

It is their right, as guaranteed by the National Labor Relations Act and by the First Amendment of our Constitution. So when workers want to vote on whether to form a union, they are not looking for special treatment. They are simply trying to exercise their basic rights. We as a nation should not turn our backs on empowering workers through collective bargaining, especially because that is the very thing that helped so many workers climb into the middle class.

In Congress, we need to continue to work to expand economic security for more families. That should be our mission to move our country forward. This resolution would simply be a step backward.

Instead of attacking workers who just want a voice in the workplace, I hope my colleagues will reject this resolution. I hope Republicans will join Democrats and work with us to protect workers' rights, increase wages, and grow our Nation's middle class.

I truly hope we can break through the gridlock and work together on policies that create jobs, expand economic security, and generate broad-based economic growth for workers and families—not just the wealthiest few.

Mr. NELSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield back all our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate having been expired, the joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 67 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Alexander	Blunt	Capito
Ayotte	Boozman	Cassidy
Barrasso	Burr	Coats

Cochran  
Collins  
Corker  
Cornyn  
Cotton  
Crapo  
Cruz  
Daines  
Enzi  
Ernst  
Fischer  
Flake  
Gardner  
Graham  
Grassley

Hatch  
Heller  
Hoever  
Inhofe  
Isakson  
Johnson  
Kirk  
Lankford  
Lee  
McCain  
McConnell  
Moran  
Paul  
Perdue  
Portman

Risch  
Roberts  
Rounds  
Rubio  
Sasse  
Scott  
Sessions  
Shelby  
Sullivan  
Thune  
Tillis  
Toomey  
Vitter  
Wicker

NAYS—46

Baldwin  
Bennet  
Blumenthal  
Booker  
Boxer  
Brown  
Cantwell  
Cardin  
Carper  
Casey  
Coons  
Durbin  
Feinstein  
Franken  
Gillibrand  
Heinrich

Heitkamp  
Hirono  
Kaine  
King  
Klobuchar  
Leahy  
Manchin  
Markey  
McCaskill  
Menendez  
Merkley  
Mikulski  
Murkowski  
Murphy  
Murray  
Nelson

Peters  
Reed  
Reid  
Sanders  
Schatz  
Schumer  
Shaheen  
Stabenow  
Tester  
Udall  
Warner  
Warren  
Whitehouse  
Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Donnelly

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 8) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 8

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the National Labor Relations Board relating to representation case procedures (published at 79 Fed. Reg. 74308 (December 15, 2014)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.*

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the veto message on S. 1, the cloture motion be withdrawn, and at 2:30 p.m. today the Senate vote on the question of overriding the President's veto of S. 1, the Keystone bill, with the time equally divided in the usual form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Is there any way the time could be changed from 2:30 p.m. to 2:20 p.m., otherwise there are four people who may miss their planes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the majority leader so modify his request?

Mr. MCCONNELL. The request is that the vote occur when?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At 2:20 p.m. instead of 2:30 p.m.

Mr. MCCONNELL. That is fine.

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

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, the vote on the veto override will occur at 2:20 p.m. Senators should be in the Chamber and prepared to vote from

their seats. This will be the last roll-call vote of the week.

#### KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE APPROVAL ACT—VETO

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Veto message to accompany S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 2:20 p.m. will be equally divided.

Who yields time?

If no one yields time, the time will be divided equally.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary order at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is on the veto message to accompany S. 1.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, if we could have order in the Senate, I wish to open debate on S. 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Senator CANTWELL will be comanaging this bill, and I thank her very much for her strong leadership.

The vote that is going to occur at 2:20 p.m. is a very important vote.

I rise today to oppose the attempt to override President Obama's veto message of S. 1, the very first bill the Senate majority brought to the floor.

As I look at this bill, it says to me that the only people who are helped by this bill are the big Canadian special oil interests.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, the Senate is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, the Keystone Pipeline is presented as something that is going really to help this economy and help oil prices. I think the only thing it helps, frankly, are the special interests in Canada—the special big oil interests—which, by the way, will carry the filthiest, dirtiest, tar sands oil into our great Nation.

If we look at the history of the tar sands, we will find that misery follows the tar sands. We still have terrible problems in Michigan and Arkansas because there was a spill of this dirty, filthy oil, and they cannot clean it up because it is so, so difficult to clean.

This is a picture of a tar sands spill in 2013 in Mayflower, AR. That has not been cleaned up because this is tar sands oil. We had a spill in Michigan, and we know that since 2011 they have not been able to clean up that spill. So why would we build a pipeline to bring dirty, filthy oil into our great Nation and our great communities when we know the dangers?

Mr. President, I ask again that there be order in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I know Senators have an opportunity to talk to one another, and I appreciate that, but it is hard to make our thoughts come out right when there is so much talking in the Senate.

I thank the Presiding Officer very much.

Here is the deal. Why on Earth would the Republicans make the first bill a bill to help Canadian special oil interests that will bring in tar sands oil and has caused terrible problems for our communities? It is the hardest oil to clean up. Why would they do it, and why would they go against public opinion?

A recent ABC News/Washington Post poll showed that 61 percent of Americans support the President's position on this pipeline, which is: Don't stop the process. Keep it going. Let's see what this does to our people and to our communities.

I spend a lot of time on environmental issues, and I am saying to you that as you look at the environmental laws of our great Nation, we find that they brought such a better quality of life to people. We can turn that around if we decide at this point—there are all of the challenges we face in our communities, such as, the challenges of lung disease, the challenges of heart disease, and the challenges of stroke. That is what happens from the pollution we get from the tar sands oil.

Earlier I said that misery follows tar sands. I met with the Canadian people who live near the tar sands excavation site. They have terrible rates of cancer.

The bottom line is that because of climate change—and we see it all around us. Just the other day we learned a remote Alaskan village has to be relocated due to climate. We know the impact of this dirty tar sands oil on that, and we know what happens when the tar sands pipeline spills. We know all of these things.

I think the President is right by allowing the process to continue. He was very right to veto this bill, and I hope we will have enough votes to sustain his veto.

I yield the floor for my friend Senator CANTWELL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I rise to urge my colleagues not to override the President's veto of this special-interest piece of legislation.

I wish to thank my colleague from California for her leadership on this issue and for her constant involvement in making sure that national environmental and safety standards are adhered to. She has been a great advocate throughout this process and I very much appreciate her voice as we close the debate about the Keystone Pipeline legislation.

This bill to approve the Keystone Pipeline undermines a well-established process for determining what is in the

national interests. If we override the President's veto, we would be subverting safety and environmental standards that are important to the American people.

I am glad the President vetoed this legislation, and I urge my colleagues not to override the decision. I think the President's veto message said it best:

Through this bill, the United States Congress attempts to circumvent longstanding and proven processes for determining whether or not building and operating a cross-border pipeline serves the national interest.

... And because this act of Congress conflicts with established executive branch procedures and cuts short thorough consideration of issues that could bear on our national interest—including our security, safety, and environment—it has earned my veto.

So the President sums it up pretty much, I think. Why circumvent the process? The people who have been advocates for the pipeline have been circumventing the process all the way through. They circumvented the process by not going through the utility commission in their State, the public utility commission, and instead wrote legislation around that. That legislation has been challenged in court. The rest of it has been an enormous process here in Washington, DC. While the company was negotiating with the State Department, it was also supporting efforts to circumvent that process at the State Department and just get a rubberstamp on their permit, saying "project approved." I think this project, as does every other project in the United States of America, should follow the rules.

While we spent the better part of January considering this legislation, there were other events that transpired. We heard a lot about the routing and that it was a settled matter. Since January, it is worth noting that Nebraska landowners have taken new steps to defend their rights as private property owners. On January 9, 2015, the Nebraska Supreme Court upheld a special carveout of TransCanada to site the Keystone XL Pipeline. They did this even though four judges who addressed the question said this carveout was unconstitutional.

After the setback, several landowners whose property would be seized along the proposed route filed a new suit and hopefully stopped the seizure of their land. Last month—just this past February—two Nebraska district courts have issued temporary injunctions enjoining TransCanada's effort to acquire rights of way to support the Keystone Pipeline by eminent domain. So at this moment here in the Senate, with the vote imminent, the pipeline's route through Nebraska is still in doubt because the new lawsuit challenges the Governor's ability to approve it.

It is also worth noting that South Dakota will hold a new hearing on the proposed route of the pipeline through their State in May. At this time we simply don't know whether South Dakota will make the same decision it did

when it first approved the route 3 years ago. The situation in Nebraska and South Dakota makes it clear that even if this bill were to become law, the Keystone Pipeline will not get built any time soon.

I know my colleagues would like to rush the process, and they will talk about all of the various steps in the process where this project got delayed. But who said building a pipeline through the United States of America by a foreign interest should get "expedited approval" stamped on it from the very beginning? That is what they have done. They have circumvented what is the process in the State, which should have been through the utilities commission, and they have tried to circumvent the process here in the Senate.

So I hope we will not override the President's veto, but give the President of the United States the ability to still consider these national interests of the environment and security.

We had a pretty robust debate here on the Senate floor, and many of the issues that would have been important my colleagues voted to say we shouldn't consider—environmental issues. So I get that on the other side of the aisle, there are people who want to give a pass-go, a speedy permit to this process. I urge my colleagues to not override the President, but allow him to do the homework that is needed on security, on the environment, and on making sure that due process is followed.

I ask my colleagues to not override the President's veto.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I came here to speak on another topic, but let me interject in light of the comments from our colleagues from across the aisle on the Keystone XL Pipeline. Everybody says, on a bipartisan basis, We want job-creating legislation. We want to facilitate the creation of new jobs here in America. When it comes to voting, our friends across the aisle seem to be stuck on voting against job-creating legislation, because our State Department has estimated that as many as 42,000 jobs would be created by the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline.

The thing that mystifies me the most about this debate is at last count, we had roughly 2.5 million miles of pipelines crisscrossing America. I have come to the floor before and I have suggested that people might want to do a search on their laptop or on their tablet for oil and gas pipelines, and they will see a map of those pipelines, and it looks like a spaghetti bowl, because they are everywhere. Indeed, we also know this is the most efficient and the safest way to transport natural gas and crude as well.

So I remain mystified by the fact that the President and many in his party seem determined to try to kill what is clearly job-creating, energy-

providing legislation that would be from a friendly source.

THE ISRAELI PRIME MINISTER'S SPEECH TO CONGRESS

Mr. President, turning to the Middle East, yesterday, as we all know, Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu delivered what can only be characterized as a powerful and important message about the common threats to the national security of Israel and the United States. Again, only in Washington would a speech such as this be controversial. I think most people would be concerned enough about the subject matter of what he talked about that they would want to hear the insights and information he delivered in that speech. It was a powerful and important message, and really a call to arms for the United States and our allies in Israel against the threat of radical Islam, particularly in the form of Iranian terrorism.

His words reminded me why—as I know many on both sides of the aisle agree—we have no closer Middle Eastern ally than Israel. Unfortunately, his speech also reinforced the belief I have held for many years that we have no bigger adversary in the Middle East than Iran.

The cold, hard truth is that today, more than ever, Iran is a terror-sponsoring theocracy that is actively pursuing a nuclear weapons capability and trying to establish an Iranian axis of power from Tehran to Damascus to Beirut to Gaza. Iran claims a right to enrich uranium for peaceful purposes, but its leaders have routinely lied and attempted to deceive inspectors in the past as a matter of standard practice.

Prime Minister Netanyahu also reminded all of us whose memories might have dimmed that over the last 30 years, Iran has engaged in a war by proxy against the United States and our allies. I was reminded by a member of my staff of an article that came out in 2011 in the *National Journal*. The heading of it is: "Record Number of U.S. Troops Killed by Iranian Weapons." It tells the tragic story that June of 2011 was the deadliest month in 2 years for U.S. troops, with 14 killed. These were primarily by Iranian-backed militias using very deadly weapons called explosively formed penetrators that could literally cut through the steel in our humvees and other armored vehicles like a hot knife through butter.

So given this track record that we were reminded of by the Prime Minister yesterday, and just the remainder that I have tried to provide here with this article, do we really believe that Iran would use its nuclear weapons in a way that would not make the world more unstable and less safe? Do we really believe that Iran, were they to get a nuclear weapon, won't give it to the same proxies that have been killing Americans and our allies in the Middle East and around the world, including the Shia militia, Hezbollah, Hamas, or the dictator in Syria, Bashar al-Assad,

who has now killed roughly 200,000 of his own civilians in a civil war, and with almost 13 million people displaced not only internally, within Syria, but in neighboring countries and the like?

So as the P5+1 negotiations involving the United States continue, there remain serious questions about Iran's true nuclear intentions and about whether the deal the Obama administration is eagerly finalizing—whether it will cement Iran's status as a nuclear threshold nation. Based on some of the details we know so far, many of which are being held very close to the vest by the administration and not being made known to Congress, much less the American people, the President's deal would abandon longstanding U.S. policy of preventing a nuclear-armed Iran, period.

I remember when the former Secretary of Defense, Senator Hagel at the time—he became the Secretary of the Department of Defense—when asked about our policy toward Iran, stumbled a little bit in his answer but ultimately said that containment was not our policy. Our policy was to prevent Iran from getting a nuclear weapon. But it appears now that the deal that is being negotiated on the President's behalf by Secretary Kerry would abandon that longstanding U.S. policy of preventing Iran from getting a nuclear weapon. Instead, it would opt for a feeble 10-year containment plan. Such an outcome would be both dangerous and unacceptable.

So while I was glad to hear Leader MCCONNELL announce yesterday that the Senate will soon consider bipartisan legislation that would give Congress the authority to approve any agreement that is reached by the administration, that was quickly replaced by confusion when I read that some of my Democratic colleagues, who have shown great courage in urging that Congress have a role in approving any negotiated agreement between Tehran and the White House—now they are suggesting they might filibuster their own bill and the vote we are going to have at 5:30 on Monday.

Yesterday, for example, one of our colleagues who had been a key sponsor of this bipartisan legislation said that he was outraged—outraged—that the Senate would vote on the very bill that bears his name. He indicated his outrage with the Senate not for voting on the substance of the bill, but basically because of the timing. He thought the timing was wrong. In other words, he opposes voting on his own bill because of the Senate procedures and the process. I don't know how we explain that back home. I couldn't sell that to my constituents in Texas, saying, I am a sponsor of this legislation; I think it is important and the right thing to do, but I am going to vote against it because I disagree with the majority leader's timing, or the procedure by which the majority leader is bringing this to a vote and debate in the U.S. Senate. Good luck explaining that to our constituents.

I suspect who is also not concerned with the process are the Israeli Government and the millions of innocent civilians who stared down an Iranian regime bent upon their annihilation every day. I suspect they could care less about the process. What they want to do is to stop Iran from getting the bomb.

So I sincerely hope everyone here who has supported Israel and embraced a policy of blocking Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon will calm down and work together and consider this important piece of legislation. Because as we heard yesterday, again, from Prime Minister Netanyahu, it has profound implications for both our national security as well as the security of our best ally in the Middle East.

Before the Obama administration initiated these misguided negotiations, Congress had created incredible economic pressure on the regime in Tehran through sanctions backed by the threat of military action. It also has helped, frankly, that America is now producing more oil, and the price of oil is now down around \$50 a barrel, more or less. That has put incredible financial pressure on Tehran itself, because they have basically had to finance their terrorist ambitions around the world through these various proxies by use of high oil prices. But we had imposed tremendous sanctions on Tehran, which, of course, the administration is now in the process of rolling back.

I believe an approach of tough sanctions is one we must return to as quickly as possible. The President and some of his friends have suggested it is either this deal or war. That is a false choice. That is not true. It is either this deal or tougher sanctions, sanctions designed along with the credible threat of military action if Tehran continues on its path to get a nuclear weapon that I believe will ultimately have the best chance of success and deter them from getting it.

The concept of good-faith negotiation, though, strikes me as a little implausible when you are dealing with the rogue regime and state-sponsored terrorism. We simply cannot trust the Iranian leadership with nuclear weapons. Yet, sadly, the President seems to be traveling down a path to secure what he views as a legacy foreign policy accomplishment when he should be implementing an Iran policy that would best safeguard America and our allies for years to come.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, protecting the President's veto of the Keystone XL Pipeline Approval Act is about protecting the review process for this project. The President deserves to have all of the input from the different agencies delivered to him so he can make his decision.

Today in the vote that we will be having shortly, we are saying the

President should be able to exercise his prerogative to review the pipeline and to decide whether it is in the national interest to have this pipeline constructed through the United States of America. But we are also protecting his prerogative to decide in the end, because this is a pipeline that should be rejected on its merits.

The pipeline fails the test on job creation. After it is built, it will only have 35 to 40 permanent jobs that the United States will have on its soil. Meanwhile, we should be having a debate about the wind production tax credit because if we extended that, we would keep 30,000 people working permanently here in the United States, as this wind revolution continues to explode. Last year, there were 5,000 megawatts of solar energy installed in the United States. That is like five huge powerplants. This year 7,500 megawatts, at least, of solar are going to be installed in the United States. And next year 10,000 megawatts, at least, in solar are going to be installed. But that tax break is expiring at the end of 2016. You would think there would be an urgency here on the floor of the Senate to debate the wind tax break and the solar tax break which will create upwards of 250,000 jobs in the United States.

We already have 175,000 people working in the solar industry, but there is no urgency to take up wind and solar. But a pipeline from Canada taking the dirtiest oil in the world, tar sands—tar. Think about that, tar. The tar has to be actually melted down so it can be put into a pipeline. It is tar, the dirtiest oil in the world, and then a pipeline like a straw through the United States of America, built right down to Port Arthur, TX.

What is so unique about Port Arthur, TX? I will tell you right now. It is a tax-free export zone, and so there is the plan for the Canadians—build a pipeline like a straw through the United States, right down to a tax-free export zone, and then get that oil out of the United States of America.

Why is that? I will tell you right now that the price for oil in the United States is now \$12 less than it is if you can get it out onto the global market. Per barrel, \$12 less. You don't have to go to Harvard Business School to get a degree to put that business plan on a 3-by-5 card. Get it out of the United States, and you will make \$12 a barrel more.

The advocates for the pipeline say that is not going to happen. That is why I made the amendment on the Senate floor. The oil will not be exported. If we are going to take all of the environmental risks, then we should receive the benefits of the oil being here in the United States.

Why is that important? It is important for this reason: We are—the United States is—the largest importer of oil in the world. China does not import as much oil as we do. We are the leader. You might see these ads on television where the American Petroleum

Institute and other oil companies advertise that with regard to what a great job we are doing in producing more oil in the United States. And we are producing more oil in the United States. Let's take note of that. The truth is we are still 5 million barrels a day short. This pipeline will be moving maybe 800,000 barrels of oil from Canada right through the United States, which could reduce our dependence upon imported oil, but it is going through a tax-free export zone. So we know what is going to happen.

Why is that important? It is important because we export young men and women in uniform every single day to the Middle East to protect the ships with oil coming into the United States that we import from Kuwait, from Saudi Arabia, from the other countries around the world. So why would we be exporting oil out of the United States while we are exporting young men and women in uniform out of America who then protect oil coming back in from countries in the Middle East? That makes no sense.

That is what this pipeline is all about. It is all about getting some benefit for the United States. Climate change, big loser. It is the dirtiest oil in the world. The Canadians actually escape paying the tax in the event that there is an oilspill. They don't have to pay into that fund, either, that American oil companies do. And then notwithstanding their ads on television that say they are going to keep the oil in the United States, they bitterly object to any provision being voted here that keeps it in the United States while they run ads on television saying North American energy independence, that is their greatest goal.

You can't have it both ways. Life is not like that. Either your ads are saying what your goal is, North American energy independence, or you are going to export it. But you can't have it both ways, do one thing on television and then another thing in real life and say to the Senate, please don't put any restrictions on our ability to export this oil. That is the challenge for us here.

By the way, one other thing. If we keep the oil here in the United States, that is going to keep a pressure to keep the price of gasoline lower, because the more oil we have here in the United States, the lower the price of gasoline. Every time there is a 1-penny reduction in the price of gasoline, it is \$1 billion that goes into the pocket of consumers in America. One penny equals a billion. So when the price of oil, gasoline, drops 10 cents, that is \$10 billion. When it drops \$1, that is \$100 billion. It is down by \$1. It is down by more than \$1 over where it was this time last year. That is a lot of money that goes as a stimulus into the pockets of Americans who can spend it on other things. But this oil is going out of the country, so the pressure it would keep to help our manufacturers, to help our drivers, is not going to exist. It fails on each one of these items: One, it gets ex-

ported. Two, they don't pay their full taxes, or any at all, to the Oilspill Liability Fund. We don't keep it here to keep the price lower for American drivers. I understand the Canadians want to make the most money by getting out of the open market. That hurts you. That hurts us. That hurts our drivers. That is the challenge.

It fails each one of these tests. It fails on the climate change. It fails on the export test because it goes overseas. It fails on the tax issue. It fails on the process issue of trying to short-circuit the President's prerogative to be able to consider this in a comprehensive sense.

The President has correctly vetoed this bill. The President is standing up for the American taxpayer, for the American consumer, for the environment of the United States. He is asking the right questions. He is doing the right things.

I urge my colleagues here on the Senate floor, within the next hour, to vote to sustain the veto of President Obama on this policy which does not advance the best interests of the United States of America.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.  
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MARKEY. I ask unanimous consent that all time within the quorum call be divided equally between the two sides.

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### HUMAN TRAFFICKING

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I rise to speak about human sex trafficking—an issue that plagues the world and our Nation. Today I join my colleagues, Senators CORNYN, WYDEN, KLOBUCHAR, and KING, in supporting legislation to help fight this evil and to stop it from spreading. Sex trafficking is real. It is affecting millions of people around the world. We should not tolerate it, and we cannot turn a blind eye. This modern-day form of slavery has continued to grow in the shadows all around us. It is time to take action.

The scale of this problem is difficult to calculate; yet many estimates, including those from the United Nations and various human rights organizations, show that millions of human

beings are being trafficked every year. Meanwhile, the criminals who force these victims into slavery profit to the tune of \$32 billion annually.

Mr. President, 300,000 children right here in the United States are at risk of becoming victims of this vile practice. Teenagers are the primary targets. These kids are being sold into a life of physical and emotional abuse. Often they are runaways who flee violent households looking for a way out. Women and girls represent a disproportionate amount of those trafficked around the world, but this does affect all of us. The pain and suffering victims experience is hard to describe in words. Simply put, it is evil. We must do more to stop this plague, and our work begins by setting a clear example.

This Sunday we will commemorate International Women's Day. As we celebrate the progress women have made here in the United States and around the world, we must also use this moment to remind ourselves of the work that still needs to be done.

As I mentioned, Senator CORNYN and I, along with several of our colleagues, introduced a new bill to address this issue. This legislation would set up a deficit-neutral fund to support people abused by sex trafficking. Through enhanced reporting and mechanisms that would reduce demand, this bill can serve as the next step in providing care for victims of trafficking and child pornography. Furthermore, Senator CORNYN's bill protects victims in courts by treating the traffickers as violent criminals. By labeling traffickers in this way, convicts can now be detained while they await their judicial proceeding. Funding for the bill comes from increased fines placed on those convicted of trafficking.

While nothing can erase the pain inflicted on these victims, we must do what we can to make a difference. I encourage all of my colleagues to join in this effort and stand against this vile practice.

A number of my colleagues have other bills as well. We should take the time to consider solutions that are offered by all of them. Our government has a responsibility to stand up and to act for those whose voices grow weak in the shadows of this imperfect world. This is our moment to do something. These victims do not have time to wait. We must act now.

I ask unanimous consent that all time spent in quorum calls before the 2:20 vote this afternoon be equally divided.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior 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.

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

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

150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SECOND INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT LINCOLN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today is the 150th anniversary of the second inaugural address of President Abraham Lincoln. Later on this evening there will be an observance in the Rotunda sponsored by the Illinois State Society and the Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Foundation to observe this anniversary. My colleague Senator KIRK is scheduled to be there; former Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood; Stephen Lang; and some of the most distinguished Lincoln scholars in America: Dr. Edna Greene Medford, Chief Justice Frank Williams of Rhode Island, and the most prolific Lincoln writer I know, Harold Holzer from New York.

There have been 15,000 books written about Abraham Lincoln. I think Mr. Holzer has written about half of them. He is not only prolific, but he is profound in his observations about this great man's life. He was joined by Edith Holzer, his wife, who stood by him through his Lincoln travails.

Historians disagree on whether the second inaugural address of Abraham Lincoln was his greatest speech or his second greatest. I am in the latter camp. I accord that highest honor to the Gettysburg Address for its brevity as well as its inspiration, but both speeches are immortal.

I am not a Lincoln scholar, but my life as a Springfield attorney, elected Congressman, and Senator from Illinois has taken me to some of the same streets and same buildings that were part of Abraham Lincoln's life.

Although he tried mightily to be elected to the Senate in 1858, Abraham Lincoln fell short. It was in that campaign of 1858 that he debated Stephen Douglas. At the end of the debates and when the votes were cast, Stephen Douglas was the victor in that senatorial contest in Illinois. Of course, the same two men faced off again 2 years later for the Presidency. But that Senate seat, the Douglas seat that was contested in the 1858 election, is the same seat I am honored to hold today in the State of Illinois.

We can feel Abraham Lincoln's presence in this building, particularly near the Senate Chamber. There is a magnificent room off the Senate Chamber known as the President's Room. It is one of the historic rooms in the Capitol.

It was in this room in April of 1862 that President Lincoln signed the bill outlawing slavery in the District of Columbia. It was in this room in 1965 that Dr. Martin Luther King and other leaders watched Lyndon Baines Johnson sign the Voting Rights Act, prohibiting discrimination at the polls—100 years after Lincoln's death. It was in the same room on January 20, 2009, that a newly inaugurated President Barack

Obama signed his first official documents as President of the United States. And it was in this room that Abraham Lincoln worked long into the night before his second inauguration, signing and vetoing bills passed in the final hours of one Congress, before the next Congress was sworn in. Imagine that, Congress leaving important business until the last minute.

President Lincoln was working in the President's Room on March 3, 1865, when he received an urgent message from GEN Ulysses Grant. GEN Robert E. Lee was seeking a peace conference to negotiate an end to the war. Grant asked the President, his Commander in Chief: What should I reply?

After conferring with Secretary of War Stanton and Secretary of State Seward, Lincoln sent word back to General Grant that he was not to meet with Lee "unless it be for the capitulation of General Lee's army."

The following day, in his second inaugural address, March 4, 1865, Lincoln explained more fully why he had refused Lee's request for a negotiated settlement. He said: "With firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in."

Less than 5 weeks later, General Lee surrendered unconditionally at Appomattox. The cannons would fall silent. After 4 years of horrific death and destruction, the worst war and the most costly war in the history of the United States was over. But the work was not.

President Lincoln told us in his second inaugural address the urgent challenge is not only to win the war, but to win the peace by achieving true reconciliation. Another President could certainly have been vindictive toward the South—that had been the practice of the day and it is what many people wanted in the North—but Lincoln understood that if America remained divided after the hostilities ceased, then the terrible sacrifices of war would have been in vain. So he counseled in that immortal inaugural address: "With malice toward none, charity for all." Let us bind up the wounds here, and not inflict new injuries. That was how the Union would be reunited and persevere.

Six weeks later after this speech, Abraham Lincoln was cut down by an assassin's bullet. He was, in fact, the last casualty of America's war within its own boundaries.

That address, that second inaugural address, remains the second shortest in the Nation's history, only 703 words. Lincoln spoke so briefly that many people were still arriving after he finished. As at Gettysburg, some listeners were mystified by the President's brevity. Few understood the genius of the speech at that moment. Frederick Douglass was an exception. He said to Mr. Lincoln afterwards, "Mr. Lincoln, that was a sacred effort."

In the century and a half since his death, we have made uneven progress in achieving the kind of America Abraham Lincoln believed we could be. A

full century passed before African Americans in the South were guaranteed the most basic right of citizenship, the right to vote.

If President Lincoln were here today, I think he would be happy to see how our Union has survived. I think he would be pleased and astonished to see that America had elected and reelected another lanky lawyer from Illinois, and an African American, to be our President.

I also think he would challenge us. When our government “of the people, by the people, for the people” is under threat from a cabal of secret, special interest money that can buy elections, I think President Lincoln would tell us we have unfinished work to do.

When we neglect to bind up the wounds of war of even one soldier returning from war, and neglect to care for widows and orphans, Lincoln would have reminded us that we have unfinished work to do.

And when the right to vote is under systematic attack in so many States for obvious political reasons, there is still work to do.

When Americans who work long and hard can't earn enough to provide for their families, I think Lincoln would tell us to put our shoulder to the plough and finish the work of creating a genuine opportunity for all Americans.

We can see in the second inaugural and in the Gettysburg Address one reason that Abraham Lincoln remains our greatest President. He shows us that America is capable of constant progress toward our professed creed. We can love our country and be determined to make it better.

#### TRIBUTE TO BILL BARTHOLOMAY

Mr. President, even by Chicago standards, this has been some winter. From Boston to Birmingham, AL, tens of millions of Americans have been clobbered this winter by record snowfalls. In fact, we are heading for the exits in Washington this afternoon with the threat of another winter storm.

That may be why so many of us are so happy this week is finally here and we can literally count the days until spring training of baseball begins. In cities throughout the Sun Belt, mighty Casey is smiling again. More than Punxsutawney Phil or the sighting of the first robin, spring training for many of us marks the unofficial arrival of spring.

Few people on Earth are happier about the start of the baseball season than Bill Bartholomay, a man who has done so much for the cities of Chicago and Atlanta, for the sport of baseball, and for our Nation.

Bill Bartholomay has achieved more in his one life than many talented people in five. He is phenomenally successful as an entrepreneur, and he has built some of the most successful insurance brokerage firms in the world. Bill has owned a restaurant, a candy company, and a chain of toy stores.

He helped a friend and business partner by the name of Ted Turner transform CNN from an upstart news station to one of the most powerful news organizations in the world.

Bill Bartholomay is more than a successful businessman, he is a principled civic leader and a true philanthropist. On top of all that, he is chairman emeritus of the Atlanta Braves. He is a man who half a century ago, with support from leaders, including the father of the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., brought Major League Baseball to America's Deep South. What a life.

In 1962, Bill Bartholomay and a group of investors bought the Milwaukee Braves. The Braves roster then included a lot of great legendary ballplayers. Among them was a young catcher with a rocket for an arm whose mother had to sign his first major league contract because he hadn't reached the age of 21. His name was Joe Torre. But the Braves greatest player then and ever was a man named Henry Aaron, “Hammerin’ Hank.”

In 1966, Bill Bartholomay and his partners moved the Braves from Milwaukee to Atlanta. Here is something that will do your heart good. Go to YouTube and watch the video of that magic night, April 8, 1974, when Hank Aaron broke Babe Ruth's record to become baseball's all-time home-run champ, a record he would hold for 33 years. For anyone under the age of 50, it may be impossible now to fully appreciate what that moment meant.

It was 6 years almost to the day after Dr. King's assassination. For more than a year, as Hank Aaron had closed in on Babe Ruth's fabled record of 714 home runs, he had been cheered by many, but also subjected to ugly racist threats and taunts. There were people who just seethed at the idea that Babe Ruth's immortal record would be broken by a Black baseball player.

Years later, Hank Aaron would acknowledge that the anger and the jeers were on him. They worried Bill Bartholomay too.

So watch that clip on YouTube, April 8, 1974. It was the Braves home opener against the Los Angeles Dodgers. More than 53,000 fans were standing for that great moment—a record crowd.

It is the fourth inning. Henry “Hank” Aaron is up at bat. The count is 1 and 0. And then it happens: Aaron swings and smashes the ball over the center field fence.

The fans roar. Fireworks fill the sky over the stadium. As Aaron rounds the bases, the Dodgers infielders reach out to shake his hand.

He crosses homeplate, surrounded by teammates, his beaming wife, and parents. And standing right next to him was Bill Bartholomay.

It had been a dozen years since Bill and his partners had bought the Braves and 8 years since they moved to Atlanta. Part of their reason for moving the Braves to Atlanta was because Atlanta was working hard in the 1960s to become the leading city of the new

South, a city that would move beyond the old legacy of Jim Crow to a new era.

Leaders, including Dr. King, believed that Major League Baseball could help to create that new Atlanta, and Bill Bartholomay and his partners wanted to be part of that dream. Eight years after he moved the team to Atlanta, there he stood with baseball's new home-run king, a man who had started his career in the old Negro League, who had just broken the most revered record in Major League Baseball and who would become a symbol of immense pride for Atlanta and all of America. That was one of the many great moments for the Braves under Bill Bartholomay.

Since he moved the team to Atlanta in 1966, Bill has witnessed the Braves winning 16 division championships, including a record-setting 14 in a row, 5 National League pennants. And in 1995 the Braves went all the way, winning the World Series.

Bill no longer owns the Braves, but he is still closely connected to the team and has served as the chairman emeritus since 2003. He is an active member of the MLB owners group.

Bill Bartholomay grew up in Illinois in a family where his father and grandfather had made good money in the insurance brokerage business. He was the second of two boys, and he grew up in Winnetka, IL, just outside of Chicago, in a big house. The Bartholomay family were friends with both the Wrigley family, who owned the Chicago Cubs, and the Comiskey family, who owned the White Sox.

As far back as he can remember, Bill loved baseball and so did his mom. They used to go to Cubs games together.

At North Shore Country Day School, his eighth grade phys ed instructor thought Bill loved baseball a little too much. He sent home a report card that said:

Billy is very cooperative in play activities. While his ability is not great, he makes up to a large degree by his enthusiasm and interest. My greatest concern with him is that he seems to borrow much of his ideas of conduct from professional baseball.

That teacher needn't have worried. The lessons of baseball have served Bill Bartholomay very well. They have inspired and shaped his entire amazing life.

One of Bill's favorite sayings is: “Start strong, finish strong and play all nine innings.” Translation: Give it everything you have got—no half measures.

That attitude has enabled Bill to build or even help build a number of powerful insurance brokerage firms, along with other diverse businesses.

In 2003, he became vice chairman of Willis Group Holdings, one of the largest insurance brokers in the world. He increased their presence in Chicago to the point where they became the regional headquarters of what was formerly known as Sears Tower, now



known as the Willis Tower. Today that office anchors Chicago's place as a first-rate place to operate a global company.

Bill is more than a businessman, more than a man of baseball; he is a civic leader as well. In the early 1980s, then-Chicago mayor, the late James Byrne, asked Bill to serve on the park commission, overseeing Chicago's 400 parks. Bill never said no to public service. So even though he had five teen-aged kids and a number of businesses, he said he would serve for 1 year. He ended up serving for 23 years, including many as commission chairman.

All told, three of Chicago's mayors recognized Bill's talents as a bridge builder in Chicago. He made sure the commission focused not only on the wealthy parts of the city but all of the city.

Bill created a charitable foundation and he has helped to make it work and helped millions of others. He is a generous man and he is generous in praise of others.

I wish to give a short story that I read when I was reading a book one day and stumbled on this little episode in Bill's life that really tells a story. It is a story about another baseball legend, a man by the name of Satchel Paige, who may have been the best baseball pitcher ever. He was an American treasure.

He was a star in the Negro Leagues during the Jim Crow era. He later became the first African-American pitcher in the American League and the first Negro League player elected to the Baseball Hall of Fame.

He played for an astonishing 250 teams in his 40-year career. He used to pitch year around, often on back-to-back days. He hurled exhibition games on his day off. He spent the winter months playing in Cuba, the Dominican Republic, and Mexico.

In 1968 Satchel Paige was 62 years old, and despite all the time he had played in baseball, he hadn't played long enough to qualify for a pension. He fell 6 months short. So Satchel Paige sent a letter to every Major League Baseball team asking them if they would consider hiring him as a coach, and if they would for 6 months, he would qualify for a pension.

Well, you can guess who replied. It was Bill Bartholomay. Bill Bartholomay, in a real true act of kindness, said: "Baseball would have been guilty of negligence should it not assure this legendary figure a place in the pension plan."

Bill made sure Satchel Paige got his pension. He hired him to be the Braves' pitcher-coach-trainer just long enough for him to meet his pension needs. In case there was any doubt about what he was doing, he assigned Satchel Paige the number 65, the age at which his retirement salary would kick in.

But there was another reason the Braves hired Satchel Paige. That summer—the summer of 1968—riots were raging and cities were burning across

America in the wake of Dr. King's assassination. Bill Bartholomay believed that having a bridge builder such as Satchel Paige might help diffuse tensions in Atlanta, and he was right.

Satchel did that partly by signing autographs and spending time with fans and serving as a good will ambassador. Even though his title was trainer, what Satchel Paige really wanted to do, even at age 62, was pitch. The club didn't care for the idea. They were afraid his eyesight wasn't good enough and a line drive might knock him off the mound, but Satchel insisted. He said he could tell by the crack of the bat where the ball was headed.

In 1969, Satchel Paige pitched a couple of innings in an exhibition game for the Braves' highest level minor league team, the Triple-A Richmond team. So picture this: Satchel Paige on the mound beaming, and who steps up to the plate? Hank Aaron. The best pitcher in baseball history against the best hitter.

Strike one, strike two, and finally Hank Aaron swings hard, gets a piece of the ball and pops out to third. Old Satchel still had it.

In his 1966 Hall of Fame induction speech, Ted Williams urged the inclusion of Negro League players to the Hall of Fame. Satchel Paige was elected as the first Negro League player to be inducted.

Satchel Paige once said: "Ain't no man can avoid being born average, but there ain't no man got to be common."

Bill Bartholomay has led an uncommonly good life as a business leader, as a pioneer in baseball, as a civic leader, as a philanthropist, and as a man who sensed in his lifetime an opportunity to build bridges in America and make us a better nation through the game of baseball and through the integration of that sport. He served the cities of Chicago and Atlanta in an extraordinary way, but he served America as well. He proved his old phys ed instructor from grade school wrong by showing that the rules of baseball are pretty good rules for life after all.

On this day, as we start spring training and a new baseball season, I wish the very best to the very best—Bill Bartholomay.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I rise today to address the motion to override the President's veto of S. 1, which would force approval of the construction of the Keystone Pipeline to transport tar sands heavy oil from Canada to the gulf coast. We will be having that vote in just a while from now.

My key consideration today is this. What would the impact of this bill be

on global warming? The reason that is the core question I am raising is that already we are seeing extensive damage to our rural resources around the world from our warming planet. We are seeing this in Oregon, and we are seeing, therefore, an impact on our future economic prospects.

To put it very simply, the burning of fossil fuels is damaging our forests, our farming, and our fishing. By many estimates, to contain 2 degrees Celsius, which is almost 4 degrees Fahrenheit, we must transition aggressively and rapidly from burning conventional fossil fuels for energy toward the use of nonfossil renewable energy.

Now, this shift is well within our power. It is well within our technology. But do we have the political will to make this happen? And that test is before us in the vote we are taking today.

Building the Keystone Pipeline opens the faucet to rapid exploitation of massive, new, unconventional reserves called tar sands, and it takes us in exactly the opposite direction from where we need to go. Indeed, the pipeline locks us into utilizing the dirtiest fossil fuels on the planet for a generation, and it accelerates human civilization down the road towards catastrophic climate change. Thus, building this pipeline is a mistake, and there is a lot to be concerned about.

Now, global warming isn't some imaginary scenario 50 years from now about some computer model predicting something bad will happen. No, it is about facts on the ground right now.

The warmest 10 years on record for global average surface temperature have occurred in the last 12 years. And 2014, the calendar year we just passed, was the single warmest year on record. While some Senators may come to this floor and say that it is just an anomaly here or an anomaly there, it is not. The facts are in. When we have 10 of the warmest years on record within the last 12 years, we know something dramatically is happening to the globe.

The average forest fire season is getting longer. Since the 1980s the season has grown 60 to 80 days longer than it was before. That means that with each year passing the fire season is growing by an average of about 2 days, and the number of acres consumed annually by wildfires has doubled to more than 7 million acres. This is an enormous impact, and those fires themselves put additional carbon dioxide into the atmosphere. So we start to see a feedback mechanism that is accelerating us down this road to catastrophic change.

The snowpack is decreasing in our Oregon mountains, the Cascade Mountains, which means smaller and warmer streams, which are certainly not good for trout. But it also means less water for irrigation. We have right now virtually no snow in the Cascades. At this point we should have a substantial snowpack. So the possibility of yet another major drought faces us this coming summer.

We had the worst-ever drought in the Klamath Basin, a large agricultural

basin in southern Oregon, in 2001. We had another devastating drought in 2010—a near worst-ever drought—and another devastating drought in 2013. And here we are this year, with virtually no snowpack to provide irrigation water during the summer. That is a very big deal.

It isn't just farming and forestry. It is also fishing. The carbon dioxide that we are pumping into the air is absorbed through wave action. It becomes carbonic acid. We can envision mankind pouring vast vats of carbonic acids into the ocean, because that is essentially the effect of what we are doing. If you think putting all that acid into the ocean wouldn't be a good idea and would have bad effects, you are right. The ocean has become 30 percent more acidic than it was before the industrial revolution—before we started burning coal and other fossil fuels as a major source of energy—and we can start to see the impact.

At the Whiskey Creek Shellfish Hatchery on the Oregon coast, we have a big problem. The big problem is that the baby oysters are having trouble pulling enough carbon out of the water in order to create their shells because the water is too acidic. That is a little bit like the canary in the coal mine. If the oysters are having trouble, what other shellfish are being affected by the increasing level of acidity?

As humans on our planet, we have the moral responsibility to exercise wise stewardship of our resources—a responsibility to this generation but a profound responsibility to the generations to come.

Now, our youth tend to have a better understanding of this than do the lawmakers who come to the floor of the Senate. Our youth widely rank global warming as a major concern, a major issue they want to see us take on. They will face the challenges that we will leave behind. But here is the problem: If we wait to tackle global warming until—we have pages on the floor—our 15- and 16-year-old pages are in office, when they are in their forties and their fifties, then it will be almost impossible to address this issue because of the feedback loops that are occurring.

I was watching yesterday a time-lapsed series of ice in the Arctic, and I can tell you that essentially, as viewed from North America, there was a swirling mass of ice—and this was over several decades—and that swirling mass became less with every passing year, to where we are halfway to starting to be ice-free in the summer. That is a massive change happening within a single human lifetime which is but a blink in time when you think about the age and course of this planet.

So big changes are occurring, and when those changes occur, we do have additional problems arise. All of that open water in the Arctic absorbs more sunlight. That is what makes the water blue and it becomes warmer; whereas, the ice reflects the sunlight and keeps the water cooler. Therefore, we have a

magnification of the effect of global warming at the poles. This is not a good thing.

So whether we are looking at the impact on our farming or the impact on our forests which are burning or the impact on our oceans and our fisheries which are becoming too acidic, we have a responsibility to address those issues. That means we are going to have to not burn all the fossil fuel that we have been clever enough to find in the crust of the Earth.

It is estimated that we would have to leave four-fifths of the fossil fuels we already have identified that are in the ground. We have to leave it in the ground rather than burn it if we are not going to exceed 2 degrees centigrade in global warming. That is a huge challenge.

That means we cannot proceed to build infrastructure designed to accelerate the extraction of these fossil fuels. The pipeline is exactly that kind of infrastructure.

Now, have no doubt, I love the idea of jobs and construction. That is why I am a huge supporter of the Partnership to Build America Act. The Partnership to Build America Act would create hundreds of thousands of construction jobs over the course of a number of years in America. That is the type of investment in jobs and construction and infrastructure we should make, but we shouldn't be investing infrastructure that is going to do profound damage to our planet. That does not honor the moral responsibility we have to the stewardship of this beautiful blue-green orb that we live on known as this planet Earth.

Let's honor our responsibility and let's not override the veto the President has put on this bill.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. HOEVEN. I ask unanimous consent for up to 30 minutes to engage in a colloquy on the Keystone Pipeline approval legislation which was vetoed.

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

Mr. HOEVEN. Thank you, Mr. President.

I am here to discuss the Keystone Pipeline approval legislation and the President's recent veto as well as our efforts today to override that veto.

I will be joined in the colloquy with my distinguished colleague from South Dakota. Also our colleague on the other side of the aisle from West Virginia will be joining us shortly, as well as the chairman of the energy committee, our colleague from Alaska. I want to make a couple points upfront and then turn to my colleague from South Dakota.

What I have here and have shown before on the Senate floor is the route the Keystone XL Pipeline would take from the oil sands in Hardisty, Alberta, coming down through Montana where we pick up domestic crude. Often people think of it as moving Canadian crude, but it also picks up domestic crude in the Bakken region. Our country likes sweet Bakken crude oil from Montana, and then it takes it on to refineries throughout the country. So that is the project we are talking about.

This chart shows the project itself, and it shows what is going to happen if we don't approve it. You have to understand, this has been going on now for over 6 years. The President has delayed this project for more than 6 years, but if we don't build the pipeline to move our domestic crude in the United States, then Canada will build pipelines to the west coast and that oil will go to China by tanker ship and be refined in China.

Again, we go through all these different discussions, but the reality is the oil will be produced. The question is, Do we want to have that oil here in our country or would we rather see it go to China?

Of course, if it goes to China, then not only does that affect our ability to use the oil in our country because we don't have the infrastructure to move it around safely and cost-effectively, but we also then continue to import oil from the Middle East.

I will run through a couple more of these charts and bring us up-to-date. It is not like we don't have pipelines. When the President takes more than 6 years to make a decision—having such a hard time with this pipeline—it is not that we don't have a few pipelines in the country. We have millions of miles of pipeline. Of course, this is going to be the latest, greatest state of the art with all the safety features—something like 53 different safety features that are required as part of the approval process that, as we say, has been going on for more than 6 years.

The other point I want to make before we go into the latest status is this is the finding of not one, not two, not three, not four, not five reports by the administration, but in fact the Obama administration's State Department has done five environmental impact statements, three draft statements, two final statements—three draft statements and two final environmental impact statements.

Here is what President Obama's report states after studying the environmental impact: "No significant environmental impact" according to the U.S. State Department environmental impact statements as a result of the Keystone XL Pipeline.

So here we are today, after more than 6 years in the "approval process" by the administration.

We passed this legislation with 62 votes in the Senate. It passed through the House with about 270 votes in the



House, a big bipartisan vote for this legislation.

Last Tuesday—last Tuesday we sent it to the President. We sent it to him in the morning and he vetoed it the same day and had it back to us that afternoon. So that was pretty efficient. We sent it to him in the morning and—bang—he has it back here in the afternoon.

His rationale for vetoing the project is he said it cut short his review process. That is right out of his veto message. It cut short his review process. So for somebody who figured out how to veto it in one day who has been studying it for over 6 years—over 6 years—and he vetoed it because we cut his review process short after more than 6 years.

Subsequent to that, the President was asked by the press: Mr. President, if Congress is somehow cutting your process short, when are you going to make a decision? His response to the press—I believe it was last week or earlier this week—he said he is going to make a decision either in a couple weeks or maybe in a couple months but certainly by the end of his term.

My question is this, How can there be any process there? Where is the process? What process are you talking about?

If he delays it for more than 6 years—a situation where TransCanada, a company that has met every single requirement of the law and regulations—they have met all the requirements for more than 6 years. The six States on the route have all approved the project. All six States on the route have approved the project. It wasn't tough; they had 6 years to do it. The American people overwhelmingly support this project in poll after poll, from 65 to 70 percent.

What process is he talking about that was cut short? There is no process there. If you go on for 6 years, where a company has spent millions of dollars, taking 6 years to try to build an \$8 billion project that would help us create energy security in this country, working with our closest friend and ally, Canada, what process is he talking about? When asked: When are you going to make a decision as to your process, he said: I don't know, maybe a few weeks, maybe a few months, by the end of my term, anyway. That is 8 years.

Isn't this a country of laws? How would you or anyone else feel—any company, large or small, anybody who feels if they comply with the law and they do everything they are supposed to do and they do it over and over again and somebody who is elected to office says, yes, you know, I just don't feel like it.

When did we cease to become a country of laws? When did we cease to have a situation where we can rely on the laws and the regulations of this State, whether it is an individual, a family, a community, a company or anything else?

So when we look at a project such as this one, that is a question we have to

ask ourselves, because if it can happen in this situation, can't it happen in any situation? When do we as a Congress step up and say: We pass the laws. We pass the laws and those laws have to be respected and enforced. Isn't that our job? Isn't that our obligation? Isn't that why the people of this country sent us? I believe it is.

It is one thing to say: Well, it is that TransCanada company. They do business in Canada. They do business here. What if it was you? What if it was your company? What if it was 6-plus years of your life? What if it was millions of your dollars? How would you feel about it?

Remember, America is the place people throughout history have come to do business. This is where they come to do business because they can count on our laws and they can count on our regulations and they can count on the fact that if they made the investment, they would be able to do business on a certain, dependable basis. What happened to that? When we lose that, what happens to our economy?

With that, I would like to turn to my good friend from South Dakota. This pipeline will run through his State, creating jobs and millions of tax dollars for his State.

Mr. THUNE. I appreciate the leadership of the Senator from North Dakota on this issue. He has been a fierce advocate for many months in the Senate for the jobs and economic activity, the energy independence, and the positive benefits to our national security in building this pipeline. The most recent development is the frustration with having the President veto a bill that has more than 60 cosponsors in the Senate. This is a broad bipartisan bill. The Senator from North Dakota worked very hard to make it that way. A lot of Members on both sides of the aisle support this pipeline.

What is striking to me about it is some of the misstatements and things that have been said here recently—the President in his veto message and some of the things he said. The Washington Post Fact Checker, as recently as a couple days ago, pointed out that when the President said that this is going to bypass the United States and we are not going to get any benefit from this, not only did they give him one, two, three—he got four Pinocchios from the Washington Post. What that means, folks, is that is a really big whopper to suggest that there is not going to be any benefit to the United States from this.

In fact, they went on to point out in that story that their estimate is that 70 percent of the oil to be refined would be used in this country.

Furthermore, as the Senator from North Dakota pointed out, this is a significant investment, obviously, by people who want to do business in the United States because of our rule of law or rules and certainty that come with that. The production, the oil sands up there in North Dakota is 30

percent owned by Americans. There is a lot of American ownership in this, and Canada is our friend and ally. Instead of getting the same type or quality of oil from a country where we don't have a favorable relationship—Venezuela, for instance—we can get it from Canada, and it can come through this country. The suggestion that it is not going to benefit anybody in this country is completely wrong.

I know the Senator from North Dakota has pointed out before that up to 100,000 barrels of oil a day would be put in here from his State of North Dakota and from Montana—a lot of the light, sweet crude that is so valued—and it would take pressure off the railroads.

Interestingly enough, the Senator from North Dakota pointed out that the administration found no significant environmental impact. Well, think about this. You are now putting this oil on a railcar or a truck, and the studies show that creates 28 to 42 percent more emissions than shipping it in a pipeline. It is going to go some way. It is going to go on a truck, a railcar or a pipeline. If it goes on a railcar or a truck, it will create 28 to 42 percent more emissions than transporting it through a pipeline. From an environmental standpoint, it makes all the sense in the world.

As somebody who represents a border State to North Dakota, we have had our own issues these last couple of years with the rail service and trying to get our agriculture commodities to the marketplace. There is an awful lot of pressure to move oil on rail. If you can move some of that in the pipeline—100,000 barrels a day—it takes a lot of pressure off of the rails and frees up that infrastructure and capacity to move agricultural commodities that are so important to both of our States.

There is a lot of misinformation that has been put out on this particular subject. I hope we can at least have discussions based upon a common set of facts, and most of the facts we are talking about are things that have been put out by the administration.

My State of South Dakota—as the Senator from North Dakota mentioned—would be crossed by this. The estimate by the State Department was that it would create \$100 million in earnings in South Dakota, create 3,000 to 4,000 construction jobs, and generate about \$20 million in property tax revenue.

There is an awful lot of interest in my State in what happens with the economic activity, the jobs, the property tax revenue, and what that could do to support local governments, law enforcement, schools, and those sorts of things—not to mention getting us away from the dependence we have on foreign sources of energy.

Let's be factual in this discussion. This doesn't bypass the United States. This has tremendous economic and positive economic impacts on our country, and we should not forget that. As we debate this here and have an opportunity now to vote on this veto, we

should at least have a set of facts that is consistent with reality.

The Senator from Alaska has been very involved and has been a great leader on this issue.

My colleague from West Virginia is here as well. He has been working very hard to move this project along. It is unfortunate we are where we are. Perhaps we will be a couple of votes short today, but who knows. Maybe some people will come to the right conclusion and help us advance this important project.

I thank the Senator from North Dakota for his leadership. The Senator from North Dakota pointed out the number of pipelines that already exist in this country. I know the Senator has also pointed out the positive impact—when we get this down and it gets refined in other parts of this country—that a lot of this energy will be used here in the United States. I appreciate the fact that the Senator has made all of those facts abundantly clear on the floor. It is unfortunate that we have not been able to persuade the President, but I still have hope.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I thank the good Senator from South Dakota, and turn to my colleague from West Virginia who has been a champion on this project and other energy projects. As a Governor, he has worked on energy. He understands job creation, and he understands that we can make this country much stronger if we produce energy here at home versus getting it abroad.

I turn to my colleague from the State of West Virginia and thank him for his leadership on this legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. I thank the Senator. I very much appreciate this colloquy, which is basically just common sense.

I became a Senator on November 15, 2010, so I have been here a little over 4 years. That is when I was first brought to understand the Keystone project, which was underway at the time and trying to be built. I was asked the question: What do you think? I looked at it very quickly, and I looked at how much oil we buy from other countries around the world. We buy the same type of oil—750,000 barrels of oil a day—from Venezuela. I was thinking that I would rather buy from my friends rather than from my enemies—the people who take the proceeds and the profits from our buying their product and use it against us. I was very clear on that, and I think most West Virginians feel the way I do.

Let's look at the facts. Forty percent of this pipeline has already been built. This is the part we are talking about, which has not been built and which we are producing and would like to build. The capacity from the Bakken—we talked about how 12 percent of the volume from this will be Bakken oil from North America.

We are saying that we are moving and producing our oil, buying from our

best, friendliest neighbor and ally, Canada, and it makes us more secure as a nation. I have heard all of the arguments against it. People have said that we can't do this because basically this oil will come straight down and go out. They make you believe it is going to come down here, get loaded on a tanker, and taken to another country, so that we get no benefit at all. That is what they are telling me.

We had a press conference 2 or 3 weeks ago. We had the Prime Minister of Canada and the Premier of Alberta. Everybody who was there agreed that will not happen, and it can't happen because they need this to refine it. They will be subjected to the same rules and regulations that our Commerce Department puts on oil in America. No crude will be exported unless we change the law. So that prevents that from happening. That is a misnomer.

Next, they said they don't pay 8 percent into the Oilspill Liability Trust Fund in case there is a spill. They agreed to do that. They said: Wait a minute; this will not be built with American steel. Yes, it will be. They agreed to that. Everything we have asked for, they have agreed to.

We can't even get our side of the aisle to agree basically to put it in a piece of legislation to make sure that it will happen. I trust the Canadians. They will do exactly what they said. I would like to codify it by putting it in the bill, and I am working on that.

The politics of what we are dealing with is this. If we can't get four more Democrats on my side to vote with me to repeal and beat the veto the President has, this is coming back. Everybody in this understands the reality of politics. This legislation is coming back in the form of an infrastructure bill or a road bill. It will come back on a bill that we will all vote for, and we will have to spend a lot of time and energy again on this same subject. I have said to do it now. Let's do it now and move on to something that we need to move on to, which will be something of great interest.

I have a hard time reasoning with those who say that this pipeline is not going to make us more secure. We buy 7 million barrels of oil a day. We buy that oil from other countries, such as Saudi Arabia, Venezuela, and even Russia.

If you want to make this country more secure, let's not depend on the foreign oil where they will use resources that will be used against us. The last time I checked, I don't believe Venezuela uses any of the money we give them for their oil to benefit America. I am not convinced that Saudi Arabia uses any of their money to benefit our country or any of these other foreign countries that we buy from.

This is a perfect, commonsense solution. I also think that our good friend from South Dakota talked about the amount of trains. My State just had a tragedy. Thank God there was no loss of life, and by the grace of God, no one

was injured. I can tell you that the amount of transportation on the rail has increased 3,300 percent since 2009. So 3,300 percent more oil is being transported in America by rail. If we can relieve some of that and be safer—as well as environmentally safer—we should do it.

I ask my colleagues to consider this legislation because if we don't do it now, it is going to come back. We have a chance to put it to bed. It makes a lot of common sense as far as jobs.

I will say one more thing about jobs. They talked about jobs. When I was Governor and when the Senator from North Dakota was Governor, we built an awful lot of infrastructure, such as roads and bridges. I never remember creating one permanent job after I built a bridge. There were a lot of good jobs that paid good money during the construction, and all of my contractors were happy. All of my affiliated trades people were happy that they had jobs, but we never expected to create permanent jobs. They were construction jobs. That is what it is.

Why are people saying that we are not creating jobs? This is construction. When it is done, it is done. I don't know why we can't come to grips with that. We do it all day long. We will talk about an infrastructure bill and be tickled to death that we are getting jobs. But when we talk about 20,000 to 40,000 jobs to build this pipeline, I don't understand why it is not something we can all embrace.

I say to all of my colleagues on my side of the aisle, as well as on the other side of the aisle, that we should all support something that makes so much sense to the American people and the working people of America and also for the security of our Nation.

I applaud and support my friend. I co-sponsored this bill. I feel very strongly about it, and I will continue to speak out about it as long as we have to. I hope today is the last time we have to speak about this legislation. I hope we get this veto repealed and move on.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I thank our colleague from West Virginia for his tremendous leadership. I know that will continue. He is right. If we don't win the battle today, we will win the war because we will find another bill to attach this legislation to. But the thing is that we ought to pass it on its merits, as the Senator so eloquently explained.

I will now turn to the head of the energy committee, somebody who is truly committed to an "all of the above" energy approach and demonstrates that leadership on the "all of the above" approach every day in this body and certainly in her leadership of our energy committee. That is why she speaks on this issue in a way that should have everyone listening to her. Whether she is speaking about fossil fuels, traditional energy or renewables, this is a Senator who has supported all of these and has great creditability on this issue.

I turn to my colleague from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I thank my friend and colleague from North Dakota for his leadership. He has been dogged not only as we have advanced this measure through the floor and process but truly over the years.

It has been 6-plus years, or 2,350 days, since the company seeking to build the Keystone XL Pipeline first submitted its cross-border permit application. Even with all this time, the President is incapable of making a final decision.

I thank my colleague from West Virginia, who just spoke. He articulated some of the myths and misconceptions that are out there, and the Senator from South Dakota annunciated them as well.

When you think about where we are today, with this veto override here in front of us—you have to think about that fact that this is bipartisan energy legislation. The first bill we sent to the President this year is bipartisan and has strong support around the country from an environmental perspective, from an energy security perspective, and from a national security perspective. The Keystone XL Pipeline is what we should endorse. It is wrong and shortsighted that this President has chosen to veto this bipartisan energy initiative.

We have heard on the floor all of the reasons why this proposal is good and sound and rational. It focuses on the energy infrastructure. I think it is also important to remind colleagues that when we had this bill on the floor in January, we had something that we have not had in a long period of time, and that was an open amendment process. We moved 41 different amendments forward to the floor, and some of those amendments actually passed. They became part of this Keystone XL Pipeline legislation.

So in addition to vetoing the infrastructure aspects of this legislation, the President has vetoed a time-sensitive provision that will provide regulatory relief to our water heater manufacturers. He also vetoed multiple provisions to increase the efficiencies of our commercial buildings. He has also vetoed a provision that would improve the energy retrofit assistance that would be available for our schools. He also vetoed what I believe many of us viewed as a very responsible path forward on the Oilspill Liability Trust Fund and our statement asserting that climate change is real.

We made some good progress with this bill. If this vote is not successful, all of that is now off the table. We are not just talking about permitting a piece of pipe, the infrastructure that goes across the border. Keep in mind, folks, we also included some things that this body felt were important to advance, and that has all been vetoed by this President. It was wrong to veto this legislation.

I think it is also important to highlight some of the irony we see with the veto of this legislation coming from

this administration. In effect, the President is making a mockery of the Executive order meant to expedite decisions, as it has been more than 2,350 days since this application was submitted for permit. But there is other irony here, and I wish to take a brief moment to point this out.

Last month the White House released the National Security Strategy for this country. I will quote from this strategy:

The challenges faced by Ukrainian and European dependence on Russian energy supplies puts a spotlight on the need for an expanded view of energy security that recognizes the collective needs of the United States, our allies, and trading partners as well as the importance of competitive energy markets. Therefore, we must promote diversification of energy sources, fuels, and routes, as well as encourage indigenous sources of energy supply. Greater energy security and independence within the Americas is central to these efforts.

Well, Canada is within the Americas.

The President's veto of the Keystone XL Pipeline contradicts his own national security policy. It contradicts his own energy policy that is outlined by the Council of Economic Advisers in their economic report when they say "the extent to which a country's economy is exposed to energy supply risks—specifically, international energy supply disruptions that lead to product unavailability, price shocks, or both.

The President is contradicting himself at every turn, whether it is his Climate Action Plan that he has introduced, vetoing his own—this veto contradicts his own climate policy.

We have an opportunity to boost our economy, to help our allies, to increase our energy security, to be an environmental leader, and to lead on energy. This President's veto denies us that. It is a failure of leadership.

I recommend that all of us on both sides of the aisle come together to override this veto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, President Obama had advocated reducing our reliance on Middle Eastern oil. The President has advocated reaffirming the commitment of the United States to its close allies. The President has led us to believe he would work to create American jobs, not veto them. Of course, signing the bipartisan Keystone jobs bill would have advanced all of those priorities, but President Obama chose deep-pocketed special interests over the middle class with his partisan veto of the Keystone jobs bill. It is the kind of thing that puts union workers on edge. I suspect it makes some of our Democratic colleagues uncomfortable too.

But here is the good news: Our Democratic friends don't have to make the same choice the President made. There is a bipartisan jobs coalition right here in the Senate that would love to have their support. We are pro-Keystone jobs, we are pro-Keystone infrastructure, and we are pro-middle class.

If you are interested in jobs and infrastructure and saving your party from an extreme mistake, then join us. Vote with us to override a partisan veto and help the President pursue priorities he has advocated in the past. There is no reason to allow powerful special interests to block the billions this infrastructure project would pour into our economy or the thousands of American jobs Keystone would support. Your vote for common sense can release this special interest stranglehold. It can return a little more sanity to Washington.

There is a lot we can accomplish by working together with serious jobs ideas and commonsense reform as our guiding principle. So I hope you will join the new majority in that effort because no matter what happens today, this new Congress is not going to stop working for good ideas, and we are not going to protect the President from them either.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I wish to thank the majority leader and our colleagues on both sides of the aisle for supporting this bipartisan legislation.

The Prime Minister of Israel was here yesterday and he spoke to Congress. We have an opportunity to declare energy independence. We do not need to rely on oil from the Middle East. I ask my colleagues to join with us and vote yes to override the President's veto of this legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill (S. 1) pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the Constitution.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) is necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 62, nays 37, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 68 Leg.]

#### YEAS—62

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

## NAYS—37

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

## NOT VOTING—1

Donnelly

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 62, the nays are 37.

Two-thirds of the Senators voting, a quorum being present, not having voted in the affirmative, the bill, on reconsideration, fails to pass over the veto of the President of the United States.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

## MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

## LYNCH NOMINATION

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, nearly 4 months ago—not 4 weeks ago but 4 months ago—President Obama announced his intention to nominate Loretta Lynch to be our country's next Attorney General. I had the privilege of attending that White House ceremony. In fact, I took this photograph at the ceremony.

But as I took it, I was mostly moved by what Ms. Lynch explained. She said she was excited about the challenge of becoming our Nation's chief law enforcement officer. She noted with obvious admiration that the Department of Justice is the only Cabinet Department named for an ideal. Think of that. The Department of Justice. It is named for the ideal of justice.

We know from Loretta Lynch's long public service career that she aspires to make that ideal a reality. She will when she becomes Attorney General of the United States. As U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of New York, she brought countless terrorists and cyber criminals to justice. She obtained convictions against corrupt public officials from both political parties. She fought tirelessly against violent crime and financial fraud. Her record shows as Attorney General she will effectively, fairly, and independently enforce the law.

As many people have said, she is a prosecutor's prosecutor. Her record of accomplishment goes beyond just that. It goes to who she is as a person. It is bolstered by the faith and values instilled in her by her family. The Judiciary Committee was honored to have her proud father, the Reverend Lorenzo Lynch, with us not only at both days of the historic hearings in January, but also last Thursday as the committee considered his daughter's historic nomination.

When Loretta Lynch was a young child, Reverend Lynch bravely opened his church to students and others to organize lunch counter sit-ins in North Carolina. He taught his only daughter that "ideals are wonderful things, but unless you can share them with others and make this world a better place, they are just words." Every one of us who has ever been in public service ought to listen to that. The fact that she has dedicated the majority of her career to public service reaffirms that she has lived those ideals of justice in the service of others.

Last week, the committee reported her nomination favorably with a bipartisan vote. I wish the vote had been unanimous. I suspect that if the President who nominated her had been a Republican, she would have been confirmed by now. But in the sixth year of this administration, perhaps there is no one who can be confirmed unanimously, because those Republicans who are opposing Ms. Lynch are not doing so based on her record. They are opposing her because they disagree with a decision that President Obama made and that she played no part in. That is not treating her fairly.

One need only look at her supporters to know how nonpartisan her nomination really is. Louis Freeh, the former Director of the FBI and a Federal judge, has written:

[I]n my twenty-five years of public service—23 in the Department of Justice—I cannot think of a more qualified nominee to be America's chief law enforcement officer.

I know Judge Freeh very well. He is a man of total integrity. He would not say this unless he strongly believed it.

The current New York Police Commissioner, who was appointed by a Democrat, and a former New York Police Commissioner, appointed by a Republican, both strongly support her nomination.

Even prominent Fox News hosts have praised Loretta Lynch's work as a prosecutor. Bill O'Reilly has called her a hero for her prosecution of a child rapist. Megyn Kelly, of Fox, has described Ms. Lynch as a "straight shooter" for her service as a Federal prosecutor, especially for her crackdown on gang crime and terrorism.

Ms. Lynch also has broad support from law enforcement, fellow prosecutors, civil rights groups, and numerous other prominent individuals.

I ask unanimous consent to have a list of letters in support of her nomination printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

Nobody else is seeking the floor. I ask unanimous consent to go beyond the 10 minutes allotted, up to 3 extra minutes.

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

Mr. LEAHY. In January, Ms. Lynch testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee for nearly 8 hours. She has now responded to nearly 900 questions for the record. I have been here 40 years and I have a hard time remembering somebody who has answered so many questions. The witnesses invited by Republicans to speak on this, not a single one of them actually opposed her nomination. In fact, I asked all of the outside witnesses: If anybody here opposes her nomination, would you please raise your hand. Nobody did.

Despite this, some voted no—some Republican Senators voted no on her nomination in committee. Some of these Senators opposed her because she would not renounce the President's Executive action to keep immigrant families together. They are attacking her for this. They blame this on her. But they fail to acknowledge that if the Republican leadership in the House had just allowed a vote on the immigration reform that passed the Senate, then the President would not have been compelled to act.

Very hard-working Republicans and Democrats came together in this body to pass by a 2-to-1 margin an immigration bill. Most people felt it would pass the House of Representatives had it been allowed to come to a vote. But the Speaker determined not to let it come to a vote. You cannot then say: We are not going to vote on anything, but, oh, by the way, we are not going to let the President do what Presidents have always done in the absence of legislation, take executive action.

Now we all agree that we have problems in our immigration system. We all agree that we need legislation to fix it. The President is not going to do that. Congress has to do it. We have to stand up and vote for or against changes. But to blame the Attorney General nominee for this is simply unfair. To blame her because the House of Representatives will not vote on immigration is not fair. Ms. Lynch played no part in the President's decision to set the prosecutorial priorities of the administration.

As a Federal prosecutor in New York, no one has claimed that Ms. Lynch has failed to enforce the law. There is no legitimate reason to delay her vote any longer. In fact, there are a whole lot of people in prison today who wish that she had not enforced the law. But if they were guilty of crimes, she enforced it, whether Republicans, Democrats—no matter who they were—and with quite a few terrorists—she enforced the law. She put them in prison.

So we should examine Loretta Lynch's nomination based on her