

country she does not know at all. She will be forced to leave the United States.

We will basically give up on the investment we have made as Americans in her education and her potential and tell her: Leave. In the words of Congressman STEVE KING, she is one of the "deportables"—one of the "deportables." Ola sent me a letter recently. Here is what she said about her dreams for the future:

I aspire to ultimately become a surgical oncologist, but more importantly, I intend to provide for patients that cannot afford the astronomical fees accompanying life-saving surgeries, patients are denied the medical treatment they deserve. My goal is not to increase my bank account; my goal is to decrease preventable deaths. I wish to remain in this country to make a difference.

Ola is not alone. There are so many DREAMers across this country just like her who want to be part of our future. It is clear this DACA Program works for America. That is why I am asking DREAMers around the country to join me, post their stories about what they have done with DACA on Twitter and Facebook using the hashtag "DACA Works."

I want the American people to understand the human cost of the bill that was passed by the Republicans in the House of Representatives and is now pending before the Senate. If this bill becomes law, DACA will end. Hundreds of thousands of DREAMers will risk deportation to countries they can barely remember. Will America be stronger if we deport Ola Kaso and others like her, young people who want to use their talents to give back to America, deporting them to countries they have some loose connection to by family ties?

Of course not. It is shameless—shameless to play politics with the lives of these young people. They grew up in this country, attended school in this country, put their hand over their hearts in their classrooms every day to pledge allegiance to the only flag they have ever known. It is shameless for the House Republicans to put homeland security funding at risk in pursuit of punishing these young people. The House Republicans feel so strongly about deporting DREAMers, they are willing to hold our homeland security funding hostage.

The House Republicans are telling the Senate and the President: Deport the DREAMers or we will shut down the Department of Homeland Security. I hope the Senate majority leader will reject this blackmail and bring a clean homeland security appropriations bill to the floor of the Senate as soon as possible.

For our part, the Senate Democrats will insist that the Department of Homeland Security be funded and that the President have the authority, which every President has, to establish America's immigration policies. The Presiding Officer was part of an effort, as I was several years, to try to resolve this issue in a thoughtful, balanced, comprehensive way.

The ultimate bill that was considered before the Senate was not perfect. Parts of it I did not like at all, but we reached a compromise. Over a year and a half ago, we sent that bipartisan bill to the House of Representatives asking them to call it for consideration and amendment. They refused, refused for more than a year and a half to call that bill. Instead, what they have done is launch these attacks on young people such as Ola Kaso.

Is that what America is all about? Is that the best we can do? For the dozen or more Republican Presidential aspirants who made that journey out to Iowa to pay homage to Congressman STEVE KING and his views about immigration, I would ask them to, when they return home: Look around you. There are young people just like this young woman who are only asking for a chance to be part of America's future.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

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 legislative 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.

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

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

INTERNATIONAL HOLOCAUST REMEMBRANCE DAY

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today is International Holocaust Remembrance Day, commemorating the genocide that resulted in the murder of nearly 6 million Jews by the Nazi regime. On this day in 1945, the allied forces entered Auschwitz, a complex of concentration and death camps in Nazi-occupied Poland. They liberated more than 7,000 prisoners. Auschwitz was made up of 3 main camps and more than 40 subcamps covering over 15 square miles. Between 1940 and 1945 nearly 1.3 million people were deported to Auschwitz and at least 1.1 million were murdered.

By January 1945 the allied forces were closing in. To eliminate witnesses to their crimes, thousands of prisoners were killed at Auschwitz, and 60,000 were forced to march west days before the liberation.

During these marches SS guards shot anyone who fell behind or could not continue. More than 15,000 died in that march. In the months prior to the liberation, an elderly French inmate urged a young Jewish prisoner named Olga to watch everything she saw, and when the war was over, to tell the world what she had seen. Olga wrote her memoirs in the years that followed and gave voice to those who could no longer speak.

Yesterday, the Washington Post featured the horrific stories of four Auschwitz survivors, including those who suffered under the sadistic Nazi doctor Josef Mengele, known as the Angel of Death. GEN Dwight D. Eisenhower, the Supreme Commander of the allied forces in Europe also understood the importance of documenting what he saw. After visiting a recently liberated Nazi camp, General Eisenhower urged Washington to send a congressional delegation to witness Nazi crimes firsthand so in the future there could be no attempt to dismiss these allegations as mere propaganda. With the remaining eyewitnesses in their twilight years, the responsibility to ensure that future generations never forget these atrocities falls to us. Recently I joined my colleagues Senators MIKULSKI, CARDIN, KIRK and others and introduced a resolution commemorating this important anniversary. This resolution calls on us to be witnesses to the 1.1 million innocent victims murdered at Auschwitz and honors the legacy of the survivors of the Holocaust.

Last Congress I chaired the Senate Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights and Human Rights. Although I am disappointed that the Republicans chose to change the name of that subcommittee under their leadership, I am going to continue to focus on protecting human rights and civil rights.

When I chaired the subcommittee, I tried to give a platform to voices that are not often heard and to examine what needs to be done to protect human rights. Our responsibility in Congress is to focus on legislation, not lamentation. So we wrote legislation and passed bills to hold the perpetrators of serious human rights violations accountable for their crimes.

In 2007 my Genocide Accountability Act was enacted, allowing prosecution of genocide committed outside the United States or by someone other than a U.S. national outside the United States. The following year President Bush signed the Child Soldiers Accountability Act, which I also introduced. In 2010 the Child Soldiers Accountability Act was used to deport Liberian warlord Dr. George Boley.

I have also authored the Trafficking in Persons Accountability Act, the Human Rights Enforcement Act, the Child Soldiers Prevention Act, the Child Marriage Prevention Act, Congo Conflict Minerals Act, all legislation aimed at protecting human rights in terrible situations, all of which became law.

Our hearts go out to the survivors who mourn their families and the millions of others murdered in the Holocaust. Today many of the survivors will return to Auschwitz. They will recall that moment when they first arrived more than 70 years ago and passed under a sign that mockingly read, in German, "Work makes you free." Standing before them was Josef Mengele to await their fate. Turning right meant death in the gas chamber, turning left may have meant survival, for a few weeks at least. So many voices were silenced that now we have to tell their stories.

As the memory of the Holocaust passes from those who were there to the generations that were not, we cannot forget the importance of remembrance and speaking out against intolerance whenever and wherever it occurs. Unfortunately these horrible crimes still take place. Consider Boko Haram in Nigeria, ISIL in Syria and Iraq, and the barbaric systems of gulag in North Korea. We cannot be silent.

As Holocaust survivor Ruth Eglash said in yesterday's Washington Post:

I used to be an optimist until a few years ago, but the situation in the Middle East has changed and the world does not notice anything. . . . The bottom line is, it can happen again and it is happening again in many places, not necessarily to the Jews, but to anyone.

Our promise to hold accountable those who commit the most unspeakable crimes will ring hollow unless we

lead the world in punishing those responsible for the gravest human rights violations. I look forward to continuing working with my colleagues in the Senate to make progress toward ending genocide and human rights abuses everywhere they exist. We should all proclaim in one voice: Never again.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

FUNDING THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I rise today on the important issue of funding the Department of Homeland Security and to urge my colleagues to come together and pass a clean appropriations bill with regard to this agency.

The Department of Homeland Security, or DHS, is charged with border security and immigration enforcement. DHS's role extends far beyond immigration. The agency is also responsible for aviation security, emergency management and response, counterterrorism, and cyber security.

Democrats and Republicans have long worked together to make sure our hard-working Federal officers on the border, in our airports, and at our ports can continue their critical work that keeps us safe.

Now the Republican-controlled House would irresponsibly risk shutting down the Department of Homeland Security to score political points over the President's immigration actions. Today I object to the effort to shut down DHS over the President's immigration Executive action because it is not only an irresponsible strategy from a security point of view, but it comes with a real cost in the everyday lives of students and parents.

Funding for the Department of Homeland Security is set to expire February 27. The President has been clear that he will veto any policy riders that undo his Executive action and harm millions of students and their families. The House Republican bill forces us to choose between shutting down the Department of Homeland Security or deporting children and families. This is an untenable choice.

Looking at the votes in the House, it is clear some Members of Congress would on the one hand say our immigration focus should be on securing our border, while on the other hand they risk turning off the lights at Border Patrol stations because they disagree with the President's immigration policies.

Last year I led a congressional delegation to McAllen, TX, and to Lackland Air Force Base to see the humanitarian crisis on the border first-

hand. My colleagues and I were heartbroken after seeing children as young as 7 years old in Customs and Border Protection facilities.

But what we also saw were hard-working border agents doing the best they could under difficult circumstances in an already stressed immigration system. These agents should know that we in Washington are going to give them the resources they need to do their jobs, not irresponsibly shut down the Department of Homeland Security, for whom they work.

Instead of threatening to shut down the government's primary homeland security agency, we should be working together to once again pass bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform. Republicans and Democrats agree our immigration system is broken.

With his Executive action President Obama took a step to bring millions across the country out of the shadows and keep U.S. citizens and their families together. Congressional action that puts families first is needed if we are to permanently fix our immigration system.

The President's Executive action helps millions of people across America by allowing certain students and families to register, work legally, and pay their taxes. His action is rooted in the reality that our immigration enforcement officers need to exercise discretion on whom to go after with limited resources and in a broken immigration system.

Those who oppose the President's action, which is reflected in the House Republican bill, say that the President and enforcement officers must act with absolutely no discretion. This position contemplates and, in fact, supports the removal of nearly 12 million undocumented people from our country. This is paramount to a policy of mass deportation.

If mass deportation were enacted, DHS would need an exponential increase in funding and resources. Billions in increased spending without any permanent fixes or reforms is not a viable option. Even if we somehow have the resources to enact the policy of mass deportation, doing so would devastate our economy, removing millions of hard-working people who would no longer be working, running businesses, buying our goods and products. That would lead to over \$2.5 trillion of economic loss to our country in just a decade.

Mass deportation is not a serious solution for immigration reform. It simply is not possible for DHS to remove every undocumented person from this country.

Passing the House bill would just make life even harder for these people, many of whom are already some of the hardest working people in our Nation.

As I mentioned, there are nearly 12 million undocumented people living in communities across America. Many have been living here for years or decades. They are parents, they are small

business owners, and they are our neighbors and our children's classmates at school.

They are people such as Bianca, a woman who lives in Hawaii with her family. After moving to the United States on a visa over a decade ago, Bianca met her husband. They moved to the place where they had always dreamed of living—Hawaii, naturally—and began a family there.

Bianca's work visa and her husband's work visa were temporary, and like many immigrant families they faced a tough decision to remain after their visas expired and to continue building a life here in America. Bianca and her husband started with nothing. Today they have two small businesses on Oahu and four American children—children born in the United States. Their businesses employ American citizens. They pay their taxes, and they work hard to provide for their families and be engaged in the community.

Because of the President's order, Bianca and her family no longer live in fear every single day of being torn from the life they have built in Hawaii.

The House Republicans' mass deportation policy is a serious proposal in only one respect. It would result in serious, negative consequences for our economy, our government, and millions of families in our country.

In contrast, prioritizing deporting felons, not families and students, is simply common sense, and that is what the President's Executive order does.

Now is the time when we should be working together on commonsense and comprehensive immigration reform that the vast majority of Americans support. Comprehensive immigration reform is supported by 70 percent of the American people. In the past Congress, nearly 70 percent of the Senate supported our bipartisan immigration bill.

Our bipartisan bill was a compromise. It strengthened border security, modernized our system, addressed visa backlogs, and allowed millions of undocumented people to step out of the shadows, get in line, and work toward becoming American citizens. Comprehensive immigration reform would have spurred economic growth in our country by over \$100 billion per year while helping to bring down the deficit.

The only thing that kept this bipartisan reform bill from becoming law was the fact that Speaker BOEHNER refused to give the bill an up-or-down vote in the House. Recklessly shutting down the Department of Homeland Security will not fix our broken immigration system. Undoing the President's Executive action will not fix our broken immigration system. We must work together, and we must fund the Department of Homeland Security so that they can continue to protect our country, and we must come together to pass commonsense reform that Americans support.

Both sides of the aisle agree that we are a nation of immigrants and our immigration system is broken. We don't

need to shut down the Department of Homeland Security or round up and deport millions of families and individuals.

We can start that process with a clean DHS funding bill, and I urge my Republican colleagues to bring one to the floor quickly.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

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

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

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I rise this morning to join our colleagues in discussing the need for a clean, full-year bill to fund the Department of Homeland Security. Just 30 days from today, funding for the Department of Homeland Security expires unless Congress acts.

I know that sometimes in congressional time 30 days may seem like a long time, but with a scheduled recess in a few weeks and the certain fact that the House-passed bill cannot pass the Senate, we must act soon to prevent a shutdown and provide the resources to keep our country safe.

Luckily, there is a path forward to prevent a shutdown. We should pass the bipartisan, bicameral, Homeland Security funding bill that was agreed to last December.

Just a few weeks ago, Senator MIKULSKI, then Chair of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and Congressman ROGERS, Chair of the House Appropriations Committee, negotiated spending bills for the entire government, including the Department of Homeland Security bill. This was a compromise measure. Not everyone got what they wanted, but the bill funded the Department at levels that would ensure the Department can fulfill its mission to secure the homeland.

Then, unfortunately, politics came into play. Some House Republicans demanded the homeland bill be removed from the larger budget because of immigration issues, and now the entire Department is funded on a short-term basis through February 27. Now we face a fundamental question: Are we going to put the country at risk because of an ideological disagreement?

Since Senator MIKULSKI and Congressman ROGERS reached that agreement in December, we have seen many threats to our Nation and to our allies. The U.S. law enforcement community is on high alert for terror threats after attacks in Australia and Ottawa, Canada, and in Paris. Recently, an Ohio man was arrested when it was discovered he was plotting to blow up the U.S. Capitol in an ISIS-inspired plan. Now is not the time to be holding up funding for the Department of Homeland Security because of ideological reasons.

Last week, I had the opportunity to visit the Department of Homeland Security's cyber security center in Arlington. The center is where officials

are working every day to prevent attacks not just against the Federal Government or against State governments but against the private sector, against U.S. companies such as Sony, and against critical infrastructure such as nuclear powerplants and the electric grid.

Last week, in the Armed Services Committee, former National Security Adviser Brent Scowcroft said that he views cyber security threats to be "as dangerous as nuclear weapons."

We must continue to make important investments in our cyber defenses. But if we fail to fully fund their budget—the clean budget that was agreed to by the House and Senate—their efforts to identify the newest technologies and strategies to protect our cyber infrastructure will be put on hold.

One of the things they talked to me about when I visited the center includes two areas I think are particularly important to our national security. One is the effort to identify a secure emergency response line, which is very critical when we have national emergencies—even the snowstorm we are seeing in the northeast in New Hampshire, where we have several feet of snow that is being predicted. We also need a secure emergency response line so our first responders—the people there on the ground when an emergency happens—can communicate with each other. That is at risk if we pass a CR rather than a clean funding bill.

The other thing at risk is the effort to identify the next generation of cyber threats. There are things being worked on that we don't even know yet, and unless we are ahead of that curve we are not going to be there to protect our cyber system throughout the country. So we need to give the Department of Homeland Security budgetary certainty so it can plan and prepare for these kinds of threats. That is why a short-term continuing resolution should be off the table. We need to pass a bill that funds homeland security for the rest of this fiscal year.

A short-term budget means the Department is on autopilot. That would be extraordinarily bad for business and for our national security. If Homeland Security operates under a short-term budget, new projects and grants are halted, contracts and acquisitions are postponed, hiring is delayed, employee training is scaled back, and grants to our first responders—those people on the ground when something happens—are not going to be awarded, and congressionally targeted reductions—those reductions we want to make in wasteful programs—are also put on hold.

Yesterday I had the opportunity to visit New Hampshire's fusion center. Every State has a fusion center. This is a network of centers designed to serve as a focal point in each State to coordinate terrorism-related information and threats to our national security, to our State security, and to our municipalities. It is a place where first responders, local law enforcement, and in New

Hampshire's fusion center, in addition to our State and local folks being represented, someone from the FBI is there on hand, someone from the Department of Homeland Security identifies potential threats and relays that information up and down the chain of command.

In New Hampshire, the fusion center has also been very critical in working to address drug interdiction and to help identify the heroin abuse epidemic that, sadly, we have seen not only in New Hampshire but in northern New England. If we have a short-term budget, new grants to our fusion centers, which are on the front lines of protecting our States and municipalities against security threats, and the security grants to State and local law enforcement will not be awarded.

Why would we threaten this important public safety and security funding for unrelated ideological reasons?

Secretary Jeh Johnson recently said:

As long as this Department continues to operate on a continuing resolution, we are prevented from funding key homeland security initiatives. These include, for example, funding for new grants to State and local law enforcement, additional border security resources, and additional Secret Service resources to implement the changes recommended by the independent panel. Other core missions, such as aviation security and protection of Federal installations and personnel, are also hampered.

That is a direct quote from the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, Jeh Johnson.

In addition to what he lays out there, I want to highlight a few specific examples of why a short-term budget—a continuing resolution—is problematic for the Department and for our national security.

Immigration and Customs Enforcement—ICE—could not fund all of its current detention, antitrafficking, and smuggling requirements under a short-term budget. Under a short-term budget, ICE will not have the funding they need to meet their legal mandate to have 34,000 detention beds in place for immigration detainees nor funding for a new family detention center.

So for those people concerned about our border security, concerned about people coming into this country, why would we want to deny funding to address efforts to interdict people coming across the border, to interdict surveillance efforts, to build a new family detention center so we can find out who these people are and whether they should go back to the country they came from? It makes no sense.

Under a short-term budget, there is no funding to hire additional investigators for antitrafficking and smuggling cases to combat the influx of unaccompanied children at the southern border.

Under a short-term budget, no funding is provided to address Secret Service weaknesses identified after the recent White House fence-jumping incident.

Yesterday we saw concerns about how the Secret Service operates. This

time I think everybody acknowledged they could not have been expected to intervene in the drone that got dropped on the White House lawn, but it highlights again the threats that are there and why we need to ensure the Secret Service has the resources to reform itself and to make sure the President and officials are protected.

A short-term budget would delay the contract for the Coast Guard's eighth national security cutter we need for maritime security.

In New Hampshire, we have a border with the ocean, so we very much appreciate the work of the Coast Guard, but I think it is critical throughout the country. And one of the things that would be put on hold is upgrading the Coast Guard's ice-breaking fleet.

Last winter alone, when the Great Lakes froze, \$705 million in shipping was lost and 3,800 jobs because we didn't have a Coast Guard ice-breaker that can open a channel on the Great Lakes.

Under a short-term budget, aging nuclear weapons equipment will not be replaced. That causes gaps in an area where mistakes are simply unacceptable and too dangerous even to comprehend.

A short-term budget would delay upgrades to emergency communications for first responders—something I have already talked about—as we think about how they respond to local emergencies.

The best way forward is to provide certainty and stability for the men and women who fulfill homeland security's mission to protect the United States from harm. To ensure our local communities and our States that we are providing the resources they need, we need to pass a clean bill—a clean bill that was agreed to last December.

Lurching from funding crisis to funding crisis is a terrible way to govern. It is an especially terrible way to govern when our Nation is dealing with major threats. The clean bill that was agreed to by the House and Senate last December provides a good budget that strengthens our Nation, protects against known threats, properly supports homeland security and those who serve on the front lines of protecting this country.

The negotiated agreement includes critical increases in funding and support for border security, for cyber security, and for other national security initiatives. It maintains strong maritime security operations provided by the Coast Guard. The agreement fully funds continued cyber security advancements. It invests in innovative solutions for border security, for biological defense, and for explosives detection.

Senators on both sides of the aisle have talked about the importance of border security and a clean bill that robustly funds border security requirements. The clean bill funds customs and border protections requirements to apprehend, care for, and transmit unac-

companied alien children, while maintaining 21,370 Border Patrol agents on our borders and safely facilitating legitimate travel and trade.

The agreement also funds enhanced border security technologies as well as air and marine surveillance along our land and maritime borders to help the Department better interdict illegal crossing of people and narcotics.

It allocates grant funding to train and equip first responders, continuing real progress and efficient preparedness, as was so evident in New England in the response to the Boston marathon bombing.

And the agreement fully funds known disaster needs and prepares us for the next disaster.

In closing, let us support our national security funding by passing a clean bill to fund the Department of Homeland Security for the rest of this fiscal year.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, today I stand in support of the Keystone Pipeline project. As an Alaskan, I feel it is important to talk about this bill and the importance of American energy infrastructure.

I live in a State with one of the world's largest pipelines. In 1973, after bitter debate—similar to the debate about Keystone—Congress passed a bill that led to the construction of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System—what we in Alaska call TAPS. It almost didn't happen. The Vice President at the time, serving as the President of the Senate, cast the tie-breaking vote. Then, like now, opponents howled. They said TAPS would be an environmental disaster. They said bird and caribou populations would be decimated.

But none of that happened. In fact, birds and caribou flourished, showing we can develop energy infrastructure responsibly with the highest standards in the world. Alaska proves this every day. TAPS was completed in 1978. It has carried almost 17 billion barrels of oil to energy-thirsty American markets. It is a technological and environmental marvel and a critical component of America's energy infrastructure. It has been a resounding success for this country and for my State. It is the engine of growth for Alaska's economy. The proven safest, most environmentally responsible way to transport oil is through a pipeline. I am certain Keystone will also prove a success.

In supporting Keystone, I am also standing for a larger, more important principle—the ideal that the Federal Government should be a partner in opportunity, a partner in progress, not an obstacle. I am standing in support of what has defined this country for centuries—the idea of the American dream.

The American dream is still alive in my home State. Yes, we have major challenges, like all States. But in Alaska, we still have hope. We still dream

big dreams, and TAPS helps fuel these dreams.

In Alaska, the very air we breathe is bathed in promise. The people still speak the language of bold ideas and rugged adventure. It is these people of all colors and creeds who make up the tapestry of Alaska that give us our strength. It is the enormous opportunities of our natural resources—whether world-class fisheries or oil and gas reserves—that drive the economic engine of my State.

But despite this promise and opportunity, I also see anxiety and frustration, and even fear, in the eyes of my fellow Alaskans, just as I know others are seeing this across the country. Despite what we are hearing from this administration, Americans have real reasons to feel this way.

Business startups are at a 35-year low, as is the percentage of Americans actually looking for work. More small businesses failed than were started this past year. Over three-quarters of Americans now believe their kids' future will be less promising than their own.

Believing that we will leave our children a better tomorrow is the essence of the American dream. But for many, that dream is starting to fade. This does not have to be. We live in a State and a country with so much untapped potential, so many opportunities, and so much promise that can bring limitless possibilities for our kids and our grandkids. Yet, in Alaska and throughout America, people are feeling that the heavy hand of the Federal Government is not working in their interests.

The boldness of America is being bludgeoned by bureaucrats, with new Executive orders and regulations arising everywhere. And every time another one of those unneeded, often absurd, regulations is promulgated, a little bit of hope dies.

A little bit of hope dies every time a doctor's office is shuttered or someone loses health care because of the complexities and costs of ObamaCare.

A little hope dies when a rural community wants to build a road that will protect its citizens and is told by the Secretary of the Interior that birds are more important than their lives.

And a lot of hope dies when the people in my State are told that the resources that are rightfully theirs can't be developed, and their lands and waters can't be fished and hunted to put food on their table.

I support the Keystone Pipeline. It will create thousands of jobs. That is why it has the overwhelming support of American labor unions. It will enhance America's energy infrastructure and contribute billions to our economy. That is why it has the support of the American people.

But just one bill, one pipeline, one project is not enough. It is not nearly enough.

Since the founding of this country we have had important debates right here, on this floor, about the role of the Federal Government in our lives. Judging

from what Americans are telling us, the reach of the Federal Government has hit its limits, it has exceeded its limits. Our citizens are telling us that their government—and it is their government—has gone well beyond deriving its powers from the consent of the government. What the American people are telling us, what Alaskans are telling me is they want a Federal Government that helps ignite their hope, not smother it.

We have a job to do. We must work to address the anxiety and frustration of the people we serve. We must work to once again unleash the great potential that is Alaska and America. And we must work to reinvigorate faith in the American dream.

How do we do this? Let me suggest two ideas.

First, we must stop delaying economic projects that benefit our citizens. Purposeful delays and roadblocks have been the hallmark of this administration's approach to infrastructure projects that benefit Americans, and Alaska has been ground zero for such delays. Bridges, roads, mines that take years simply to permit, not to build; oil wells that cannot be drilled on Federal lands despite billions of dollars of leases from the private sector to the Federal Government; a state-of-the-art clean coal plant that sits idle for over a decade despite the dire need for lower cost energy throughout Alaska.

The Keystone Pipeline, a project that has been studied for 6 years, is just the latest example of the willful delay that has been the weapon of choice for this administration for killing projects they don't like.

Enough is enough. We are Americans. We know what we are capable of. We built the 1,700-mile Alaskan-Canadian Highway, the Alcan Highway, through some of the world's most rugged terrain, in less than a year. We built the Empire State Building in 410 days. The Pentagon was built in 16 months. There is no reason that Keystone should have been studied for 6 years.

If the executive branch continues to dither on America's economic future, Congress can and should act to expedite such projects. That is what we are doing with Keystone, and that is what I will be pressing the Congress to do for Alaska's and America's next great energy infrastructure project—the Alaska LNG project—which will create thousands of jobs and provide clean and affordable energy to Americans and our allies for decades.

Second, we need more, not less, access to our Federal lands. As Americans, these are our lands. We own them. They are not the Department of the Interior's or BLM's lands. Yet this administration is adamant on keeping us from responsibly developing them. Once again, Alaska is ground zero for their efforts.

Through Executive orders of various dubious legal merit, this administration locked up half the National Petroleum Reserve of Alaska. This isn't a

national park. NPRA is an area specifically set aside by Congress for oil and gas development. And just this weekend, in another brazen action, the Obama administration announced they are working to lock up millions of acres of land on Alaska's coastal plain, some of the Nation's richest oil and gas prospects.

This is an affront to Alaskans and Americans who cherish security—energy security—the rule of law, and the strength of our Nation, and it is an affront to Members of Congress regardless of party. How we develop Alaska's lands is an area where Congress, not the Executive, has preeminent authority.

I think the Obama administration needs a reminder of what article 4, section 3 of the Constitution states:

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States . . .

This brings me to my third point: We must get back to the rule of law. The rule of law, carefully built up and nurtured for centuries in America, is a fundamental pillar of our great Nation. Most countries don't have it. We do. It is a gift. But if we continue to erode this rule of law, we ultimately undermine what it means to be an American, and it will be hard to get it back.

But I hope, because there are still enough of us here who respect the rule of law and see the Constitution not as a mere suggestion but as the foundation for the structure of our government and our individual liberties. There have been cracks in the foundation recently, but the people sent us here to repair those cracks.

Fourth, while I believe in a limited Federal Government, it is important to recognize where the Federal Government does not have responsibilities, it needs to carry out its duties with more efficiency and compassion, particularly toward the most vulnerable in society. This is especially true when it comes to honoring the sacred trusts of responsibility we have toward our veterans.

That is why I cosponsored the Clay Hunt suicide prevention bill. I am confident my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will quickly vote on this important measure and move it on to the President's desk.

It is also why I will support effective programs where the Federal Government and States can work together to address our problems throughout this country with regard to sexual assault and domestic violence.

Fifth, and finally, we must challenge the conventional wisdom that has existed in this town for decades that the Federal Government's power and intrusiveness should always be expanding like some inevitable force of nature. Nowhere is this more important than reforming the overgrown regulatory thicket that strangles our future.

According to the President's own Small Business Administration, Federal regulations impose an annual burden on our economy of close to \$2 trillion. That is roughly \$15,000 per year per American family. Federal regulations are sapping our strength as a Nation. So many of them don't make sense, and others are not authorized by law or the Constitution as they must be. And, increasingly, those who promulgate and enforce them are showing less and less restraint for the well-being of our citizens.

The recent Obama administration ANWR assault is the latest example, and I will use all of my power to protect the economic growth and prosperity of Alaska. That is why I have already filed amendments with Senator MURKOWSKI to rescind the Obama administration's ANWR order.

I have also filed an amendment that seeks to check another abuse of Federal power. When the EPA was initially authorized in 1970, no one thought it necessary to arm its employees with weapons. But today, in a classic case of Federal Government power creep, close to 200 armed EPA agents are roaming our country. It is a disturbing fact.

But it was particularly disturbing for a small group of miners who, during the summer of 2013, prospecting for gold in Chicken, AK, were swarmed by armed EPA agents.

This wasn't some huge mining conglomerate. This was a small mining operation in interior Alaska—sluice boxes with specks of Alaska gold, and EPA agents armed with rifles, body armor, a helicopter overhead, looking for Clean Water Act violations. They found none. And apart from terrifying the miners, they accomplished nothing.

As Alaska's former attorney general and commissioner of Natural Resources, I have worked with many fine Federal agents, and I understand the importance of sensible regulations that are based on the directives of Congress. But problems arise when regulations become excessive—and big problems arise when regulators are given guns to enforce these regulations. It is our responsibility to say: Enough; to stand up for those we serve, and to roll back Federal power when necessary.

I am all for a country with an armed citizenry. As a marine, I have taken an oath to defend and fight for this critical constitutional freedom. However, I am not for a country with an armed bureaucracy.

Let's give my State and the rest of the country a little hope that we are doing the jobs they sent us here to do. One concrete step in that direction would be to pass this simple amendment I am offering to disarm the EPA. They can certainly do their job without having guns. They have done so in the past, and they should be able to do so in the future.

Finally, I will close with a few words on how I view my mission here. I suspect it doesn't differ greatly from what most of us hope to accomplish. We all

want the best for the people we serve and the States we represent. We want to be strong here at home, which will help us be respected once again by our allies and feared by our adversaries. We want our children to be safe and secure, and we want the same for our neighbor.

We want to live in a country of unlimited opportunity—a country of Alaska-sized dreams. We want a government that holds dear what our Founding Fathers knew—that all powers are derived from the consent of the governed. I think most of us can agree that we must unleash our country's enormous economic potential once again.

I believe our government should be helping us, not hindering us from achieving these efforts. I believe unlocking our country's vast energy potential is one of the best ways to re-ignite the American dream.

Despite challenges, despite big government's creep into our lives, and despite armed EPA agents, we continue to live in the greatest country in the world—in the history of the world. There is no doubt about that. The people who sent us here still have big dreams and big hopes. Let's help those dreams grow and their hopes flourish.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). The majority leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate our new colleague from Alaska on his initial address to the Senate and just comment that it could not be more timely, as his State is obviously under assault by this administration. His prescription for the way forward, both for Alaska and America, strikes me as entirely appropriate for our country, and I congratulate our colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. I wish to thank the majority leader for his kind words and all my other colleagues who came to witness a new Senator's maiden speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I also wish to congratulate our new colleague from Alaska. Well said, and welcome. The two Senators from Alaska have dominated the start of this new session, and we are glad they have because they are bringing very important legislation and decisions to this body. So I congratulate both the senior and junior Senators from Alaska for their efforts, and I look forward to working together to accomplish what we all want to accomplish—a growing economy and better opportunities for Americans. The Senator from Alaska is certainly an important component of that in leading the way to that goal.

INDIANA HEALTH CARE

Mr. President, this morning we received the announcement that after nearly 2 years of negotiations, the State of Indiana and the U.S. Depart-

ment of Health and Human Services have reached a major breakthrough, an agreement that approves Indiana's Healthy Indiana Plan 2.0 waiver application by allowing it to move forward and be implemented.

This agreement is great news for hundreds of thousands of low-income Hoosiers and a testament to the effectiveness of the current Healthy Indiana Plan. Now an expansion of that will be made possible through this waiver. It solidifies Indiana's position at the forefront of Medicaid reform and the advancement of consumer-driven health care. Those are key words—reforming a current dysfunctional and broken Medicaid system, advancing consumer-driven health care, getting consumers into the role of making decisions about their health and not just having a government agency say: This is what you can get, and this is what you cannot get or this is what makes you healthy. The Healthy Indiana Plan incentivizes consumers to determine what is best for their own health.

The Healthy Indiana Plan was originally crafted under Indiana's former Governor Mitch Daniels. He extended health care coverage to lower-income residents who earned too much to qualify for Medicaid but too little to afford quality health coverage.

The guiding principle of the original plan was simple. Individually owned and directed health care coverage has a positive effect for individual citizens and the health care system as a whole. We have proven that giving people a stake in their own health care decisions works.

Governor Daniels put it well in a 2010 Wall Street Journal article, stating:

Americans can make sound, thrifty decisions about their own health. If national policy trusted and encouraged them to do so, our sky-rocketing health care costs would decelerate.

The original plan had three main objectives: individual control of health care spending, taxpayer protection based on the stipulation that enrollment could not grow faster than available funding, and disease prevention by incentivizing preventive care.

Then in 2013 our current Governor, Mike Pence, announced plans to reform and expand the original Healthy Indiana Plan to cover more low-income Hoosiers. Today, after more than a year and a half of negotiations, the Healthy Indiana Plan 2.0 has received a green light from the Obama administration. Coverage will begin on February 1 of this year.

I applaud Governor Pence, and I applaud Health and Human Services Secretary Sylvia Burwell for working together to move forward to continue Indiana's successful consumer-driven approach that empowers members and provides access to quality care.

This agreement will expand an existing proven program to more than 350,000 low-income Hoosiers and allow the State of Indiana to end traditional Medicaid for all nondisabled adults between the ages of 19 and 64. They will

be transitioned into the new plan just approved through this waiver.

The answer to our Nation's health care problems is not the broken status quo of ObamaCare. Indiana has shown, and will continue to show, that reforming traditional Medicaid and offering innovative health care solutions is the right way to empower individual citizens as they seek access to quality health care. Once again, Indiana is leading the way nationally by creating State-based innovative ideas for governing.

As I serve individuals and Hoosiers here in Washington, I have often turned to what I call the Indiana model as a blueprint for a more efficient and fiscally responsible Federal Government. I developed a legislative roadmap that I call the Indiana Way—a 10-point plan that takes the model of Indiana, which it has put in place and proven over the last 10 years, and the ideas that I have gathered from Hoosiers as I travel about the State—ideas and plans that will make our State and Nation stronger. Innovative and effective solutions put forward in Indiana are what is desperately needed in Washington today to put our country back on a path to economic growth and opportunity.

I congratulate Governor Pence and our State on this terrific news, and I look forward to continuing to highlight Hoosier's success stories and the Indiana way.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I wish to acknowledge my colleague from Alaska, and I appreciate the comments he made this morning in his first speech on the Senate floor and in choosing to clearly focus on the opportunities that we have as a State and the challenges we face.

I do feel it is unfortunate that, as a State, it seems that our largest battle is against our own federal government. How unfortunate is that? I feel very fortunate to have him as a partner here in the Senate as we take on these initiatives that have such impact and are of such import to our State and to how we fit with the other 49 States. We have no shortage of issues to take up when it comes to Federal overreach and the impact it has on our Nation and our State and how we will be able to develop our resources. I look forward to working with the Senator in these different areas.

I do have to comment, given where we are in the discussions here on the Senate floor about the Keystone XL Pipeline and what benefit that infrastructure will provide to this country by way of a resource that will help us with our energy security and truly helps us with our national security, is it not better to receive oil from our friend and our ally Canada than it is from Venezuela? To me these are subjects that should not even merit that level of discussion because it is just common sense.

Yet this President and his administration have taken 6 years to get to a point where they may decide on this issue. It has taken 6 years to decide whether it is in our country's best interest to receive oil from a friend and neighbor rather than from those who would do us ill. And then in a stunning act on Sunday—in one breath—this administration has taken an area that has been identified as the greatest source of oil potential that we have in this country, outside of Prudhoe Bay, with an estimated mean average of 10.3 billion barrels, which could provide 1 million additional barrels a day that would come down the Trans-Alaska Pipeline, which my colleague has talked about, and would help us to provide our Nation with the resource we need and would not only help us from a jobs and energy perspective but also from a security perspective.

On one hand, the President is saying, nope, I think I would rather continue to receive oil from Venezuela and Nigeria and all these other countries, and then on Sunday he just decides to put it off limits—the greatest source of oil we have identified in this country to date.

Just this morning, the President released his 5-year lease-sale plan, which is putting off—not deferring but withdrawing—areas in the Beaufort and the Chukchi, which will limit our opportunity for the 23 billion barrels of potential in the offshore there.

As my colleague has noted, the President has taken off half of the national petroleum reserve—the area we have designated for accessing our oil and gas resources. There is a move underfoot right now where this administration, I believe, is going to make the first production in NPRA and push it to a place where it will be uneconomic.

We have a stunning situation. This administration says they want an all of the above energy policy, except maybe in Alaska. We can't do it in ANWR. We are going to push you off of NPRA, and offshore we are going to make it that much more difficult for you. We are going to put the throttle on Alaska's energy opportunities for this country. We are going to put the throttle on Canada and say: Don't run it through the United States—not down into the gulf coast where we have these refineries.

What is he doing? He is putting our national security at risk with actions such as these.

So when we talk about Keystone XL, this is more than just a pipe or piece of infrastructure crossing the border. We are talking about energy security and national security. Then we have actions from this administration this week that choke off Alaska's energy opportunities. This is why I need my colleague in this fight. Believe me, the Alaska delegation is prepared for it.

It just causes us to wonder why. What are they thinking? What about energy security and national security for this country? We have the potential

to be secure. North American energy independence is not a myth. It is real. But we have to have the will to make it happen—we certainly have the resources. We just need the ability, the opportunity to be able to develop them. So get out of the way and let us do that.

My colleague from Washington and I have been working all morning trying to see if we can't identify a series of amendments that we might be able to move to this afternoon. We would like to give colleagues a sense of how we are going to be advancing through these additional amendments, get some additional amendments up pending, and really lay out that process. I think we have had really constructive conversation this morning, and I am encouraged. Obviously, we have a few more issues to work out, but I am hopeful we will be able to announce—hopefully in the short term—a glide-path that will give Members a little more certainty.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECESS

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

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:46 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE ACT— Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

GUANTANAMO DETAINEES

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today I rise in support of S. 165, which restores many of the terrorist detainee transfer safeguards that were weakened in the fiscal year 2014 National Defense Authorization Act, as well as imposes a 2-year bar on the transfer of detainees to Yemen.

This legislation has been authored by Senator KELLY AYOTTE, one of the Senate's foremost leaders on national security, and its cosponsors include the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Senator JOHN MCCAIN, and the chairman of the Select Committee on Intelligence, Senator RICHARD BURR, as well as the Senate's preeminent expert on military law, Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM.

I am honored to add my name to the list of Senators who have cosponsored this legislation.

Mr. President, the effect of this legislation is to preserve the ability of the