

Even if Nebraska moves the route to another route, guess what: This bill that is pending here—the Hoeven-Landrieu bill—would already say the new EIS is approved. That is wrong. So only 35 permanent jobs. Most of this oil is exported. Economists say the price of gas in the domestic market will go up. And we compare it to embracing a clean energy agenda while we still develop oil where it is safe and sound, and we still develop all of the above when it is safe and sound. But if we embrace clean energy, I have to tell my colleagues, the jobs will dwarf the 35 permanent jobs for sure that this pipeline brings us.

In California we are so excited with what is happening. And we don't want to look like the people in China where they walk around in masks, and we don't want to have little girls and boys with those inhalers because they can't breathe the air. This is real. This is about health. Yes, it is about jobs. Yes, it is about prices. And I find it really fascinating that a few years ago when this all came up, what did we say? We said, Oh, this pipeline will make us energy independent. Now we know that we are going to allow this oil to go right through the middle of our country. Misery follows the tar sands: spills. We have already had spills. We know what happens when there is a spill. And what do we get at the end? The oil goes to the rest of the world.

Our friends say, oh, it is still good. It is good for prices. No, it isn't good for prices. Economists have told us it is not good for gas prices, and it doesn't help us become energy independent. It imperils our planet with large amounts of carbon going into the air. It imperils our families with pollutants that are very carcinogenic and very dangerous.

So I hope we will let the process continue. I don't know what happens today. I know the handwriting is on the wall. I know it is on this one. But when we see the country we love going down a route that makes sense, following a procedure that makes sense, letting court cases resolve themselves, letting the people's comments be looked at, making sure we know exactly what we are doing, and we see that process shortcut by legislation and people who, by the way—and I am talking about my Republican friends: Oh, we are not scientists. We don't know if there is climate change. That is right, they are not scientists and they don't know, so they should listen to 98 percent of the scientists who are telling us that the Keystone is a dangerous move for this planet, because it is going to allow this oil that is far more carbon intensive.

I am a humble person. I am not a scientist; I do listen to them. I have to say to go blindly down this path is a huge mistake. Yet, that is what we are facing, and it is fine with me that we are facing it. We will stand and we will debate until there is nothing more to be said. We are probably getting to that place right now, so I will stop and reserve the remainder of my time.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 1:06 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m., and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. BALDWIN).

TO APPROVE THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

If neither side yields time, both sides will be equally charged.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to speak for up to 5 minutes in opposition of the bill presently on the floor.

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

Mr. HARKIN. I oppose this legislation to approve the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline. Again, I believe it is one more step in the wrong direction, one more capitulation to our fossil fuel habit, one more accelerant to global warming that threatens our children's future. I know I have limited time. I just want to point out that we have had a number of studies done by the Department of Energy recently.

One study found that retrofitting residential and commercial buildings had the potential to reduce consumer demand by 30 percent by 2030 and reduce greenhouse emissions by 1.1 gigatons each year, saving over \$680 billion.

The second study found the retrofits—I am talking about building retrofits in America—could save \$1 trillion in energy spending over 10 years and reduce CO₂ emissions by 10 percent.

What would retrofitting do for jobs?

According to the Rockefeller Foundation, this type of retrofitting nationally would create 3.3 million new jobs.

So why are we talking about building a pipeline that is going to cause the development of more tar sands oil, which is the dirtiest oil in the world—the dirtiest—when it is going to create a few jobs for a very short period of time, a couple of years and that is it.

Why aren't we focusing on what we know works and creates a lot of jobs and saves energy and saves money; that is, retrofitting all of the buildings in America to make them energy efficient—3.3 million jobs in that 10-year period of time, saving us untold billions of dollars in savings for consumers in America, of course reducing greenhouse gases.

I find this whole issue of this Keystone Pipeline to just—at this point in time when the planet is warming up, when we may be at that tipping point where we can't do anything about it, I find this debate about the Keystone Pipeline to be out of bounds, considering the impact it is going to have.

I would say this: After all my years here, serving 10 years on the science

and tech committee in the House, serving here on agriculture, the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee as chair, study after study I have read, I have come to this conclusion on why I cannot vote for the Keystone XL Pipeline. I have come to this one conclusion: Every dollar that we spend today on developing and using more fossil fuels is another dollar spent in digging the graves of our grandchildren.

I don't want to dig that grave anymore. It is time to get off our fossil fuel habits. I am not so naive as to think we can do this overnight. I understand that. What we ought to be on is a very steep glide slope down, understanding that by focusing on renewable energies, the wind and solar, ocean thermal energy conversion, all of those things, geothermal, and, yes, retrofitting buildings to be more energy efficient would create hundreds of thousands more jobs, millions more jobs than the pipeline. It will make us more secure as a nation. It could have the effect of getting us on that steep glide slope down of fossil fuel. The fossil fuel era comes to an end. That is what we have to do. Bring the fossil fuel era to an end. The sooner we do it, the better it is going to be for our grandkids and our planet.

I know the Keystone Pipeline is a small part of it. It is a small part, but they all add up and one step leads to another. There are those that say they are going to develop the tar sands regardless. I don't believe that.

I have seen a lot of studies that show Canada can't ship that west, and it is too expensive to ship it east on the railroads. The only way they have to go is the pipeline through America. I don't know whether cutting off the Keystone Pipeline will slow down or stop the tar sands development, but I believe we have to do everything in our power to slow it down and to get our neighbors to the north—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has consumed 5 minutes.

Mr. HARKIN. Just 1 more minute to finish.

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

Mr. HARKIN. To get our good neighbors, the Canadians, to the north to start moving away from the development of the tar sands, both for their good and for the good of our planet.

I don't want to keep digging the grave for our grandkids. I cannot vote any longer for anything that would develop or use more fossil fuels anywhere in our country or globally.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Before the Senator from Iowa leaves the floor, I thank him not only for his heartfelt remarks, because what we are doing here—we are here a short period of time in essence, whether we are here 6 years or 26 or 36 or even longer.

How long has the Senator been here?

Mr. HARKIN. Forty.

Mrs. BOXER. Forty years. When we look at the universe, we are here a very short time. He always thought about our kids and grandkids because that is what our job is.

We are so fortunate that we had a life in America that gave us the opportunity with policies that kept us healthy enough to do our work.

The tar sands are the dirtiest kind of oil there is. My friend makes that point. We need to protect the health of our families and the health of the planet, as my friend pointed out.

I just want to say to him how much I think it means to all Americans, the leadership the Senator has shown his entire career and the passion he is still showing today.

Mr. HARKIN. If I may respond in kind.

Mrs. BOXER. Yes.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank my dear friend and colleague, long-standing in the Senate and in the House before, and to thank the Senator for her intellectual and energetic leadership on all issues concerning the environment and the health of our people and the health of our planet. Senator BOXER has been a stalwart. She has been a Rock of Gibraltar around here in making sense and making sense of our debate and the issues surrounding energy, energy use, energy efficiency, always keeping in mind what it means for the future of our kids.

As I leave the Senate I am happy to note the Senator from California will still be here.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you so much.

I see that Senator MURKOWSKI is here. We will reserve the balance of our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Thank you, Madam President. I assure my colleagues from Iowa, California, my colleagues from around the country, that as a Senator from an oil- and gas-producing State, a State where we have fossil fuels in abundance, that I, too, am focused on that next generation of energy security.

I want to do what we can to develop those renewables, whether it is geothermal, whether it is our amazing hydro capacity, whether it is what we have with our oceans or our tides, our winds, and our Sun.

I also recognize very cleanly that when we are talking about energy and energy security, we also need to think about the geopolitics and our national security when it comes to energy use and our vulnerability.

There is a lot of discussion on this floor right now about the Keystone XL Pipeline and the number of jobs it will bring.

I think we recognize that when we build something, there is that flurry of activity. There are those jobs that are very real, very good, very promising but can stretching jobs—jobs come and they go. What do we have left after

they have completed Keystone XL Pipeline?

What we have is in a very real sense an energy lifeline, a lifeline that connects our friend and neighbor, Canada, to the north, to our opportunities for refining capacity in the Gulf of Mexico, our opportunities within this country to be more energy secure, to be less energy dependent.

I wanted to take just a few minutes this afternoon to not necessarily talk about the jobs perspective of the Keystone XL Pipeline, as passionate as I feel about that, but I wanted to focus on just a couple of points. One is the artificial chokepoints that are created in North America if we do not move forward with the Keystone XL Pipeline.

Earlier this month, the Energy Information Administration, EIA, published a report on world transit chokepoints for the global oil and gas trade.

There are about 90 million barrels a day of oil on that world market. Of that, 56.5 million barrels, about 63 percent, is transported by ship. It is moving around on our oceans.

This maritime trade that we see is dependent on a few chokepoints. We have heard of some of them—obviously, the Strait of Hormuz, 17 million barrels a day go through the Strait of Hormuz. We have the Strait of Malacca, where there are 15.2 million barrels a day. We also have the Suez Canal and the Sumed Pipeline, and the Bab el-Mandab between Yemen and the Horn of Africa.

Effectively what we have are these very tight chokepoints where this flow of oil that comes around the world, around the globe, moves through.

Meanwhile, the Keystone XL would have the capacity of about 830,000 barrels per day. These are barrels that are secure, both economically and strategically, from a reliable friend and ally.

When we talk about the pros and cons of approving this pipeline, I think it is important that we think beyond just the benefit to our country, the benefit that Canada will have as a trading opportunity, but think about it from a national security perspective, from a global security perspective. By not approving the Keystone XL Pipeline, the President is creating an artificial chokepoint here. Other pipelines are full. We know the rail capacity is under severe constraint.

So think about it. We already have enough chokepoints out there in some of the most volatile points of the world. So factor this into the discussion that we have at hand.

The other point I would like to make is the integration of Keystone as a source of supply when we are talking about North American energy independence. We talk about that a lot on the energy committee. It is important when we talk about integration to understand how this piece from Canada fits into the source of supply for the Americas.

Again, EIA back in January published a report. This was on liquid fuels

in the Americas. North and South America hold about 536 billion barrels of proved oil reserves. Back in 2012 the crude production was 19 million barrels a day. In North America, Mexico, Canada, and the United States, this is the lion's share of the Western Hemisphere production that we have right here.

So integrating our markets between the U.S. and the Canadian side just makes sense. In fact, it is the economic reality that is already on the ground. Last week I came to the floor talking about Keystone XL. I said: Why? Why is it such an issue, such a dilemma when we have 19 existing cross-border oil pipelines between Canada, Mexico, and the United States? They have been operating. They have been providing a resource to the benefit of both nations for years, for decades. Now we are twisted in knots, arguing for 5 years about whether or not the Keystone XL should proceed. I think we are going to look back on this a generation from now and we are going to wonder why and how we blocked this historic integration of our energy markets.

Then, the last thing I want to raise here is how the U.S. refineries—particularly those in the Gulf—are truly best prepared for the Canadian crude and thus bringing great benefits to Americans as a result of the pipeline. We have the total refinery or distillation capacity here in the Americas of about 27.7 million barrels per day. This was last year's number. Roughly one-third of the world's refining capacity is here in the Americas. In North America nearly one-third of that capacity, 17.8 million barrels per day, are here in the United States. Specifically, for heavy crude, we have over half of the world's choking capacity here in this country.

The largest refineries in the Americas are down in the gulf coast as well as in Venezuela. There are others on the west coast, in the Midwest, and some on the east coast. But if you look at the map of where the refineries are—in the Americas and really globally—it is obvious the destination for the Canadian oil is in the gulf coast area.

This is a debate on Keystone XL that has generated a lot of emotion and a lot of discussion about how, if you are opposed to it, what we need to do is cut off this Canadian supply and somehow or other we will be at a new phase in our energy production and consumption. Our reality is the Canadians will continue to produce. The good news, I think for all of us, is that the Canadians are utilizing technologies and innovation in the industry that have come a remarkably long way in how they access the crude in Alberta and how they are able to process it in a way that truly is better for the environment.

So for those who are concerned that we must stop this pipeline dead in its tracks now, and if we do so, we will be a nation that has moved on beyond oil, I think that belies our reality.

I am one who wants to make sure we are pushing ourselves always to utilize our smarts and our technology to do better as we access our resources and do so in an environmentally responsible way. But I also want to make sure that as a nation we have energy policies which are directed toward resources that are affordable, abundant, clean, diverse, and secure. The security aspect of it is something I do not want my colleagues to forget.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I am going to yield Senator SANDERS 10 minutes.

I heard "clean energy." Just for the record, let's be clear. The tar sands oil is one of the dirtiest known on the planet. Heavy metals—we went through it chapter and verse. The hardest to clean up—it is a nightmare. So if my friend wants clean energy, she should vote no.

With that I yield 10 minutes to Senator SANDERS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. The issue that we are dealing with today is of enormous consequence for our country and, in fact, for the entire planet. For that reason I rise in very strong opposition to the legislation on the floor and to the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline.

I strongly oppose this legislation and this project for a number of reasons. First and foremost, at a time when the scientific community is virtually unanimous in telling us that climate change is real, that it is caused by human activity and carbon emissions, that it is already causing devastating problems not only in the United States but all over the world in terms of drought, forest fires, flooding, extreme weather disturbances, and rising sea levels, at this moment when the scientific community is so clear about the dangers inherent upon a further dependance on fossil fuels, it is absolutely imperative for the future wellbeing of this country that we listen to the scientists and we begin the path forward to break our dependency on fossil fuel, not accelerate more drilling for the dirtiest oil on the planet.

The scientific community is telling us that we have a narrow window of opportunity to address the crisis of climate change. We do not have years and years. There are some people who think, in fact, that the game is already over, that the problem is irreversible. But be that as it may be, clearly our job now is to move as dramatically, as forcefully, as aggressively as we can to transform our energy system away from fossil fuel to energy efficiency, to weatherization, to sustainable energy such as wind, solar, geothermal, biomass, and other sustainable technologies.

The Keystone XL Pipeline would move us exactly in the wrong direction. More dependance not only on fossil fuels but on some of the dirtiest fos-

sil fuels imaginable—the dirtiest fossil fuels imaginable. That is crazy. To reject what the scientific community is telling us and then to add insult to injury by going forward aggressively and accelerating the drilling of dirty oil is something that is almost beyond comprehension.

I wonder what our kids and our grandchildren will think years and years from now when they have to deal with the damage we have caused, when they have to deal with the floods and the extreme weather disturbances and the droughts and the wars that are fought by people over limited resources. I wonder what they will think about a Congress which was told by those who know the most to move away from fossil fuels, and, in fact, moved in exactly the wrong direction by accelerating drilling for the dirtiest oil on the Earth?

That is the major point. But furthermore, this legislation is being referred to by some as a "jobs program." Well, in my opinion, we do need a jobs program. We need a major jobs program. Real unemployment in this country is close to 11 percent. Youth unemployment is 20 percent. Unemployment in the construction trade industries is very high. We need a real jobs program.

That is why we have to invest a substantial sum of money into rebuilding our crumbling infrastructure—our roads, our bridges, our water systems, our rail, our airports. In doing that we improve life in this country. We make our Nation more productive, more efficient. That is very different than creating jobs through the Keystone Pipeline, which damages the future of our planet and the lives of our kids and our grandchildren.

Furthermore, when people talk about this being a jobs program, let's understand that there is no debate that what we are talking about are less than 50 permanent jobs—less than 50 permanent jobs. So to suggest this is some kind of big jobs program is nothing more than a cruel hoax and a misleading hoax to workers in this country who need decent-paying jobs.

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Senator yield without losing his time?

Mr. SANDERS. Yes.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask unanimous consent that the time I use in this colloquy be taken off the time I have left.

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

Mrs. BOXER. I say to the Senator, your point is so well taken. I just want the Senator to know that this morning I said that the CEO of Keystone commented that there will be only 35 permanent jobs with the pipeline. I stand corrected. I went back and looked: 50 jobs—50 jobs.

The reason I want to take a minute to engage in this colloquy is that my friend has been, I think, one of the strongest and most effective voices for job creation and building a middle class that we have in the Senate. I was just looking at the numbers and want-

ed to go through a couple of things without my friend losing any time. In 2012 the U.S. installation of solar panels grew at a rate of 27 percent. I know my friend is trying desperately—and we work together on a lot of issues—to get us to put more of these solar panels on. In 2013 the solar industry employed 142,000 Americans in good-paying jobs. In 2013 the U.S. solar industry added 24,000.

So just looking at solar—and wind is another great story. At the end of 2013 the U.S. wind industry supported 560 manufacturing facilities and supported 50,500 full-time jobs in development, siting, construction, transportation and manufacturing, operation and services—direct jobs.

When we look at putting 50,500 full-time jobs, 142,000 jobs from solar, and you compare it to 50 full-time jobs, I think the Senator was so right to make the jobs argument what the Senator is making of it. It is not 50 jobs to do something that is going to make life better for our people. It endangers the planet, and it has these terrible pollutants which cause respiratory illness, cancer, and the rest.

But I just wanted to thank the Senator for bringing up the issue of jobs because it is the biggest phony-baloney argument when you have the CEO of the company itself—of the pipeline—admit that it is 50 full-time jobs permanently. I think we have to shatter this illusion and continue to talk about clean energy future and really good jobs. I yield to my friend.

Mr. SANDERS. I thank the Senator. I would mention that several years ago we worked together to pass the Energy Efficiency Block Grant Program, which pumped billions of dollars into weatherization, into sustainable energy.

I can tell you that in the State of Vermont right now work is being done weatherizing homes, saving substantial sums of money on fuel bills for working people, seeing a 30-, 40-percent reduction in fuel bills and equivalent reductions in the emission of carbon into the air. That is what we should be investing in all over America. Let's create those jobs. Let's create jobs building the wind turbines and the solar panels that we desperately need.

We need to be aggressive in that area and above that and beyond that. Everybody knows that bridges in Vermont, in California—the Senator is chairman of not only the environmental committee but the public works committee. She knows that as well as anybody. We need to rebuild our crumbling infrastructure. I understand why the construction workers want these jobs, with high unemployment in construction industry.

We have to put these guys to work and we can do that. We can do it by transforming our energy system. We can do it by rebuilding our crumbling infrastructure. We are talking about millions of decent-paying jobs, not 50 permanent jobs or a few thousand construction jobs. We are talking about millions of permanent jobs.

I would further add, when we heard this discussion during the caucus today—and I would ask the Senator of California, the chair of the committee, if my Republican friends are so concerned about jobs, please tell me where we are going with the wind tax credit and the solar tax credit, which have been so very important to creating jobs in the wind and solar energy.

Clearly, our friends who talk about the “all of the aboves” are enthusiastically supporting these tax credits.

Will my friend from California enlighten us?

Mrs. BOXER. I am so pleased the Senator made the point.

Today we had Senator THUNE make an eloquent statement about jobs—eloquent—and I thought he was going to change his position on minimum wage. How about that. Try raising a family on that.

These wind tax credits and these solar tax credits, this is creating a boom. I will say in my State, as in yours, I put something in the RECORD today, we have bounced back from this recession better than almost any State because of clean energy. It is such a win/win.

But our friends on the other side, when it is something the oil companies want—oh, they are out there, oh, yes, yes, jobs. But we know this is 50 jobs. This is the CEO of this pipeline company admitting that is it, 50 jobs. So it is not about the jobs, it is about their view of energy, which is the old way, which is the going backward. This was not embracing the clean energy future so that we can, in fact, create many more jobs and keep the planet clean.

Mr. SANDERS. If I may reclaim my time and wind down and finish my remarks, there are two basic issues. No. 1, I know many of my Republican friends deny what the overwhelming majority of scientists are telling us; that is, not only is climate change real, that it is caused by human activity, that it is already causing devastating problems. To continue to deny that reality is to endanger the lives of our kids, our grandchildren, and the planet on which they will live. To say to people all over the world that we Americans are concerned about climate change and yet vote for a project which will encourage and accelerate the excavation of some of the dirtiest oil in the world will make all of us look like fools and hypocrites throughout the world and will make future generations wonder what we were thinking about on that vote today.

With that, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, it took an election on November 4. It took an election, but here we are at long last, some 6 years after the initial application for the Keystone XL Pipeline was filed and, as you know, for a long time now, I think at least since 2012, we have been trying to get a vote,

the very same vote that is now scheduled for this afternoon. We have been trying to get a vote on the Senate floor so we could see whether there was a bipartisan majority, a supermajority of 60 or more, who would join our colleagues in the House and pass this bill authorizing the Keystone XL Pipeline and send it to the President.

We know the Keystone XL Pipeline would be good for our economy. We know it would be good for job creation, and I know there has been some quibbling, perhaps, about how many jobs, but the Department of State has said about 42,000 jobs would be created as a result of this project.

We also know this would be good for U.S. energy security to have a source of safe energy from Canada—one of our best allies and partners to the north—as opposed to shipping it in from troubled regions like the Middle East. It makes sense from an energy security standpoint, and it would be good for national security as well. It would also be good for our strategic interests overseas.

I have heard my colleagues, mainly on the other side say that, well, we are concerned about the environmental impact, and I am too, but President Obama's own State Department has once again found that the Keystone XL Pipeline would have a negligible impact on the environment.

In short, even in a moment of intense polarization in Washington, there is a strong consensus on Keystone, and if we get 60-plus votes today I think that consensus will be demonstrated.

Will we all agree? No. We have strongly held beliefs on both sides of this issue. But the way we function in the Senate is by actually scheduling votes—as we are going to have today—and letting the majority carry the day. And that, I predict, will happen today.

This is a day that I know my colleague, the senior Senator from North Dakota, Senator HOEVEN, has been working for a long time, again, across the aisle. He has been our No. 1 leader on this issue for years now and he has consistently explained the benefits of the Keystone XL Pipeline.

He comes from North Dakota, the second most productive State in the country when it comes to oil and gas. I come from the No. 1 State. I point that out often when it comes to producing oil and gas, and this has been a renaissance for the American economy and for American energy, what has happened in America, thanks to private investment and innovation in the oil and gas industry.

Senator HOEVEN has constantly worked with people across the aisle to rally the kind of support that has led us to this day, and he has repeatedly pressed the majority leader, Senator REID, to allow a binding vote on the floor such as we are going to have today, and then the next step will be to send it to President Obama for his signature.

Well, we haven't had that kind of vote before the November 4 election.

That is why I said elections can change things and indeed, apparently, it has changed the majority leader's mind to allow this vote, which at long last we will have this afternoon.

Why has there been a change of attitude on the part of the majority leader to allow us to hold this vote this week? I will leave that to the pundits, but I will say our collective decision on Keystone should be determined by what is in America's national interests, not the interest of a single political party or the interest of a single Senator. The interests of our country as a whole should be our guide.

For that matter, it is time for our President to put his cards on the table. I know once this vote was scheduled, the President's press secretary and the President himself made some ambiguous remarks, leaving in doubt whether he would actually sign or would ultimately veto this legislation. I hope we don't see a continuation of the gamesmanship we have seen until this point, and that once this bill passes—if it does this afternoon—the majority leader will send it promptly to the President so the President can make that decision.

What I mean by I hope the gamesmanship doesn't continue is I know there is the flexibility the majority leader might have to actually hold the bill here and to wait until after the December 6 runoff election in Louisiana before sending it to the President. But I hope we don't have that kind of gamesmanship.

The American people deserve the truth, they deserve accountability, and it has been more than 6 years since this application first came through. The proponents of this project deserve this vote today, as do the American people.

As a matter of fact, back in March of 2012, before his reelection, the President traveled to Cushing, OK, to champion the Texas leg of the Keystone XL Pipeline. He didn't have any real role to play in authorizing that, because that was within the continental United States. The President's role, and the one that this bill would force his hand on, literally, is what would authorize this international pipeline between Canada and the United States. That does require his approval. This legislation would require it or, in fact, mandate it.

But he went to Cushing, OK, to champion the Texas leg of the Keystone Pipeline project, and it did not need his approval, but at the time he said he would work to expedite that portion. However, that portion didn't require his approval and it was already up and running at the time. So you will have to determine why the President would go there for a project that did not need his approval and said he would expedite it—what his real motivation is. But he said:

And as long as I'm President, we're going to keep on encouraging oil development and infrastructure and we're going to do it in a way that protects the health and safety of

the American people. We don't have to choose between one or the other, we can do both.

I actually agree with what the President said, the words I just quoted. That is a good statement of what our policy should be. But I have been around Washington long enough to know that we can't just listen to what people say, we have to watch what they actually do, because sometimes those are diametrically opposed.

In this case, notwithstanding what the President said in Cushing, OK, he has continued to delay, delay, and delay, making a final decision on the portion of Keystone XL Pipeline that requires his approval.

But we are here this afternoon to say enough is enough. Regardless of how this vote turns out, it is time for the President to explain his views on the project that his own State Department has said would create 42,000 jobs in America. He can choose to endorse the Keystone XL Pipeline and thereby deliver a significant boost to America's economy, America's security, and America's relations with our largest trading partner in Canada.

Alternatively, the President can choose to oppose Keystone and thereby miss a golden opportunity to promote a richer, stronger, and safer American future. I can only hope he makes the right choice.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 51 minutes for the opposition.

Mrs. BOXER. And on the other side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senator HOEVEN controls 67 minutes and Senator LANDRIEU controls 32 minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. While we are waiting for Senator WHITEHOUSE—he is on his way—I want to focus the attention of those who are watching this debate on truly what we are talking about. If this was about building a pipeline that was carrying something that didn't hurt anybody, I wouldn't be standing here. But this is about building a pipeline that is going to carry the dirtiest oil we know of, and this dirty oil is already causing lots of problems.

Where it is refined in Port Arthur, TX, I met with the people there. I met with the people there. Senators don't live near refineries. Again, if I am wrong on that, I would like to be corrected. People live near refineries sometimes because it is where affordable housing is, and this is what it looks like. They do not want this stuff.

With all the talk of jobs, jobs, jobs, let's be clear. The CEO of the company

said 50 jobs. So if you want to lay this kind of misery on people who live in this community, vote aye. That is fine. But just take a look at this. We don't see many kids playing on this playground because this pollution is vicious. It adds more heavy metals. It causes asthma. The pollutants cause cancer. We are talking about lead and we are talking about sulfur in very heavy quantities.

So let's be clear. We don't see my friends who support this talking about what happens when you refine, but that is what happens. If this was the only thing we could do to make ourselves energy independent, that is one thing, but I have already shown, with the Senator from Vermont, Mr. SANDERS, how many incredible jobs are being produced across this Nation in clean energy: solar, wind, geothermal. We are looking at a potential of millions. In California, those clean energy jobs have led us out of the darkest recession we have seen since the Great Depression, and I have put those statistics into the RECORD.

I have to say this. In all the years I have been in public life, starting when I was a county official, not one constituent ever came up to me and said: BARBARA, the air is too clean. Oh, God. My air is so clean. The water I drink is so pure. Please don't get in the way of making it dirty. I have been in office for a very long time. No one has ever said that. On the contrary, what they say is: Please, my child has asthma. Please don't back off. Don't let Big Oil or big coal or the Koch brothers or whoever it is stand in the way of my family having a good quality of life.

We can take a look at a country where they have thrown the environment under the bus. Here it is. This is what it looks like. That is what it looks like in China. I am sure you have heard a lot of the speeches in China that we will be hearing here: Oh, we need the jobs and we need the energy. They realize now they are in trouble. The President just made a pact with the leader of China to cut back on pollution. But this is what happens when you throw the environment under the bus. People can't breathe. Kids have to wear masks. That is a fact.

Go to any school and ask the kids—and I know my friend, our great Presiding Officer—ask the kids: How many of you have asthma or how many of you know someone who has asthma? Honest to God, more than half the class will raise their hands.

We need clean energy. We need clean energy. We need clean energy jobs. And if we can clean up our coal, I will be right there. If we can do safe nuclear and not build these plants on earthquake faults, as they did in my State, fine. But don't unleash the dirtiest oil known to mankind when the CEO of the company says it means 50 jobs.

We all know that oil is going to be pumped right out of here. We all know it is the toughest oil to clean up because we have seen the spills in Kala-

mazoo, MI. We have seen the spills in Arkansas. Because of the nature of this oil, the heaviness of this oil, they are still cleaning up that oil 3 years later.

It is now my pleasure to yield to Senator WHITEHOUSE for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I thank the Senator for her constant leadership on this issue. I am going to start on a somewhat unusual note because I want to compliment my lead adversary here, Senator LANDRIEU, who has fought so hard to bring this bill to the floor. She is passionate about getting this done, and it is because of her efforts that we are here.

I have to say I am just as passionate as she in opposition to this bill. Many of us come from coal States or oil States or natural gas States. Rhode Island doesn't have coal—at least it hasn't in generations. We used to mine coal in Portsmouth, in Cumberland, but that has been a long time ago. We don't have natural gas sources. We don't pump oil.

What we do have is a coastline, and at that coastline what coal and oil and natural gas are doing to all of us through the operation of natural laws, through the operation of the laws of science—stuff we can't get around because this isn't opinion—is very harmful to our island.

Naval Station Newport has a tide gauge. My friend Senator MANCHIN was kind enough to come and visit from West Virginia and we started out bright and early in the morning and our first stop was with the Navy folks down at the tide gauge. At that tide gauge what they show is that since the 1930s the water levels are up 10 inches.

We had something very big happen in Rhode Island. In the 1930s we had the hurricane of 1938. If anybody wants to take 2 minutes and Google hurricane of 1938 and hit images, they will see terrific destruction. They will see our capital city flooded to the top of the buses. They will see houses smashed to flinders and boats thrown up onto the land. That was with a sea 10 inches below what we have now, and every responsible scientist tells us the risk of worse and bigger ocean storms has increased because of the emission of carbons.

So I have a very clear perspective on this, and that is that we have to address our carbon pollution problem before it comes home to roost in very dangerous ways in my State. It is there already. As the Senator from West Virginia saw, we have fishermen who say this is not my grandfather's ocean. Their world has changed because of the way we have changed it. This pipeline, because of the filthiness of the fuel that it brings into the market, will add additional carbon dioxide in the amount of nearly 6 million cars per year on the roads—6 million cars per year on the roads—and that comes home to roost in Rhode Island. That comes home to roost in warming waters.

Narragansett Bay is nearly 4 degrees—mean winter water temperature—warmer than it was 50 years ago. I can remember driving over the Newport Bridge and Jamestown Bridge and looking down in the winter and seeing trawlers out at work—trawlers at work fishing for the winter flounder. The winter flounder is gone. It has had more than a 90-percent crash, largely because, as the scientists have told me, the warmer Narragansett Bay is no longer hospitable to the fish. Four degrees doesn't seem like a big deal to me. It probably doesn't seem like a big deal to any human, for whom the water is kind of an alien place, but for the fish that live in it, 4 degrees is an ecosystem shift. My wife, a major professor at the University of Rhode Island School of Oceanography, explained that to me several decades ago for the first time.

The argument is that this is going to bring jobs. I am all for those jobs. But let us not be selective about when we are for jobs. If we are only for jobs when it is oil pipelines, then something else is going on than the concern about jobs. Where was the concern about jobs when a bipartisan piece of legislation called Shaheen-Portman for energy efficiency was on the floor and was estimated to create not 42,000 temporary jobs, not less than 4,000 direct temporary jobs, not less than 50 permanent jobs, but 190,000 jobs? That bill got nowhere. It died here, and it died here for reasons that were very open on the front of the paper.

JEANNE SHAHEEN's opponent, who is a former colleague of ours, asked to have the bill die so she would not have a legislative accomplishment to her credit. So the agreement that the bill was going to pass got reworked, and the folks came back to Majority Leader REID and said: Actually, we are not ready to support this bill. We need a vote on Keystone Pipeline. We need a sense of the Senate on Keystone Pipeline. Senator REID said: OK. We can have a sense of the Senate on Keystone Pipeline. Agreed. Then they came back again—moved the goalpost again—and said: Well, we need more than a sense of the Senate now. We actually need a hard vote on the Keystone Pipeline. Leader REID checked around and said: All right. I don't like this much, but sure. Fine. In order to move Shaheen-Portman, a 190,000-job bill, go ahead and have your vote. Then they came back and moved the goalpost a third time. They said: We don't just need a vote on the Keystone Pipeline, we need to win the vote, and if you can't give us a win on the vote, then you don't get Shaheen-Portman.

When the goalposts get moved that often, you can pretty much figure out there is something more going on than the merits of the bill. They didn't want the bill to pass. They didn't want it to come up. But where was the concern then about 190,000 jobs, when everybody is in an uproar about these 40,000 indirect temporary jobs?

I will stop right now and do anything to get infrastructure legislation passed and put people to work rebuilding America's roads, rebuilding America's water pipes, and rebuilding America's bridges. We can put hundreds of thousands of people to work doing that. But when we had the chance to do that, when Chairman BOXER brought a 6-year environment bill out of the Environment and Public Works Committee, where every billion dollars we invest in highway infrastructure supports 13,000 jobs, and this was a multibillion—multibillion-dollar bill, did they pass it? No, they filibustered it, stopped it, and gave us a 3-to-5-month stopgap bill, during which nobody is going to enter into any big contracts, depressing employment, and moving the bill into the next Congress where they thought they would have a majority and in fact they will.

If you want to do something about jobs, we can take your 42,000 dirty pipeline jobs and we can raise that by a factor of 5 just by doing Shaheen-Portman. We can raise it by a factor of 10 or 15 with infrastructure legislation. We can do big jobs bills, and we are ready to do them, but not when it is only dirty oil pipelines. Because there are two sides of the ledger. There is the side that says jobs, and there is the side that says harm. My problem with this is that our friends on the other side of the aisle will not look at the second page. They pretend the second page doesn't exist.

Even in coastal States where I have been, down to Georgia, to Sapelo Island, where the University of Georgia has a terrific marine science undertaking that has been going on for decades now, they are very clear. Carbon pollution is doing real harm to the coast. It is raising the Georgia sea level at a rate that is challenging the ability of the famous marshes to keep up. If they cannot keep up, they flood. If they flood, they get washed away and you lose that entire infrastructure that supports clambers and oystermen and fishermen and tourism and all the things that are important for Georgia. I say that because I see my friend Senator ISAKSON on the floor.

You could use an example of everything that stays in the country, and our colleagues will never ever look at that other page. If you were the CFO of a corporation and you only looked at one side of a ledger, you would go to jail for that.

It shouldn't be asking too much to ask our colleagues to reflect on the fact that there are benefits to this pipeline and there are harms to this pipeline. From my State's point of view, it is all harm. From a net point of view, the harm vastly outweighs the value by I think virtually any State's measure—perhaps not South Dakota. There is real harm that this will cause. Six million cars' equivalent of CO₂ added every year is more than we need.

So I think we need to turn the corner. More importantly, it is not what I

think that matters; the American people understand we need to turn the corner on climate change and carbon pollution. It doesn't matter whom you ask. If you ask independent voters, it is better than 2 to 1. If you ask all voters, it is about 2 to 1. If you ask young voters, it is more like 4 to 1. There is a poll that shows that among young Republican voters, self-identified Republican voters under the age of 35, when asked about a politician who denies that climate change is real, they say that politician—they are asked to check off the box, and what they checked off was "ignorant, out of touch, or crazy."

So it is time to make this turn, and there is no better moment to make this turn than on this pipeline that would bring the filthiest fuel on the planet into circulation and hurt even more those of us who are already being hurt by carbon pollution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, my oldest son graduated from Tulane University in New Orleans with a master's degree in economics. He wrote a paper for his master's thesis called "The Dutch Disease." I had never heard of the Dutch disease, but, him being my son, I read the thesis because I thought it would be important. What is the Dutch disease about? The Dutch disease is about a country that has an infinite supply of wealth—i.e., resources—but doesn't ever use that money to reinvest in its people. They buy what they need. It was about the Middle East, and if you look at the Middle East, every country over there that has a tremendous supply of oil and petroleum—what do they do? They buy their doctors and bring them over. They don't build universities. They don't make investments in themselves, and they give money to their people. The country's people suffer from the Dutch disease because the money is not reinvested to expand the wealth of the country.

There is another disease called the dumb disease. The dumb disease is when you don't have a natural resource and have the opportunity to get some of it, but you turn it away for reasons that don't make any sense.

I have tremendous respect for the gentleman from Rhode Island and the distinguished lady from California. In fact, I traveled with the distinguished lady from California to go to Disko Bay in Greenland to listen to Dr. Alley talk about climate change and climatology. While I completely realize that carbon is something we need to reduce in the atmosphere, I don't completely buy into the fact that it is the be-all and end-all destructor of the environment. I think it is good politics for all of us to reduce carbon everywhere we can but not by stopping progression, not by stopping jobs and not developing.

On the Keystone XL Pipeline, let's be realistic. You are going to have up to

500,000 barrels of oil a day traveling from the tar sands in Canada to Houston, TX, and the South of the United States to be refined, and it is not going to generate one single isotope of carbon because it is going to be underground. It is not going to be burned. It is not going to be carried in a tanker truck that is going to be burning diesel in transport. So you have less generation of carbon by building the pipeline than you would have otherwise.

Secondly, as another alternative, that oil is going to go somewhere. If we don't allow the TransCanada pipeline to be built by the Keystone people in the United States, they are going to build a pipeline to Vancouver, and they are going to ship, on ships, the oil from the tar sands to China. In other words, it is going to get somewhere where there are not good standards and more carbon will go into the atmosphere. Just because you burn it in America doesn't mean it is not going to get to China and vice versa.

We have estimates from the people of expertise that this would generate 42,000 jobs. That is a lot of jobs. I think that is important. That is No. 1.

No. 2, it will give us a diversified supply of petroleum in the United States and help continue the United States on the track of being an energy-independent country—the most important thing we can possibly do for our national security.

The only reason the Russians went into Ukraine and Crimea was simply because they held the gasoline and petroleum to hold those countries hostage and there wasn't another source from which to take it.

Every time we improve our access to petroleum, every time we improve our access to energy, we are improving our national defense and the national security of our country, and we maintain ourselves as a superpower not just by name but by economic force as well.

So I am all for reducing carbon isotopes in the atmosphere, and I think running that pipeline does exactly that because it moves it without burning it. And I am for jobs. I am for 42,000 jobs in America anytime we can get them. I am for expanding our access. Sure, some of the petroleum that is refined will be sold in the world market. It will be refined in the United States. If we had a shortage somewhere else, we could help make up that shortage. We could take that money and raise the supply and reduce the price of petroleum in the world marketplace.

The Keystone XL Pipeline just makes good sense. Let's not do something dumb and reject an asset our country has sitting there. We would be sitting on a ham sandwich and starving to death. Looking at our food and not eating it would be crazy, and we have the access to do it.

The State Department on five separate occasions—five separate occasions—has approved it. We have tried for 6 years to get this vote. Regardless of how we get it, I hope we get it and I hope we get 60 or more votes here.

I hope the President will rethink his position on vetoing the bill because the American people are for it, the petroleum industry is for it, the automobile industry is for it, it generates revenues and jobs in the United States of America, it diversifies our energy supply, and it makes us more energy independent than we would otherwise be.

Just as the Dutch disease afflicts countries that don't take advantage of the wealth they have in terms of natural resources, the dumb disease is when you have access to natural resources and you pass them up because of reasons that are political and not practical.

I am going to cast my vote in favor of the Keystone XL Pipeline. I will cast my vote for jobs in America, for common sense, and for not succumbing to the dumb disease in the United States of America and instead investing in our petroleum and our ability to refine and our ability to use it.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Before my friend leaves, since he said those of us who vote against this have the dumb disease—and I think it is funny. I am not insulted in any way, shape, or form. But I just feel very differently because I don't think it is dumb to say no to a resource that you think is going to hurt the people because it is such dirty, filthy oil.

The CEO of the pipeline company says it means 50 permanent jobs, when you could have so many more millions of jobs if you embrace clean energy.

Also, I don't think it is dumb at all to say what the economists are now saying, which is that it is going to raise gas prices at home because it is going to be exported.

So I think "dumb" is in the eyes of the beholder. And I think my colleague is very smart, but I don't think those of us who say no to Keystone are dumb. I think we are smart. I think we are looking at the future. I think we are standing up for the health of the American people. I think we are standing up for jobs and a clean energy economy, and I feel very strongly about that. And what we are talking about is the dirtiest, filthiest oil on the planet.

I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. This debate is really about some simple fundamental principles. Keystone is a Canadian export line. That is what the oil is going to do. It is going to travel from the dirtiest tar sands fields in Canada through a pipeline like a straw through the United States, down to the Gulf of Mexico, and then be exported out of the United States of America.

How do I know this? I know it because I made the amendment on the floor of the House of Representatives saying this oil stays in America. Do

you know who opposed it? The American Petroleum Institute and the Canadian Government. This is the Canadian Keystone export pipeline. We take all the environmental risk and this oil goes out of our country.

Ladies and gentlemen, we still import approximately the same amount of oil in 2014 as we imported in 1975 when we put the ban on exportation of oil on the books. We are still exporting young men and women overseas into the Middle East to protect tankers coming into our country, and we are going to build a pipeline for the Canadians down to the Gulf of Mexico so they can use us as a straw to send it down and then export it out of our country? Where is the American angle on this?

I keep hearing that it is about American security. Do you want to know what this is all about? I will tell you what it is all about. The Canadian companies want to make more money. They want to take the oil from Canada, bring it down through the United States, bring it to the Gulf of Mexico, and then send it to Europe, Latin America, and China. Why? Because they will pay more for this oil than the United States will pay for this oil. They will make billions of extra dollars once they can get it on a ship because the price for world oil is set at a price, which is called Brent, but it is the global price.

Well, in the United States, because of fracking, because of our rise in domestic energy production, and because of our dramatic increase in fuel economy standards, we are producing more oil and consuming less simultaneously, and the price of oil at the gasoline pump for people who use home heating oil as a way of heating their home is going down dramatically.

What does that translate into? Well, every time the price of a barrel of oil goes down just 1 cent at the pump, it is \$1 billion into the pockets of the American consumers—\$1 billion. So from July of 2008 until today, it has dropped from \$4.11 to \$2.88 at the pump, and Americans all across America are not afraid to go to a gasoline station right now and fear that they are going to be tipped upside down and have money shaken out of their pockets because they can pay \$2.88 and it is dropping.

If we keep the Canadian oil in the United States, that price is going to drop even more because we will have to import even less than we do now from the Middle East. That helps consumers. That helps our economy. That should be the plan, not taking all these environmental risks and not getting the economic benefits.

The lower the price is, the greater the economic activity in our country. Manufacturers start to say: I will build my plant here. The price of energy is much lower. There is much greater economic activity because people have more money in their pockets to buy other American products other than

oil, and they buy them in their neighborhoods, they buy them in their communities. That is what this should be all about.

What is this debate not about—I mean decidedly not about? It is not about solar, it is not about wind, and it is not about energy efficiency. It should be. If we are going to debate an energy future for our country, it should not be oil above all; it should be all of the above.

So right now what we are hearing from the other side is that they just might not support the extension of the wind tax break, even as wind has now created 80,000 new jobs in the American economy. They are not talking about extending the solar tax break for another 5 years, which they should be. That has creating 142,000 new jobs in the American economy. And I will tell you why. Because this is an agenda to make sure the oil industry gets what they want on the one hand, and they can starve their competitors on the other—wind, solar, energy efficiency.

Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN had a bill that addressed energy efficiency. It has been dying here on the floor of the Senate for the last 2 years. What is its biggest problem? I will tell you what it is: It creates 190,000 new jobs in energy efficiency which would reduce the need to use fossil fuels to generate the same amount of electricity because the single wisest way to consume energy is to not consume it in the first place so you don't have to take the money out of your pockets. That is energy efficiency. That is working smarter, not harder. Shaheen-Portman, dead. The Republicans killed it. The wind tax break, dead. The solar tax break is not going to be extended.

If we are going to have a debate in our country, if we are going to talk about job creation, if we are going to have something that really deals with the future of our country, let's put solar, wind, energy efficiency, biomass, and geothermal—let's bring them all out here. Let's have a big debate and not just something that has the Canadians use America as a conduit—as a straw—to get their oil out of our country so they can make an extra \$5 or \$10 or \$15 for every barrel they sign. You don't have to go to Harvard Business School to see this business plan on a 3-by-5 card. If you get it out of America, you make \$10 to \$15 more per barrel. It is simple. There is no thinking required here.

What is in it for us? The dirtiest oil in the world goes through the United States so that Canadian oil companies can make money. It makes no sense, not if America is generating hundreds of thousands of new jobs with wind and solar and the tax breaks in those industries are on the table to be killed. We should be trying to use this as a debate about the big issues. Yes, reducing greenhouse gases, but it is job creation and it is national security. If that oil stayed in America—this Canadian oil—

and if wind and solar and biomass and geothermal were given those incentives, we could tell those Arab nations that we don't need their oil any more than we need their sand. That is what we should be talking about out here, that plan. That is not what we are talking about, however. We are talking about something that is very narrow and only creates jobs in the short run. Once the pipeline is built, it takes almost a handful of employees to run that pipeline. Rather than creating the permanent jobs in wind and solar, the permanent jobs in energy efficiency, the permanent jobs in solar panel manufacturing—how do you possibly expect the American people to think this institution is serious if we are not going to be having that kind of a debate?

Ladies and gentlemen, don't kill the production tax credit; don't kill the solar tax breaks in 2 years. Let's have the big discussion about where America is going. Let's do it in a way that has a comprehensive plan which is ultimately put together.

I say to you right now: Do not build this Canadian Keystone “export” pipeline. Don't build it until we have the debate, which this country expects. Young people in campuses all across the country expect a debate on wind and solar; they expect a debate on using technology. We are the brain country; we are the technology country. We are the country that can invent our way into this new world—into reducing greenhouse gases and breaking our dependence on imported oil. That is who we are as a nation.

We put a man on the Moon in 8 years. We were challenged, and we did it. We invented new metals and new propulsion systems. We are the can-do Nation. We invent the new technologies that young people want. We are not doing that here today. We are just helping the Canadians take oil and send it right out of our country.

If they would accept an amendment to say this oil stays here in America, that would change the debate a little bit. If they were willing to add wind and solar tax breaks and efficiency incentives, that would change the debate. But they are not going to do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used his 10 minutes.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask for one additional minute.

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

Mr. MARKEY. By the way, I just served over in the House in the last 4 years when the Republicans—the tea party—took over the House of Representatives. What did they do on an ongoing basis? Cut incentives for renewables, cut the energy efficiency budget, kept passing bills that stripped the Environmental Protection Agency of its ability to regulate pollution and its ability to increase the fuel economy standards, not just for cars but for boats and planes. That is not the direction our country should be going in.

I urge a “no” vote on this bill.

I also have to say at the same time that I have the highest respect for Senator LANDRIEU. She is a passionate and dedicated and articulate force fighting for her State and fighting for her beliefs. There is no one in this entire institution whom I respect more than her and her passionate belief and the cause she is championing out here on the Senate floor, but at the same time, I respectfully urge a “no” vote on the Keystone Pipeline.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts. He calls it the Keystone “export” pipeline, and that is exactly right. I call it the Keystone “extra lethal” pipeline given the type of pollutants that come with this oil.

At this time, I ask unanimous consent to propound a UC request on an issue that is completely different and ask that it not count against my time. It is a 60-second UC. I believe Senator VITTER is here to oppose it, but I don't want it to count against any debate time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on November 18, 2014, to conduct a business meeting where we would have three votes for two TVA members and one Nuclear Regulatory Commission member. All three nominees have had extensive hearings. In the case of Mr. Baran, he has had 88 written questions and answers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Reserving the right to object. There are major concerns, particularly about the NRC nominee. He has no technical or scientific background. He visited his first nuclear plant this summer.

Given that, and given that there is no precedent anywhere that I can find for a 4-year nomination to the NRC not to have a nomination hearing before the committee, all we are asking for is a normal, routine nomination hearing.

Given all of that, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask that we continue the agreement that this not count on Keystone time.

I need to make the point that Mr. Baran, who is the subject of Mr. VITTER's complaint, has already been confirmed. What we are doing is putting him in a different seat on the same commission that has a different expiration date. He has already had a hearing, and Senator VITTER asked 56 questions.

I think it is sad—the Republicans have won the election. Yes, they did. And they said: Oh, we are going to get busy and we are going to work.

All I want to do is have a meeting so we can do our work off the floor on people who have had extensive hearings. Now they say: Oh, no, we can't possibly do that. And then my friend talks about the nominee's lack of experience when, in fact, he was already confirmed. When Republican Commissioner Spinickey was nominated, she had never even visited a powerplant. Nobody ever said anything about that, and we all let it go.

Sadness is in my heart. Really. This is our work. We are here to work. I thought that is what the Republicans said they wanted to do—they wanted to work. Oh, no. They come here and object to a meeting off the floor of the Senate so that we can move forward.

I wish to make a point: The TVA, Tennessee Valley Authority, is a very important authority. They deliver electricity, and they do it in a good way, they do it in a cheap way, and they do it in an environmentally sound way. That is their job. They need commissioners.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission—my God, after Fukushima, you would think people would want to work together. We have a great nominee who worked over in the House for years. He has already been confirmed.

Let it be known to the world, as I stand here today, after an election where I admit we lost and they won, and they said they were going to be good soldiers and cooperate, but we can't mark up the first thing that happens.

So now I will have to use another technique that I have in my rules, and I will, but I don't want to do it. I wanted to have a bipartisan meeting, but if they force me to just do it with the majority, which we now have, so be it. But I will not allow these vacancies to continue.

In the case of the NRC, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, it is actually dangerous. I have nuclear powerplants sitting on earthquake faults and in tsunami zones. I want to have an NRC that is functional.

In any case, I will calm down and get back my Keystone Pipeline voice, and I say to my friends who are not here: They blocked this now, but unfortunately we will have to use the rules to get this done because that is our job. We have to fill these slots.

I thank my colleagues very much.

Senator WALSH is here and wishes to speak under the time of Senator HOEVEN, and I will get out of the way and allow him to proceed.

How much time remains on the opponents' side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 29 minutes remaining in opposition.

Mrs. BOXER. How many remain on the proponents' side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They control 62 minutes. The Senator from

Louisiana still has 32 minutes, so they have a total of 94 minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the Keystone XL Pipeline, a critical infrastructure project that has been delayed by political games for far too long. Just recently the American people have said they are tired of political games. They want action in Washington, DC.

The Keystone Pipeline will provide good-paying construction jobs to Americans—including hard-working Montanans—at no cost to the American taxpayer. As the Bakken region continues to boom, this pipeline will provide an important onramp for Montana oil which will boost local economies.

This year the Bakken formation produced its billionth barrel of crude oil. That means hundreds of millions of dollars have been invested in local economies to support good-paying jobs in the United States instead of being sent abroad. It also means 1 billion barrels of oil did not come from places such as Iran and Russia.

A few weeks ago, I got to see firsthand the remarkable development that is happening in eastern Montana and the work that is being done to help secure our energy independence. I have seen firsthand the costs of dependence on oil from hostile places.

During the Iraq war, I commanded the largest deployment of Montanans to war since World War II. In World War II, our strategic interest in the Middle East has been oil. Our dependence on foreign oil should never again be a reason for war.

By carrying Canadian and American oil to American refineries, the Keystone XL Pipeline will play a vital role in making us more energy secure and prosperous while insulating our economy from price shocks caused by foreign conflicts.

The continued delay in approving and building the pipeline is also costing Montana and other States along the route millions in lost tax dollars each year. I say again, millions of lost tax dollars each year to those States where that pipeline is going to come through. As responsible domestic energy production continues to boom, we must also address the serious infrastructure limitations to safely transporting American oil to the marketplace.

In March, I commissioned a report from the Government Accountability Office to study recent rail traffic trends, especially those patterns associated with the oil boom in the Bakken. The report identified several safety concerns as a result of rail traffic. The increase in rail congestion has also impacted Montana's farmers who rely on rail to bring their crops to the market.

These challenges are not going to go away. In fact, the Department of Transportation expects freight traffic

to rise by 51 percent between 2007 and 2040, in part due to limited oil pipeline capacity. Any further delays in approving this project present serious threats to the health and safety of our people, as well as our economy.

By building this pipeline with proper precautions taken to guarantee pipeline safety and reliability, we can provide energy producers with the infrastructure they need to deliver their products to consumers in a safe and efficient manner.

I wish to make clear that building this pipeline does not distract from our responsibility to address climate change across our economy. Coming from a State such as Montana, where we cherish our clean air, our clean water, and our beautiful public lands, it is very important to maintain our environment. But we won't solve global problems by stopping individual projects. We need more comprehensive solutions that transition us toward a cleaner economy.

The excessive delays in approving this project is another example of how Washington is broken. The State Department has finished the environmental impact study required before approving the Keystone XL Pipeline. This project enjoys strong bipartisan support here in Congress, and the American people have spoken that they want bipartisan support and they want action from the representatives they send to Washington, DC. This is our opportunity to act on behalf of the American people.

It is time to build this pipeline, and build it right, with the best possible materials, while preserving protections for landowners and implementing effective energy response plans. We can do it, and we can do it safely. Today we have an opportunity to show the American people that Congress is still capable of meaningful action to promote a strong and stable economy while reducing our reliance on countries who wish to do harm to us.

Today, I encourage all of my colleagues to vote yes on this vital project.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

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

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

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

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

CHINA'S ENERGY CHALLENGES

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to talk about China's inability to keep its promise with the United States. We had someone go over

there. Of course, the President went over and talked to President Xi, and they gave assurances that certain things were going to happen. I have always said for quite some time—I have had occasion to visit with the Chinese, and a lot of them were hoping the United States would restrict development here at home so that the only place our manufacturers could go would be places such as China, India, Mexico, and so on.

One of the statements made by the President of China was that they would stop increasing their emissions by 2030. But it is impossible to accomplish this goal because of its current domestic energy mix and heavy reliance on coal for affordable electricity for its economy.

Now, even if that statement were accurate—that they will eventually stop increasing emissions—what they are also saying is that they are going to continue increasing their emissions from where they are today until 2030. That is a long ways from now.

Nonetheless, I made a speech last week in which I said that China has no known reserves of natural gas. I was wrong. I was wrong due to some of the misinformation we got. The fact that they are not able to realize these reserves is very significant. That shouldn't distract from the fact that China has a difficult road ahead in developing affordable sources of fuel to meet its energy demands.

According to a Forbes article dated August 19, 2014, "China is not the United States and faces technological, geological, technical and topological hurdles in developing its shale gas resources."

That is a quote from Forbes magazine.

China announced in August that it had to lower its natural gas production forecasts significantly. In 2012 the Chinese projected they would produce 60 billion to 100 billion cubic meters of natural gas from shale by 2020. In August of this year they cut that forecast to only 30 billion cubic meters, and an additional 30 billion cubic meters of production is expected to come from coal field sources. Now, all told, this would meet 1 percent of China's total electricity generation needs by 2020. That is 1 percent. That is all we are talking about here, if all of these assumptions are right, and this is by their own admission.

As the New York Times reported on August 21 of this year, China's ability to extract sufficient natural gas is in serious doubt and its natural gas production is "growing at a slower pace than its decelerating economy."

China's problem is that its shale deposits are much different than ours. The formations are deeper and they are more laden with clay, making it more difficult to extract the natural gas and more expensive to get it out through the hydraulic fracturing process.

I am very familiar with this. Hydraulic fracturing actually started in my

home State of Oklahoma in 1948. So we are familiar with this.

Chinese companies have had a difficult time bringing online the natural gas they have found. One company, Far East Energy, recently shut a quarter of its wells for a number of technical and transportation problems, including a lack of gas-gathering pipelines. This underscores that China simply doesn't have the deep technological know-how that we do in this country, which made the shale revolution possible that we have all enjoyed so much in the last 5 years. It was built on the back of 100 years of successful oil and gas development and technological advances in this country, which obviously they haven't had.

China will continue to rely heavily on coal for its electricity generation, and we see this happening today. China continues to build the equivalent of one new coal-fired powerplant every 10 days.

Just think about that. In the last 7 years—in a speech I made on the floor, we had analyzed and calculated the number of coal-fired plants they have, and they are going to continue that into the future. Another option for producing electricity with lower CO₂ emissions is nuclear. However, the country's nuclear plants have stalled following the Fukushima disaster in Japan. Renewables are also an option, but we all know these alone can't affordably power the world's largest economy.

I doubt China will stick to any agreement to reduce greenhouse gas emissions if it puts at risk the country's economy.

Meanwhile, the United States has agreed, by the President's statement, to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions from 26 to 28 percent by 2025, so that the President can solidify a legacy on climate change that will be at the cost of the American people. We are handcuffing our economic future to the President's policies, which fail by their own measure. Acting unilaterally, the President's greenhouse gas regulations would reduce global temperatures by only 0.018 degrees Celsius by 2100. That is 86 years from now. We have been doing this for quite some time—ever since they started the United Nations meetings to get together all of these countries that make all kinds of promises and projections. China has always been there with tongue-in-cheek, just wondering if we were really going to do that in this country. We should stop and think about what China is doing right now in its development, in its growth, and the fact that they are just cranking out these coal-fired plants at a rate that is hard for us to understand. Nonetheless, they are doing it and will continue to do it, by their own admission, until 2030.

With that, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KAINÉ. 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. KAINÉ. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the bill mandating approval of the Keystone Pipeline. I oppose the project because I believe accelerating the development of tar sands oil is contrary to our national interests, economic interests, national security interests, and environmental interests.

I believe there is no way to fully analyze this question without grappling with another question: Is carbon pollution from human activity affecting the world's climate in a negative way? Because if carbon pollution doesn't affect climate, then tar sands or this pipeline would not be a significant issue for me. But if we accept the general scientific consensus—and Virginians do—that carbon pollution does cause negative changes in climate, stopping or even slowing development of the tar sands is good for the United States and the world.

Some of the people who encourage me to support this project duck when I ask them this question: Do you think manmade carbon pollution affects our climate? One Virginia CEO, whose company is filled with scientific talent, basically told me, "I don't know, I am not a scientist." And a representative of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce testified similarly before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee earlier this year. But those of us who take an oath to serve here have a responsibility to consider the scientific evidence.

In Virginia, the second largest region is Hampton Roads, comprised of 1.6 million people in numerous cities and counties along the Chesapeake Bay and Atlantic Coast. Hampton Roads is a thriving economy as well as the home of the largest concentration of naval power in the world. It is also, next to New Orleans, the region most directly affected by rising sea levels, and all agree that rising sea levels are caused in part by carbon pollution. Climate changes are not a tomorrow issue in Virginia, they are a today issue.

Throughout Hampton Roads, rising sea levels are causing significant challenges, flooding roads, homes—with neighborhoods damaged and some even unmarketable—and causing economic harm to families and businesses. At current projections, the main access road into the U.S. Navy's principal base in Hampton Roads will be flooded and impassable 3 hours a day by 2040. With an economy so dependent upon the naval presence, anything that threatens this military investment is potentially devastating.

I sponsored a symposium on sea level rise in Hampton Roads this summer attended by hundreds, with bipartisan representation from local, State, and Federal officials and Members of Congress. The concern is real and virtually all estimates of sea level rise in this

community pose staggering challenges to every aspect of life here for years to come.

It is not just Hampton Roads. Virginia's largest industry is still agriculture and forestry—very affected by climate. Tourism is a major industry which is very affected by climate. Aquaculture is an important industry and climate affects it. So to those who want to duck the question of climate change or challenge the scientific evidence, I say to them, come to Virginia with me and talk to people whose lives are being seriously affected today by climate changes caused in part by escalating climate pollution.

So what is the answer to this problem and how does it relate to the Keystone Pipeline?

We have to continue to move toward a cleaner energy economy. We can't throw the brake on the use of fossil fuels. That would be unrealistic and hurt our economy.

As Governor of Virginia, I supported building a state-of-the-art coal plant in exchange for converting a plant that predated the Clean Air Act from coal to natural gas.

I support development of offshore energy. We can use a phased approach to produce energy cleaner tomorrow than today, reducing pollution caused by our energy sources through innovation and creating jobs. Guess what. As you know, that is exactly what we are doing.

Wind power involves no carbon pollution, and it is the fastest growing energy source in America. Cleaner tomorrow than today.

Utility scale solar electricity output increased 23-fold in the last decade. Cleaner tomorrow than today.

The revolution of natural gas production in the United States has turned our country into the world's leading energy producer and helped us reduce carbon pollution. Cleaner tomorrow than today.

Innovation driven by smart regulation in the American auto industry means we are producing cars that go much farther on gas than ever before. These developments help reduce demand for oil, thus dropping prices to consumers. Cleaner tomorrow than today.

Virginia ratepayers supported nuclear investments over the years that have enabled us to generate 40 percent of our power through noncarbon technology. Cleaner tomorrow than today.

And just as new technologies helped us make coal plants cleaner in the 1980s to battle acid rain, there are ways to make our existing and future coal plants emit less carbon pollution. Cleaner tomorrow than today.

With the United States taking significant leadership steps, it is more likely that other nations will do so as well. I believe our innovative path is one of the reasons why China was willing to announce recently they will take similar steps. Cleaner tomorrow than today.

The United States is now becoming a global leader in reducing carbon pollution, and we are there because of smart regulations and, especially, American innovation. We always have to make sure regulations strike the right balance. But by becoming cleaner tomorrow than today, we are creating jobs, protecting the environment, reducing our trade deficit, and ending our overdependence on energy from foreign nations. As members of the Armed Services Committee, the Members here on the floor, this reduced energy dependence is great for American national security.

This is why I oppose the Keystone project. Tar sands oil is dirty energy, producing significantly more carbon pollution than petroleum. After all we have done to be cleaner tomorrow than today, why would we embrace the technology that is a huge backslide that produces more, not less, carbon pollution than conventional sources? Embracing a dirtier energy technology moves us in precisely the wrong direction.

Keystone as a single project is neither the environmental game over some would suggest nor the energy panacea others would promise. But whether we embrace the tar sands oil development does send a message about how we intend to meet American and global energy needs. We can either send the message of cleaner tomorrow than today or send a message anything goes. Because U.S. innovation is helping us lead the world to a "cleaner tomorrow than today" energy future, we should not turn back now.

There are those who say that the tar sands fields of Alberta will be developed anyway so why doesn't the United States just go along? The owners of the resource may well develop it and find alternate routes to ship it through Canada. They can make their decision on their own, although falling oil prices may make the relative cost noncompetitive. Even if the owners of those fields decide to move forward in this development, the official policy of the United States should not, in my view, be to embrace, promote, and accelerate tar sands oil. Our official policy should be "cleaner tomorrow than today" and not "anything goes."

For these reasons, I oppose the bill to force approval of the Keystone Pipeline project and make accelerated tar sands oil development the official policy of the United States.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, this is what the American people have been waiting to see. They want Washington to work together to grow our Nation's economy. Sometimes that takes debating what some consider a tough vote.

I personally don't see the authorization before us as a difficult vote, by any stretch of the imagination. To me, this is a no-brainer. Here is why. Keystone is a job creator. This project will

bolster the American economy and Arkansas's once we move forward.

In my home State of Arkansas, Nucor Steel in Blytheville and Welspun Tubular in Little Rock are two companies that should be employing people to work on the pipeline for the project right now. These are two communities in my home State that would have already benefited from the project if the President had not been stalling the approval of the Keystone Pipeline.

In fact, Welspun had been producing pipe for the Keystone XL project. Hundreds of miles of pipe, produced for the project, are just sitting at their facility. Unfortunately, due to the administration's delay the company was forced to lay off employees.

The Keystone Pipeline proposal has been studied to death. Every box has been checked. Our friends to the north are moving ahead with or without us. Canada will develop their oil resources whether or not we approve the pipeline. Where the refining is done depends on the President's decision on Keystone. Right now, Canada is currently using other methods of transportation such as railroads to ship their oil.

Without Keystone, they most likely will build their own pipelines to ship their crude oil to Asian markets and refineries in China. They have lax environmental standards.

Instead of working with us to avoid that scenario, the President has unnecessarily prolonged the process, giving Canadian officials more reason to seek opportunities in China.

The Senate majority provided cover for the President's delay tactics for 6 years, simultaneously putting the brakes on thousands of employment opportunities for Americans.

During that time the project has received approval in every study the State Department has conducted. The review process has been exhaustive.

There is no reason for additional delays. The pipeline is ready to go and my colleagues have tried to move it forward. But until now, the Senate majority prevented us from having an up-or-down vote on authorization. Meanwhile, the House voted nine times to approve the Keystone Pipeline. The most recent of these votes came last week.

Now we finally have a chance to send something to the White House that forces the President to make a choice once and for all.

Without congressional activity, the President sees no reason to make a decision. The American people delivered a reason on election day. They want to see Washington work. We can start by passing the Keystone Pipeline. The President claims he heard that message. Let's pass this authorization and give him a chance to approve that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield the floor?

Mr. BOOZMAN. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. DONNELLY. I rise today—

Mrs. BOXER. Could I ask the Senator to yield? I want to ask whose time is the Senator taking at this point?

Mr. DONNELLY. I believe this would be Senator LANDRIEU's time.

Mrs. BOXER. That is fine. Thank you.

Mr. DONNELLY. I rise today in support of the Keystone XL Pipeline. The strong energy economy is critical in both my home State of Indiana's economy and our country's economic success. It is critical to our national security.

I support this project because it would promote economic competitiveness and energy security for both Indiana and the United States. The Keystone XL Pipeline is about creating jobs, investing in infrastructure and going all in on American energy.

Put simply, it is about opportunity. It is an opportunity to strengthen our economy, to strengthen our national security, and to become more energy independent. Energy security and national security. It means all in. Don't be for Keystone and then be against solar and wind. All of those are part of the equation of making our nation stronger. From solar and natural gas, from nuclear to clean coal, from biofuels such as ethanol made of Indiana corn and biodiesel made of Indiana soybeans, all renewable, to wind and oil, we should pursue every resource possible to increase our energy independence while also respecting our environment and using the most advanced technologies possible.

Developing energy sources makes sense for American business. It makes sense for American families. It makes sense for America's national security.

We should take every smart opportunity to stop sending billions of American dollars overseas and begin to continue to develop homegrown energy sources that help provide affordable energy in the future and put more Americans to work today.

This is about investing in pipefitters and ironworkers and plumbers and steelworkers and electricians and all kinds of building trade folks and many other people who then have a chance to make their American dream come true. This is about investing in our energy infrastructure and cutting redtape so stalled projects can move forward.

Earlier this year, in April, I joined 10 of my Senate colleagues in sending a letter to the President asking him to make a final decision on Keystone. Facing an indefinite extension of the review, I joined many colleagues in cosponsoring legislation to approve it. We are still at this point stalled. We are still waiting to move forward.

I am glad we have the chance to vote on this commonsense legislation that authorizes the pipeline. This product is already being shipped by other means today. I stand here to support the Keystone Pipeline because it creates jobs, has support in both parties, makes America energy independent, and helps increase our national security.

This is the kind of investment we can and should make in energy that Democrats and Republicans can support, going all in on energy, and that means wind and that means solar and that means ethanol and that means biodiesel and so many other things. It makes our country stronger and it creates more jobs right here. It is good for America. It is good, as has been said, for our national security.

That is why I urge my colleagues on both sides to vote yes.

I want to thank my colleagues Senator LANDRIEU and Senator HOEVEN for bringing this bipartisan bill forward.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

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

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

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I rise today again to respond to some of the concerns that have been expressed on this floor regarding the Keystone XL Pipeline, to urge my colleagues to move this important, shovel-ready project forward. I had a chance earlier this afternoon—I guess it was this morning—to listen to a fair amount of the debate as I presided. A lot of what we are hearing over and over again is the same messages, in some ways confused messages, because I do not know if we are talking about stopping the oil sands in Canada or if we are talking about approving a pipeline; I do not know if we are talking about doing the State's work in siting a pipeline within their State, or if we are talking about making a determination as directed by legislation from this body to the President to make a determination on whether approval, which is to take that pipeline across the border of this country, is in the national interest.

I think we have confused a lot of the dialog here. I just want to take a moment to start from Ground Zero. That is that we have a requirement that when a pipeline—a legislative requirement—that when a pipeline is going to come across a border, the State Department has an obligation to determine whether that is going to be permitted. The determination is whether it is in the national interest. I do not think anyone anticipated that a pipeline would take 6 years—6 years of dialogue, 6 years of study, millions and millions of dollars and actually billions of dollars of stranded investment—waiting for approval of this pipeline.

So anyone who says, let's wait for the process to work is not facing the reality that the process is broken. This process has not worked. This process has not brought this project to some kind of finality, yes or no. Yes or no. People say: Well, we need to wait for the Nebraska Supreme Court. Nothing is going to go through Nebraska until

the people of Nebraska, through their representatives, actually approve a route.

That is an issue, in my opinion, that belongs to the people of Nebraska and to their elected representatives and to their people. When they say: Look, the EIS may have said that, but it is not reality. When the EIS, commissioned by the State Department, says there will not be a carbon impact as a result of this pipeline, but we are not going to even talk about that because we do not agree with that fact. We do not agree with that fact in the EIS, that this is not about stopping the oil sands in Canada, the oil sand development. This is about a pipeline and whether it is in the national interest to bring that pipeline south.

Now I want to tell you why I think it is in the national interest. I think it is in the national interest because when I talk about energy independence for our country, when I talk about energy independence for our country and looking at how we can deploy our resources for the good of the world, I am talking about North American energy independence, whether it is collaborating with our great friends to the north, Canada, or whether it is, in fact, building relationships and building infrastructure with our neighbors to the south, Mexico, that has a—Mexico is holding a huge amount of oil and gas reserves.

I also find it kind of curious, because there has been a lot of discussion about gasoline prices and how—you know, see, we do not need Keystone XL development or production because look at what is happening with gas prices, and they are going down. This is classic supply-and-demand economics. You know why gasoline prices are going down? Because we are producing more oil in North America, because we are adding to the supply. The supply obviously is meeting world demand, meeting the conditions. We have a discussion in OPEC, I will acknowledge that. But fundamentally it is economics at work. When you have a greater supply and you have reduced demand, the price goes down. That is why we are seeing lower gasoline prices.

So when so many people say we will not benefit from the Keystone XL Pipeline, and they talk about deployment of that pipeline, and they talk about what it means to have this system be deployed, I will tell you that we can thank what is happening in Canada in energy production for gasoline prices that now are, for the first time in a long time, below \$3 in many parts of our country—below \$3—because we are producing more domestic and North American crude oil.

So I think we need to be honest about what we are talking about here. I frequently say the pipeline has taken a role in American politics that is way disproportional to what it is. It is a pipeline. There are over 2 million miles of pipeline in America today. This is going to be just another one of those.

It is going to be state of the art. Can I predict a perfect world? Can I predict that there will never be any kind of consequence? No, I cannot, anymore than I can predict what is going to happen tomorrow with any kind of natural resource or any kind of transportation infrastructure. But I can tell you that I have seen the extra precautions.

I want to report on some of those things that TransCanada has done, the pipeline company that would build Keystone XL, to respond to the concerns. They have agreed to 57 special safety conditions that go above and beyond what is required in Federal regulation, including the installation of automatic shutoff valves not only every 20 miles but in specific spots that cross waterways. There are over 2.3 million miles of pipe in the ground, and around 160,000 of those miles are being used for crude oil transport. Think about that. Think about the need for this infrastructure. There was a lot of discussion today about how this oil will fly out of the country magically. I will tell you the reason why, contrary to what you have been told today, that this pipeline is destined to go south into the United States—you have been hearing that the pipeline did not go east and west because Canada did not want it.

That pipeline went to the south because that is where heavy crudes are refined. A lot of the heavy crudes that are refined in Texas and in the South—the Gulf States—is crude that is imported from Venezuela. It is imported from Venezuela. Who would you rather buy your crude oil from, from Venezuela, or would you rather buy it from our friends to the north in Canada?

We have so politicized, for lack of a better word, something that should be a clear economic position. We have made this an important cause on both sides. I will call out both sides. This is a pipeline. It is a pipeline that will transport an important commodity that will be used in our refineries in our country to produce gasoline and diesel fuel that drives the engine of our economy, certainly our transportation economy.

We are buying it from our friends to the North, Canada. Canadian officials have years of responsible investment, responsible development of their infrastructure. They are people we should want to do business with. Instead of simply making the decision based on, yes, environmental considerations, that, yes, we cannot ignore that the EIS says there are not any environmental impediments to this pipeline. People say: Well, what about if it changes in Nebraska? Do you honestly believe if there is a change in Nebraska, there is going to be a change that will put more of the Nebraska environment in harm's way? Do you honestly believe that is the outcome of the Nebraska Supreme Court decision? No.

So when we look at this, we need to begin to focus on what this is. It is a pipeline. It is a critical piece of energy

infrastructure. It is something that has languished too long because of a failed process. Six years. Six years. There are young people here, the pages. What if I told you that you could not get your driver's license for 6 years? What if I told a business: We are not going to permit you for 6 years? What if we told anyone down the road who needed some kind of license or approval from the Federal Government, 6 years? That is what it is going to take—6 years. There is no one who thinks that is appropriate.

So if this process today, which was started by my great friend, MARY LANDRIEU from Louisiana, spurs a further discussion that resolves this issue one way or the other—one way or the other—we have accomplished a great deal today. We have accomplished a great deal by having this important discussion, on which obviously there are heartfelt opinions on both sides.

In fact, my colleague from California has described it as a vote of conscience. I will tell you from my perspective it is a vote for common sense. It is a vote for common sense in moving this piece of infrastructure forward and making sure we are doing everything that we can to provide affordable energy that drives this economy.

That is the new dynamic, the new energy renaissance. I believe we will approve this pipeline. I am hoping it is today. But we will approve this pipeline. At the end of the day, all we have done has resulted in incredible frustration and incredible delay that has cost money for not only the pipeline but for the taxpayers of this country. It is time to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining as a proponent who was originally given 1 hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seven minutes.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I would like to take 1 minute now and then we are going to ask for some additional time.

I want to thank the Senator from North Dakota for her really clear and direct explanation of this and her practical approach to what we do here. It is so refreshing. It is so wonderful to hear her knowledge and the depth of her knowledge about this.

I put this up again just to remind the American people that what she said is absolutely true. We already have 2.6 million miles of pipe moving oil and gas from where it is produced to where it is needed. This pipeline, which I have outlined in blue here, is just one of many pipelines that is going to be in our country. Our country needs this energy. We need oil. We need gas. We need clean coal. Yes, even when we build huge solar operations out West, where we have a lot of sun—we do not have sun down South—or we build windmills off of Massachusetts' border,

you still have to move that power to the places that need it.

This infrastructure is absolutely essential to the economic power of the United States of America. If the middle class is telling us anything, they want more economic power in America.

The Senator from North Dakota is also right. When I speak about energy independence, I like to talk about Canada and Mexico as well, North American independence. We might be able to do it in just the 50 States and territories of the United States, but I am confident we can do it with Canada and Mexico.

The added benefits are these: We do not have to be dictated to by Russia and China. Hooray. We can also create jobs not just in the United States but in Mexico. Hooray. You know, people who can work in Mexico and have good jobs in Mexico might stay in Mexico—hooray for that—instead of desperately looking for work in the United States. It can help to solve some of our immigration problems. What is wrong with this? We can create technology transfers from the United States to Mexico. So this is a win-win.

I am sorry people have taken this Keystone Pipeline to be the beginning and end. It is just another pipeline. But it is a symbol of common sense. It is a symbol of infrastructure necessary for us to be energy independent. I do not want to hear one Senator coming down here to the floor to say: We are going to be energy independent without infrastructure. All they say is “wind” or “gas” or “oil” or “coal” or “solar.” Those are all the words people use. Lovely words. But unless you are talking about pipes, transmission lines, rights of way, highways, roads into rural areas, you are not talking about energy, you are just talking nonsense, absolute nonsense.

This is an infrastructure bill, an important pipeline. It should have been built and given permission years ago. As I have said, people say: Well, MARY why are you circumventing the process? How long could the process possibly be?

Six years is a long time. It should have taken 1 year or 2, and we have the report that is finished. We are not circumventing the process trying to shortchange it as some people have claimed. This is a final report. It was issued in January. I got this report in January. I got it, Senator HOEVEN read it, and then we filed the bill in May. January, February, March, April, May—we drafted the bill carefully, giving 6 months after the report was given, thinking surely that is enough time for people to read this report. Someone could read it in one sitting, but we gave them 6 months.

When it didn't happen, Senator HOEVEN and I dropped our bill—not the House bill that had all sorts of bells, whistles, and a lot of messaging that wasn't going anywhere. We dropped a bill—clean Keystone.

Now I would have liked to have tied it with something else. I tried tying it

with energy efficiency, thinking that would maybe get us to a debate on the floor. We could maybe tie it to the minimum wage and get some votes on it. You could tie it to something else that might make sense but never could get the other side to agree to a piece to tie it to.

I only have 2 minutes left, and I ask unanimous consent for another 5 minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. Reserving the right to object, could that be off my friend's time?

Ms. LANDRIEU. I don't have any additional.

Mrs. BOXER. Then we need to add 5 minutes to our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. LANDRIEU. We waited for 6 months after the final report was done. So the final report has been done. It has been 6 years. It is clearly in America's interests. We have labor unions, business organizations—the Association of Petroleum Institute, the American Chemical Association.

Let me talk just 1 minute about their letter. Cal Dooley signed this letter to me today and said on behalf of the American Chemistry Council—which is all over this country, in Delaware, Michigan, Minnesota, Illinois, New Jersey: This project could add 407,000 permanent new jobs by 2023.

He was not talking about the specific pipeline, but what Cal is talking about in the Chemical Council is the symbol that America is ready, willing, and able to be energy independent and all the blessings that would bring to our country and to our economy. We don't have to rely on China and Russia, and we can clean it as we go. We can make it cleaner as we move.

So that is why I brought this debate to the floor today. I am excited for this debate—whatever side you are on. I think it has been a breath of fresh air for the Senate to actually talk about something that people can understand, and may we have the vote at the time allowed.

I thank my dear colleague from California for allowing that 5 minutes and, of course, for our side I am the only one on the floor. So we will be happy to give those additional 5 minutes.

I reserve the remainder of my time, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, how much time do the Republican proponents have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have 52 minutes remaining.

Ms. LANDRIEU. We only have 5 minutes remaining.

How much time do the Democratic opponents have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have 27 minutes remaining.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Senator HOEVEN is on the floor. Senator BOXER is also. I know our vote is at 6:30, and it is 4:30. Should we divide the time equally or how do we think this would work? If Senator HOEVEN would say what he thinks, we could do one-third, one-third, and one-third or whether the Senator from California perhaps wants to do half and half.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. I would respond to the question of the Senator from Louisiana. My understanding is we were targeting to maybe have the vote at 5:30. I would be certainly pleased to work through that with the Senator and Senator BOXER, finishing up, maybe with me at 5:45 or whatever we work out within that timing.

Mrs. BOXER. A question through the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I think it would be very helpful if the three of us could get together for 1 minute to work out the details of how to close out, and then we could make a unanimous consent request so Senators would know exactly what to do.

May I suggest that we go into a quorum call and that it come off of all three sides and have a couple of minutes to discuss this. Is that all right?

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, that seems to be the right way to go. I have no objection.

Mrs. BOXER. We rethought this situation.

I ask unanimous consent that we take no time off of anybody's time at this point and that we just meet and discuss how we are going to close this debate.

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

Mrs. BOXER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mrs. BOXER. I yield 5 minutes to my friend from Washington State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I would like to take a few minutes to talk about the legislation we are considering regarding the proposed Keystone XL Pipeline.

As with too many controversial issues, we have lost track of the facts and the basic process for moving a project such as this one forward. So let's be clear. The legislation we are

voting on today isn't just a bill to say yes or no to the Keystone Pipeline. This is legislation that would have us skip the established process for determining whether a major infrastructure project, with potential impact to millions of Americans, our economy, and our environment, should be approved. We are still in the middle of that process. But if this bill passes, it would mean we are bypassing all the scientists and engineers and experts who are evaluating the proposal. It would put an arbitrary, manufactured timeline on a project whose evaluation is incomplete and would short-circuit the process for the public to weigh in on this project.

Regardless of how different Members feel about this, we should all agree that this is no way the U.S. Government ought to approve a project of this scope. So that is one reason I will be voting against this legislation. When it comes to protecting our environment, we should rely on facts, patience, and a fair process.

There is no denying that the proposed Keystone Pipeline project has become larger than the sum of its parts. I understand the desire of my colleagues to expedite the projects they support, and I understand cutting through redtape to get things done. But when we are considering a project that could have significant impacts on our economy and our environment, making a decision before we have all the facts could be reckless and it could be dangerous.

The Keystone Pipeline proposal is a great example of why our process for evaluating the potential consequences of projects such as this one is not only important, it is absolutely necessary. We simply cannot put expediency ahead of scientific facts regarding climate change because as a country we have done that for far too long and now we are paying the price.

Earlier this year, as chair of the Budget Committee, I held a hearing on the impact of climate change on our country. We heard testimony from business leaders, from environmental experts, from industry leaders, and even from military officials. Their message was clear: The consequences of climate change are not hypothetical and they are not exaggerated. The impacts of human activity on our planet are real, they are significant, and they are happening right now.

The Federal Government, for example, spent three times more on disaster relief in the past decade than it did in the previous decade. If we do nothing, continued climate change will result in more frequent and more intense episodes of extreme weather, just as we saw with Hurricanes Katrina and Sandy.

The U.S. Department of Transportation today sends about \$22 billion a year to State and local governments just to help them keep their existing transportation infrastructure in good repair. But hotter temperatures and

more frequent flooding will wash out roads and will put added stress on bridge supports and public transit systems and will require substantial additional Federal investment.

We know an uptick in temperature and heat waves will reduce annual yields of major crops and cause more livestock deaths. It will hurt farmers and agribusinesses, cause consumer food prices to rise, and really create a ripple effect that will increase costs to U.S. taxpayers.

Our military experts say that climate change will act as a catalyst for instability and conflict around the world, creating additional threats to our country and adding to the cost of protecting our Nation's interests.

So, Mr. President, with all we already know about the impacts of climate change, how can we possibly move this project forward before we have a thorough understanding of the environmental impacts that will result from building the Keystone Pipeline? How can we force the decision that could very possibly make the impact of climate change even worse?

As a Senator from the State of Washington, I am very proud of my work to protect the environment, and I am proud of my State's leadership in combating climate change. Even though the Keystone Pipeline will not run through my State, Washingtonians know well that the pipeline's impacts could quickly reach our communities, from Seattle to Spokane.

So I come to the floor today to oppose this legislation, and I will continue to oppose any efforts in Congress that ignore or brush aside the environmental consequences of our actions. For far too long we have put short-term interests ahead of our environment and long-term realities, and that has to stop.

I yield the floor.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the previous order with respect to debate time on S. 2280, the time until 5:45 p.m. be equally divided between Senators HOEVEN, LANDRIEU, and myself, or our designees, and that at 5:45 p.m., Senator HOEVEN be recognized for up to 2 minutes for closing remarks; that upon the conclusion of his remarks, Senator LANDRIEU be recognized for up to 2 minutes; that upon the conclusion of her remarks, Senator BOXER be recognized for up to 4 minutes; that upon the conclusion of Senator BOXER's remarks, the Senate proceed to vote on passage of S. 2280, with all other provisions of the previous order with respect to the bill remaining in order; and finally, I ask unanimous consent that the time used by Senator MURRAY count toward Senator BOXER's time.

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

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, it is with great pride that I call on my colleague from California as she gets herself ready to speak to this issue. Sen-

ator FEINSTEIN and I represent a State that is creating so many clean energy jobs, and I am very proud to yield to her 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague, and I wish to congratulate her on her leadership on this issue. We clearly have had a very extensive debate in our caucus on this. There are varying views, and I have thought a lot about it. I have had 120,000 California constituents write and call, of which about 93 percent are strongly opposed. I would say to the chairman of the committee that one of the things that interested me from reading these constituent letters was really how informed individuals were about this pipeline.

Let me lay out some of the environmental concerns. You have heard this, but perhaps you haven't heard it in entirely this way. The Keystone Pipeline was proposed to accommodate increased extraction of oil from the tar sands of Alberta. These tar sands cover an area of 54,000 square miles. That is roughly the size of New York, so it is huge.

I first came upon this by reading a March 2009 issue of National Geographic, and in that they showed part of the desecration to the land—forests down, tar sands. It looked like a Moon face. A huge portion of these deposits can only be accessed through open-pit surface mining, which destroys natural forests and bogs. Then the oil sands are mixed with heated water, chemicals are added, and it is driven up with steam in order to separate it from the sand. These methods are costly, they are energy-intensive, they are carbon-intensive, and they leave behind a significant amount of toxic waste. And that is just the extraction process.

Transportation of the oil poses additional risks to the environment—namely, the risk of pipeline spills. The first Keystone Pipeline, which is already operating in our country, had to be shut down several times for safety concerns. It leaked 14 times during its first year of operation. Across the border in Canada, the same pipeline spilled 21 times in its first year of operation. These pipeline spills are dangerous and difficult to clean up. The danger from spills is even greater since the new leg of the pipeline would run over Nebraska's Ogallala Aquifer, which is a critical source of drinking water for millions and an irrigation source for farmers.

Beyond degrading our environment, this project also runs against our efforts—as has been said many times on this floor—to combat climate change. According to the National Energy Technology Laboratory, by the time oil from Keystone makes it to a car in the form of gasoline, it has already produced 80 percent—80 percent—more greenhouse gas emissions than typical crude oil.

Here is how the math works out. Producing, refining, and combusting oil

from Keystone will release up to 27 million metric tons more carbon dioxide every year than would be produced from burning the same volume of crude oil. Those additional emissions are equivalent to the emissions of 5.7 million cars on the road or 8 coal-fired powerplants. I think that is pretty impressive as to the totally negative impact of this. So this would be a poor way to begin meeting the President's pledge in Beijing to dramatically reduce our emissions, if the first time we do something it creates 27 million metric tons more carbon dioxide every year and is equivalent to the emissions of 5.7 million cars.

On the economics of the pipeline, there is simply not enough benefit to outweigh the environmental damage. The project is not going to lower gasoline prices for American drivers. The oil is intended to be sold on the global market, not for the benefit of American motorists. The State Department has concluded that the pipeline would have little impact on the prices U.S. consumers pay.

So I believe this project has terrible environmental hazards and risks, it is not necessary, and it certainly is not helpful to our environment.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time during the quorum call be taken off everybody's time here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I would like to take 5 minutes to respond to some of the comments the Senator from California made in regard to the environmental impacts.

First, if we look at the environmental impact statements—actually, there were five environmental impact statements done. And what they found and said very clearly is that the Keystone XL Pipeline will have no significant environmental impact. Let me repeat that—no significant environmental impact. That is from the environmental study done by the Obama administration.

Again, that is not me saying it. That is the State Department for the Obama administration saying no significant environmental impact, according to the environmental impact statement.

In addition, I would point out that if we don't build the Keystone XL Pipeline, this 830,000 barrels of oil a day moves by railroad. Now think of that.

What is going to produce more greenhouse gas emissions? Moving all this oil by rail—which by the way takes 1,400 railcars a day—or moving it in tankers across the ocean to China where it will be refined in refineries that have much higher emissions or you putting it in the pipeline? So again, just common sense, what is going to produce more greenhouse gas emissions, having the pipeline or 1,400 railcars per day or sending it in tankers to China to be refined in their refineries that have much higher emissions? Not to mention the fact that what are Americans going to think about that we are going to make Canada send their oil to China so we in America can import oil from the Middle East. That is a pretty tough sell. Again, with the pipeline you have lower greenhouse gas emissions. In addition, the heavy crude we import from Venezuela now has higher emissions than the oil that will be provided by the Keystone. I am not even including the fact that it is not just Canadian crude that comes in. It is also light sweet Bakken crude from my home State of North Dakota and our neighbor to the west, Montana. We are not just moving Canadian. We our moving our own crude, and if we don't, we are going to continue to get that oil from Venezuela, which has as high or higher greenhouse gas emissions. As a matter of fact, the heavy crude in California, the good Senator's own State, has greenhouse gas emissions that are equal to or higher than the crude that would come through the pipeline. That is produced in California.

The final point I would like to make on the environmental aspects is that 80 percent of the new production in Canada—in the Canadian oil sands—80 percent of the new production is being done by what they call in situ drilling. So instead of excavating, which is what is being done now with much of the production at the oil sands, they are drilling. They would drill down similarly to the way they would drill for oil with conventional drilling and then put steam down in the hole and have that bring up the oil. So the carbon footprint is reduced using this in situ method, and 80 percent of the production in Canada will be with this in situ method. That will reduce the greenhouse gas emissions and the footprint, similar to conventional drilling in the United States.

When you look at the environmental track record in Canada, the Canadians care about their environment too. We all want to find ways to produce energy and do it with good environmental stewardship. I submit to you that the way to do that is to empower and enable the deployment of new technologies that not only produce that energy more cost-effectively, more independently but also do it with better environmental stewardship because you are using the latest, greatest technologies. Instead of moving the product through railcars, you are moving it through the latest pipeline with the

latest safeguards. So I wanted to take 5 minutes to respond to some of those environmental issues, and I thank the Senator from California and turn the floor now back to her.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, could the Presiding Officer tell us who has how much time at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). The Senator from North Dakota has 14 minutes, the Senator from Louisiana has 19 minutes, and the Senator from California has 8 minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. Well, Madam President, I will take three minutes of that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. As we get ready to have a vote here in a while, what makes me very sad about this debate is that if we would all actually embrace an “all of the above” energy future, we wouldn't have to have these arguments. But we cannot get any support over there for clean energy. We just cannot. Let's just call it what it is.

It is sad because when I look at my home State, we are booming. We are booming because our State has always been an environmental leader and with it comes jobs and, as Jerry Brown has shown, balanced budgets. People are smiling.

I don't want it to look like what it looks like in China. We have a photo here. This is what it looks like in China. I know you have been there. People are walking around with masks on their faces because they cannot breathe the air and you cannot see. Yet still we go down this path. The heaviest polluting oil is what the tar sands oil is—the heaviest polluting oil.

I stood with doctors and nurses. They joined in my call for a health review. My colleagues say: Oh, well, this project has been studied up and down, up and down, and down and up. Well, I don't think so, neither does Senator WHITEHOUSE and neither do the nurses who all joined with us. They are the most respected profession. So don't listen to me, because I am in one of the least respected professions, I am sad to say. Listen to the nurses. They say we need more studies on the health of the people. We don't want our people walking around like this. I remember the days in Los Angeles when the air looked like this. I don't want to go back to that. This is the filthiest, dirtiest oil. That is why I call XL “extra lethal.”

The pipeline itself is a pipeline. It is what you are putting in it, it is what you are unleashing that is going to mean a 45-percent increase in the tar sands oil into our Nation, and there will be consequences.

I've got news for you. Senators don't live near refineries. Take a look at what that looks like. Senators don't live near pipelines when there are spills. This is what it looks like—lovely, isn't it—in Port Arthur, TX. I stood with the community leaders. This is what it looks like. This is filthy, dirty oil with pollutants that kill, and that is the truth.

Yet it is all: Oh, how many jobs? I will tell you how many jobs. The CEO of the pipeline company says it is 50 jobs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has taken 3 minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you very much. I will yield 1 more minute.

So the CEO of the company itself said 50 jobs. This is why we are risking the health of our children? The fact that they have to run away from the playground because they cannot breathe—this is worth it? This is supposed to be in the national interest? And the kicker is, as Senator MARKEY pointed out, all of the oil is going to be exported. It is going to drive up the price of gasoline here at home. I know this is counterintuitive, but it is a fact. The oil is going to come in here, it is going to go straight out, and all of this stuff that is refined here is going to move out of this country and our gas prices are going to go up so that kids have to suffer this because oil companies want to make more profit? Not in my world.

So I reserve the balance of my time, and I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that the time be divided equally.

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

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Ms. LANDRIEU. How much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighteen minutes.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I thank the Presiding Officer.

First of all, let me associate myself with the remarks of my cosponsor, Senator HOEVEN, who before he had to slip out the door to take a call relative to this vote was really very clear on so many important points that he made.

The first and most important point I think in this debate—and I respect the opponents of this—but the most important point, the basic fact is this. This resource will be developed by Canada no matter what anyone in the United States and the House or the Senate of either party does. That is a fact. It is indisputable. How do we know that? Because the Prime Minister of Canada and the Premier of the Province have told us that—of all the different parties. It is the unquestioned truth. They are going to develop this resource, and they are going to send this resource through their avenues out to either China—

Excuse me. Could I get order?

They are going to develop this resource. This debate isn't going to stop them or start them.

No. 2, we have to develop partnerships for progress because no country, even as powerful as the United States

is, can hardly do anything completely by themselves. We do lots of great things and have since the moment we were formed, but we have always had partners. Even in the Revolutionary War, France came to help us and the Netherlands lent us money—a tiny little country that could fit inside of Louisiana. We have always had partners.

So the question for this debate is—the first point—this resource will be developed and will go on the market to the world—period.

The second point is America needs partners in our energy production. Who is the best partner we could possibly have—the one that is close to us geographically, closest to us in terms of our democratic outlook, closest to us in environmental standards? Even the Senator from California would admit if I asked her—she is standing right here next to me—which country has one of the highest environmental standards in the world besides the Netherlands and besides one or two Scandinavian countries, it would be Canada. In some ways you can argue that their environmental standards are higher than our own.

So I am sure they are feeling very offended being lectured to by U.S. Senators about a process where they have tighter environmental standards than we do.

No. 3, contrary to the ranting of some people that this is for export, it is contrary to the facts. I am going to read from TransCanada, the pipeline. It says: “Comments were received throughout the review process speculating” whether this heavy crude oil carried by the proposed pipeline which passes through the United States would be loaded onto vessels ultimately for sale in markets such as Asia.

As crude of foreign origin, Canadian crude is eligible for crude export license as long as it is not commingled with domestic crude. However, such an option appears unlikely to be economically justified for any significant durable trade given transport costs and market conditions.

Keystone is not for export. It is actually to come to the refineries in the gulf coast which is why I know a lot about this and why I have been a supporter from the very beginning—because this is my home. Louisiana and Texas are kind of the epicenter for refining heavy crude. We transformed our refineries from light crude when we were kind of running out of it, when Venezuela was discovering its heavy crude. I took a trip down with Frank Murkowski 18 years ago when I was a freshman on the committee. He said: “Go with me to Venezuela.” I went. He said: “You’ve got to see this heavy crude. This is what our future is.” Our country doesn’t have much. We would rather get it from Venezuela and the Middle East. I went to Lake Maracaibo. I went to Venezuela years and years ago. They don’t need permission from us. These are business people making business decisions. They transformed their refineries to heavy crude.

The heavy crude that comes from Canada has a great partnership with the refineries in the gulf coast. This is business, not politics, and business is good for this country, contrary to popular opinion. This was a business deal—a good deal for Canada, for the United States, for our economy, for jobs, and because it has a negligible impact on the environment.

I know Democratic Senators will come down here and talk about the environment. This is the last of five environmental studies. It has been published since January of this year. Senator HOEVEN waited to introduce our bill. He kept coming to me and asking: Should we introduce our bill? I kept going to him and asking: Should we introduce our bill? We decided to give them a little more time. We didn’t want to rush it. It has been going on for 6 years. We tried to be patient.

Finally, by May, after this had been published, it clearly says there is negligible environmental impact from President Obama’s own State Department and EPA. They said it is much easier, safer, and cleaner to transport this oil by pipeline than it is to put it on barges going down the Mississippi River—and since we are at the end of it, we would know about this. It is safer than putting it on railcars that go through towns and could potentially blow up. That is what they say in here. I know people don’t want to read it, but that is what this says.

It is not for export. This is a partnership with one of our best and longest allies in the world, Canada, with the highest environmental standards. It is a high-tech, state-of-the-art pipeline that is going to put thousands of people to work, but more importantly than the people, building it is the signal it is going to send to chemicals, to our manufacturing base that has seen an extraordinary renaissance, and not just in the gulf coast. In some places, our unemployment rate is 2.5 percent.

It is also in other States, such as Ohio, Michigan, Pennsylvania, the Midwest, and, yes, the west coast and the east coast. That is the third major argument.

The fourth major argument is this has absolutely nothing to do with climate change. It simply has to do with smart partnerships—economic business partnerships to produce the resources North America has in the most environmentally friendly way.

If we could vote on this today—which we finally will. We have been working for years to finally get a vote, and hopefully to passage—we can then move on to a broader discussion which should take place about climate change. I am not a denier of climate change. I am not. I understand there are impacts to the environment. This doesn’t happen to be one of them. This does not happen to be one of them.

This resource is going to be produced, either with Canada and the United States doing it in the cleanest, most efficient way possible, or it is it going to

go in an inefficient way to partners that do not have oversight, do not have an EPA, and do not have standards. It is a no-brainer. After we finish with this, we can then get on with the big debate I have had with Senator BOXER, Senator SHELDON WHITEHOUSE, and others about what to do with the human impacts of the environment and start talking about real issues that can move us one way or the other by also maintaining our commitment to economic growth. That is why I have been fighting for a debate and a vote on the Keystone Pipeline.

Madam President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 9 minutes.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I wish to call attention to the bill itself. We talk about many bills, but we don’t really debate many bills, so this has been a refreshing day on the floor of the Senate. I have not really seen a day like this in 8 years.

I am encouraged by what the outcome will be, but I am really encouraged by the debate we are having on the floor of the Senate.

There are a lot of businesses in America that are focused on this debate. There are a lot of labor unions and their leaders who are watching this. The pipefitters are watching, the boilermakers are watching, the engineers are watching, and the operating engineers are watching. They have been fighting for this pipeline for their members for 5 years, and their cries for help and support have fallen on deaf ears on this side of the Chamber. So they are watching.

Unlike a lot of bills that we debate, this bill is a page-and-a-half. This is the bill. It is S. 2280. It was drafted to be very simple. The bill basically says that over the course of 6 years every study that is required by law has been completed. Every study has been completed, published, and made public. Since the process is finished and over with, the Congress is directing the President to build this pipeline based on his own studies that have greenlighted it time and time and time again.

There is no study to be turned in. The only issue outstanding—and it is important—has to do with one portion of the State of Nebraska. There is an aquifer in Nebraska, and the people there did not want the pipeline to go through it, and so the leaders in Nebraska moved the pipeline away from the aquifer. When they did that, a small and vocal environmental group, which is against the Keystone Pipeline, filed suit to say that the way they did that was wrong, the process was wrong. They are in court now, and that is going to be resolved. The Supreme Court has already taken arguments. It will happen any Friday. It could be this Friday or next Friday or the next Friday. That is it. It is done. We could start building parts of it and eventually get to Nebraska because they have

already approved it to go through the State. It is just a matter of exactly who had the authority to do it, and that will be resolved by Nebraska. Our bill acknowledges that and says nothing shall step on private property rights.

As I have said over and over, Senator HOEVEN and I carefully drafted this bill after consulting with Senator TESTER from Montana about private property rights and talking to the Senators from Nebraska about respecting Nebraska.

Enough is enough. Six years is long enough. Just like the Senator from North Dakota said, if a business wanted to get a permit to dredge a channel or build a dock or put up a big store in a mall and walked into city hall and they said, that is lovely, but you have to wait 6 years, no one in America can function that way. It is not right. It is wrong.

It is so clear to the people of Louisiana that this pipeline should be built, and it is so clear to the people of Texas. Many Democrats in our part of the country—strong members of the Black Caucus have voted for this pipeline. CEDRIC RICHMOND, my Congressman, has voted for this pipeline, as has BENNIE THOMPSON, the Congressman from Mississippi, and JAMES CLYBURN. The coalition is broad and diverse. The Republicans, Democrats, Black Caucus, labor, and business community are saying: What is wrong with the Members of Congress that they cannot understand that 6 years is long enough? The reports are in. The facts are what they are. This pipeline needs to be built for many good reasons.

I wish to reserve my last 2 minutes.

This is America's hour to become energy independent. We don't have to kowtow to Russia. We don't have to be held up by the politics of Putin and his bullying in Eastern Europe. We can help Japan, a strong ally of ours, to stand with us. We can help Europe, and most importantly, we can help ourselves and build a new energy renaissance that is all of the above—that is the cleanest and most environmentally sensitive that we can. Let's get on with doing this.

I am so proud to have literally kick-started this debate. I hope this is the beginning of many important debates that take place. No more theater, no more positioning, and no more chess games that nobody understands, because if you are not at the chessboard, it is really hard to follow. Even when you watch chess on television, it is a real hard game to get excited about.

Let's get back to what we do best: debating bills that have impactful outcomes. In my opinion, this bill does that in a positive way for the people of the United States.

Let us build a middle class again. Most importantly, let's listen to them. Let's pay attention to them and use our common sense.

I yield the floor and reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, what is the time situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has just under 4 minutes. The Senator from North Dakota has 13 minutes, and the Senator from Louisiana has 2½ minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. And that is before we get to the final debate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I want everyone who is watching us from Louisiana to know that without MARY LANDRIEU, we would not be having this debate. She makes a point when she says it is good to have this debate. It is really good to have debates. We have had debates before on war and on health care. I put them in a bit of a different category, but this is an important debate.

I do want to cover a little ground here. First of all, it is important to note we Democrats are under a big umbrella. We have Senators who agree with the Big Oil philosophy. We have Senators who agree with the "all of the above" philosophy, and we have Senators who are pushing for clean energy. This is true about our caucus, and I am proud.

MARY LANDRIEU and I worked hand-in-glove on Katrina. She asked me to do something for her in my capacity as chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee that I had to say no to. She is a great Senator. The way I feel about Keystone is not the way she feels about it, and that is the beauty of our party.

I want to make it clear for the RECORD, I met with Canadians who live near the extraction of the dirty tar sands oil, I have met with the people in Port Arthur, TX, who live near the refineries of the dirty tar sands oil, and I have talked to community activists who saw a Little League team that had to flee a field in Chicago because the petcoke—petroleum coke, which is so filled with particulates that you can't breathe around it—started to fly all over the Little League field.

The Canadians I met with were not happy with their government. I am not here to pass judgment, but I will put in the RECORD:

In October 2014, the Canadian Office of the Auditor General issued a scathing report detailing the Canadian Government's failure to adequately protect the environment during the tar sands development.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have this summary printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POOR CANADIAN ENVIRONMENTAL OVERSIGHT
OF TAR SANDS INDUSTRY

In October 2014, the Canadian Office of the Auditor General issued a scathing report detailing the Canadian Government's failure to adequately protect the environment during tar sands development.

The report found that:

The Canadian federal government has no firm plan to monitor the oil sands beyond 2015; and

The 2012 Canada and Alberta Joint Oil Sands Monitoring (JOSM) program set to be in place by 2015 has met delays—including on monitoring one of the key pollutants—PAHs (polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons). Numerous peer reviewed studies have found high levels of PAHs—carcinogens—downstream from tar sands production.

Mrs. BOXER. I can't get into how good Canada is on a daily basis, but I can tell you that when it comes to the tar sands, they don't have a good record.

I have stood with doctors and nurses from America, and they all said: This is dangerous, dangerous stuff because it has heavy metals, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxide, particulate matter, carcinogens, and all of these things.

So welcome, tar sands oil, to America to cut through our country and then be exported to other countries. I have to say that it leaves me in amazement.

Senator MARKEY laid it out. We are going to see higher gas prices because of this bill. They will just unleash more of their oil and get it out of here because they get a higher price abroad than they do in America.

When you stand with the people who live along the excavation route, when you stand with people who live right near the refineries, when you stand with people who had their kids playing Little League and soccer right near the petroleum coke, you have to say, what is in the national interest?

Madam President, I ask for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask unanimous consent for an additional 1 minute.

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

Mrs. BOXER. I would add 1 minute to Senator LANDRIEU's time as well.

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

Mrs. BOXER. To me, all of these health reasons are reason enough to say let's not interrupt what the administration is going through now, which is careful study of whether this is safe for our people. Two million people sent in their comments. Don't shortcut that.

Then there is the whole issue of the climate. We know this tar sands oil is far more carbon intensive and it is going to hurt our planet, and we want to have a planet that is habitable for our children and our grandchildren and generations to come.

I embrace this debate. I think it is an important debate to have. But we really have to ask ourselves the question: Is it worth exposing our people to these risks, with whom I stood shoulder to shoulder, and is it worth exposing the planet to these risks when we can create millions of jobs in a clean energy economy as we are doing in my State? And we are going gangbusters.

I thank my colleagues, and I say to the people from Louisiana, they could not have a better fighter. We are in the ring together and it is tough, but that

is the beauty of the Democratic Party, that we are an inclusive party.

I yield my time.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I rise to commend Senator LANDRIEU for her work on the bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

Since coming to the Senate in 1997, Senator LANDRIEU has worked tirelessly to reach across the aisle and get things done for her constituents. She has been by my side as a member of the Appropriations Committee as we rolled up our sleeves to break through the gridlock to keep the government open and functioning. She has done outstanding work as chairwoman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, along with her Ranking Member Senator MURKOWSKI, and I am so proud to have her as a colleague and a friend.

I am a blue-collar Senator. I grew up in a blue-collar neighborhood in Baltimore during World War II where my father had a small neighborhood grocery store. We were the neighborhood of mom-and-pop businesses and factories. We made liberty ships. We put out turbo steel to make the tanks. Glenn L. Martin made the seaplanes that helped win the battle of the Pacific. We were in the manufacturing business. So I know the value of good, blue-collar jobs.

Estimates show that the Keystone XL Pipeline could create 3,900 direct construction jobs over its 2-year construction period. But only fewer than 50 would be permanent.

I recognize the need for jobs in construction, but I can't ignore the environmental and legal concerns surrounding the pipeline that still won't be resolved if we pass the bill today.

First, I am worried about the safety of our water supply. The corrosive, thick sludge that would travel through Keystone makes the pipeline more vulnerable to leaks and accidents and endangers the drinking water of the more than 1.8 million Americans who get their water from the Ogallala Aquifer.

Second, I am worried about the increased carbon in the air as a result of this project—the equivalent of Americans driving their cars 60 billion more miles per year. This means more of the devastating impacts of climate change which could harm jobs in aquaculture and seafood that are so important to the coastal economy of Maryland.

Finally, there is a lawsuit pending in the Nebraska Supreme Court on the route of the pipeline. The route cannot be finalized until this lawsuit is complete, and no construction will begin before then.

For these reasons—at this time—I will oppose the approval of the Keystone XL Pipeline. There are too many environmental concerns that still need to be addressed, and the pipeline cannot be constructed until the lawsuit in Nebraska is decided. We should take this time to work on addressing the environmental concerns, and come back to make a decision once we have all of the facts.

In the meantime, there are plenty of other jobs bills Congress can pass that will put people back to work. I am for creating a national infrastructure bank to finance new construction projects. I am for closing the loopholes that allow businesses to make money off of moving jobs overseas—let's pass the Bring Jobs Home Act. And finally, I am fighting to pass an omnibus appropriations bill that funds TIGER grants that support State and local construction projects. All of these bills would create good jobs and would have real and lasting benefits on American workers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The time will be charged equally to both sides.

The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Madam President, I would inquire as to the remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota has 13 minutes and the Senator from Louisiana has 3 minutes.

Mr. HOEVEN. I would inquire of the Senator from Louisiana if she would like to use her 3 minutes in addition to the agreement for the final 8? Would the Senator from Louisiana like to use her 3 minutes at this time?

Ms. LANDRIEU. I just need 3 minutes to close.

Mr. HOEVEN. Would the Senator from Louisiana like to do that now? Then she would still have 2 minutes to use after I finish as well. I am trying to find out how the Senator would like to use her remaining time.

Ms. LANDRIEU. The Senator from North Dakota can do his closing and then I will yield to the Senator from California. Would that be OK?

Mr. HOEVEN. Sure. That is fine.

Madam President, I am going to go through a series of charts here. They are actually getting a little worn because I have used them now for a number of years. I am very hopeful that after today, or certainly after the first part of the next year, I can retire these charts, because it is long past time to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

This is an effort that started in September of 2008. The TransCanada company applied for a Keystone XL Pipeline permit. They started this process in September of 2008. I wasn't in the Senate then. I was Governor of North Dakota at that time. I worked on it for 2 years as Governor, and now I have worked on it for almost 4 years here in the Senate—not building the project, but trying to get approval for this project. The irony is—one of the many ironies—is that the TransCanada company actually built the Keystone Pipeline. A lot of people say, what? What do you mean? I thought that is what we are talking about. No, what we are talking about is the Keystone XL Pipeline. The Keystone Pipeline has already been built.

In 2006, the company applied for a permit to build a pipeline from Hardisty, which is in Alberta, down to

Patoka, IL, for the Keystone Pipeline. They applied in 2006. They were granted a permit in 2008. By 2010 they had the pipeline built and operating, bringing about 640,000 barrels a day, going down from Canada, through my State, through South Dakota, through Nebraska, and over to Patoka, IL. Permitted in 2 years, built it in 2 years, and 4 years from start to finish, all done. That is the Keystone Pipeline.

What we are talking about here now is the Keystone XL Pipeline. It is a sister project, and the company has been trying for 6 years to get a permit.

Here we see the route. It is very similar, but it also goes down to Cushing and to the Gulf of Mexico. It is hard to believe it has been 6 years in the making.

We passed legislation to try to get a decision out of the administration. Not only is this not the first pipeline, which is the Keystone XL Pipeline, after we already built the Keystone Pipeline, but this is not the first bill to approve it. In fact, we have passed other bills to approve it.

As a matter of fact, in 2011 I introduced a bill which we passed in 2012 attached to the payroll tax holiday so the President wouldn't veto it, and what that bill said is: Mr. President, you need to make a decision on the Keystone XL Pipeline. If we are going to have an energy plan for this country, if we are going to make this country energy secure, energy independent, we have to have the infrastructure to move that energy to market. We have to have this vital infrastructure. So all that bill said in 2012 is: Mr. President, make a decision. It has been years in the permitting process. Make a decision. And he did. He turned it down. He turned it down because he didn't like the route in Nebraska. So what did we do? We went to work with the good people of Nebraska and set up a different route. We addressed the concerns the President said he had. We rerouted the pipeline and we came back. Still no decision. Still no decision, making it very clear—the President won't turn down the project. We have to ask, why isn't he turning it down? Because it is about jobs and energy and economic growth. It is about energy security, therefore national security, and the American people overwhelmingly want this project—60, 70 percent every time it is polled. That is why he doesn't want to turn it down, because the American people want it but he won't approve it. So what is his strategy? His strategy is defeat through delay. Defeat through delay. Don't take my word for it. Actions speak louder than words. We are now in year 6 of the permitting process.

What does this bill do, Senate bill 2280? We have 56 sponsors on this bill—56. It is a bipartisan bill. We already have a majority of the Senate. Now we just need to get to 60. What does it do? If the President won't make a decision, then Congress needs to. What this bill does is that under the commerce clause

of the Constitution, Congress has the authority to oversee trade with foreign powers. We have the authority and the responsibility to oversee trade with foreign countries. So we have the authority to approve the cross-border approval for this pipeline. We have that authority under the commerce clause. So this bill simply says, all right, Congress approves the cross-border authority for this pipeline. That is it. The States still have their right to the route and the oversight in their respective States. We honor, we respect, and we protect. We protect property rights. We are just saying under the commerce clause of the Constitution that we can bring this pipeline across the border, just like the many other pipelines that have come across the border. This pipeline will have the latest, greatest technology, and it will be part of the more than—the millions of miles of pipelines that we already have, except this one will be newer with safety features the other ones don't even have.

That is what this bill is about, and that is what we are working on today. It really comes down to a very simple decision. Do we make a decision for the American people, or do we make a decision for special interest groups that oppose the project?

I wish to thank my colleagues for this very vigorous debate on the Keystone XL Pipeline today. It is very appropriate that we debate it. And it is very appropriate that we vote on it. I had not anticipated getting to a vote until the new Congress, but I am pleased to get a vote today. It is certainly past time that we approve the Keystone XL Pipeline—as I say, 6 years. Six years in the permitting process. How in the world are we going to build an energy plan for this country that truly makes us energy secure and energy independent if we can't build the infrastructure to move that energy around the country—to move the energy we produce and that our closest friend and ally Canada produces from where we produce it to the refineries and to the markets around the country? We can't build an energy plan for this country if we don't approve and build the infrastructure to make it work.

A lot has been written and a lot has been said over these 6 years. But I go back to the most important point, and that is let's make this decision on the merits and let's make this decision on the facts. It is about energy, jobs, and economic growth, and it is about national security through energy security.

On the environmental issues, after five environmental impact statements, the Department of State says there is no significant environmental impact. Look, this isn't me saying it. Read the environmental impact statement. It is not as though we just did it once. It is not as though we just did it twice or even three times. Five of them. Five environmental impact statements. Think about it. Where is the common

sense here? Five environmental impact statements. Verdict: No significant environmental impact.

On the jobs issues, the Department of State, again, in the environmental impact statement, says 42,000 jobs. Some say, those aren't good jobs, those are construction jobs. Really? If they are not good jobs, why are all the major national unions strongly supporting the project? Ask them if these are good jobs.

Furthermore, energy is a foundational industry. Low-cost, dependable energy helps all of the other industry sectors in our economy go and makes us more competitive in a global economy.

On the export issue, I think we have heard our President say, oh, it is just all going to be exported. Well, that is interesting, because his Department of Energy says otherwise. If we look at the report from the Department of Energy, it says we are going to use that oil here in the United States. We are going to refine it and use it here in the United States. Interestingly enough, in order for the oil to be exported, we have to get approval from the Department of Commerce—from the Obama administration's Department of Commerce.

One other interesting point: It is not just oil from Canada, it is oil from my great State of North Dakota and oil from Montana—light, sweet Bakken crude that we have to find a way to get to our refineries in the United States. Right now North Dakota produces almost 1.2 million barrels of oil a day, and it is going up. The only State that produces more oil than North Dakota is Texas. Of that almost 1.2 million barrels of oil a day that we produce, 700,000 right now is moving on rail—700,000 barrels a day. That is a problem. This pipeline alone will take 1,400 railcars of oil—1,400 railcars to move that amount of oil. So if we don't have Keystone, we are going to have 1,400 railcars a day moving that product. We already have a problem. We already have our agriculture products backlogged in the Midwest because we are trying to move all of this oil.

Look, we need infrastructure in the right balance. We need pipelines, we need rail, and we need roads. Without it, we have more congestion on the rail as well as more risks for accidents.

For all these reasons and more, as I said a minute ago, the American people have spoken clearly. They have said that it is time to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline. I hope that today that is exactly what we do.

We are here now, and we agreed to have a vote at 5:45 p.m. I know that my colleagues from Louisiana—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. HOEVEN. I have 2 minutes remaining to start the final portion of the debate prior to the vote. So without objection—

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

Mr. HOEVEN. So I turn to my colleague from California and my colleague from Louisiana. The time has come to vote. We have had the vigorous debate. I would go back to what I said on this floor repeatedly and will continue to say until we get this project approved. This is about what the American people want. We work for the American people.

I have gone through the merits. I have gone through the arguments. I laid out how the bill works. I talked about the history. But at the end of the day, this is about our job representing the people of this great country and listening to them and doing what they want us to do. The American people overwhelmingly support this project and want it approved. So I ask for an affirmative vote today to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I wanted to ask the Senator to yield so I can personally thank him for his leadership. It has been a pleasure working with him to build the Keystone Pipeline. He and I have worked together now for several years. We have negotiated every step of the way—when to introduce the bill, what the bill should say.

I want to personally thank him for his leadership. I have been pleased to work with him on it as an individual Member of the body as well as the chair of the energy committee, and I look forward to working with him on many projects in the years to come.

Let me close by making a couple of points. First of all, I wish to read from a statement from the mayor of Port Arthur, Deloris "Bobbi" Prince, who is strongly in favor of Keystone. I know you thought there was some hesitation on the part of the mayor. She says: Our unemployment is very high. She represents the city of Keystone. The unemployment rate is 15 percent and a poverty rate of 25 percent.

These are my closing points. One, to the opponents of this that have stopped it and installed it every step of the way, I will say this again. This resource will be produced. Nothing that we do on this floor, what they do in the House or what the President of the United States does will stop this resource from being produced.

Two, this product will move to these refineries. It will move by rail or it is going to move by car or it is going to move by barge. The studies are in, done, signed, sealed, and delivered. It is less efficient and it is more dangerous to the environment, and we should use a pipeline that is state of the art.

Number three, these heavy oils will not be exported. This is for energy to Florida, which doesn't produce an awful lot. This is energy to California. They do a great job of conservation—I will give it to them—not a great job of production. We actually do very well at both in Louisiana.

This is for Americans, for American jobs, and to build an American middle class. It will immediately create 40,000 jobs. If the people of this Congress have not noticed, there are long unemployment lines in some parts of the country. The people at the very top might be doing really well, but the people in rural America, the people in smalltown America, and the people who don't have \$1 million in their 401(k) plans could use a job. According to the American Chemistry Council, it is going to create 407,000 jobs in the next 9 years, and that is just the beginning.

Finally, let us do more than send a message. Let us do more than talk. By our actions, let us send hope to the middle class.

I wish to conclude by thanking Senator MARK BEGICH, who will no longer be with us, Senator DONNELLY, Senator HAGAN, who will no longer be with us, Senator HEITKAMP, Senator MANCHIN, Senator MCCASKILL, and Senator PRYOR, who will no longer be in our next Congress.

I wish to also recognize Senator TESTER, Senator WALSH, Senator PORTMAN, Senator CARPER, Senator CASEY, and Senator BENNET for their great leadership. In the 30 seconds I have left, I specifically wish to thank the Industrial Union of Operating Engineers, who have fought for 6 years, the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, the Laborers' International Union of North America, the pipefitters and plumbers, and the North America's Building Trades Union, which represents all of them and has fought every day for 6 years to try to talk this administration and this Congress into acting on their behalf.

The time is now to build the infrastructure necessary to make America energy independent. We can spend \$6 trillion in wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, and we can't give a green light to a pipeline that has gotten five environmental reviews? The comment period is over, and the time to act is now.

I yield the floor.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I wish to make a point of personal privilege. We would have voted on this bill a long time ago if my Republican friends had not blocked the Shaheen-Portman bill from being part of the unanimous consent agreement. Let's stop the hypocrisy that is going on here.

We would have had a vote, but it is only about Big Oil and the Koch brothers and all of that—fine. I am looking for this vote—win or lose—because we had to have it at some point. I was for having it a long time ago. If we want to grow this energy economy with good jobs, if we want to protect our families and protect our planet from devastating climate change, the vote is no on the Keystone XL Pipeline, which I call “extra lethal.”

I will tell you, if the President vetoes this, I hope we will sustain the veto if it passes today.

We should work together for the future of clean energy which will create far more jobs than the 50 permanent jobs even the CEO of the Keystone Pipeline says is the right number. That is how many permanent jobs will be created.

I come from a State that is booming with hundreds of thousands of jobs, with balanced budgets, and clean energy future. I come from a State that embraced cleaning up the environment and building the economy and jobs. They go hand in hand. Anyone who tells you they don't really doesn't understand anything.

I can tell my friend—he talks about polls. I want to talk to him about another poll he won't like. That poll says that huge majorities of Americans want the EPA to clean the air, clean the water. They want them to do the job.

It is very popular even though some of my colleagues have tried to undermine the work of the EPA. So why don't we work together on a clean energy future, and if you want to know the way, come to my State.

We are looking at millions of jobs all across this nation in clean energy.

Why vote against this pipeline?

We know misery follows this pipeline. That is not rhetoric. Here is Port Arthur, where my friend says the mayor is all for this. Fine—I didn't meet with the mayor. My friend didn't understand. I met with the community leaders who live around here and breathe this stuff. Senators and mayors, with all due respect, don't live in these communities. What is in all of this black smoke that goes into your lungs if you happen to live there? It is huge amounts of pollution—more sulfur dioxide, far more nitrogen oxide, far more lead—and this is serious stuff. It is not rhetoric. It is fact. There is something called PAHs which are cancer-causing pollutants. That is proven. We put a peer-reviewed study into the record. I will show you a picture. This is what happens after you refine this tar sands oil. It goes to these holding areas.

I will tell you what happened in this particular case in Chicago. There was a little league baseball game going on right near this petcoke. The wind came up. The petcoke blew around, and this is a direct quote from the newspaper: Kids that were playing ball just had to get the heck out of there because all this stuff was going into their eyes and their mouths. For what? Fifty jobs? Fifty jobs and a lot of profit in the pocket of the people who own the tar sands oil? What is in the national interest?

I will just close with this.

I ask unanimous consent for 30 seconds additional.

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

Mrs. BOXER. I want to show you a picture of a little girl. She has an oxygen mask on over her face. I am telling you, as sure as I am standing here, the

nurses stood with me and the public health doctors stood with me and they said, you know what, let's be very careful here because this pipeline is going to unleash 45 percent more of the dirtiest, filthiest oil. That is why I call it the Keystone “extra lethal” Pipeline, and I hope we won't vote it up today. I hope we vote it down. I hope the President will veto it if it passes, and I will be on my feet because I came here to protect people like this.

I yield floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

Under the previous order, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 280 Leg.]

YEAS—59

Alexander	Enzi	McConnell
Ayotte	Fischer	Moran
Barrasso	Flake	Murkowski
Begich	Graham	Paul
Bennet	Grassley	Portman
Blunt	Hagan	Pryor
Boozman	Hatch	Risch
Burr	Heitkamp	Roberts
Carper	Heller	Rubio
Casey	Hoeven	Scott
Chambliss	Inhofe	Sessions
Coats	Isakson	Shelby
Coburn	Johanns	Tester
Cochran	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Collins	Kirk	Toomey
Corker	Landrieu	Vitter
Cornyn	Lee	Walsh
Crapo	Manchin	Warner
Cruz	McCain	Wicker
Donnelly	McCaskill	

NAYS—41

Baldwin	Hirono	Reed
Blumenthal	Johnson (SD)	Reid
Booker	Kaine	Rockefeller
Boxer	King	Sanders
Brown	Klobuchar	Schatz
Cantwell	Leahy	Schumer
Cardin	Levin	Shaheen
Coons	Markey	Stabenow
Durbin	Menendez	Udall (CO)
Feinstein	Merkley	Udall (NM)
Franken	Mikulski	Warren
Gillibrand	Murphy	Whitehouse
Harkin	Murray	Wyden
Heinrich	Nelson	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 59, the nays are 41. The threshold has not been achieved, and the bill is not passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF LESLIE JOYCE ABRAMS TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

NOMINATION OF MARK HOWARD COHEN TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

NOMINATION OF ELEANOR LOUISE ROSS TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations, which the clerk will report.

(DISTURBANCE IN THE VISITORS' GALLERIES)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will restore order in the gallery.

The bill clerk read the nominations of Leslie Joyce Abrams, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Georgia; Mark Howard Cohen, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia; and Eleanor Louise Ross, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia.

ABRAMS NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on the Abrams confirmation.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I yield my time to the two Senators from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. On behalf of the people of Georgia, the next three votes will be three judges for the State of Georgia.

Senator CHAMBLISS, the senior Senator from Georgia, has done an outstanding job of leading our Judiciary Committee to negotiate with the President and White House on six nominations, three of which we have approved and the final three are tonight.

I heartily recommend to each Member of the Chamber a vote for Leslie Abrams for the Middle District of Georgia, Eleanor Ross for the Northern District of Georgia, and Mark Cohen for the Northern District of Georgia. All are extremely competent, talented individuals.

I thank the Obama administration and all those who worked with us to come up with a package of judges to fill the vacancies in the State of Georgia.

I yield to Senator CHAMBLISS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. I join with my colleague Senator ISAKSON in recommending that all of our colleagues vote for all three of these judges: Judge Eleanor Ross, Judge Mark Cohen, and Judge Leslie Abrams—or future judges in all three cases. They are excellent candidates.

I particularly wish to commend Senator LEAHY for working closely with us, the President for being willing to sit down and discuss our judicial nominations, and particularly former White House Counsel Kathy Ruemmler. We would not be here today if Kathy had not demonstrated great legal skills in working this package and putting this package together.

I encourage all my colleagues to vote in favor of all three of these judges.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

KEYSTONE PIPELINE

Mr. MCCONNELL. I would point out to my colleagues in the Senate that consideration of the Keystone Pipeline will be very early in the next session of the Senate, of the Congress, and I congratulate Senator HOEVEN for his good work on this issue.

VOTE ON ABRAMS NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Leslie Joyce Abrams, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Georgia?

Mr. CORNYN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 100, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 281 Ex.]

YEAS—100

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

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON COHEN NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to the vote on the Cohen nomination.

Mr. REID. I yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Mark Howard Cohen, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON ROSS NOMINATION

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

Who yields time?

Mr. REID. I yield back all time.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Eleanor Louise Ross, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia?

The nomination was confirmed.