

Before Hall of Famer Ernie Banks became Mr. Cub, he was 17 years old playing in a sandlot in Dallas, TX. That is where Cool Papa Bell, one of the legendary leaders in the Negro League, discovered this young man and signed him to play for the Kansas City Monarchs for \$7 a game.

While playing for the Monarchs, Ernie Banks was managed by another legend, Buck O'Neil.

Playing for the Negro League legend had a profound impact on young Ernie Banks. Buck had so much love for everybody that Ernie decided to model his life after him. It was with the Monarchs that Ernie learned to play with boundless energy and enthusiasm. He learned to express his joy for the game and took to heart the message Buck O'Neil, the manager, would often shout at him: "You gotta love this game to play it!" Ernie Banks loved it, and it showed.

Years later, O'Neil reunited with Ernie Banks when O'Neil agreed to manage the Cubs in 1962. Incidentally, he was the first African-American manager in Major League Baseball.

As one of the first African-American baseball players in the Major Leagues, Ernie Banks helped break down the color barriers. The Hall of Fame slugger and two-time MVP made his Major League debut at Wrigley Field in 1953, and he became the first African American to suit up for the Chicago Cubs.

He was only 180 pounds. He was not the most intimidating batter at the plate, but he had powerful wrists that generated tremendous bat speed. He whipped the bat through the ball, hitting 512 home runs in his career, with 2,583 hits, 1,636 RBIs, and having a career batting average of .274.

From 1955 to 1960, he was the most prolific home run hitter in the game, hitting more home runs than either Hank Aaron, Willie Mays, or Mickey Mantle during those years.

In 1958 and 1959, he was named the most valuable player in the National League. He was the first ever to win the award in consecutive years.

He was also the first player to have his jersey number retired by the Cubs, and on game days his number 14 flies proudly over the left field foul pole at the friendly confines of Wrigley Field.

Not surprisingly, Ernie Banks was inducted into Cooperstown the first year he was eligible. But it wasn't the numbers on the back of the baseball card that made Mr. Cub a beloved member of Chicago and the community. It was his passion for the game and the appreciation he showed to everyone he encountered.

Over the last several days, I have heard from baseball fans sharing their stories of meeting Mr. Cub. Nearly all were humbled by the opportunity to meet their hero, but even more impressed to find that Ernie was just as appreciative of his fans as they were of him.

It is an understatement to say that the Chicago Cubs had some tough sea-

sons during Ernie's 19-year career. The Cubs had not won a World Series since 1908 or a National League title since 1945. But every day, win or lose, Ernie would lace up his cleats, step on the field, and smile for the whole world to see. You could not help but love watching him play.

And for Ernie Banks, the eternal optimist, he always believed this was going to be the year for the Cubs. Every spring he predicted, without fail, the Cubs were going to win the pennant.

Well, Ernie never got to play in the post season. But his love of the game never wavered despite this. He became famous for his contagiously positive attitude. He often remarked: "It's a great day for baseball. Let's play two." That was the charm of Mr. Cub.

An 11-time All-Star, first-ballot Hall of Famer, selected to baseball's All-Century team in 1999, it was never about accolades or money for Ernie. He played for the pure joy of the game.

After hitting his 500th home run, becoming only the 9th player to achieve that feat, he summed up his feelings by saying: "The riches of the game are in the thrills, not the money." That is an inspiring message.

In 2013, I contacted some friends in the White House and asked President Obama to consider a Medal of Freedom for Ernie Banks. I felt that his impressive career with the Cubs and his courage in breaking down the color barrier in baseball were reason enough. But more than these amazing achievements, Ernie's spirit set him apart.

It was a special moment to be there at the White House when Ernie Banks received the Presidential Medal of Freedom. I was honored to see it and experience it.

After being awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom, we held a reception for him in my office up here. I don't know if there have ever been so many humbled politicians coming by my office looking for an autograph. He happened to sign this photo for me that day that I have in the Chamber. I remember JOHNNY ISAKSON from Georgia—a faithful Atlanta Braves fan—made a point of being there to meet Ernie Banks. And I remember HARRY REID, when he met Ernie Banks, said: "I used to play a little baseball." Ernie Banks said to him: "Well, Senator REID, what position did you play?" He said: "I was a catcher." Ernie Banks said: "If you were truly a catcher, get down in that catcher's position." Somehow or another, HARRY REID got down in that catcher's position right in my office to prove it to Ernie Banks.

Ernie could not have been more gracious with his time, signing autographs for everybody who showed up. He made time for everybody.

The North Side of Chicago and Wrigley Field will not be the same without Ernie. "Let's play two" will echo off the bricks and ivy for generations to come. His positive, hopeful, Cub view of life filled every room and

every baseball diamond he ever touched.

And now it would seem they need to find a new roster spot on the Field of Dreams—and everyone better be ready for daytime double-headers too.

Ernie Banks, your spirit, passion, and sunny outlook on life will be missed.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1, which the clerk will report.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1) to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

Pending:

Murkowski amendment No. 2, in the nature of a substitute.

Vitter/Cassidy modified amendment No. 80 (to amendment No. 2), to provide for the distribution of revenues from certain areas of the Outer Continental Shelf.

Murkowski (for Sullivan) amendment No. 67 (to amendment No. 2), to restrict the authority of the Environmental Protection Agency to arm agency personnel.

Cardin amendment No. 75 (to amendment No. 2), to provide communities that rely on drinking water from a source that may be affected by a tar sands spill from the Keystone XL pipeline an analysis of the potential risks to public health and the environment from a leak or rupture of the pipeline.

Murkowski amendment No. 98 (to amendment No. 2), to express the sense of Congress relating to adaptation projects in the United States Arctic region and rural communities.

Flake amendment No. 103 (to amendment No. 2), to require the evaluation and consolidation of duplicative green building programs.

Cruz amendment No. 15 (to amendment No. 2), to promote economic growth and job creation by increasing exports.

Moran/Cruz amendment No. 73 (to amendment No. 2), to delist the lesser prairie-chicken as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973.

Daines amendment No. 132 (to amendment No. 2), to express the sense of Congress regarding the designation of National Monuments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Madam President, I came to the floor to speak about a measure that is supported by Members of both sides. I was listening to the remarks by the minority whip on who commemorated the life of Ernie Banks.

REMEMBERING ERNIE BANKS

I began school in Chicago in the early 1960s, when Ernie Banks was playing, and it is to be noted for the record that my grade point average would have been higher had I not spent so many afternoons at Wrigley Field watching the Cubs play. During that time all the games were played during the day, and

as such I missed a few classes to watch our beloved Cubs.

But our beloved player—perhaps the most beloved player in baseball history—Ernie Banks was a true delight.

I wish I had time to speak more on that particular issue, but what I would like to direct my attention to is a bipartisan-supported measure, S. 1. The American people, in November, said: Get back to Washington. Work together, and get things done. And one of which was the Keystone Pipeline. It has bipartisan support. In fact, on the motion to proceed to this measure, 10 Democrats joined Republicans in this effort. And that is what we are debating here.

MEDICAL DEVICE ACCESS AND INNOVATION
PROTECTION ACT

But I am here to talk about a second bill that certainly deserves to be in the top five of pieces of legislation that have bipartisan support and will hopefully result in passage and then sent to the President. And, hopefully, with a number of Democrats joining Republicans in these efforts, the President will take a second look at his veto threats on measures that have bipartisan support.

It was Winston Churchill who said that a nation trying to tax itself into prosperity “is like a man standing in a bucket and trying to lift himself up by the handle.”

Unfortunately, one of Indiana’s most vibrant, growing industries is stuck in the bottom of the bucket because of a small provision tucked away in the 2,000-page ObamaCare law, which imposes on them an excise tax, a 2.3-percent excise tax on every sale they make of medical devices, hindering innovation and job creation.

Medical device manufacturers in my State directly employ over 20,000 Hoosiers and indirectly support thousands of additional jobs. These are jobs that pay well above the average—56 percent higher wages than the average wage rate in Indiana. So these are top-quality jobs, providing significant employment for a significant number of Hoosiers.

We have more than 300 FDA-registered medical device manufacturers in our State, and this is true of many other States. This industry is boosting our State’s economy, our Nation’s economy, and producing technologies that are changing and saving lives.

Products ranging from wheelchair van lifts to artificial knees, hips, and shoulders, to catheters used in heart procedures, have improved or saved the lives of many Hoosiers and countless others not only in my State, not only in America, but across the globe.

Since the implementation of this excise tax—passed in the ObamaCare Act in 2010, imposed in 2013—this destructive tax has caused companies to freeze hiring, lay off workers, and shelve plans to expand and build new facilities.

A survey by the Advanced Medical Technology Association found that the

device tax forced manufacturers to let go of or avoid hiring 33,000 workers in 2013.

Look, I thought we were trying to get people back to work. I thought we were working to pass bipartisan legislation that would benefit this country and benefit those who are seeking employment.

Cook Medical of Bloomington was forced to table plans for a major expansion because of the device tax.

In 2013 testimony before the Senate Budget Committee, Cook Medical chairman Steve Ferguson stated:

Cook has made the difficult decision that without repeal [of the medical device tax], we will move important new product lines outside of the U.S. Our previous plans to open up five new manufacturing facilities in American towns are now on hold as we use capital intended for these projects to pay the device tax.

The negative impact of this tax is not only felt by large employers such as Cook Medical, it also hurts gross sales of companies that are not making a profit but are developing innovative new ways to find benefits for the health and safety, and even the life, in many cases, of those who need these medical devices.

As a result, these companies are not profitable because they are having to pay the tax. They are struggling to launch new innovations to save and improve lives. For instance, a small Warsaw, Indiana-based manufacturer, which develops and sells orthopedic implants for children, had to shelve two important projects simply because it had to use its resources to pay the medical device tax.

After the tax was implemented, an employee of that company shared his story with me. Because of this tax, he said, the manufacturer is now largely inhibited from working on important new products, such as a device that reduces a wheelchair-bound child’s discomfort.

How ironic that ObamaCare, which the President said would increase the health benefits for Americans in coverage, is actually a barrier to improving lives and health outcomes.

Last week, I joined nine of my Senate colleagues, including five Democrats, to introduce the Medical Device Access and Innovation Protection Act. Our legislation would eliminate this tax and has strong bipartisan support.

During the last session of Congress, 79 Senators voted to pass a bipartisan amendment to the fiscal year 2014 Senate budget resolution that called for the repeal of this device tax—79 Members, 34 Democrats and 45 Republicans. It does not get much more bipartisan than that.

So we are hoping that while this may not be labeled S. 2, it certainly stands in the top three or four issues that have strong support and will respond to the call of the American people in November to get back to Washington, get together, work on things with bipartisan support that are going to improve

our economy and get people back to work, and get it up to the President.

I hope my colleagues will see that this egregious, harmful tax, tucked away in the Affordable Care Act, will force us to move forward, repeal it, and result in the kind of improvements the American people are asking us to address. It is long past time for Washington to stop punishing medical device innovators in Indiana and across the country. I am urging my colleagues to support this bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, we are trying to figure out how to do a fair division of the time that remains. I ask unanimous consent that Senators STABENOW and PETERS have 5 minutes between them to discuss an amendment they have been working on, followed by Senator CARDIN, who would have 3 minutes to explain his, followed by myself having 2½ minutes to discuss my amendment, then Senator HEITKAMP would have 5 minutes after that, and then the remaining time for Senator SESSIONS. Because that would be equal. That would add to our having as much time as Senators SESSIONS or MURKOWSKI, whoever at that point wants to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I am seeking clarification. Is the Senator from California asking that these respective Members have an opportunity to speak to amendments or to get their amendments pending?

Mrs. BOXER. Well, some will ask for amendments to be pending. I know I will. Some will not ask that; they just want to be heard. But there is 30 minutes left in the debate. Your side just finished. Obviously, if we do not want to be fair, somebody could grab the time on our side now and talk for 30 minutes. We do not think that is right. We are trying to divide it up between our side and your side. So I have divided about 15 minutes on our side and given 15 minutes to Senator SESSIONS, who wanted to be heard on the matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COATS). The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, again, I am seeking clarification here, because up until this point in time, what we have done, in order to get amendments pending, is the ranking member and I have kind of worked back and forth in terms of what it was that would come up as far as pending.

As far as Members just seeking to speak to amendments, I certainly do not have a problem with what the Senator from California has proposed. I am trying to get some other understanding. I was also—my understanding is that I had the time beginning at 5:15 p.m. reserved. I think there is a little bit of confusion here.

Mrs. BOXER. Reclaiming my time, we have already wasted 4 minutes of the 15. The Senator can object if she does not want to allow us to have an amendment pending, but I am going to start off here. Is the Senator still objecting? Instead of Senator SESSIONS, I will give—now it is about 12 minutes to you at the end. Is that all right with the Senator?

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, again, I am trying to understand. If Members just want to speak to their amendments, there is not a problem with what the Senator has suggested. It is just the question of whether we are getting amendments pending, because we have been going back and forth, side to side, up to this point in time.

I will be happy to put the microphone down and let the Senator from California speak to her amendment while Senator CANTWELL and I talk about how we get more amendments pending. That way she can get talking.

Mrs. BOXER. Well, if I might say this: Every Senator has a right to ask unanimous consent on anything. If the Senator does not like it, she can say, "I object." I do intend to—I cannot speak for anybody else. I want to make my amendment pending because it is germane. I want to make sure it is heard. It is about public health. So if my friend does not want to agree to this unanimous consent, then I think what we will do is I will hold the floor and I will yield to colleagues for questions and they can make their points.

I do not understand my friend's objection to the way we have it laid out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Ms. MURKOWSKI. There continues to be objection. I would like to meet with the ranking member to continue a process of back-and-forth to make amendments pending. I have no objection to the Senator from California speaking to her amendment at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mrs. BOXER. Well, I am going to take the time now—the entire time—and yield to colleagues for them to ask me questions. So I will speak for 2 minutes or less and then I am going to ask unanimous consent on my amendment.

We want to have a study of the significant human health impacts of the Keystone Canadian XL tar sands pipeline. I do not believe they were adequately addressed in the supplemental environmental impact report or completely analyzed.

I held a press conference with doctors from Canada who spoke about the adverse impact on the health of people living near the pipeline. We have had spills along the pipeline in Michigan, in Arkansas. Those spills are not adequately cleaned up as we speak.

As Senator CANTWELL informed me, there have been an additional two spills since the new Congress came into session. From extraction to transpor-

tation to refining to waste storage, misery follows the tar sands. We know there are dangerous air pollutants and carcinogens that have been documented from tar sands refining—all of this to help a Canadian private company make a whole bunch of money, and we cannot even keep the oil in this country.

Are you kidding me? Thirty-five permanent jobs. The least we can do is have an in-depth health impact study before we approve this pipeline.

I am very sad to say—you know, we still have this kind of gag-athon going on from the other side. They would not even let people speak for 1 minute on their amendment. That is why I am grabbing the floor here. I could not even get agreement to divide up the time, so I am taking the time.

I will be happy to yield to my friend from Michigan, through the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Thank you very much to my friend and colleague and leader from California.

I first want to say thank you to Senators MURKOWSKI and CANTWELL who have worked so hard with Senator BOXER moving forward a process that, until Thursday night, was working very well going back and forth.

Before we authorize the building of a new oil pipeline in America, it is important for us to consider the safety of pipelines we already have.

In 2010, a pipeline that runs from Canada through Michigan spilled nearly a million gallons of tar sands oil into the Kalamazoo River, causing the largest inland oil spill in U.S. history. That cleanup cost \$1.2 billion.

Nine days ago, another pipeline broke in Montana, and for the second time in 4 years, tens of thousands of gallons of oil emptied into the Yellowstone River, making that water unsafe to drink.

Right now in Michigan, we have a 61-year-old pipeline which runs along environmentally sensitive areas and goes beneath the Straits of Mackinac and our magnificent Great Lakes.

That pipeline carries 1.2 million gallons of tar sands oil per day and has undergone only a few upgrades since it was first installed in 1953. A spill would be devastating, not only to the region but to all Americans—because the Great Lakes are a vital source of our Nation's fresh water supply.

Yet none of the companies transporting heavy tar sands crude are required to pay into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, which would ensure that taxpayers are not footing the bill.

When we offered an amendment to fix that, the Republicans said no.

America's economy is only as strong as our natural resources, and those resources are threatened every time a pipeline breaks.

Making matters worse, Republicans said no to amendments that would keep the oil in America, guarantee the pipeline be built with American steel and use American workers.

So Americans take all of the risks with very few, if any, rewards.

Because Republicans refuse to make this Canadian oil company pay into the oil spill fund, American taxpayers may have to bailout the company if the pipeline breaks.

So, before our Colleagues vote on behalf of the oil companies to approve the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline, it is critical that we pass the amendment that my friend and partner from Michigan and I have introduced.

This amendment ensures that we address the safety of the pipelines that we have now—before beginning construction on Keystone. And it would ensure that the heightened safety standards being applied to Keystone exist in pipelines around the Great Lakes.

The Republican majority has promised an open amendment process, so I certainly hope that when my colleague from Michigan offers this amendment in a few moments, the Republican majority will allow a vote on this critical pipeline safety amendment—even though Big Oil may not like it.

Again, the American people are taking all of the risks when the oil will not even stay in America. The least Congress can do is guarantee the pipelines are safe.

I would ask my friends to join with Senator PETERS and me in saying that before we authorize the building of a new oil pipeline in America that we have to consider and strengthen the safety of pipelines, the pipelines we already have. In 2010, a pipeline that runs from Canada through Michigan spilled nearly 1 million gallons of tar sands oil into the Kalamazoo River—this has been talked about before—causing the largest inland oil spill in U.S. history.

So we need to vote on Senator PETERS' and my amendment. The cleanup itself cost \$1.2 billion. Nine days ago, another pipeline broke in Montana. For the second time in 4 years, tens of thousands of gallons of oil emptied into the Yellowstone River, making that water unsafe to drink. So would my friend from California agree with me and share concerns that under the Straits of Mackinac—and our gorgeous, beautiful Great Lakes—we have a 61-year old pipeline that runs through environmentally sensitive areas, goes right under the water, and has only been upgraded a couple of times since 1953?

Before we pass this Keystone Pipeline bill, we should make sure our Great Lakes have the pipeline safety we need, as well as all of our pipelines across the country.

Would my colleague agree with that?

Mrs. BOXER. I could not agree more with my friend. Her question is pertinent and to the point of this debate. We are giving permission to a Canadian company to come through and use America as a passthrough. They are going to leave behind petcoke, leave behind spills—they have already done it before with the tar sands pipeline. This is the hardest oil to clean up.

I absolutely know that my friend Senator PETERS has a question as well.

Without losing my right to the floor, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment so that I may call up my amendment. I will wait for the objection to be heard. I am not going to plow through this.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mrs. BOXER. That was my amendment No. 128. I am very disappointed, because what the Senator is talking about, making sure the pipelines are safe, and what I am talking about, a health study, are quite related.

I know my friend from Michigan wanted me to yield for a question. I am happy to do so.

Mr. PETERS. I appreciate the Senator from California yielding for a question, as I am listening to this debate and hearing from my colleague, the Senator from Michigan, as to the importance of pipeline safety, as we are now debating a very comprehensive bill to give approval for one specific pipeline in this country, which I think is very much an unprecedented type of vote in the Senate.

My question is: Why do we not have an opportunity, or would the Senator not agree that we should have an opportunity, to offer amendments? I know I am new to the Senate, but I was informed this would be an open amendment process. My idea of an open amendment process means you can actually offer amendments. It means you can also actually debate amendments. That is an open process, particularly something as important as protecting our Great Lakes, this incredible, immense body of freshwater, one of the largest bodies of freshwater in the world. We have a pipeline that goes through there, above the lakebed, that could potentially be catastrophic if there is a break.

As Senator STABENOW mentioned, in Michigan we have already had the most expensive pipeline break in history—4 years of cleanup of Canadian tar sands oil, oil that sinks to the bottom of the river. It is more expensive to clean up—over \$1.2 billion in cleanup. So you can imagine if we had a pipeline break in the middle of the Great Lakes. It would be catastrophic to this country, it would be catastrophic to the State of Michigan, but really catastrophic to the entire world. It is a risk we cannot take.

That is why we have authored a commonsense amendment that says we should ensure that there is adequate inspection, that PHMSA has the resources they need in order to inspect this, and if there are special requirements to protect the Great Lakes, as there were special requirements for Keystone, it should also be available to other pipelines, particularly in sensitive areas such as the Great Lakes.

That is why, in the spirit of an open amendment process, in the spirit of

this great deliberative body, where people are allowed to debate the big issues affecting our world, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment so that I may call up my amendment No. 70.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mrs. BOXER. If I could answer the question posed to me by my friend—he asked do I think there ought to be an open amendment process. Not only do I think there should be, we were promised an open amendment process. What occurred here at midnight on Thursday night, before the Senate left—some of our colleagues who are running for President went out to my beautiful State to make their case, as they have every right to do. But instead of staying on Friday, we adjourned on Thursday night. It was anything but an open amendment process.

I see the Senator from Massachusetts on the floor. He had a critically important amendment. He asked for 60 seconds to explain his amendment. I have been here over 20 years. I have never seen a situation, ever, where five Members in a row, five great Senators representing their great States, were told: Sit down; we are gagging you. That is what happened. This is wrong. So we are going to be asked to proceed today and shut down the amendment process even further. I do not know how the Senate is going to vote. However the Senate votes, it votes. But the bottom line is, this has been anything but an open amendment process. My friend is absolutely right.

I know the Senator from Maryland wanted to ask me a question.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, could I ask my colleague from California to yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. The question I am going to ask Senator BOXER to respond to is: What are the consequences if we invoke cloture about 15 minutes from now when that comes up for a vote on the floor?

There were many of my colleagues who had amendments they wanted to offer. They filed those amendments.

Unless those amendments become pending, it is my understanding that—and unless those amendments meet the very narrow germaneness rule—they may be relevant to debate—but the germaneness rules are pretty tough so that unless we defeat cloture, we may not have an open amendment process.

I know the majority leader talked about an open amendment process, but many of my colleagues—including this Member, who has additional amendments I would like to have considered—will not be able to get those amendments considered, if I understand it, Senator BOXER, unless the cloture motion is defeated.

Let me talk for one moment about amendment 75, which I filed and is pending, and I think is critically important.

What that amendment would do is allow our Governors and our county officials to be able to get information about the risk to their drinking water as a result of the potential spills on the aquifers. This is not a hypothetical question because the Ogallala Aquifer, which is the country's largest underground freshwater resource, is crossed by the proposed line of the Keystone. Therefore, it is of major concern to the Governors and local officials what a potential spill could have with regard to their drinking water supplies, to their communities. At some of places the aquifer is within 5 feet of the surface. So a spill could have a dramatic impact on the supply of safe drinking water.

As has already been pointed out by my colleagues in Michigan, in July 2010 there was a pipeline rupture near Marshall, MI, that released 843,000 gallons of tar sands oil. It had a horrific impact on the environment, and it is still difficult to see the end in sight because of the cleanup difficulties in this thick, tar sands oil.

On March 29, 2013, there was a pipeline rupture in Mayflower, AR, that caused an incredible challenge to the cleanup.

So my amendment is pretty simple. My amendment would allow that information to be made available to our Governors and our local officials so that they could then notify the President that they have a concern on the route and allow that to be considered before the pipeline is constructed, giving our local governments the opportunity to be heard—to have the information and then be heard on this very important issue.

My question to the Senator from California, Mrs. BOXER, is: If we are going to have an open amendment process, how can that be if the cloture motion that was filed by the majority leader were to become approved? Wouldn't that deny us that full, open amendment process that we had heard was going to be used in this Congress?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank my friend for the question.

Again, we were promised an open amendment process.

I wish to make a point to my friend who has worked so hard on the Environment and Public Works Committee. I am so appreciative of his work. Do you know, if an amendment like yours does not pass, what it means is that American companies will be treated in a much harsher fashion than a Canadian foreign oil company—in other words, because the other side is just saying: No more facts, no more information, no more environmental impact statement—even though we know there are health impacts due to the tar sands.

The Senator has pointed out the possibility of having a bad impact on drinking water. We have seen what has happened in West Virginia when we don't worry about that.

So my friend is absolutely right, and I am honored that he asked me to comment on this particular amendment. And I hope that he will ask—I know you are pending. I hope that you are going to get a vote on this amendment one way or another.

I know some other colleagues may want to ask a question.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Would the Senator from California yield for a question?

Mrs. BOXER. I am pleased to yield to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. I thank the Senator.

From the start, let me say that Senator BOXER and I are not on the same side on the principal bill. I have long been one of the staunchest supporters of the Keystone XL Pipeline bill.

A lot of what we have heard today is about the consequences of aging infrastructure. So the question I have for Senator BOXER is: Would it not make sense, as we are talking about this Keystone XL Pipeline bill, that we find common ground that we all should agree that we need the resources to have the regulatory authority and the regulatory personnel to go out and make sure that aging infrastructure—the infrastructure underneath the Great Lakes and what happened now in the Yellowstone River—that we have a robust and very complete PHMSA organization that has the personnel to go out and follow the pipeline, test the pipeline, and review the results? But even as important to me is PHMSA's role in making sure that our transportation of oil on the railroad is actually adequate, that we have adequate regulation.

So one of my amendments—not pending but filed—is, in fact, an amendment that would address directly what I would hope would be common ground for everyone in the Senate, which is making sure we are, in fact, regulating interstate pipelines.

I also wish to talk about how we have an “all of the above” policy that everybody talks about where we somehow don't seem to get to that point.

One of the amendments I have at the desk, which I would dearly love to call up and make sure that it gets a vote, is an amendment that would provide a long-term—just 5 years—glide path for wind energy.

I think we have seen, as we have included this in the tax extenders, this stop-and-go policy that has, in fact, not only put the companies' lives on hold but also their employees' lives.

I am hopeful. We don't know how the vote is going to turn out. No one knows until the vote is done, but I am hopeful that we will be able to come back and introduce so many of these amendments that my colleagues have advanced—some of which I agree with and some of which I don't.

But that is the nature of the Senate—that we actually have a vote, because I think, as a believer, I have good ideas but my ideas should have a debate in the Senate.

But wouldn't the Senator agree that one common area that we all share is making sure that we have a robust regulatory environment to protect our waterways, to protect our farmers' soil from any leaks, and to make sure that any leaks, to the extent they are preventable, are prevented.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I say to my colleague from North Dakota, of course, I agree with her. We don't agree on the tar sands pipeline, but we do look for common ground, and she has found it. The importance of inspecting the infrastructure can't be overstated.

I say to my friend, before she leaves the floor, this is a picture of a recent spill. Actually, it was 2013. It still has not been cleaned up in Arkansas because the pipeline burst—200,000 gallons of tar sands burst from the pipeline, and it spilled all over the streets of a subdivision. Residents were exposed to high levels of benzene, a known carcinogen, and hydrogen sulfide. They suffered from dizziness, nausea, and headaches—all classic symptoms of exposure to the chemicals found in tar sands.

Rainfall causes oil to float to the top of the soil and off gas. What is happening here is it still has not been cleaned up.

My friend has an amendment that would say: Let's inspect the infrastructure to make sure things such as this do not happen. Of course, I support it. I hope she will vote her conscience and hopefully vote to keep this amendment process open.

I know my friend from Massachusetts has a question, and I yield to him if he does.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. The Senator has to ask if I would yield for a question.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the Senator. I thank the Senator for taking the time to have this very important discussion in the Senate this afternoon.

This past Thursday night the majority leader decided they would not allow for a debate on an amendment I was propounding that would have imposed a tax on the Canadian oil as it is being transported through this proposed pipeline. In the eventuality of an oil spill, the Canadians would have to have contributed to.

The majority did not make it possible for me to speak for even 1 minute on ensuring that the Canadians had to pay the tax in the event there was an oil spill with their oil in the United States of America, while Americans would have to do so.

This is the question I am going to propound to the Senator from California. Right now we know that there is increasing carbon pollution in the atmosphere, which stacks the decks, increasing the chances that our country, our planet would draw an extreme

weather joker that would have catastrophic consequences for our country or for any other place in the world. We know that while no one storm can be attributed to climate change, scientists agree there is an increase in the intensity and the frequency of extreme weather events. In fact, in the 2013 consensus report bulletin of the American Meteorological Society said: “The number of severe regional snowstorms that occurred since 1960 was more than twice the number that occurred during the preceding 60 years” in the United States of America. So my question to the Senator from California is: Shouldn't we be debating this issue of increased frequency of snowstorms, of rain storms, of droughts, of extreme weather conditions? And isn't this something that Members should be allowed 1 minute, at least, to address, if not a full debate of these issues that have been triggered by the Republicans deciding they wanted to bring this bill onto the floor as their No. 1 priority for the year 2015? Is that not the subject we should be discussing and should it not be an open debate?

That is the question I propound to the Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I would say in response to my friend's question, I was so shocked when the Senator asked for 1 minute to explain his amendment and we heard multiple Republicans saying: No, no, a thousand times no.

As Senator DURBIN said, this is supposed to be the greatest deliberative body in the world. I grew up thinking that was true. I never saw this before where colleague after colleague after colleague after colleague was essentially shouted down. I haven't seen it here.

It has reached a new low with a Republican majority since. They absolutely won a huge election victory. There is no question about it. There was the promise that it would be an open process, and then we can't even have colleagues talk for 1 minute.

I know the Senator from New Jersey has a question as well. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey, because time is running out at 5:30.

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

Mrs. BOXER. Yes, I will.

Mr. BOOKER. I am grateful that Senator BOXER will yield for a question.

This is a question I have of Senator BOXER, and I wish to get her feedback because of her years of experience, her wisdom, and her depth of understanding on this issue. I think there needs to be an amendment for critical protection.

The need for regulation requires agencies to supplement already issued environmental impact statements when significant new circumstances come about. When there is information about these new challenges to the environmental impact of a project, something really has to happen.

So this pending bill deems that the final environmental impact statement issued last January would fully satisfy the NEPA, that this would remove the obligation of permitting agencies to supplement that EIS if any new circumstance or information is discovered.

The amendment would change that and would preserve the obligation of agencies to supplement—if we had such an amendment, it could really protect that.

I was told by a lot of people that NEPA is sort of referred to as the environmental modern day Magna Carta. In other words, it is such a critical set of protections. If we have a circumstance in which there is a significant change in the pipeline—say they just decide to change the direction or move it a little bit and it goes through an entirely new area—not to be able to take into consideration new information, new circumstances where an environmental impact statement abated, seems to be wrong. It actually seems to be giving this company, this foreign company, more information, more opportunity than our current American companies.

I would love for the Senator to comment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Senator BOOKER should be proud of this contribution to this debate and what he is doing in the environment committee.

Let me say quickly—because I know we are running out of time—here is the deal. You raised the golden standard—NEPA, the National Environmental Policy Act. The underlying bill says everything is satisfied. All you want to make sure of in your amendment is that if there is new information which shows this could harm the public—maybe cause more cancer, cause more asthma, and cause other problems—that we need a supplemental EIS, that we need a supplemental study before we approve this pipeline. Right now, they are not letting you offer that amendment.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, today we are voting to end debate on the Keystone Pipeline bill.

I want to be clear right from the start. I do not support this bill. I will vote against cloture and against final passage of the Keystone Pipeline bill. And I am disappointed about the way it is being jammed through to a vote.

I supported the motion to proceed to this bill for one reason and only one reason—because we were assured there would be an open amendment process.

We started that process last week. We have worked back and forth between Republican and Democratic amendments. Many of those amendments are important. And I believe we should continue until every Senator who wants to amend this bill has had a chance to make his or her case.

I have an amendment for a renewable electricity standard which would create hundreds of thousands of 21st-cen-

tury American jobs in my State and across the country. We owe it to all Americans to consider this and other amendments that would improve the bill.

The bill as it stands is not acceptable on many levels.

First, I am concerned that the new leadership chose to begin with a bill mandating a single pipeline for a foreign private company. This is a questionable use of the Senate's time and an unprecedented piece of legislation. Congress has never gotten involved in mandating a pipeline of this nature. But that is where we are. Now we are voting to cut off debate. The majority leader moved last week—late in the night—to set aside the Democratic amendments and bring an end to debate.

So we have a bill with a questionable beginning and a regrettable ending. The result is a missed opportunity to seriously address the energy needs of our country.

I said at the beginning of this debate that we are faced with a choice, a profound choice. We can deny that our climate is warming. We can fall behind our economic competitors. We can ignore the danger to our planet and to our security. That is one choice. Or we can move forward with a clean energy economy, with an energy policy that makes sense, that creates jobs, that protects the environment, and that will keep our Nation strong.

We had a good debate on climate change during this bill about whether or not humans significantly contribute to it. Many Senators made it clear where they stand. Many agree that yes humans are significantly contributing to climate change.

But while that is good for the record, it doesn't do much for the reality, because we have fallen short of taking any real action to address this great challenge. In fact, we are now compounding the problem by trying to pass this bill.

The bill lacks a comprehensive energy policy; it lacks even trying to set one. This is not a "do it all" energy bill. This isn't even a "drill, baby, drill" bill. This is a "drill, Canada" bill.

I believe we should continue working on the bill to address serious climate solutions, like a renewable electricity standard. The Keystone Pipeline is an investment in doing things the old way—importing foreign oil. Instead of doubling down on foreign oil, we should be talking about how we can move America forward by investing in the homegrown energy of the future.

A national renewable electricity standard would combat global warming, while creating hundreds of thousands of jobs across the country. It will help maximize our energy potential, while strengthening our economy and our energy security.

Let's vote on that, and let's move forward to meet the real energy needs of American families.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mrs. BOXER. My time has expired. I thank the Chair very much for his patience.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls related to the cloture motions on Senate amendment No. 2 and S. 1 be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the Murkowski amendment No. 2: the Keystone XL pipeline approval act.

Mitch McConnell, Lisa Murkowski, Richard Burr, Jerry Moran, John Thune, Marco Rubio, Johnny Isakson, Kelly Ayotte, Ben Sasse, Deb Fischer, John Boozman, David Vitter, Tim Scott, Roger F. Wicker, Richard C. Shelby, Michael B. Enzi, Roy Blunt.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the Murkowski amendment No. 2: the Keystone XL pipeline approval act, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. McCASKILL), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID), and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 53, nays 39, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 29 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Alexander	Crapo	Inhofe
Ayotte	Cruz	Isakson
Barrasso	Daines	Johnson
Bennet	Donnelly	Lankford
Blunt	Enzi	Lee
Boozman	Ernst	Manchin
Burr	Fischer	Murkowski
Capito	Flake	Paul
Cassidy	Gardner	Perdue
Coats	Graham	Portman
Cochran	Grassley	Risch
Collins	Hatch	Roberts
Corker	Heitkamp	Rounds
Cornyn	Heller	Sasse
Cotton	Hoeben	Scott

Sessions	Thune	Vitter
Shelby	Tillis	Wicker
Sullivan	Toomey	

[Rollcall Vote No. 30 Leg.]

YEAS—53

NAYS—39

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Nelson
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Peters
Booker	Hirono	Reed
Boxer	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Shaheen
Carper	Markey	Stabenow
Casey	McConnell	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Udall
Durbin	Merkley	Warren
Feinstein	Murphy	Whitehouse
Franken	Murray	Wyden

NOT VOTING—8

Kirk	Mikulski	Rubio
McCain	Moran	Warner
McCaskey	Reid	

Alexander	Donnelly	Murkowski
Ayotte	Enzi	Paul
Barrasso	Ernst	Perdue
Bennet	Fischer	Portman
Blunt	Flake	Risch
Boozman	Gardner	Roberts
Burr	Graham	Rounds
Capito	Grassley	Sasse
Cassidy	Hatch	Scott
Coats	Heitkamp	Sessions
Cochran	Heller	Shelby
Collins	Hoeven	Sullivan
Corker	Inhofe	Thune
Cornyn	Isakson	Tillis
Cotton	Johnson	Toomey
Crapo	Lankford	Vitter
Cruz	Lee	Wicker
Daines	Manchin	

NAYS—39

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Nelson
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Peters
Booker	Hirono	Reed
Boxer	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Shaheen
Carper	Markey	Stabenow
Casey	McConnell	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Udall
Durbin	Merkley	Warren
Feinstein	Murphy	Whitehouse
Franken	Murray	Wyden

NOT VOTING—8

Kirk	Mikulski	Rubio
McCain	Moran	Warner
McCaskey	Reid	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 53, the nays 39. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the cloture vote on the Murkowski substitute amendment No. 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

CLOTURE MOTION

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL pipeline.

Mitch McConnell, Lisa Murkowski, Richard Burr, Jerry Moran, John Thune, Marco Rubio, Johnny Isakson, Kelly Ayotte, Ben Sasse, Deb Fischer, John Boozman, David Vitter, Tim Scott, Roger Wicker, Richard Shelby, Michael Enzi, Roy Blunt.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL pipeline, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID), and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 53, nays 39, as follows:

very time sensitive. We were also able to add two sense-of-the Senate provisions to S. 1. One provision relates to the oil spill liability trust fund and the other provision is related to the issue of climate change.

Here we are, more than 2 weeks into debate on the Keystone XL Pipeline, and we voted on a total of 24 amendments to the bill. We voted on more amendments last week than we did in all of 2014. In fact, Thursday was a long day for all of us. We moved out 15 amendments, and that was as many as we had voted on in all of 2014. In 2014, this Senate voted on 15 amendments. This past Thursday, we voted on 15 amendments in one day on this Keystone bill. We are now up to 24 amendments, and we have made some progress.

I am very aware that not everyone is fully happy with where we are right now. We hit our first bump in the road—back to regular order—but that is the way we have to roll with some things every now and again. I hope we are at the point where we will be able to get back on track, a track that will allow for again closure of this very important measure.

I wish to remind Senators that we are in this place where we had to vote on cloture because we got to a point last week where a unanimous consent request to vote on the then-pending 12 amendments was blocked. I will also remind colleagues that invoking cloture on a bill does not end all debate. We still have up to 30 hours of additional debate time left, and during that time amendments that are germane to the underlying bill can still be called up, considered, and voted on. We have quite a few of those left.

In fact, at last count the amendments that have been filed to date—there are 143 amendments that I have on my tally today that have been filed. I don't know if that is a current, up-to-the-minute accounting. We asked Members to have their amendments in by 3 this afternoon and second-degrees filed by 5 p.m. My point to colleagues is that there is still much to be done with this bill if your interest is voting on amendments.

I wish to repeat something that the majority leader commented on when we came into session just a little bit ago. We were on this bill just 2 months ago, and at that time there was a grand total of zero amendments that we voted on—zero. So now, as I mentioned, we have at least three that have been incorporated into the bill already—two sense of the Senate, one on climate, one on the oil spill liability trust fund, and one on energy efficiency. Again, there are some 140 to 150 amendments that have been filed.

I am glad we have this process going on. I am glad to see these amendments. For those who suggest that somehow or other the majority is closing down the opportunity for debate or to offer amendments, all we need to do is look where we were 2 months ago. Two

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 53, the nays are 39. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the cloture vote on S. 1, the Keystone XL Pipeline bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, we are here this evening, after the conclusion of two cloture votes where we have failed to get the sufficient 60 votes that are required to cut off debate and move forward on this bill.

As the floor manager, I will be working with my counterpart on the energy committee, Senator CANTWELL, to define a list of amendments and define the universe we are talking about. Perhaps we can work toward an agreement that will allow for additional amendments to be processed and ultimately allow us to get to passage of the Keystone XL Pipeline.

This measure, S. 1, is a bipartisan measure that will work to create jobs for this country and will not only help with our relationship with our friends and allies to the north but is also widely supported by the American public. I am hopeful that what we will be able to do tonight—by working with colleagues—is to again define how we will get to the final resolution of this very important bill.

Last week we saw this measure include several important energy efficiency bills—including the adoption of the measure of the Senator from Ohio—particularly the one provision that relates to water heaters, which is

months ago this bill had zero amendments. Fast forward to today, and we have had votes on 24 amendments to this bill. We have adopted at least 3 of those amendments, and again there are some 140-odd amendments that are out there.

I want us to get through this measure, and I wish to do so in a way that is respectful to the process, respectful to Members, and that dignifies this institution. We have a lot out there, and I recognize that.

I have had Members from both sides of the aisle ask me: How do I get my amendment pending? How do I get it to the point so it can be considered? We will be working on that issue tonight and into the morning.

I thank my colleague from Washington because I do think we have truly been trying to work in good faith.

My colleague from North Dakota has a few words on the process, and then I would like to reclaim my time for just a few more moments, if I may.

With that, I turn the floor over to the Senator from North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I thank the bill manager on our side of the aisle, the good Senator from Alaska, as well as the bill manager on the Democratic side, the Senator from the State of Washington, for working together and trying to get a list of all of the amendments and do everything possible to get them scheduled for a vote.

I ask that Members on both sides of the aisle work with the bill managers to try and get a list of amendments so they can be scheduled for a vote. As the Senator from Alaska said, we have already had at least 19 amendments. We know there are more amendments that Senators would like to have a vote on, and we appreciate and understand that. There has been a real effort to try to get those votes scheduled.

Again, I thank the bill managers for their hard work and ask that Members on both sides of the aisle work with the bill managers to try and get those amendments identified where they need to have a vote and get them scheduled so we can get to the votes in a timely manner so Members can have as much information as possible ahead of time in order to consider their respective issues and have a vote.

We have to remember that in trying to go back to an open amendment process and regular order, there is some work on figuring out how to get that going and to do so in a bipartisan way, and of course we are working through it on this legislation.

A final point: At the end of the day, we will be discussing more about this legislation, but it comes down to how the individual Members of this body feel about this underlying legislation. It is about energy, jobs, economic growth, and national security at a time when energy security for our country is so very important. Again, this goes to the underlying merits.

Let's see if we can't get these amendments scheduled and vote on them and move this along as well as we can this week and get that done. It is not only important for this legislation, but we want to have that same kind of open process with other legislation as well. It is about getting the work done for the American people.

With that, I yield back to the Senator from Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Senator from North Dakota for his leadership on this issue. He has been persistent, diligent, and very articulate as we have moved through the process, and I appreciate that a great deal.

I thought I was going to be spending the vast majority of my time this week going through each of these many amendments that Members have presented. As I mentioned, we have 140-plus amendments. But my attention on Keystone and the issues in front of us was dramatically pulled away because of an announcement by the administration which I learned of late on Friday evening, and which was the first announcement today.

The fact is I am not in a very good mood right now. I am not in a very good mood, and I think it is probably true to say that most Alaskans are not in a very good mood, because folks back home woke up Sunday morning to the news that this President effectively declared war on our economic future in the State of Alaska.

I know those are pretty hard words. It has been suggested by some in the administration that perhaps I am overreacting. Let me tell my colleagues, when our economic opportunities as a State, which lie in our natural resources, are denied us as a State and the promises that were made when we entered the Union—the compact we made—we are now not able to see those promises, then there is nothing else. There is no other way to describe it than that it is a war on our economic future.

We have winter going on in Alaska right now. In my hometown where I went to high school, I think it was about 30 below this weekend. Up on the North Slope, temperatures are about 60 degrees below zero. It is pretty cold.

The President, in his video where he made his announcement that he is moving to put the Arctic Coastal Plain in de facto wilderness, described the area in the North Slope as fragile, that the wildlife is fragile. I will tell my colleagues, the area in the coastal plain, the area in ANWR is an amazing place. It is a special place, as are so many places in Alaska. It is an amazing place. I am blessed to call it home. But the President decided on Sunday that this was the perfect day to announce his unilateral decision to manage the Arctic Coastal Plain as de facto wilderness.

Now the coastal plain—and I don't have my maps, but we are going to be

seeing a lot of maps of Alaska and ANWR coming up here. The coastal plain is the area on the very northern part of the State, and it is part of the nonwilderness portion of ANWR. People need to understand that ANWR is a huge area. It is 19.7 million acres. It is an area the size of the State of South Carolina. There are portions of ANWR that have been designated as wilderness and they were designated as wilderness back in 1980, along with other areas in the State of Alaska that were designated as wilderness. In fact, so much wilderness—close to 60 million acres of wilderness designated in 1980—so much so that there is actually a provision in the law, in ANILCA, that says, that is enough. Alaska has given enough, in the sense that more than half of the wilderness area in the United States of America is in Alaska. That is, Alaska has more than half of all of the other wilderness in all of the remaining 49 states. Alaska has more than half. So the sense was there will be no more wilderness declarations in Alaska. Yet, the President announces Sunday that, in addition to the coastal plain, effectively all of the balance of ANWR will be managed as wilderness.

So what does this mean to a State such as Alaska? Again, history is going to be important in this discussion going forward because the area in the coastal plain—the 1002 area—and it is designated as such because of a section in the law—the coastal plain was specifically set aside in 1980 for further study of its oil and gas potential. So a decision was made back in 1980 where we had more than 100 million acres in Alaska that were turned into Federal law, but it was recognized that this area—that 1.57 million acres—was unique because of its resource potential. It was identified in law as such. And it said, We are going to reserve this. We are going to study it for its oil and gas potential.

Then, in the 1980s, the Reagan administration did just that. They studied the coastal plain and they recommended that it be open to responsible energy development. Ever since then we have been seeking permission to open up just 2,000 acres on the coastal plain for that very purpose—for oil and gas exploration.

We are not talking about opening up the full coastal plain. We are not talking about touching any of the area that was designated as wilderness in 1980. We are talking about a development that would have an impact on an estimated surface area of 2,000 acres in a 1.57-million-acre area that has been set aside specifically for this.

So when we think about what that means, we learn that 2,000 acres is .1 percent of the entire 1002 area. It is .01 percent of ANWR. When we put it into context, 99.9 percent of ANWR would remain untouched if all we were seeking to do was to access the 2,000 acres.

We also know that if we were able to access this small area within the coastal plain that we can gain access to an

estimated 10.3 billion barrels of oil. If we produce oil at that rate of 1 million barrels a day, it will last almost 30 years.

Right now we have an oil pipeline in Alaska, the Trans-Alaska oil pipeline, which bisects the State 800 miles from the North Slope down to Valdez, and it has been doing a fine job of providing resource to the country in an environmentally sound and safe manner. It is an engineering miracle. It is fabulous. What it lacks right now is more oil in the pipe. We are less than half full. So the State of Alaska is being aggressive in looking for how we might not only fill up the pipe to help Alaska and to help the country and to bring about jobs and bring about revenues, but how we can do so in a responsible manner.

We think we have some pretty high standards in Alaska, and we need to. This is extreme environment. It is tough working there right now, let me tell my colleagues. They don't shut down because it is cold. In fact, this is the only time of the year they can explore out there, because the environmental safeguards are such that we can't take exploration rigs out on the tundra in the summer where it might leave a mark. No. We wait until it is the coldest, the darkest, and the ground is frozen as far as it possibly can. So this is the time of year that we are hoping to be able to do more.

But what this President is doing is not only saying no to that 2,000 acres we are seeking to access that will be bringing us a million barrels a day, potentially, for 30 years and allowing for jobs and a resource—no to that 2,000 acres—he would say no forever. He would not only say no to oil and gas development, but no to anything else. No road, no airstrip, no nothing.

The President is saying the Congress has to make this decision, and in fairness, that is true. It is only the Congress that can make that decision to convert the coastal plain to permanent wilderness. But the reality is he has made this decision, and he has made it without us. What happens under this comprehensive conservation plan—this CCP—this area is now immediately treated as wilderness, with or without our approval. So that designation may not be there, but how is it being treated? It is being treated as wilderness.

I would assert this is in clear violation of the “no more wilderness” clause—the “no more” clause in ANILCA. It is so frustrating. It is so infuriating to think that we acknowledged that some 30 years ago, when ANILCA was passed, and that recognition—when so much of the State of Alaska was put off limits to any form of development, to place it in wilderness status and to have the Federal Government agree that we had done our part, that we had contributed enough of our lands.

The Presiding Officer is from a State that has wide open spaces. What do we do as a State if we have so much of our State—66 percent of the State of Alaska

that is federally held? And we all know there are different aspects to Federal public lands. BLM lands mean something, Park Service means something, refuge status means something, and wilderness status means something else altogether. So when we acknowledged and the Federal Government acknowledged no more in Alaska, we thought that would be respected. We thought that might be respected. But, apparently, this President is going to choose to ignore it.

My colleagues can tell this is an argument and a debate I feel very strongly about, and I feel very strongly about it because I have been living with it my entire adult life. For as long as I can remember, we have been talking about how might it be possible to look into these extraordinary reserves and resources that we know are in the 1002 area. There have been highs and there have been lows. Back in 1995, when it was my father and Ted Stevens who were working this issue, they were able to successfully get it through the Congress only to have it vetoed by President Clinton. And then 10 years later, it was Senator Stevens and myself who were able to get it so close; we were one vote shy in the Senate. The House has passed ANWR, I believe Congressman YOUNG told me today, on 12 separate occasions. Now we are back yet another 10 years later. So maybe this is an issue that keeps coming back every 10 years.

This wasn't the worst part of the news I was dealing with this weekend. At the same time I was given a heads-up that the administration was going to be releasing this CCP—this comprehensive conservation plan that will treat ANWR as wilderness—I was told that we are going to see the announcement of the administration's 5-year lease/sale plan. That is substantial for us. As folks know, we have been trying to advance the leases that have been sold in the Beaufort and in the Chukchi for some period of time, and it has been a tortured process, as many people know. But what we are told is that with the lease/sale that will be announced, portions of the Beaufort Sea and the Chukchi Sea will be indefinitely withdrawn from the next 5-year plan for the Outer Continental Shelf which, again, is due to be released.

I think it is important to know we have had deferrals off of our coasts in the Beaufort and the Chukchi, but these are no longer going to be deferrals. They are going to be withdrawals, which means that not only will they not be included in this lease sale from 2017 to 2022, but they will stay in place until such time—it is an indefinite withdrawal—as the next President, whoever he or she may be, should decide to change it. It is different than a withdrawal.

What it then says to us is, okay, no, we are going to lock up ANWR permanently so that the resources that may be available to you—as much as a million barrels a day coming down

through your pipeline to supply this country—no, put that off limits, and, oh, the offshore you want to try to advance, we are going to make it a little more difficult because we are going to take these areas and we are not going to include them in this 5-year lease sale. In fact, we are going to indefinitely withdraw them.

This could have significant impact on our ability to access the estimated 23 billion barrels of oil of Alaska's North Slope. Again, when we are talking about how we are going to fill up that pipeline, we have been working toward those opportunities offshore. But there is a third gut punch to Alaska that is coming—a third.

Remember, all these were supposed to be unveiled this week. What a week.

First, close off ANWR permanently.

Second, make the offshore that much more difficult.

And third is in the area where all those who said no to wilderness, go over to the National Petroleum Reserve, that is where you should be accessing this oil. Well, okay, that is where folks are going. ConocoPhillips is trying to access some leases in the National Petroleum Reserve. These are leases that were awarded in 1998, so more than a few years to be working through all of the issues here.

What we learned was that the terms and conditions of the mitigation that are going to be required by the Department of the Interior to allow Conoco to proceed with the alternative that would allow for a short road to access the pad, those mitigation costs and other requirements are going to be so much that the project will no longer be economic.

Think about it. Years in the process and the permitting and the cost that goes into it, years to get there.

I don't think most people know—do you realize how much oil is produced on Federal lands in Alaska? It is a real easy answer because it is a big fat zero. There is none. There is no oil that is produced on Federal lands. We have been trying to make it happen.

We have been going to the National Petroleum Reserve because we have been put off limits with ANWR. It hasn't been made permanent wilderness. We haven't been able to access it because that too takes permission from Congress. So the whole area where our State has these resources—these reserves, ANWR to the east, Beaufort, Chukchi offshore, National Petroleum Reserve—Alaska—what this administration is doing is saying this “all of the above” strategy for an energy plan for America, we are starting to think in Alaska that means everybody but Alaska.

I just can't articulate the anger, the frustration. As I tried to convey my thoughts to the Secretary, I said, I am just not sure if this administration doesn't care about Alaska and its people at all or whether you even think of us. But I have come to the conclusion that they still view us as a territory, a

place where you could come in and do what you will because you are a territory. Well, we are not a territory. We are 1 of the 50 States. We are one of those stars on that flag. Last time I checked, we had just as many rights as any other star on that flag.

What is coming at my State and the arrogance with which this administration is treating us is unacceptable, and it will not stand. Everybody wants to know, what are you going to do about it? What are you going to do about it? I am going to make sure that people understand who we are, that people understand that there are human beings who live in the 1002 area. You are going to take an area and declare it wilderness. People live there. Children go to school there. Yes, we actually have a polar bear watch to make sure the kids don't leave their homes early in the morning to go to school when it is still dark, and there might be a polar bear out there.

Things are different in Alaska, but we still live there. We still want a quality of life for the people that is not unlike what we would have here. We don't want to have communities where we still have no sanitation facilities, where people are hauling their human waste in a bucket in the corner of the house and dumping it in a lagoon. We don't want to be in that situation. But you know what, it seems as though we have to get permission to do anything, and that permission is routinely denied. Or if it is denied, they delay it indefinitely so that it adds to your cost.

We pay more for our energy. We pay more to keep warm in the State of Alaska than you do anywhere else. You might say, of course, it is colder up there. You know, back here it is going to be cold in New York. There is nobody in New York who is paying \$10 a gallon for fuel like the people in Kobuk are paying. There is nobody in Massachusetts who is going to get hit by this storm and it is going to be cold and is paying \$7.50 for fuel like the people in Fort Yukon are paying.

We live there because we want to live in Alaska. It is an amazing place. We make a lot of sacrifices. But one of the sacrifices that we won't make, one of the things we will not give up, is to be treated like some second-class citizens, to be treated like a territory that has no rights. So when we are full participants and we say there are special places in Alaska that should be wilderness—and we signed off on that in 1980—then negotiate with us. Talk to us about what happens next.

But I made the statement—again, it is harsh words, but I have suggested that this administration is one that is willing to negotiate with Iran, but they are not willing to negotiate with Alaskans. Those days are over. Those days are over.

We have some issues to deal with in front of us right now as we move through the legislation in front of us. We have been focused on energy for a good couple of weeks-plus now. I am

glad of that. I am glad we are going to be able to work through a process where we can move through some of these amendments. But know that the words I have spoken tonight on the floor are words that come from my heart as an Alaskan.

This is not about politics. This is not about me being able to wield some muscle because I have the gavel in the interior appropriations committee. This is about Alaska as a State and our rights as a State. This is about a compact that was made with the State of Alaska, about how we would be able to use and access our lands, how we would be able to care for the people who call Alaska home. This is pure passion that drives my comments, and my comments will be echoed not only by the full Alaska delegation, as small as we are, but by our Governor, by our legislature, by our elected officials, by people who live all around the State, including the people who live in the coastal plain in ANWR.

This is serious, and Alaskans are going to take this very seriously. You will be hearing a lot more from us.

With that, I thank my colleagues for the indulgence of time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. May I first inquire of the distinguished bill manager whether I may take a moment to seek to call up an amendment or whether they have present business they need to attend to on the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. I was going to give some comments in addition to my colleague from Alaska about the process and where we are and respond to some of the comments she has made. If the Senator from Rhode Island could wait a few minutes, is that possible?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Happily.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Point of inquiry: Do I understand that the Senator from Rhode Island wishes to make his amendment pending or just speak to the amendment?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I simply wish to make my amendment pending, and at a convenient time I would like to do that. There was a bit of an aura of good feeling on the floor when the distinguished chairman of the energy committee and distinguished Senator from North Dakota were discussing an orderly approach for getting the amendments pending. Since then, we have heard a good deal about frustration and anger and a bad mood, so I am not sure—maybe a little time to revert to that previous aura might not be in order, but I am only seeking to get my amendment pending.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I do know the Senator from Washington and I were hoping to get a plan and a proposal for colleagues so that they would better understand how we might proceed tomorrow. And because we haven't had that opportunity to do

that as of yet, I would like the chance to consult with Senator CANTWELL here. My concern is that if we start getting all these amendments pending right now before we reach some kind of a path forward, it could get complicated.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Rather than face an objection to my unanimous consent request, I will defer it until the chairman and her ranking member have a chance to go through that process, and I will come back at an appropriate time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island. We are here tonight because we haven't ended debate on the Keystone Pipeline bill. We haven't ended debate because our colleagues voted to not end debate on this important measure, and I think for good reason.

Our colleagues from both sides of the aisle got to offer amendments last week, to discuss them, and have a chance to vote on them. I would say this is a very different process from what happened in December, where basically an up-or-down vote was going to be given on a process.

So I am glad my colleagues—like from Michigan where they had a major tar sands spill in their State—who want to offer amendments on pipeline safety can do so. I want my colleagues to be able to offer amendments as it relates to security and safety, particularly when it relates to safe drinking water and the issues of the pipeline.

Since this bill has been introduced, two major pipeline spills have been discovered. So just within the time we have been on this bill, 3 million gallons of brine spilled from a pipeline in North Dakota. That was discovered on January 6, the same day we started with this bill being introduced.

On Friday North Dakota officials discovered that the contamination from the spill reached the Missouri River. So on January 17, 30,000 gallons of oil were spilled into the Yellowstone River, a different incident, from a pipeline that broke in Eastern Montana. It temporarily shut down drinking water services for 6,000 people in Glendive, MT. So you bet these issues are important to me, and they are important to my colleagues. I hope we do not have to rush through the process of having a vote on these amendments. I think all of my colleagues see the Thursday night event, where the discussion was, let's get four or five amendments or six pending amendments and then coming back 1 hour later to table them is not the kind of legislative process we are used to here.

I hope in the next couple of days my colleague and I can work on these in a much more productive fashion, with the list of amendments that Members want to offer and a timely way to debate them. Hopefully my colleague from Alaska and I could actually work

with our colleagues, and either get some of them accepted or work for a vote schedule that would actually allow us to have the vote and have the debate as opposed to tabling.

This Senator is not arguing that any side does not have a right to table an amendment. I am simply saying: I think colleagues want to know what the process is going to be and whether they can discuss this.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a story that is about one of those pipeline spills. It is about the Federal Government issuing warnings to the pipeline company in November about the concerns regarding those spills.

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

[From EnergyWire, Jan. 23, 2015]

FEDS ISSUED WARNING TO PIPELINE COMPANY
IN NOVEMBER

(By Mike Soraghan)

Federal officials issued a warning late last year to the owner of the Montana pipeline that contaminated a city's drinking water for keeping poor records about the condition of the system.

And the owners of the Poplar pipeline have had at least seven pipeline spills since early 2008, records show, along with other spills at production facilities.

Bridger Pipeline LLC officials say the warning letter from the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration is unrelated to the leak of 50,000 gallons of oil into the Yellowstone River.

"I don't believe there is a link between that letter and what we're dealing with," said Bridger spokesman Bill Salvin. "That seems to be a difficult connection to make."

A thick layer of ice on the river is hampering cleanup efforts centered on Glendive, Mont., where the water treatment plant was shut down after cancer-causing benzene was detected in supplies.

Crews have recovered about 10,000 gallons of oil from the rupture directly beneath the river, about 50 feet from the south shore.

The spill's cause remains unclear, but oil sheens have been reported as far away as Williston, N.D.

The warning letter last year resulted from a 2012 inspection by federal officials. Chris Hoidal, director of PHMSA's Western Region, wrote that the company had conducted 24 inspection digs for external anomalies, but then employees failed to note the condition of the pipeline as required.

Salvin said that "steps have been taken" to address the concerns laid out in the letter.

"We take all requirements very seriously," he said.

Federal officials have undertaken another inspection in connection with the record-keeping, in addition to the spill investigation.

The warning came about six years after a spill that led to a more serious enforcement action by PHMSA. The agency said that the company failed to accurately update its reports on a May 2008 spill from the pipeline.

In the same enforcement action, PHMSA charged that Bridger failed to perform a pressure test on tubing installed at a pipeline station in 2007 and 2008.

The agency also alleged that the company was too slow to review its emergency operations manuals and failed to keep up on inspections. The company paid a \$45,000 fine.

This image was taken from a drone surveying the ice slotting oil containment

trench carved in the ice of the Yellowstone River near Crane, Mont. Photo courtesy of Unified Spill Command.

The company also paid a \$100,000 fine in an enforcement action brought in 2005 regarding the qualifications of its personnel.

PHMSA inspections also led to two other enforcement actions in September 2005 and February 2007 that did not lead to fines.

Montana records show that Bridger Pipeline had two spills in 2009, another in 2010 and a fourth in 2012. The total released in the four spills was about 3,300 gallons of crude oil.

In August, a gasket failure caused a Bridger pipeline to spill about 4,000 gallons of crude in Mountrail County, N.D.

In addition, another company's 6-inch fuel line was broken during excavation of a new pipeline by Bridger on Sept. 1, 2014, in McKenzie County, N.D. Dry natural gas was released to the atmosphere, but inspectors noted that it could have led to an explosion.

Bridger is part of Casper, Wyo.-based True Oil LLC. In May 2014, True's Belle Fourche pipeline ruptured, spilling 25,000 gallons of crude oil into an ephemeral drainage near Casper, according to federal records. The oil traveled about 3 miles in the drainage.

True Oil's production operations have had at least 16 spills since early 2009 in Montana, Wyoming, Colorado and North Dakota, according to state records. The largest was a spill of more than 30,000 gallons of oil and wastewater in 2011 in Campbell County, Wyo.

Ms. CANTWELL. To me this is an issue where we have had some debate about the pipeline and the oilspill liability trust fund. I would hope we would come back to that issue because these issues about spills and safety and security should be part of the debate. But I go back to the larger issue which is I hope we turn down this legislation overall.

To me all of the issues we are talking about, whether it is about safe drinking water, whether it is about oilspills and the requirements on these companies or if it is about whether TransCanada can take U.S. property under eminent domain or whether it is about the route itself, all of these questions in my mind are premature for us, the Congress, to decide.

Over 60 percent of the American people say they want this pipeline decided in a normal process. They want the State Department, in this instance because it crosses a border, to be the entity that determines national interest. So I do not want to predetermine that when there are so many important issues to be negotiated. The very company that wanted to negotiate with the State Department on this pipeline was negotiating some of the original routing. Yet at the very time the State Department was telling them the original routing would not work, they were here trying to persuade Members to vote for the authority to override the President and to give that routing, which we now know was flawed.

I do not want to be premature about this. I do not want to be premature about cutting off debate. I want to get to these amendments before us and get the bill done with the input of my colleagues, given that the debate was brought up to the floor.

If you ask me what I want to debate, I would be debating some other legisla-

tion because I do not think this bill is going to be signed by the President of the United States.

I would be debating energy tax policy on clean energy items. I would be debating other things that I think would be impacting more our energy strategy for the future, our economy, and job creation. I think there are a lot of those out there. I hope my colleague from Alaska and I, once this debate is over with, will be able to sit down and talk about these issues, in a bipartisan fashion, and work with the committee.

In 2007, we passed the Energy Independence and Security Act out of the energy committee on a bipartisan basis. It was landmark legislation that unleashed a lot of investment. It unleashed investment in making sure we had higher fuel efficiency cars in our country, which was good for the consumer because they got a car that got more mileage. It made investments in things such as the smart grid and other energy infrastructure.

I hope that is what we will get back to, because when I look at what is happening—I know my colleague from Alaska just talked about some of these issues as it related to Alaska. I know she means what she says when she says she is speaking from the heart and working hard for Alaskans. I visited Alaska with her and my colleague, then-Senator-from-Alaska Mark Begich. I visited many parts of Alaska.

I understand. Alaskans want to have an economic opportunity. They want their energy to be cheaper. I would say I am empathetic to the issue because we have five refineries in the State of Washington. We are the fifth largest refining State in the Nation. A lot of our oil comes from Alaska. So I can tell you that people in the Northwest are furious that even though we have those refineries—so a lot of refining capacity and the oil comes from Alaska—we still have some of the highest gas prices in the Nation. Many times we have asked for various investigations about why we have the highest gas prices in the Nation and why this issue continues to plague us.

I know my colleague, when she speaks about the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge or ideas about more drilling, that it is about getting more oil supply. But more oil supply from Alaska has not helped Washington consumers have cheaper gasoline prices.

So I want to continue to diversify our economy off of fossil fuels and onto other things. I hope we will get a chance to work on an energy bill that does that. If I could just address for a couple of minutes the issue of the President's decision to move forward on a plan that would help preserve the Arctic wildlife refuge as wilderness. My colleague from Alaska mentioned this issue is something that has been going on for some time. She is right.

The predecessors that she and I—the former chair of the energy committee, Scoop Jackson, and the former late Senator Ted Stevens—everybody has

been a part of this. I actually was here at a pretty dramatic floor debate on this issue in 2005, in which some people wanted to open the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge for drilling, even to the degree that they put that as a rider on the Defense bill. We were able to stop that. I think that was the will of Congress, that they did not want to see drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

But we have had this discussion since 1960, when Dwight Eisenhower set aside originally 9 million acres, and in 1980, thanks to the work of Scoop Jackson, Congress passed the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, which expanded the refuge to 19 million acres.

I have visited the refuge. I do believe it is a critical habitat for wildlife and the Gwich'in people who called this the sacred place where life begins. It is truly special. I do think we have had many discussions about this. This action probably will not be the last of them, but I do applaud the President for taking the Arctic refuge, which is habitat for 45 different species of land animals, 36 different species of fish, 180 species of birds—and has the greatest variety of plant and animal life of any park or refuge in the polar Arctic. I do believe it is an ecosystem and an ecosystem that is unlike anything else we have in the United States.

So I am proud the President has taken what has been a refuge that was lacking a plan and has now put a wilderness plan in place or the elements of what it will take to preserve those various species and animals and that very special place.

I know my colleague feels very strongly about the President's announcement. I think a refuge plan that is based on science and public comment—we have had a plan, but this is the first plan to say we are going to protect this area. It recommends 12 million acres of refuge, including the coastal plain as wilderness. It is one of the most pristine and unique public places.

I am confident America can meet our energy needs without opening the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. I am convinced we can come up with an energy strategy that is much more compelling for the future of the United States, one in which we can lead and one in which we can help other countries, whether it is what the President did with China in getting an agreement or working with India or all the things we are doing to try to be a leader in what is energy efficiency and ways to impact the marketplace so consumers can look for cleaner, more efficient uses of fuel.

So this is going to be a continuing debate in this Congress between a 19th century view of energy policy and a 21st century view of energy policy. I would ask my colleagues to think about these countries the President has just recently visited. He went to China. No one thinks China's air standard is what we should have in the

United States. India has had its own challenges. They have hundreds of millions of people who are without electricity needs.

So the question is whether these sources of energy are going to be that solution, whether a dirty source of fossil fuel is going to be the solution or whether we can work together on cleaner energy solutions. I think we can do that.

In fact, I am excited the United States can be a leader in these technologies, which will result in more job growth, just as those previous energy bills did when we worked together for higher fuel efficiency standards, for more energy efficiency, to come up with more sources of diversified fuel. I am very confident we are going to, in the next few years, usher in a new era of aviation.

We have already proven we can fly airplanes with a 50-50 drop in jet fuel. We now have to prove we can manufacture those large sources and get planes flying on that. What a great accomplishment that will be in reducing carbon emissions and giving the flying public and those airlines something that is much more affordable than what we have been dealing with for the last 10 or 15 years.

I look forward to my colleague and I working tomorrow—some tonight and a little bit starting early tomorrow—on how we move forward with this legislation. I know my colleague and I see a path forward. Similar to any two people who are trying to manage a bill on the floor, we also know we have all of our colleagues to work with because nothing in the Senate operates unless it operates through our process and working collaboratively or, I should say, it can work, it is just going to take a very long time.

So we pledge to work in the next few days to try to get an amendment process that will not be prematurely cut off after 1 hour of a pending bill but will come to terms, and hopefully our colleagues will work with us to limit the number of those amendments and we can move forward to legislation that we think will help our economy grow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I know our colleague from Delaware is wishing to speak. If I may just proceed to do the closeout and he would be able to speak after that.

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

CENTRAL ILLINOIS XPRESS BASKETBALL TEAM

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I wish to recognize the remarkable strength and

spirit of the Central Illinois Xpress basketball team and its coach Tariq Toran.

As the only team of girls in an all-boys fifth grade basketball league in Springfield, IL, the Central Illinois Xpress has defied the odds and emerged as a powerhouse in the Illinois AAU boys' league. With an impressive record of 8 wins and 2 losses in the first half of the season, Coach Toran and the Central Illinois Xpress girls have made a name for themselves not just back at home, but across the Nation.

Strong, confident, and determined, the team comprised of nine girls ages 10 and 11 years old do not shy away from hard work and tough competition on the basketball court. With a series of two-on-one drills coupled with push-ups and sprints, these girls know how to practice hard and play hard. The Xpress girls use their summers to compete in a higher division comprised of older girls, which helps prepare them to play against tough teams during the season.

This tireless preparation and fearless attitude brought Coach Toran to sign the girls up for the all-boys' league this year. So far, the team's success has been undeniable. With their dribble drives, crisp passes, and methodical game play, the Central Illinois Xpress players have racked up more than enough wins to show the boys, and the community, that they are a force to be reckoned with this season.

These girls know what it means to push themselves for excellence, to fight for something against the odds, and to prove themselves to those, including some of the boys they are playing, who don't expect a girls team to be strong and play smart, aggressive ball.

It is my pleasure to wish these fifth-grade girls in Springfield the best of luck in the second half of this season.

RECOGNIZING THE VERMONT STATE POLICE

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, during the closing days of the 112th Congress, and for the duration of the 113th Congress, I had the privilege of serving the Senate as the President pro tempore. It of course was a great honor, and a humbling one, to serve the Senate and to represent Vermont in this position. With this designation, because of the matter of presidential succession procedures, I was assigned a security detail. I have spoken before about the outstanding work of the U.S. Capitol Police, and about how much Marcelle and I appreciate the sacrifices they made in the course of their service.

Today I want to thank the Vermont State Police for their outstanding service and steadfast support during my time as President pro tempore. With their extensive and comprehensive knowledge of Vermont's unique landscape and communities, the Vermont State Police coordinated with the U.S. Capitol Police and provided essential guidance, information and support. I