do in the northern part of the country.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I thank my friend from South Dakota. I think the energy revolution is wonderful and we ought to embrace it. As I was saying earlier, what has happened in my State as a result of the war on coal, 90 percent of our electricity in Kentucky comes from coal-fired generation. We have been among the top five of the lowest utility rates in the country in any given year for as long as anyone can remember.

The war on coal is not only a war on coal miners. It is a war on all of Kentucky because our utility rates are beginning to go up, which is going to make the energy less affordable for people on fixed incomes in my State and make us less able to compete for other industries.

I repeat. I am thrilled at what is going on in North Dakota and what is going on in Texas. We would like to have some of that job growth ourselves and calling off this Environmental Protection Agency which seems to be just hell-bent to take coal out of the equation.

It is a heavy price to pay for this ideological crusade which the President seeks to lead on a worldwide basis and says to the Chinese they don't have to do anything for 16 years while we take away our own jobs and opportunity.

Mr. CORNYN. I wonder if the Senator would yield for one last question. I see the Senator from Alaska, and I hope she will join us in this discussion.

To follow up on a very important point made by the Senator from North Dakota that hadn't been explored a lot, he talked about the implications of more North American energy self-sufficiency and what that might mean in terms of geopolitics.

We know, for example, that Vladimir Putin used his energy as a weapon in Ukraine and Europe to try to intimidate people and to keep them from resisting his invasion of independent republics such as Ukraine.

I think it is significant because for so long we have been dependent on imported energy from the Middle East, which we know has been a real challenge because of the instability there, millennia old conflicts and sectarian strife.

I would be interested if the Senator from Kentucky or perhaps other Senators have observations about what this means in terms of the safety and the security of the United States as we become increasingly North American energy self-sufficient. We haven't even talked about New Mexico. They are just now beginning to open their domestic energy production to the kinds of things we are already seeing in North Dakota, Texas and Alaska and elsewhere.

It promises not only jobs but a great opportunity for us to become a safer

and more stable source of this necessary energy supply.

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, obviously what is happening is America is on its way to being energy independent in natural gas and oil. We have the ranking member of the energy committee on the floor as well. I wonder if she had a question.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, and to our leader on the floor and to the colleagues who have come together to talk about this important issue for us as a nation from an energy perspective—and we mentioned the jobs and the benefits that flow to our Nation's economy. When we talk about the issue of energy independence, there was a time when people would scoff at the notion that as a nation we would ever have a level of independence. I guess I look at it and say energy independence to me is a place where we are no longer vulnerable for our energy sources from those who would wish us ill. What has happened to this Nation in the past half dozen years has been transformational.

We talk about the shale revolution. We talk about a renaissance. What this means to us is that we are truly approaching that point where we are more energy secure and from a national security perspective. The vulnerability we once had is greatly lessened because of our own ability to produce our own resources for our people.

It is not just within the continental United States. It is Alaska as we point out, but it is North America. We are talking about North American energy independence and what that entails and what that means. When we think about where we have come and the fact that next year we will be producing more oil than Saudi Arabia, who would have thought that the United States would be in this perspective. Who would have thought we would have a conversation about energy abundance rather than energy scarcity.

It hasn't happened because this oil has just suddenly migrated to North America. It has always been there. It has been our technology. It has been our ingenuity that allows us to access it. Think what we can do when we partner with our friends and neighbors whether it is Canada to the north or Mexico to the south. So when we talk about energy independence and energy security, the Keystone XL Pipeline is kind of that corridor that helps connect us as two nations. The benefits that derive to both of us are quite considerable.

We are talking about jobs for America and we should be. I think we also need to recognize that when we are talking about the Keystone XL Pipeline, it is about a trade relationship with our closest neighbor and truly our closest ally and the benefits that come to both of us because of this relationship.

There is a phrase that is used. We say the United States and Canada are joined at the well—literally joined at

the well. This is something the Congressional Research Service actually says.

There are currently 19 cross-border oil pipelines that are already operating between the United States and Canada or Mexico. This is in addition to all of the dozens of natural gas, electric transmission lines. These are oil pipelines that are crossing the border with Canada into Montana and into North Dakota, into Michigan, into New York, into Washington, into Vermont.

One would think this Keystone XL was the first pipeline to ever cross the border from the north to the south. It is some new precedent setting. There were 19 cross-border oil pipelines.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Back in 2009 this administration, this Obama administration, came to a decision about the Alberta Clipper project. This was yet another pipeline from Canada to the United States. There were arguments for and against. But ultimately Clipper was approved just as Keystone XL should be approved. So when we are talking about plowing new ground here, I think it is important for people to recognize there is no new ground that we are plowing here. This is just a reticence and a reluctance from an administration to do what I think people across the country believe is the right and the reasonable thing, not only from a jobs perspective, from an economic perspective, but from an energy security perspective as well as a relationship with our closest friend and ally.

I know my colleague from Kentucky had an opportunity to serve with our former colleague here, Senator Ted Kennedy. I am not going to ask the Senator whether he recalls the quote, but I think it is important to kind of put this in context. We have not as a nation always been opposed to importing this crude from Canada. As I mentioned, 19 cross-border agreements are in place today. But back in 1970 the Nixon administration announced they were going to place a quota on Canadian oil exports. This was when things around the country were getting dicey.

It was Senator Ted Kennedy who led the fight against this. He said—and this is a quote from a Senate hearing back in March of 1970. Senator Kennedy said:

The reason why Canadian oil has never been restricted in the past is obvious. Canadian oil is as militarily and politically secure as our own and thus there can be no national security justification for limiting its importation.

So not only is this an issue that has been going on for a long time, both sides of the aisle recognize that there is an imperative when you come together with your allies for a resource that we recognize is a benefit to all, creates jobs for all.

So I ask my colleague from Kentucky, because he has not only served in this body for considerable years, but he has been through these debates over the decades. The question is: Why is

this Keystone XL Pipeline being held out to be such a groundbreaking initiative that this President would put a hold on it for 5 years?

Mr. McCONNELL. I would say to my friend from Alaska, I am as perplexed by that as she is. The Senator pointed out that having a cross-border pipeline is not exactly something new. As our chairman, Senator HOEVEN, has pointed out repeatedly, it has cleared every environmental test. We cannot figure out why this has happened other than some misplaced ideological crusade the President wants to lead, not approved by Congress.

We all remember what it was like here in 2009 and 2010. Our friends on the other side had 60 votes. They could do whatever they wanted to. They could not pass cap-and-trade when they owned the place. They passed ObamaCare. They passed the stimulus. They passed Dodd-Frank. They couldn't pass cap-and-trade.

The President obviously feels so strongly about this, he is willing to give the Chinese a 16-year pass, ignore Congress and go full speed ahead. Part of that ideological rigidity is reflected in the challenge our friend from North Dakota has had here for a number of years in getting a decision made, which by any objective standard ought to be a no-brainer. My goodness, this is about as close to a no-brainer as you will ever run into.

I came out here for the specific purpose of praising the great work of the Senator from North Dakota. Without him we would not be where we are today on this issue.

I wonder if the Senator has any further question or observation to make?

Mr. HOEVEN. Madam President, I would like to thank the minority leader. I would like to thank all the Members of our caucus for joining on this bipartisan legislation. You know, we are continuing to work across the aisle to get 60 votes. At the end of the day, you have got to go back to what this is all about. This is about building an "all of the above" energy plan for this Nation. You cannot build an "all of the above" energy plan for the Nation if you do not have the infrastructure to move that energy around the country. We are seeing what is happening. Because we have been blocked on building these pipelines, now we are not able to move our grain to market, because there are so many rail cars now trying to move crude oil—700,000 barrels a day out of our State alone, and it is growing.

Keystone alone will replace 1,400 rail cars a day that are now carrying oil. That is 10-unit trains. So, you see, this is about so many aspects of our economy, strengthening our economy and creating good-paying jobs that people want. That is why the American people—and that is who we work for, that is who we represent. That is what this is about. That is what we heard loud and clear in the election, is that the American people want us to work together. They want us to get jobs going,

get this economy going, build the right kind of energy future, get our budget deficit under control.

That means we have to do the fundamentals. When we talk about building infrastructure, we are talking about the fundamentals. That is what is going on here. This has been 6 years. We need to get this economy going. That starts with common sense. This is common sense. This is common sense because it is about energy, it is about jobs, it is about growing the economy, it is about national security, it is about not having to get oil from the Middle East, and it is about doing what the American people overwhelmingly time and again have told us they want us to do.

Again, I want to thank the minority leader. I will turn to him and again say: You know, I believe we can find a way, either in this lameduck or in the next Congress—and I would ask the leader—in the next Congress, and I believe it to be true, as the majority leader, he will make this a priority as part of an energy plan for this country.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Let me wrap it up by thanking again the Senator from North Dakota for his extraordinary leadership on this issue and assure the American people that we will be back. Hopefully it will be approved and signed by the President sooner. If not, he will have another opportunity later.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, I most certainly have enjoyed this colloquy and have been down on the floor most of the day. I am extremely disappointed I could not get any Member of the other side to recognize me for questions. I see the minority leader leaving the floor now, although he knows I have many questions for him that he does not want to answer. But that is his prerogative. You know, I thought we came here to work together. I am standing here. I have worked with Senator HOEVEN on this bill. Before Senator HOEVEN leaves the floor or Senator BARRASSO or Senator MURKOWSKI, if they would stay, I would like to thank Senator HOEVEN for his extraordinary leadership on this bill.

Although the other side does not acknowledge any of the leaders over here, such as the Presiding Officer or Senator MANCHIN or Senator Baucus, who is no longer here but was a strong voice for Keystone many years ago, or some of the other Democratic Senators, I want to personally thank Senator HOEVEN for his leadership and thank Senator MURKOWSKI for her extraordinary leadership on this issue.

The Senator has been a real partner to me in the truest sense of the word and in the greatest spirit of bipartisanship. Of course, she had an experience that not many Senators have. She was defeated by her own party in her own State. They chose someone else and ran against the Senator, which is unusual, and did not support her in her

reelection, even though the Senator and her father have chaired, on and off, the energy committee for years. I have been a strong partner not only with LISA, the Senator from Alaska, but with her father Frank.

But the Republican Party did not support the Senator in her last election. So the Senator had to sign in on an Independent ticket. I was one of the first people to call her and say: Go, girl. Let's get it done. She did. So I have the utmost respect for Senator MURKOWSKI. I have the utmost respect for the Senator's father. I have the utmost respect for Ted Stevens. I stood with Ted Stevens until the end, even though my party went against him. I would fight for him to this day if he were here, because some of us actually believe in bipartisanship. Lots of people around here talk about it, but that is really it.

The evidence I am going to give—I am sorry the Senator from Kentucky is not here to defend himself. I want the quote he wrote down. He might come back to the floor when he hears what I am going to say. I am going to speak for 1 hour.

The Senator from Kentucky, who will be the majority leader, has not left his partisanship in Kentucky because you just saw it on display here. He cannot help himself. He cannot speak for 3 minutes without mentioning the President. He had his back turned the whole time, would not even acknowledge anyone over here. So he does a lot of talking about bipartisanship. But his statement just yesterday was, "I am confident Dr. CASSIDY will use his position to succeed where Senator LANDRIEU failed."

I do not necessarily think this is failure to get a vote on the Keystone Pipeline. I think this is a great victory. I want to share this victory with Senator HOEVEN who is a leader. I also want to have printed in the RECORD—the Senator from Kentucky had a lot to say about everybody else not doing their job. I want to say that on at least one occasion, he did not do his either. On March 16, there were 15 Senators—March 16 of 2011, not 2012. I mean not 2014, not 2013, not 2012, but 2011. I think that was before the Presiding Officer was here. On March 16, 2011, when Secretary Clinton was still the Secretary of State, there were 16 Members of the Senate who signed a letter to her asking her to approve the Keystone Pipeline. I am going to read those names because I think it is important. My name is first, amazingly. I am very proud of that, didn't even remember it. MARY LANDRIEU. ORRIN HATCH circulated a letter with me. Max Baucus. Kay Bailey Hutchison, my dear friend from Texas. PAT ROBERTS from Kansas, another dear friend. MIKE ENZI from Wyoming. LISA MURKOWSKI—of course her name would be on here—from Alaska. Senator JOHN CORNYN from Texas. JOHN BARRASSO from Wyoming. MARK BEGICH from Alaska who just unfortunately lost his race because of several

reasons, one of which is that people talk a lot about bipartisanship who do not really honor it. Nobody better than MARK BEGICH has shown a willingness to work across party lines. He is no longer with us, but he signed this letter. ROY BLUNT from Missouri. JOHN HOEVEN from North Dakota, and RON JOHNSON.

But you know a signature that is not on this letter is MITCH MCCONNELL's. Maybe MITCH MCCONNELL was too busy to sign this letter. But his name is not on here. Now am I saying MITCH MCCONNELL has not been a supporter of the Keystone Pipeline? Absolutely not. Senator MCCONNELL has supported this project. But what I am saying is that Senator MCCONNELL has not been truthful with the American people about actually how this has always evolved. To support that claim, which is a strong one, on May 7, 2014, Senator REID offered a vote on the XL Pipeline. Senator MCCONNELL objected. On May 12, 2014, Senator REID offered a vote on the Keystone Pipeline. Senator MCCONNELL objected. On May 12, I offered a vote on the Keystone Pipeline. Senator FLAKE objected for Senator MCCONNELL. On June 24, Senator SHAHEEN offered a vote on the XL Pipeline. That, of course, I believe, was connected with the energy efficiency bill with Senator PORTMAN. Senator INHOFE objected. Senator MCCONNELL did nothing to help. Then on June 25, Senator REID offered a vote on the XL Pipeline. Senator MCCONNELL objected.

I want to underscore this. I am not saying Senator REID is a supporter of the pipeline. He has never been. He is not a supporter of the pipeline, but he has asked for a vote on Keystone a number of times and Senator MCCONNELL has objected.

Senator MCCONNELL will come to the floor and show a list such as this when he has asked for votes on the Keystone Pipeline and Senator REID has objected. That is the truth of the Congress. The saddest thing about this is I have believed for over 1 year that if we could actually get a vote, we have the 60 votes to pass it.

I have said that on any number of occasions. I believe we have the 60 votes to pass Keystone. I believe the coalition of oil and gas and energy and manufacturing companies that are very strong, with the coalition of the strongest labor unions and organizations that represent working people, and with the vote in this last election, and with the people of the United States—mostly because of the people of the United States asking us to do our jobs, I, on faith, and with strong evidence that I have—but on faith in what is right, what is true, and what is best—we have the 60 votes on this floor. That is why I came to the floor yesterday—on that faith.

I said that I believed that it was time to vote on the Keystone Pipeline now. The most important reason is to show the American people that we are willing to put partisanship aside. I called Senator HOEVEN—the first thing I did.

The Senator has left the floor because I am not really sure anyone wants to debate me on this. But that is OK. I am used to it. I don't have anybody to debate at home in my election because my opponent won't show up. So I am very used to debating all by myself. So they have all left the floor.

But when I arrived in Washington, the first thing I did was to call Senator HOEVEN. I spoke to him because I have done that on any number of occasions. I said to him: JOHN, I think this is a very good time, and there are several reasons why. I think the politics are cleared up. I think the people spoke—cleared up, not meaning me. It is not about my politics, but it is about the politics of some people who lost and won.

Some people who were opposing the vote have lost. Some people who supported having the vote are here. I have said it looks to me as if this is a perfect opportunity to do two things—to get done something that you and I have wanted to do now for over 1 year.

This letter most certainly suggests that there were a number of us—not many. There were only 15 of us who signed the letter to Secretary Clinton asking her to push forward on the pipeline. Other people were either too busy to sign it or didn't think—whatever—but it is a bipartisan letter and it was very good.

So I called the Senator, and he said that he didn't think that it would happen until the next Congress.

So I said: Well, let's try. Maybe we could get it done. He said that he would talk to his leadership, and that was the last conversation I have had with him.

I came down to the floor yesterday just thinking: Well, maybe I will just kick it up a little bit, and sure enough, I did. It got kicked up pretty high. I was actually here around 2 o'clock because I have been around here enough to know that if you show up early you actually might get something done. Don't show up late; don't be late. My dad taught me to be on time, so I was here at 2 o'clock.

I was very interested to see what Majority Leader REID would say and Minority Leader MCCONNELL would say, and the Senator from Texas, who is usually always with the Senator from Kentucky, what they would say about what we should do.

I sat here fully expecting the minority leader from Kentucky—soon to be the majority leader—to say OK, the people have spoken; let's get on with a bill that is very important. Everyone in the country—not everyone, but many people—many people in this country, in all regions, support the Keystone Pipeline—not everyone. There are strong feelings against it, but every poll I have seen shows people from many different areas of the country, many different political persuasions. This is not as if only Democrats are against it and only Republicans are for it. There are many Democrats in

my State that have supported it—poor people, rich people, black people, white people—Democrats who support the Keystone Pipeline. I am certain that is true in the State of the Presiding Officer, North Dakota. I am sure that it is not even a party issue in the State of North Dakota. This is just a common-sense issue to get the Keystone Pipeline bill.

At approximately 2:15 yesterday I sat on the floor, ready to go. I had called my leader and JOHN HOEVEN. His name is first on this bill. I could have asked for my name to be first on the bill because I actually chair the committee, but I was trying to be bipartisan, gracious, and a team member. It hasn't gotten me very far, but I just used it as an example.

I said: JOHN, this means the world to you, although it means the world to me, put your name first. So it is called the Hoeven-Landrieu bill. I called him since it is his bill and asked him what he thought. He said he thought we could do it in the next Congress. I said, I actually think we can do it now. He said he didn't think so. So I just came to the floor.

I waited for MITCH MCCONNELL to say something. This is what he said:

Mr. President, last week the American people sent a strong message to Washington. They voted for a new direction. They called for a change in the way we do things in the Senate, and they sent a new team to Washington to carry their wishes forward, and we plan to do just that.

But several items remain for the outgoing Congress to consider and that is our immediate focus.

So I am sitting in my chair thinking OK, here we go. I am ready. I have been ready since we started, but definitely my staff can't find anything before that which I can show for any evidence, other than this letter. So I can just say I think I was for it since I heard about it. But since I can't prove it, let's go back to March 16, 2011, because my signature is the lead on this letter. So that is some indication that I have been leading at least since then.

I get a tremendous amount of credit, of course, from my own caucus because they understand that even though most of my caucus doesn't agree with me and thinks I have been—and I have really pushed them on this issue and will continue to, because that is what good Senators do. We don't represent our caucuses. We represent our States, and we fight hard for what we believe is right. I have, for the longest time, felt this was the right thing to do. So that was that letter.

I was sitting and thinking: Here we go. But this is what the minority leader went on to say:

In the weeks that remain in this Congress, we should work to accomplish the essential task [not of building the Keystone Pipeline] of funding the Congress and preventing retroactive tax increases.

I thought he could say the essential task of funding Congress—which I will put first, although a lot of people don't think we should fund ourselves because

we are not doing a very good job—but I will give him that.

The second I would put—and let's show the people that we mean business by passing a bipartisan bill, the Keystone Pipeline, and moving it to the President's desk. But he said:

... preventing retroactive tax increases. We must address the expiring authority passed earlier this session for the Department of Defense to train and equip a moderate, vetted Syrian opposition [I agree that is very important] and we must continue to support the efforts to address the Ebola crisis [equally important].

But then something interesting happened. They brought to the floor a childhood bill—the majority and minority together. The leadership brought a bill that has bipartisan support—but so does Keystone. But the majority leader and the minority leader didn't think Keystone could get votes or couldn't pass or maybe they didn't want to pass it.

But as long as I am a Senator—I hope to be for many years to come—I am going to continue to fight for what is right and do it in as gracious a manner as possible to give credit where credit is due, to honor the Members on the other side and on my side who work very hard and just don't talk about bipartisanship but actually work at it every day.

I am sorry that it doesn't seem possible for the minority leader—soon to be majority leader—to do that. When he finished speaking, I just sat here because I can't get leader time because I am not the leader of the caucus. Then I thought well, maybe Senator CORNYN will say something.

Senator CORNYN spoke at approximately 2:30, the record says. He spoke longer than the majority leader. He also talked about dysfunction, but he never called for a Keystone vote either. So I thought that was strange.

He said: "We will pass a budget next year—something our friends across the aisle have failed to do . . ."

He said: "I know Republicans and Democrats will continue to have policy disagreements."

He also said:

So last week's election will not change some of the fundamental policy differences we have between political parties on ObamaCare, on what we need to do to preserve and protect Social Security and Medicare and the like . . . but it will give us a chance to make some steady incremental progress on issues where we do agree.

He talked about Ted Kennedy, the lion of the Senate. He talked about MIKE ENZI and how MIKE ENZI, who is a wonderful Senator—someone I have worked with very closely—said: Let's work on the 80-20 rule.

He said: What is that? He said: Let's work on the 80 percent that we can agree on and the 20 percent we cannot.

Then he went on to say:

That strikes me as eminently practical and a way for us to begin to get back to work again.

When I talk about the easy stuff we can do, I am referring to the bipartisan majority

that supports things such as the Keystone XL Pipeline authorization . . .

I want to repeat that:

When I talk about the easy stuff we can do, I am referring to the bipartisan majority that supports things such as the Keystone XL Pipeline authorization . . .

So I thought he would call for us to see what we could do in this lame duck. We are going to vote on an early childhood education bill. Most certainly we would have the time to vote on a jobs bill.

Now I believe early childhood education in the long term is the best jobs bill we can do. I have said that over and over, and my life has been committed to early childhood education, good schools, excellence in education, and accountability. I am not saying this to diminish the bill the Senate is poised to pass, which is for early childhood education. But if we started today with 2 year olds, it will literally take us 20 years until they are 22, and the American people want jobs yesterday. They want jobs now. They don't want jobs in 22 years.

So I was hoping the majority would see that there is a clear path for the Keystone Pipeline to pass—a clear path. You can see it. You don't need a magnifying glass. You just need a brain in your head, an understanding of what happened in the election, and the votes that are here. It is—yes, what happened in the election, not only that the American people spoke, but that some Members who were opposed to it and who didn't want to vote have lost their elections.

The votes are here to pass this bill. It was clear to me; I thought it should be clear to the majority leader. So people are going to have to go ask the majority leader. He left the floor, and he will not answer this question, but I am going to continue to ask it until I get an answer from him because I think the people of the United States deserve it. Why didn't he? He has been talking about it incessantly every day, not only beating up on Democrats, even though about 15 of us—maybe more—will vote for it, but he has been beating up on the President incessantly, every day. And when he had the microphone, when he had the chance, when he was elected overwhelmingly in his State, he walked to the floor and didn't say a word about the Keystone Pipeline. Not a word. He didn't even refer to it.

Then the Senator from Texas, who I thought, well—because they do their scripts together, they coordinate them very well. I thought maybe the Senator from Texas was going to give the signal. The Senator from Texas didn't give the signal, either.

So as all Senators here who are elected have the right to stand up at their desk and ask for recognition—it is about as simple as that. I didn't even have a script. I was just sort of thinking that they were going to do it. That is why I was here, because I thought at least I would like to say I agree with it, and I am prepared to do what I have done to rally our side to get the votes.

So neither one of them said anything. And we can read it for ourselves. It is very clear. The Senator from Texas said we should do easy stuff like the Keystone Pipeline. We will do that. Next time we will work on workforce training. He said: No. 4, we can work on infrastructure; No. 5, he said we should discourage abusive, costly litigation; No. 6, we are going to repeal ObamaCare, particularly restore the 40-hour workweek; repeal the medical device tax; and No. 8, we are going to abolish the Independent Payment Advisory Board under Medicare. Each of these things I have mentioned has bipartisan support. If we can pass these measures, we will send them to the President for his signature. So starting with the easy stuff we have already identified that has bipartisan support.

Well, I lead the bipartisan effort on the Democratic side, and I am proud to say that I lead it with the Senator from North Dakota who is presiding, who has been an equally ferocious and sometimes more effective, I will admit, champion than I have been, and the Senator from West Virginia, who has also been an absolute bulldog on the issue.

There are other Senators. Max Baucus was a strong supporter of Keystone. Senator TESTER. Is it impossible for Republicans to utter the words? Senator TESTER. Senator HEITKAMP. They don't have to say my name. I am clear about why they are not doing that, but they could at least be gracious enough to recognize the leadership of the other Senators here who have worked hard.

When we start this next Congress—and I am going to do everything I can to be a part of it—I really hope the reporters in this Chamber and people who are following this will start reporting what really happens here instead of what happens at press conferences, instead of what people say in press releases, instead of what people say when they buy staged television ads. If the reporters would actually just report what happened, I think that would be a good start.

Sometimes they are going to say: This is what Senator LANDRIEU did, and I disagree with her. This is what MITCH MCCONNELL did, and I disagree with him. But at least they would report what actually happens.

So when they finished speaking, I stood up and said I think the votes are there. I have reason to believe they are. I worked for a couple of days last week just calling around because I am the chair of the committee, and my job is to pass legislation. I passed some significant pieces of legislation even before I was the chair of the energy committee, although you would not believe that listening to some people. We passed the RESTORE Act. I led the pushback against Biggert-Waters, although I didn't put my name on it because I knew if I did, it would never pass because they wouldn't have allowed it under any circumstance. So Senator MENENDEZ and Senator ISAK-

SON were gracious to step up, and they led the effort, and I just kind of organized behind the scenes—it is clear that happened—and we passed it. I am grateful to this day that I didn't put my name as the lead because they never would have passed it in an election year, and we would have had 5 million people in this country literally turning their homes back to the banks or telling their children: The home that I built and that we built together that has \$300,000 or \$400,000 of equity—I am just telling you we are bankrupt.

I am so glad that didn't happen. I am thrilled.

So we did that bill. We did the RESTORE Act. I passed early in my career a revenue-sharing bill that is going to serve the State of Louisiana and the gulf coast beautifully for years to come.

Harry Truman offered us a portion of offshore oil and gas revenues even before I was born. When I got through college and read about it, I thought: Geez, that was a good idea. I liked Harry Truman's idea, and so I filed a bill and passed it as a junior member of the committee—I remind people, over the objection of my own chairman, who was a Democrat at the time, the Senator from New Mexico, JEFF BINGAMAN, who was adamantly opposed, adamantly fought every day, not just voted against me but lobbied against me, fought against me, spoke against it—not me personally but the bill. He just didn't believe in it—not me personally but the bill. I passed it over his objection, which is a very hard thing, for a junior member of the committee to pass it over the objection of their own chairman. But the reason I did it is because I figured out the votes, and we drafted it in a way that could secure the votes and passed it. That is the truth.

So I am happy tonight. I am not sad. I am happy tonight that the House of Representatives is again—because this is like the third time this has happened in my career. It is a great honor for a House that I haven't spent 2 minutes on the floor of—I mean, I know my delegation, but I haven't spent any time in the House. I wasn't even a Member of the House. This is the third time in my career that the House of Representatives has actually taken a Hoeven-Landrieu, Landrieu-Hoeven bill, stripped their bill—and I didn't even ask them to do it—and put my bill over there and passed it, and then they are going to move it over here. I could not be happier because we need to get the Keystone Pipeline done. They did sort of the same thing with revenue sharing, the RESTORE Act—well, four times—and the Biggert-Waters bill.

So I could not be happier that I was here at 2:00, that I listened to my father, who is listening now—he should be happy to say: Show up on time. You might not ever figure out what could happen if you aren't there on time.

So I was, thinking absolutely they wouldn't put the early childhood vote

on the floor, they would put Keystone on the floor because they talked about it every single day—every single day in my State, in Alaska, in North Carolina, in Georgia, and in Kentucky. Every single day.

What was wrong with yesterday? What was wrong with yesterday? It was a good day. I am going to let that question sit because there are a lot of people around here who know the answer; I don't have to tell it to them. What was wrong with Tuesday? So when they didn't mention it, I thought that I would because, as is the truth, I have been leading it since 2011. I am not going to stop until we get a vote on the Senate floor, for as long as I am here as chair, as ranking member—which I will be, and not as happy as being chair but thrilled to be able to work with the Senator from Alaska. If I had to pick one person in this body on that side of the aisle to work with, it would be LISA MURKOWSKI without a doubt, not only because she is a woman but because she is an independent woman. She is strong. And since I was raised by one, I cotton to them.

So I am a happy camper. It does not bother me because, as I have said, I have now worked here long enough to have worked in the majority and in the minority. I have worked with Republicans. I have worked with Democrats. I have worked with three Presidents of different parties and six Governors. Why would I be sad? This is kind of like somebody said to me: This is the gig you signed up for. Yes, it is. It is strange to many people, and I don't blame our constituents for getting aggravated, but it is a gig I signed up for because my dad signed up for it, my brother signed up for it, and my sister signed up for it because it is what we do, and we do it well. And every single member of my family—and my husband signed up for it, and his mother signed up for it. I think it is worth signing up for, is why I am here.

Other people can have their opinions about the people who are here. I think they are some of the best people in the world. Maybe the institution is dysfunctional—it is. It is dysfunctional at this moment, but the people are not. The individual people who are here on both sides are not dysfunctional individuals; they are some of the most extraordinary people on this planet. I know I am going to get criticized for that statement because people will say: There she goes, just talking about politicians. But I have served long enough to know there are really some extraordinary human beings who serve in this Senate—smart, capable, caring—on both sides of the aisle, and I am proud to be a part of it.

I was not proud of the minority leader from Kentucky on Tuesday. I was not proud of him today. I was not proud of the Senator from Texas today. I was very disappointed in the Senator from North Dakota. But they are my friends. We will get through it, and we will work forward together.

I am glad the House is debating and voting. I look forward to being back here on next Tuesday, where our vote will occur, and I am very hopeful we will have and I believe we will have not 60 but probably 61 votes for the Keystone Pipeline. What the President does is a different matter, and I would like to challenge the Senators on Tuesday to just focus on the Senate.

Let the Senate's will work. Let us pass this bill. We will then send it to the President, and under the Constitution—which is read to us on a frequent basis—the President has the right to sign it or to veto it. If he vetoes it, it is going to take 67 votes to override his veto. Mine will be one of them if he vetoes this bill. If I am here, my vote will be there to override his veto. I don't believe there are 67 other votes in the Senate to do that. There might be. I don't know what mindset people will have, but let's cross that bridge when we get there.

Stop talking about the White House and talk about the Senate. If the Senate can function, then maybe the House will do a little bit better, maybe the White House will do a little bit better. My mother taught me if you want to criticize others, start with yourself first. Get yourself straight before you start criticizing everybody else. All I hear around here is what this one didn't do and what that one didn't do and what the President didn't do. Let us work as a Senate. Let us show the American people how the Senate works.

The House is going to do their job on Keystone. We are going to do our job on Keystone, and that will break the gridlock, which we desperately need on a significant—not an easy bill, not an easy bill—but easier, such as early childhood education. Who could be opposed to that? But let's break the gridlock on a tough bill that is hard on our Members to vote on. There are Members here who think it is the worst thing in the world. I understand that. I think there are things that have passed here that I thought were the worst things in the world and I didn't like them, but voting is important. Senator DURBIN has said this and others have said this over and over again; Senator LEAHY, who has been here a long time. Let us vote and let us stop criticizing everyone else, and do our job, and I am proud that I helped to get us moving in that direction.

I am going to ask—Senator CARPER is seeking to speak on another matter. I understand my hour of postcloture is about to expire. I don't need any additional time. I note that Senator CARPER is here, but before that, Senator HEITKAMP, I would respectfully say to the Chair, I think may have some comments she would like to make, and I yield the floor, but if Senator HEITKAMP could go now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRANKEN). For the information of the Senate, cloture having been invoked, the motion to refer falls.

The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Thank you, Mr. President. I want to thank my very good friend MARY LANDRIEU for everything she has done for our country, for her State, for her tenacity, and for her willingness to shepherd this through at a very critical time.

We talked yesterday on the floor about how important it is to send the right messages to the American public. A lot of people will say, well, they pick this agenda or this agenda. They just want us to start working together. And they want us to turn on the television and watch C-SPAN and say, there they are in the sandbox again, fighting about things that don't matter to the American public. You know, picking fights with each other, bad-mouthing each other, as opposed to working together.

It is a little tough right now, because I think that if we are going to set the tone today, yesterday, today and in the days that follow during this lameduck, the tone that will establish the relationships and the courtesies we are going to have going forward in the next Congress, we need to make sure we are communicating when the tone goes a little wrong.

To me, I have fought this issue. I have been in favor of the Keystone Pipeline ever since I looked, and I somewhat famously likened it to carping about a reality TV show that has nothing to do with people's lives, and wondering why we care so much about Keystone, because it doesn't have a whole lot to do with carbon. It doesn't. Keystone Pipeline is about transportation of oil. That oil is going to get transported, it is going to get produced, and it is going to move. It is going to move on rail or it is going to move on pipe someplace. When you look at all the studies that have been done, the environmental studies, you turn it around 100 different ways, you come to the same conclusion, that the Keystone Pipeline makes an incredible amount of sense.

It is a job-ready project, shovel-ready project, with good trade union jobs. That is something you don't see every day in America. New things coming—it will help us transport 100,000 barrels of oil. That is less than 10 percent of what we produce every day but it will take, as my senior Senator said, a lot of unit trains off the rails so we can move grain, and it will be state of the art in terms of the quality of the pipeline. I have seen the pipeline. I have seen the oil sands. I have been there. We are headed for North American energy independence if we don't get in our own way.

Keystone has taken a role larger than life, and it has been this hot button issue that doesn't belong in this debate. It should have been approved, in my opinion, years ago, absolutely years ago. It has taken us longer to analyze Keystone than what it has taken us to beat Hitler—by far, almost 50 percent more time spent analyzing the Keystone Pipeline.

The people of the United States are tired of this issue. They are tired of our gridlock, and they are tired of the partisan bickering back and forth. So I would ask as a way to move forward on a lot of very difficult energy issues that we are going to have here, whether it is what I believe, we need to begin to lower the barriers and eliminate the barriers for exportation of crude oil. It has been something I have talked about a lot. I believe we need to export and to facilitate the exportation of natural gas. I believe we need to do everything we can to continue to develop our renewables. I believe we should have a renewable fuel standard that encourages—encourages—the development of renewable fuels. I believe a lot of things on energy, and we frequently hear in this body we are all of the above and people start talking and you know they are not. They are not all of the above. They are polarizing this issue.

At the heart of it, as I said yesterday, one of the reasons why the United States of America has not experienced an economic downturn or the slowdown that you see globally is because of this energy renaissance. This is what the American public has sent us to do, to set public policy, but more importantly, to get out of the way of private invention and entrepreneurship.

So I would respectfully, very respectfully, ask that when our colleagues from the other side come to the floor, think about how we can use language that brings us together, that doesn't tell the American public, there they go again. You know, here we are again in the sandbox trying to figure out who gets credit. You know what, when this place works, we will all get credit. And more importantly, when this place works, the American public will have their faith in their government restored.

So let's be very careful with language. Let's recognize everyone for the commitment they have made, and for the leadership they provided. And I have said many times in my home State, Senator HOEVEN has led this effort. He talks about it. He has been a champion for the Keystone Pipeline. I hope I have been a champion. But I certainly have not done the time that he has done on this issue. Senator HOEVEN deserves an incredible amount of credit; but equally, MARY LANDRIEU deserves an incredible amount of credit for moving this issue right at this point of time and moving this issue forward. We who are working on this side to gather the number of votes that we know we are going to need to pass this—that is not easy work. Trust me, that is not easy work, but we are making tremendous progress. We are making tremendous progress.

Now what happens next week? We hope we pass it. And we will cross the bridge of a Presidential veto when we come to it and if we come to it. But let's not presuppose what people are going to do and let's not stand here at

a time when the American public wants to see us all come together, let's not stand here and worry about who gets credit. Let's not stand here and call out people for what you consider past wrongs. Let's move forward on behalf of the American people.

I wanted to personally say thank you, Senator LANDRIEU, for your leadership, for your tenacity. And if I could add one point, and I will say this because I was with you every step of the way on flood insurance. Flood insurance would not have happened without MARY LANDRIEU. We had great support on the other side, great bipartisan effort, but she sounded the alarm before anyone knew we were going to have this problem and had already built that groundwork.

You know, I am sure there are a lot of things her opponents and her detractors can say about the positions she has taken over the years. Be honest about it. She has been a leader on Keystone. She has been a leader on oil and gas. She has been a leader on flood insurance. She has been a tenacious voice for all of those issues. And she has in her heart the best interests not just of the people in this country, but particularly the great people of the great State of Louisiana. So, thank you, MARY, for everything you do.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I did not come to the floor to praise Senator LANDRIEU, but while I am at it, I would like to say a few words.

I have the privilege of chairing the committee on governmental affairs. Senator LANDRIEU chairs the appropriations subcommittee that deals with Homeland Security. She is also a member of the authorizing committee. So she works both vineyards. She is as tenacious and tireless in her defense of our country against cyber attacks, against terrorist attacks, against all kinds of ills that would otherwise be visited on our country. She still finds time as chairman of the energy committee to focus not only on issues that are important to her State—and this is one of them—but also issues that are incredibly important to our country.

I said to my wife the other night—we were talking about Senator LANDRIEU and her tenacity. That word has been used tonight a couple times about her, as an unrelenting advocate for her State and the causes she believes in. Others have mentioned that she is a tireless advocate not only for Louisiana but for the causes that she sees that are just.

There is no quit in this one, as I said to my wife this week. She said, "How is Mary?" I would never want to run against this woman, and fortunately I would never have to. And for those who have to, good luck and God bless. But I am proud to be here with MARY, and with Senator HEIDI HEITKAMP as well.

The reason I come here tonight is to discuss a number of nominations that

have been considered and approved by the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee that both Senator LANDRIEU and Senator HEITKAMP and I serve on. Senator COBURN, our colleague from Oklahoma, is the ranking Republican on that committee, and we have worked tirelessly ourselves for the better part of the last 2 years to try to make sure there is a full complement of leadership in the Department of Homeland Security to provide the leadership for one of the most important agencies in our government. I have spoken with people on this floor and wherever else I could find a venue about the large and very troubling backlog of nominations in this Senate. I call it executive branch Swiss cheese. Executive branch Swiss cheese.

There are a couple of ways you can cripple an administration. No. 1, you can refuse to provide appropriations and funding. Another way to cripple an administration is to not approve the nominations of people who fill key leadership positions. The most important ingredient I found in any organization—I don't care if it is a legislative body such as this, a State such as Minnesota or Delaware or Louisiana or North Dakota—I don't care if it is a college or a business, a church. The most critical factor in all of those is leadership.

When we deny a President or a Governor or a mayor, for that matter, the ability to put his or her leadership team together—even when they are nominating well-qualified, competent people, people of integrity—we do not do just a disservice to that person who has been nominated and has gone through the process, but to the State or the county or the country in which they have been nominated to serve.

I think it is every Senator's constitutional role to provide advice and consent on the President's nominations in a thorough and timely manner as part of the Senate confirmation process. I have exercised that constitutional role and our right and our obligation. I think we do our country no service and do ourselves no honor when we leave critical agencies—and Homeland Security is certainly one of those—without proper leadership and leave honorable men and women who are willing to serve in the government twisting in the wind.

I am a big believer in the Golden Rule, as our Presiding Officer knows: treat other people the way we want to be treated. How would we like it if we were nominated, and we have a job—maybe it is an important job, maybe it is a job that pays a lot more than what they have been nominated to do in service to our country. All too often people are asked to put their lives and their family on hold. They don't know if they are going to be uprooted from wherever they are in the country to come here and live or for their spouse or father or mother to work. It is not fair.

In some cases, it is just to put people before committees and berate them

publicly for sins of omission or commission that may be fabricated. No wonder it is hard to get good people to serve.

In this case, I have several people that I will talk about tonight. These people deserve not just our consideration but our strong support.

During my 2 years as chairman of the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, I have made it one of my top priorities to work closely with our ranking Republican, Dr. TOM COBURN, who is a physician and also a Senator, and to vet the President's nominees that we have jurisdiction over and move them in a timely manner when they meet muster, scrub them good, make sure we have drilled down on what they believe in, their credentials and competency for serving, and when they do pass muster, try to move them along and bring them through our committee—almost every time—with a bipartisan vote and then bring the nomination to the floor.

TOM COBURN and I try to do that religiously with respect to our nominees. We try to do the same kind of bipartisan approach with our legislation. We have had a lot of success and we are grateful to our colleagues for supporting what we have done in our committee. We are grateful to Majority Leader REID and Senator MCCONNELL and their staffs. They have been valuable partners in this effort. Gary Myrick, who works on the floor for the Democratic side, and Laura Dove, who works on the Republican side for Senator MCCONNELL, have been terrific to work with, and we thank them for their stewardship.

Just yesterday our committee reported out three more outstanding nominees, one of them, Sarah Saldana, to be head of Immigration and Customs Enforcement at the Department of Homeland Security. It is a big job, it is an important job, and it is a tough job. Russell Deyo has been nominated to be the top management official at the Department of Homeland Security. Mickey Barnett has been nominated by the President to serve another term on the Postal Services Board of Governors.

I believe Ms. Saldana and Mr. Deyo will almost certainly be confirmed in short order. I urge my colleagues to review their qualifications and work with Dr. COBURN and me to fill these two vacancies at the Department of Homeland Security in the coming days.

I wish to spend a few minutes of my time tonight discussing the nomination of Mickey Barnett, who is already serving on the Postal Board of Governors. He is a Republican and nominated again by the President. I will then talk about a couple of lower profile nominees that I think we urgently need to confirm as quickly as we can—certainly this year during this lame-duck session.

Mickey Barnett is among a group of five partisan nominees to the Postal Board of Governors. His nomination was submitted by a Democratic Presi-

dent. Two of the nominees are Republicans, and Mickey is one of those, and three of them are Democrats.

If we don't confirm Mr. Barnett and his colleagues by December 8—a little more than 4 weeks from now—Mr. Barnett, who is currently the Board's chair, will be forced to leave the Board. If that happens, the Postal Board of Governors will no longer have enough members to achieve a quorum and will not be able to conduct business.

At a time when the Postal Service is struggling to address a number of financial challenges and adapt to the digital age and the Internet world we live in, being unable to conduct business would not be good for the Postal Service. In fact, it would be very bad. We need to avoid that from happening. I think if it does happen, we will be inviting a disaster.

Today, because of our inability in Congress to come to a consensus on postal reform legislation—and they are actually creeping closer—the good work by Dr. COBURN and a number of other people to actually develop a bipartisan consensus around the legislation that was reported out of our committee—I believe in a 9-to-1 vote earlier this year—the Postal Service will continue to twist in the wind, able to only do so much to address the financial challenges they face and to transfer themselves in a digital age. They need to figure out how to make themselves relevant—a 200-some-year-old establishment—in delivering that work that goes to every business and every residence in this country, for the most part, 6 days a week.

How do we enable the Postal Service to make money? They are figuring it out, and we can help them with our legislation.

Meanwhile, the customers of the Postal Service are left with uncertainty about what the future holds for the Postal Service. Are they going to be around? Are they going to be able to do the job? Are they ever going to modernize their fleet? Are they ever going to modernize their processing centers and the post offices themselves? We can answer that question and enable them to be financially viable once again. We would make that uncertainty that surrounds the Postal Service even worse if December 8 comes and goes and our five Postal Board nominees are still waiting for us to act.

The same goes for our nominees to fill vacancies, not on the Postal Board of Governors, but on something called the Postal Regulatory Commission. It is a five-member commission. It is the regulator, if you will, for the Postal Service. The two people who have been nominated by this President are Nanci Langley and Tony Hammond. They have been waiting since the spring of 2013 to be confirmed. As a result, the commission has been working with only three commissioners out of five. We need to do something about that as well, and waiting for another year—waiting for another month is foolhardy.

These people deserve a vote. We ought to vote them up or down. They have been unanimously approved and confirmed by our committee, and I think they need a vote. When they get a vote, I am sure they will be confirmed.

Also pending before the Senate are two nominations to the District of Columbia Superior Court, Judge William Nooter and Judge Steven Wellner. They are both well-qualified nominees who, like the Homeland Security and Postal nominees I have discussed, won bipartisan support in the committee and are needed to fill vacancies on the District of Columbia's very busy trial court.

Judge Nooter and Judge Wellner were reported out of our committee with unanimous bipartisan support months ago. In Judge Nooter's case, it was more than a year ago.

As I have discussed, these men are not alone in waiting so long for confirmation, but the problem is particularly unfair when it comes to the District of Columbia's court system. Earlier this fall during the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee Hearing on DC statehood, the current vacancies on the DC Superior Court were included as just one of many injustices the District faces simply because it serves our Nation's capital.

The District of Columbia already suffers from not having control over its laws or even its own local dollars. The citizens of this city should not have to face a compromised legal system as well. While we in Congress may not be able to fix everything, I do think this is one of the few issues we can and must address now.

The DC Circuit Court is a local court. It hears primarily local matters. Most nominees are entirely uncontroversial and used to go through the Senate without a recorded floor vote. But because these local judges go through Senate confirmation, they have been caught up in a broader political stalemate of the Senate floor. I hope that is going to come to an end.

Meanwhile, no other local or State jurisdiction must have its non-Federal judges approved by the Congress. If we are talking about Federal District judges or Circuit Court of Appeal judges or Supreme Court Justices, of course they should come through and be debated and approved here. These are local judges, and it is only by a quirk in the law that they have to come here for a confirmation at all. They are local judges in the District of Columbia.

How would we like it if we had been nominated and held up for over a year—particularly in courts where there are huge backlogs. We are talking about caseloads of tens of thousands of people, and they don't have a full complement of judges because of us. How fair is that? Well, it is not.

No other local or State jurisdiction must have its non-Federal judges approved by Congress, and no other State

or locality is without a vote in the Senate to help push for action on nominations of concern to that community.

The DC Superior Court is operated by the Federal Government and its judges are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate for 15-year terms. It is important to note that although this court is operated by the Federal Government, it is separate from the Federal Government. Instead, the Superior Court is the local trial court for the District of Columbia. It handles matters such as local crime and domestic and civil disputes.

Nevertheless, because this court is operated by the Federal Government, the President nominates candidates for judicial vacancies from a slate prepared by a nonpartisan nomination commission and the Senate must confirm the nominees.

Currently, there are four vacancies on the Superior Court. Due to planned retirement and medical leave, this number will rise by the end of the year, and it is going to get worse. These vacancies hinder the Superior Court's ability to administer justice for DC residents. The Superior Court judges already carry, as I said earlier, enormous caseloads. The existing vacancies—the majority of which are in the family court division—threaten to undermine the judge's ability to give proper attention to each case, including those cases in family courts that affect the welfare of families, and particularly the welfare of children.

Recently the chief judge of the Superior Court and the Bar Association in the District of Columbia sent to both Senate leaders and Dr. COBURN and myself a letter raising these concerns and ultimately seeking a Senate vote on Judges Nooter and Wellner. They are preaching to the choir.

Judge Nooter is currently the presiding magistrate judge on the Superior Court and has served as a magistrate judge for the past 14 years. As presiding magistrate judge, he manages 23 fellow magistrate judges and serves on the leadership team of the chief judge of the Superior Court.

Meanwhile, Judge Wellner currently serves as an administrative law judge for the District of Columbia Office of Administrative Hearings. Since 2011, he has led the unemployment insurance division, and by all accounts skillfully coordinates a team of 10 administrative law judges and support staff to adjudicate over 3,000 unemployment insurance cases per year.

Given the caliber of these nominees, the lack of controversy over their nomination, and the unanimous bipartisan support they have received from the committee of jurisdiction, I urge—and I am sure I urge with the full support of Dr. COBURN, our ranking Republican member of the committee—this body to move their confirmations forward as soon as possible. Justice delayed is still justice denied. It has been that way for centuries and these delays are insufferable.

I will close by saying that what we are doing is not just bad judgment, it is not just bad form, I think it is shameful, and we need to fix it.

With that, I am finished, and I am looking around to see if there is anybody else seeking recognition. I don't see anyone, so with that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, after the election, I have heard a number of my colleagues in the House of Representatives and in the Senate say they are going to come to the floor of the Senate and to the floor of the House and again try to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

I said last night on the floor that it strikes me that during an election I would think Members of Congress would hear from their constituents, whether it is in Minnesota or Ohio—the Presiding Officer's State or mine, or around the country—and once we start talking to real people—not campaign rallies, not a country club dinner, not a fundraiser, but real people—about their lives, we would understand what the Affordable Care Act has meant to a whole lot of people.

In my State, there are a lot more than 500,000 people who have health insurance today who did not have it 1 year ago because of the Affordable Care Act. In addition, there are 97,000 and counting young people—18—20—25-years-olds—who are on their parents' health care plan who wouldn't have insurance without it. There are a million seniors in my State, from Gallipolis to Troy to Toledo to Zanesville, who have gotten free—meaning no copay, no deductibles—free cancer screenings, preventive care, diabetes checks—all of these kinds of preventive care, including when their doctor prescribes getting a physical for seniors that is free, all because of the Affordable Care Act. There are thousands and thousands of people in Ohio who have a child with diabetes or a son or a daughter with asthma, and that family has been denied coverage year after year, but now, because of the Affordable Care Act, they have coverage. So we know what this has meant.

I heard Pope Francis say a few months ago, speaking to his parish priests—he exhorted them to go out and listen to people and understand their lives, as should others, before they come to the floor and try to repeal the Affordable Care Act. There is

something a bit untoward where people of privilege—we are Senators; we have great titles, we are paid good salaries, most of us dress well, most of us have nice haircuts—we come to the floor with government-paid insurance, and we say we are going to repeal the Affordable Care Act and take insurance away from 500,000 Ohioans and tens of thousands of Minnesotans, and take away young people's and their parents' plan, and take away these benefits for seniors.

I came to the floor to share a handful of letters because I want to put a face on some of these, what this actually means, if we were to—if Congress, thinking that is what the voters want—come to this floor and say we are going to repeal the Affordable Care Act. Let's talk about what that means.

Connie from Hamilton County, in Cincinnati—the Presiding Officer has been in that city a couple of times—writes: As one of your constituents, I want you to know the deleterious impacts of the DC Circuit Court's ruling on my well-being. Because of a change in both my employment status and marital status, I have looked at the Affordable Care Act as a godsend. I worked full-time in a well-paying job for more than 35 years when I was organized out of a position at the worst time during the recession. I have been able to maintain limited and temporary part-time contract work since. But the income I net is substantially reduced from what it was.

She said she worked for 35 years, so I assume she is at least in her fifties.

As an older worker, I'm having a difficult time securing permanent employment. I believe strongly in the importance of health care. I have recently qualified for a catastrophic health plan with tax credits on healthcare.gov. Paying for it is a stretch, but I have willingly bit the bullet.

As you know, Ohio is one of those States that has opted out of establishing its own state plans. That wasn't a problem until recently. Now, facing a plan that may be ineligible for the Federal tax credit, I face a dire financial situation. If I were the only one caught in this Catch 22, I would not be writing. I understand there are approximately 5 million Americans in similar straits.

Living in a State where the Governor did not want to set up an exchange, and the Supreme Court—nine privileged men and women who are lawyers, who get government health insurance—may take these benefits away from these 5 million people. That was my editorial comment.

She writes:

Please, please, help find a way to ameliorate the impact of this circuit court ruling. Many of us are dependent upon it so we don't become burdens on the health care system.

So the question: Why do people who dress like this, who have titles such as "Congressman" and "Senator, who get health insurance paid by taxpayers, why do they want to take it away from so many other people? Why do they want to take these benefits away? Why do they want to cancel these consumer protections? So when they cast these votes on repeal of the Affordable Care

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Act, they should be thinking about theConnies of the world.

Sharon from Franklin County in the middle of State, Columbus, is a lupus patient. She writes:

I urge you to maintain the health care reform that helps us afford coverage. Before Congress starts gutting the health care reform, please visit a support group for any chronic illness, and listen to the stories of people struggling to pay their medical bills, about people being denied insurance due to preexisting conditions, cutting their meds in half to try to stretch them to the end of the month.

My wife was in a drugstore not too long ago. Right in front of her, somebody was trying to figure out: Can I skip, take half this number of pills so they last twice as long? That happens all the time. If more of us would get out to a drugstore, if more of us would get out and talk to people, we would learn that.

Sharon writes:

I have got a good education, a good job, good insurance, but I know I could be wiped out in a matter of months if my job were outsourced or discontinued. Since I work at home and telecommute due to my illness, my chances at a new job and new health insurance are grim. The health care reform bill isn't perfect, but when it was passed, a collective sigh of relief went up for millions of Americans who are struggling to maintain their jobs, their families, and their lives while suffering with chronic illnesses like lupus. Please don't play politics with our lives. Please don't gut the health care bill.

Again the question is, Why do my colleagues—almost all of whom have health insurance provided by taxpayers—why do they want to take these benefits away from Sharon and Connie?

A couple more.

Rose from Hamilton County writes:

Senator Brown, please vote no to repeal the health care law. My family and friends appreciate the added benefits we are getting from the current health care law. My son's fiancée is currently finishing her graduate degree.

She is 25.

Thank God she is able to remain on her parents' insurance; otherwise she would not be able to afford the high cost of private insurance.

This a young woman about whom Rose is writing. This is a young woman who wants to get more education, wants to do better in life, wants to further her career, but what will happen? If she cannot stay on her parents' plan, if my colleagues are successful in repealing the Affordable Care Act, what will happen to her? Why should we even be asking that question?

My niece graduated last year from college and has not been able to find a full-time teaching job.

She is doing what we need more of—good teachers in our country.

Fortunately, she too can now stay on her parents' insurance because of the health care law. In addition—

She has an illness—

the current health care law ensures that when it's time for her to get her own health insurance, she will not be discriminated against.

This woman, Rose's niece, is in this situation. She is right out of school. She wants to teach. She does not have a job yet. She is on her parents' health insurance plan. Then when she gets a job, if it were not for the Affordable Care Act, she probably would be denied coverage because she has a preexisting condition. So she is a perfect example of two things about this law that my colleagues for whatever reason want to take away.

I will close with this. Chris from Fairfield County—kind of southeast of Columbus—writes:

Senator, I just wanted to thank you for standing by the health care law. I now have insurance after 4 years without it. I am now receiving treatment for my knee after 3 years of pain and swelling. Turns out I have arthritis and I go to an orthopedic surgeon next week for further diagnosis and treatment. Without the insurance I purchased through the exchange, the x-ray that discovered the arthritis would have never been possible because I could not afford it.

So, again, why would my colleagues—almost all of whom have health insurance—why would they want to take those benefits away? Why would they say to this person in Fairfield County—why would they say to Chris: Well, sorry, you are not going to get that x ray.

In the end, what would happen? Chris would not get the x ray, would not know about the arthritis until it gets worse, and then it would cost the health insurance company more money.

Part of what the Affordable Care Act does—and the Presiding Officer played a role in writing many provisions of this law—part of what it does is it encourages and gives people incentives to get preventive care.

So if we repeal this law, if my colleagues—again, I know I said this over and over, but almost all of whom have health insurance provided to them by taxpayers—if they have their way, all of these people—Chris and Rose and Sharon and Connie—where do they turn? Where do they turn? Their lives end up worse. They end up being sicker. They possibly die younger. They end up costing the health care system more money. They are less productive as citizens. The niece and the son-in-law and the fiancée one of these ladies talked about would not be able to get an education, get ahead—all of the things we say we value in this country.

How can any anybody think in good conscience that repealing the Affordable Care Act makes sense for our families, makes sense for our communities, makes sense for the States of Minnesota and Ohio, makes sense for our country?

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 5:30 p.m., Monday, November 17, all postcloture time be considered expired with respect to the House message to accompany S. 1086; that the motion to concur with amendment No. 3923 be withdrawn; and the Senate proceed to vote on the motion to concur in the House amendment to S. 1086; that upon the disposition of the House message, the Senate proceed to executive session and vote on cloture on Executive Calendar Nos. 856, Abrams; 857, Cohen; and 858, Ross; further, that if cloture is invoked on any of these nominations, that on Tuesday, November 18, following the Senate's action with respect to S. 2280, as provided under a previous order, the Senate proceed to executive session, that all postcloture time be considered expired, and the Senate proceed to vote on confirmation of the nominations in the order upon which cloture was invoked; further, with respect to the nominations in this agreement, that if any nomination is confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that upon disposition of the Ross nomination, the Senate resume legislative session and the motion to proceed to S. 2685; that there be 30 minutes of debate equally divided between the two leaders or their designees on the motion to proceed; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to S. 2685; further, that with any sequence of multiple votes there be 2 minutes for debate prior to each vote and all rollcall votes after the first vote in each sequence be 10 minutes in length; and, finally, that the time in opposition to S. 2280 be under the control of Senator BOXER or her designee.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

RUNAWAY AND HOMELESS YOUTH AND TRAFFICKING PREVENTION ACT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, as another polar vortex bears down on States across the country this week, we must consider how the dropping temperatures across the Nation will impact those who do not have refuge from the cold. The issue of homelessness is especially urgent in places like my home State of Vermont. For those of us lucky enough to have warm homes, winter brings a magical beauty. But for those without shelter, the cold