

and to innovation to solve the problem. That includes the private sector, universities, and even just someone out tinkering in their garage and coming up with a great idea.

Prizes like this are not a new idea. Back in 1714 the British Government offered a big prize for the first person to invent a better way for measuring longitude. It was a clockmaker whose name was John Harrison. He won the prize, and his idea transformed the way that we sail the seas.

In 1927 Charles Lindbergh flew non-stop from New York to Paris. This helped create the new modern aviation industry. He took the flight to win a \$25,000 prize-sponsored by a New York hotel owner.

The prize created by this amendment—and there is more than one. There are several prizes. The prizes created by this amendment are meant to encourage that kind of new thinking, that kind of bold action. So that is one of the amendments, one of the bipartisan ideas.

Another amendment and idea that we have talked about, which is again bipartisan, is an amendment we voted on yesterday, amendment No. 3030. This was an idea that had bipartisan support. My lead cosponsor was my friend from North Dakota, Senator HEITKAMP. This amendment would have expedited the permit process for natural gas gathering lines on Federal lands, on Indian lands. Gathering lines are pipelines that collect unprocessed gas from oil and gas wells and then ship it to a processing plant. At the plant, the different kind of gases—methane, propane—are separated from one another. Then they are shipped out again by other pipelines to locations where they can be sold and used by people to power our country, to power our economy. That is what the producers want to do. The problem is, we don't have enough of these gathering lines to gather up this gas and send it to the processing plants. So a lot of times there is only one option, and that is to flare or vent the excess natural gas at the well. If there were more gathering lines, then we would have a lot less waste.

You don't have to take my word for it. Last month, the Obama administration proposed a new rule that restricts this kind of flaring of oil and gas operations on Federal land and on Indian land. In that rule, the administration admitted that the main way to avoid flaring "is to capture, transport, and process" that gas for sale, using the same technologies that are used for natural gas wells. It makes sense. The administration said that the rate of energy production in some of the areas outpaces the rate of development of this infrastructure to capture the gas. The administration said the production had overwhelmed the capacity of the gathering lines, and Senator HEITKAMP and I were talking about ways to deal with the problem. Even though the administration seems to recognize and give voice to the problem, its proposed

rule doesn't actually address the problem or provide a solution, and Senator HEITKAMP and I have a solution.

The rule doesn't do anything to speed up the permit process for natural gas gathering pipelines. The President ignores that component. Whether you agree with this new rule or you disagree with it, the only practical way to reduce the venting or the flaring of natural gas is to build more of these gathering lines. The rule will not work without them.

If we don't build the infrastructure to solve the problem, the administration's rule will end up pushing oil and gas production off of Federal lands, off of Indian land, and this is completely unacceptable. It is unworkable.

The Obama administration says this type of gas venting and flaring is bad for the environment. They say the government is losing royalty money because the gas isn't being sold. I agree. That is why the bipartisan amendment Senator HEITKAMP and I sponsored would solve both of these problems at once. Even though we weren't able to get that amendment adopted yesterday, this is an idea that all Republicans and Democrats should be able to support. It would help Americans get the energy we need and do it in a cleaner way and at a lower cost. That is the goal.

I know Senators on both sides of the aisle are going to keep talking about this idea, and we are going to keep trying to get it enacted into law. These are just two commonsense, bipartisan ideas Republicans and Democrats have offered to solve the energy challenges America is facing.

In my home State of Wyoming, people know we need to balance a strong economy and a healthy environment. They are in favor of using our natural resources responsibly. Part of that is remembering that these are resources and resources should be and can be used.

We should also recognize that the important resource we have in this country is American ingenuity. We should be investing in it. We should be cutting through the redtape that holds back innovation. Abraham Lincoln once said that when we face new and difficult challenges, we must think anew, and we must act anew. Lincoln knew the importance of setting a big goal, of unleashing the ingenuity of the American people to get it done. He had the vision for the transcontinental railroad. He also signed the original charter for the National Academy of Sciences. We must think anew; we must act anew.

It is not enough for environmental extremists to say that the resources have to stay in the ground. That is not realistic. That is not responsible. America can do better, and the American people are ready to be part of this solution. They are ready to make energy as clean as we can, as fast as we can, without raising costs on American families. They need us to help show the

way. With this kind of bipartisan solution I have been talking about today, I think we can take a step toward reaching that goal.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

TRIBUTE TO ZIPPY DUVALL

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, first of all, I am privileged and honored to commend Zippy Duvall, a great Georgian who just a few weeks ago was elected, in the 97th year of the American Farm Bureau, as its 12th president. Zippy has been the president of the Georgia Farm Bureau since 2006. He has been a leader in our State for decades, and I am so proud he will now represent agriculture throughout our country. He himself is a cattleman. He raises hay. He raises broilers. He has run the Farm Bureau and been a great advocate for agriculture and farming in our State.

He and his wife Bonnie have four children and three grandchildren. He serves on the Farmers Bank board. He serves as the president of the Georgia Farm Bureau. He serves on the local electric membership corporation board. He serves on the soil and water conservation board. He is a total public servant, and he is an outstanding advocate for agriculture and an outstanding representative of our State.

The best example of Zippy Duvall that I know is, if you ride through South Georgia—the heart of agriculture country in my State—and you look at all the bumper stickers on all the pickup trucks, you will see a unique bumper sticker—not mine, not a Member of Congress's, not the Governor's, but a bumper sticker that says very simply "Ditch the Rule." Zippy Duvall was one of the leaders in our country who took on the EPA to stop from going into place the waters of the U.S.A. regulations that would hurt agriculture so desperately in our State. That bumper sticker became a slogan for agriculture all over the country, and farmers worked together to advocate on behalf of better agriculture without an overly oppressive EPA effect.

I am proud to come to the floor today and recognize a member of my State, a great farmer in Georgia, and a great citizen of our country. He will be the 12th president of the American Farm Bureau, and he will be the best president of the American Farm Bureau. I commend him and his family for all their sacrifice and effort. I wish him the very best of luck in his endeavors as president of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

75TH ANNIVERSARY OF USO

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I rise to recognize another organization that is meaningful to all of us and in particular the Presiding Officer. It is called the USO—the United Service Organization—a private organization

chartered federally in 1941 by Franklin Delano Roosevelt and the Congress of the United States.

America was on the verge of world war, and the President knew it. We had fragmented volunteer organizations to serve our troops but no organization to really give them the services they needed. The Congress passed a resolution creating and chartering the USO, consolidating those organizations into one. Since that charter 75 years ago, that organization has served over 10 million American soldiers in uniform from the time they put it on until the time they take it off.

One need only go to their local airport, which, for me, is the Hartsfield International Airport in Atlanta. Last year 100 million passengers went through that airport. Many of them were soldiers, a lot of them on the way to deployment in Afghanistan or the Middle East. When they go through the Atlanta airport, the first thing they see is the USO booth, and the first thing they get is services from the USO to help them in their trip, their endeavors, and help them with their families. The USO provides invaluable help to the men and women who provide all of us the security we relish in this great Nation of ours called the United States of America.

On this 75th anniversary of the USO, I commend the volunteers—900 of them in Georgia—who provide services to 150,000 Georgia soldiers a year, for all they do on behalf of our country and on behalf of our services. The USO is a great organization for a great country, serving the greatest of all military in the United States of America and throughout the world.

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

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

ENERGY POLICY MODERNIZATION BILL

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I have two different amendments that are coming to the floor. One deals with the Energy bill. One of them deals with the Land and Water Conservation Fund. This bill does a permanent extension of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. My question on that has been this: The money that is being allocated for the Land and Water Conservation Fund to be able to purchase properties—are we also allocating money to be able to actually maintain those properties?

Currently, in the current existence of this bill, there is some money allocated to it in some future way, but I have a simple request: As much money as we

allocate to dealing with purchasing new properties, we should also focus in on maintaining what we already have because we have billions of dollars in maintenance backlog. Right now one of the worst conservation things that can happen in many parts of the country to land is actually put it into Federal trusts because it is not being taken care of once it actually goes into the Federal trust.

But that is not the prime issue I want to talk about right now. Oklahoma is truly an “all of the above” energy State. Oil, gas, coal, wind, geothermal, hydroelectric, solar—we actually use all of those platforms in a very diverse energy economy. A tremendous amount of wind energy is produced in Oklahoma, used in Oklahoma, and exported to other States around us. It is a very important energy source for us. It has been incredibly beneficial, and it is an important part of our portfolio of a diverse energy platform.

We have a challenge to deal with our tax policy. Just a few weeks ago, this Congress—the House and the Senate—passed a change in the way the wind production tax credit will be handled. As a quick review for this body, the wind production tax credit was put in place in 1992. It was a short-term tax credit to give a little bit of help to a brandnew wind energy and several other diverse energy portfolios, but it was especially targeted at wind to help a brandnew energy source get started.

Twenty-four years later, this temporary tax credit is still sitting there. As of a few weeks ago, it was changed. It was changed so that in 2015 and 2016 the full tax credit will still be there, but starting in 2017 that tax credit will drop to 80 percent of what it is now, in 2018 it will drop to 60 percent, in 2019 it will drop to 40 percent, and in 2020 it is left undefined.

I heard multiple individuals say this is a phaseout of the production tax credit—a phaseout. That is something many of us have pursued for many years—how do we get out of this perpetual cycle? The problem is it wasn't a phaseout, it was a phasedown of the production tax credit because in 2020 the PTC is left undefined. Most people would say that is not a problem. It will just go away. It is left undefined. The problem is 10 times in the past 24 years the production tax credit has been undefined for a future year assuming it would go to zero, and 10 times this Congress has gone back and retroactively put it back into place—10 times. So to say in 2020 we are going to leave it undefined and it will go away is not a true phaseout. That is a phasedown, and it leaves it in the Tax Code.

My amendment is simple. A few weeks ago this body agreed that we would phase out the production tax credit. The best way to do that is to remove that part from the Tax Code in year 2020 and then it would be eliminated and would actually go away.

Why would I encourage that? I would encourage that for several reasons. It

provides certainty in the industry. Several individuals I talked to in the industry say they need certainty in their planning. This would help with certainty in planning. It is assumed right now that it goes away in 2020. I would like to make sure everyone understands it really does go away in 2020. It is eliminated from the Tax Code. This is keeping everyone honest based on what they said they wanted to do, and we actually eliminate that production tax credit that year. It provides that great certainty that industry needs to know for their own planning, for their investment, and for outside capital resources and how that money comes in. It is also because these extensions are extremely costly.

The extension that was just done in December by this Congress will cost \$17 billion over the window—\$17 billion. May I remind everyone that we just had an extended argument over how we were going to fund the Transportation bill last year when we needed to find \$13 billion a year to fund transportation, and we just did a production tax credit for wind that is \$17 billion.

If we are going to deal with a lot of our national priorities, I am great with having wind in our portfolio, but this is not a new industry that continues to need support and provide the clarity that is needed to make sure we actually end this tax credit when we said we were going to end this tax credit. Let's remove it from the Tax Code in 2020 and make sure it goes away, and the only way it can be renewed at that point is to go through the normal tax process, create a new tax, and actually do it in the full sunlight rather than just say: Well, we are going to do another tiny extension again.

Wind has increased generation dramatically over the past 24 years, and I am glad. It is a good source. In our Nation, since 1992, wind generation has increased 3,000 percent. It is well developed, it is economically stable, it is pulling its own weight in the system, and we should allow it to continue to fly on its own. It is not as if wind goes away if we don't provide a tax credit.

It is interesting to note that in 2014 we faced something very similar to this. In 2014 it was one of those years that the tax credit was to go away and not exist anymore. It had expired. The problem was that at the very end of 2014, Congress did a retroactive renewal of the production tax credit for the year 2014 in the last days of December. So the whole year had gone by without the tax credit, and during the very last days of 2014 Congress once again renewed the production tax credit and did it retroactively. That year, 2014, the wind association noted that there was \$12 billion of private investment into wind that year. The tax credit was only applied in the final days.

Wind is a good energy source, but it does not need additional Federal dollars to be able to compete in this market. We have made that decision. Now it is time that we actually both trust