

I asked him earlier: What is the first thing these people will get? He said: Lights. Naturally that is what they are going to try to get.

Again, we appreciate them. And also, Jo Ann Emerson, a long-time friend and colleague on the House side, president and CEO of NRECA.

In addition to donating their time and raising more than \$100,000 to support this electrification effort, the group also trained local linemen, donated power infrastructure materials, and distributed humanitarian aid items to these local villages.

I again thank the coops and acknowledge them for how they are making not only Arkansas better but also making the world better.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, today President Obama is doing televised events talking about climate change. According to press reports, the President is ready to pivot to the environment as an issue.

Well, I also want to talk about environmental stewardship today. I want to talk about what is going on in some of our States, where they are actually doing something, not just talking about it.

Today the Senate and Congressional Western Caucuses are issuing a new report called "Washington Gets it Wrong—States Get it Right."

The report shows how regulations imposed by Washington are undermining the work being done at the State level to manage our lands, our natural resources, and to protect our air and water.

More often than not, Washington regulations and one-size-fits-all mandates do get it wrong. In the West we take very seriously our commitment to ensuring the health and viability of land, wildlife, and the environment. That is at both the local and the State levels.

Federal agencies such as the Environmental Protection Agency and the Department of the Interior like to think of themselves as the ultimate protectors of our Nation's skies and open spaces. But we have seen time and time again that the work being done at the State level is more reasonable, more effective, and certainly less heavyhanded.

Thousands of people are working across the West to protect their communities. These are people who live in the West, not bureaucrats in Washington offices. Nobody is better qualified than the folks who actually live in the West, because they actually walk the land and breathe the air—the land and the air they are trying to protect.

So our report looks at the work being done by State agencies to protect not just the land they live and work on but also the people who rely on the health and safety of that land.

As this report demonstrates, extreme regulations imposed by Washington un-

dermine the work being done at the State level, whether it is to manage lands and natural resources, protect air and water, or conserve species.

When we look at the work of these State agencies—as the Western Caucuses have done in this report—it is clear that when it comes to conservation and environmental efforts, the States do get it right. More often than not, Washington gets it wrong.

It is time for Washington to stop its overreaching regulations and the continual drip, drip, drip of mandates. It is time for Washington to stop getting it wrong and start recognizing how States get it right.

The report has details about specific things different States are doing, but I want to mention four categories where States are leading the way when it comes to environmental stewardship.

The first is protecting species on the ground. This includes conservation policies that States are developing, where they work with industry and landowners to protect species without hampering multiple-use policies; that is, multiple use of the land.

Second, States are showing the right way to protect our water, land, and air. They are putting in place ideas that are tailored to the needs of their own communities. They are actually looking at what is unique about their State and the best way for people to solve problems locally.

Third, States are promoting access to fish and wildlife. States understand they need to manage and protect lands and waters in a way that allows for public spaces to be enjoyed. That means ensuring those spaces remain intact for future generations. These are called natural resources for a reason—they are meant to be enjoyed by all of us, not sealed off under Washington's lock and key.

Fourth, the report looks at what States are doing right when it comes to in-state scientific and support staff. State agencies are employing thousands of people who live in the communities they are trying to protect.

Who has more incentive to protect the local environment? The people who are living there, the people who are working there, and the people who are raising their children in these communities, or some bureaucrats locked in a Washington, DC office? Who knows more about the specific unique features of a State or local area and what will work best there?

The Senate and Congressional Western Caucuses have put out this report to highlight just a few of the State initiatives we believe are working. I hope the President will take some time today to not just talk but to actually listen and to read our report and see some of the ways States are getting it right and Washington is getting it wrong.

If others are interested and wish to read the report, they can certainly find it at my Web site, [www.barrasso.senate.gov](http://www.barrasso.senate.gov).

Madam President, I yield the floor.

#### RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:43 p.m., recessed subject to the call of the Chair until 2:43 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. BALDWIN).

#### THE ENERGY SAVINGS AND INDUSTRIAL COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 2014—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, Americans understand the relationship between affordable energy and a stronger economy. They understand it. They may not know all the numbers, but intuitively they know in their gut that affordable energy is critical to a sound and strong economy.

Between 2008 and 2013, America suffered through a financial crisis—a deep recession, sometimes called the great recession. There was nothing great about it because it turned our country and our economy on its head, and it resulted in the highest level of unemployment since the Great Depression. Yet over the same period of time, U.S. production of oil increased by 50 percent.

Meanwhile, from 2007 to 2012, America's production of shale oil increased by an astounding 18-fold while our production of gas grew by more than 50 percent. In fact, it is now projected that the United States could well be a net exporter of natural gas. The terminals that were built along the gulf coast and elsewhere to try to facilitate the importation of natural gas are now being retrofitted and turned around so that the excess natural gas produced right here in the U.S.A. is available to export.

As we have learned, among other things, this could change the geopolitics of the globe. If America and the rest of the world no longer depend on the Middle East—and if Europe and Ukraine are no longer dependent on Russia—for their sole supply of energy and oil, it could change the world as we know it.

Well, as I started out by saying people understand the relationship between affordable energy and a stronger economy, nowhere else do they understand it any better than in Bismarck, ND, or in the Permian Basin in Texas. Those are the two places, the last time I checked, that had the lowest level of unemployment in the country, and it is not a coincidence. These are places that are producing huge volumes of American oil and natural gas, and it is creating a lot of jobs in the process.

In short, even amid a difficult period of economic stagnation, America has

been experiencing a true revolution in domestic energy output. This is a little bit inside baseball, but a few years ago people were talking about peak oil, as if all of the oil that could be discovered had been discovered in the world; we were running out. Well, obviously, that has proven not to be true. But, as I said, all you need to do is to visit the Permian Basin in West Texas, the Eagle Ford Shale region in South Texas or the Barnett Shale region in North Texas and see what happens when America is a good steward of the natural resources we have been provided.

The numbers in my State are really amazing—in the great State of Texas. During the month of February, our State's average daily oil production hit a 28-year high—a 28-year high—as we produced more than 2 million barrels of oil a day. What does that mean, if you do not come from an oil-producing State, an energy-producing State? That means, at minimum, that is 2 million barrels a day less we have to import from OPEC—the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries—in the Middle East. That is 2 million barrels less a day that we are held hostage to that volatile region of the world.

In Karnes County, TX, alone, which is part of the Eagle Ford Shale region, total monthly oil production was nearly 4.9 million barrels. How did this happen? Well, it happened because of the innovation of this sector of our economy—the energy sector—and it has made it cleaner, safer, much more productive than it has been at any other time in the past.

In Midland, TX, which I mentioned a moment ago—part of the incredibly productive Permian Basin, which has been producing oil and gas for many decades now—monthly oil production grew from about 842,000 barrels in February 2008 to 1.9 million barrels in February 2014, for a total increase from 2008 to 2014 of 128 percent—128 percent. Incredible.

As I said, it is not surprising that this area of our State and our country has one of the lowest unemployment rates in the entire Nation. There is a relationship between affordable energy and a strong economy and strong job growth. It is a place, for example, where a person with a high school diploma or a general equivalency degree, a GED, can make \$75,000 a year driving trucks. So if you can get a commercial driver's license in Midland, TX, and you have a GED or a high school degree, you could make \$75,000 a year. I was told yesterday that at the McDonald's restaurants in the area, people are being paid \$15 an hour. That is not because the Federal Government has raised the minimum wage to \$15 an hour; that is because the market demands it because the economy is booming.

As I said, people in my State have long understood—because we have been an energy-producing State—that U.S. energy policy is a critical part of U.S.

economic policy. Thanks to this innovation I alluded to a moment ago, you are seeing other parts of the country experience this, some for the first time.

But we are all learning that maximizing domestic energy production will create American jobs, and it will make America safer. They are also beginning to understand better that misguided government policies can destroy those same jobs and perpetuate our dependence on foreign energy sources. For example, many people in my State are very concerned about the regulatory process at the Federal level and particularly a proposal that will, in essence, enact a backdoor energy tax in the form of new greenhouse gas rules. The proposed rule would have a major economic cost in return for meager or nonexistent benefits. The Obama Environmental Protection Agency itself admitted that its greenhouse gas rule would not have a notable impact on U.S. carbon dioxide emissions by 2022.

Speaking of which, I hope my friends across the aisle—who frequently argue that we must have government-imposed CO<sub>2</sub> reductions, even if it kills jobs and raises the price of energy for consumers—appreciate that this same natural gas and energy revolution that we have talked about has itself—all by itself—resulted in a significant decline in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. That is by virtue of this same innovation that has created all this natural gas—cheaper, more affordable energy—to help drive our economy and help create more jobs. At the same time it has reduced CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. Between 2005 and 2012, U.S. emissions dropped by more than 10 percent. Indeed, emissions dropped more in the United States than in Europe, which already has in place some draconian measures, such as a cap-and-trade rule, a carbon tax, and those sorts of policies. It has dropped more in America without those because of this innovation and this natural gas renaissance.

I admit this natural gas boom was not the only reason our emissions went down, but many experts believe it was the most important.

Despite this progress, the majority leader insists that we are still not doing enough to curb CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. But do you know what. He refuses to bring a bill to the floor that would actually, according to his scenario, do something about it—the so-called cap-and-trade bill. I do not support that because I think it would raise energy costs, it would have negligible benefits, and it is really just throwing a bone to some of the most radical people in America when it comes to our environment and exploring and producing American energy. But cap and trade failed to command sufficient Senate approval even when our Democratic friends controlled 60 votes, which in the Senate is unassailable in the sense that you can do that purely on a party-line vote. But the reason it did not pass was pretty simple, and our Democratic friends understand this as well. The costs of cap and trade vastly outweigh

the benefits of cap and trade. It does not pass the cost-benefit test.

The same is true of President Obama's backdoor energy tax. Over the coming decades, America's contribution to worldwide carbon dioxide emissions growth will be minuscule. Moreover, as I mentioned, the EPA itself—the Obama administration Environmental Protection Agency—does not believe the greenhouse gas rule would have a significant impact on U.S. emissions by 2022—8 years from now. So the benefits of this backdoor energy tax would be virtually nonexistent, while the costs would be all too real, including higher energy prices and lost jobs.

The shale gas revolution, as it is called—shale because that is the rock it is produced from through this phenomenon known as fracking. And for those who are scared about the concept of fracking, who do not really understand it, this is a process that has been used for about 70 years around the country. It is very safely regulated at the State and local level, and, if proper drilling practices are observed, casing is submitted in a hole in a way that protects drinking water and other possible contamination. So it can and has been done on a daily basis for lo these seven decades.

But the shale gas revolution has been critical to America's economic growth during a time the rest of the economy has struggled, and it is going to be even more vital in the decades ahead.

According to one study, by 2035 unconventional oil and gas resources alone—that is what comes from shale; shale oil, shale gas—will support close to 3.5 million jobs in America and make \$475 billion in value-added contributions to America's economy.

Where would we be this last quarter, when the gross domestic product of our economy grew at 0.1 percent, if it were not for what I am talking about here, this energy renaissance in America? We would be in a recession, in my judgment, because it has contributed so much that it has essentially negated a lot of the other bad policies that have kept American job growth nearly flatlined otherwise.

Given all of that, it would be my hope based on this evidence—not based on my comments or my arguments but based on the evidence—we should be doing everything in Washington to support this revolution, or some have called it a renaissance. Call it what you will, but it has supported American job creation and lowered energy costs and helped our economy.

So why not embrace an energy policy that is progrowth, projobs, and proconsumer, an energy policy that is consistent with our environmental interests but serves our economic interests as well and our strategic interests. That means, in part, doing what I said earlier; that is, blocking regulations that do not pass a simple cost-benefit analysis. It means streamlining the regulatory process here in Washington so these projects can go forward on a

timely basis. It means approving job-creating proposals such as the Keystone XL Pipeline.

Many of us have seen, in horror, some of the accidents that have occurred on the railways, where tanker cars have derailed, catching fire, only to learn that in the absence of adequate pipeline capacity, that is the way the oil moves. It moves along the railroad lines in tankers, and sometimes accidents happen, unfortunately.

But we need the Keystone XL Pipeline, which will create tens of thousands of new jobs. It will mean we have a safe source for additional oil, in addition to what we produce here in America, from our friends in Canada. For the opponents of the Keystone XL Pipeline who think that somehow by denying approval of the Keystone XL Pipeline this oil will not be produced and sold, well, it is going to be sold somewhere. Canada is going to sell that oil abroad if it cannot sell it to the United States. That oil, when it comes down the pipeline, will end up in southeast Texas, in a lot of the large refineries there, and be turned into affordable gasoline, fuel oil, and jet fuel, among other things. We have offered amendments that will do that and more.

We will accelerate natural gas exports to our allies and trading partners. Think what Vladimir Putin might do if he knew he did not have a stranglehold on Ukraine and Europe when it came to energy. Think what would happen if they had an alternative—from American exports or pipelines from other places—that could circumvent Russia and could heat homes, keep the lights on, and avoid this stranglehold Vladimir Putin and Russia have on so much of Europe. I think it would make him think twice about his invasion of the Crimea and the threatening actions and the disruption which are taking place in Ukraine today and which could extend even further.

My point is that we have amendments to this underlying Shaheen-Portman energy conservation bill which are relevant to the topic of energy production, albeit broader, which would do all these things. We are trying to offer some of these ideas, which I hope any fairminded observer would say are constructive ideas. You may not agree with all of it—we may not even win a majority of the vote in the Senate today on these amendments—but why in the world would the majority leader insist on denying us an opportunity to have a fulsome debate on American energy policy, not just conservation but on producing more energy as well?

Unfortunately, though, he has given every indication that he will allow no votes on bipartisan amendments—and each of these amendments that I have mentioned has bipartisan support. As a matter of fact, he has indicated he won't allow votes on any amendments on this bill.

The distinguished Republican leader from Kentucky has pointed out that since July this side of the aisle has only been allowed eight—and I think now we have gone back and looked at it—maybe nine votes on amendments that came from the Republican side of the aisle.

Forget me, forget the prerogatives of an individual Senator, but think about the fact that I represent 26 million people. What a tremendous honor and privilege it is but how unfair it is to my constituents; how unfair it is to constituents—American citizens all—that everyone on this side of the aisle represents to shut them out of the process.

Someone called this the HARRY REID gag rule. That pretty well describes it when the minority is deprived of any right to offer constructive proposals and to have votes and debate on these policies in the Senate. We used to call—well, I see the pages here, and I know they go to school while they are pages. I bet if they go back and look in some of their history or civics books, it will tell them that the Senate is called the world's greatest deliberative body. No more. That is history.

If the minority can't offer constructive proposals that would actually improve the availability of American-produced energy, would help grow the economy, and would create jobs, no more is the Senate the world's greatest deliberative body. Unfortunately, it is the result of the decisions made by the majority leader.

When it comes to energy policy, I hope my friends across the aisle will remember what I said about these back-door energy taxes hurting lower-income Americans, as well as our seniors who are on fixed income, because they are the people who can least afford paying higher energy bills or they are the ones who are least able to afford losing their jobs.

We want to adopt on a bipartisan basis energy policies that are progrowth, projobs, pro-environment, and proconsumer, but we will never get there as long as Majority Leader REID decides to deny us an opportunity for a vote on relevant legislation.

This isn't just about inside Senate baseball, this is about one of the Nation's most important governing institutions being able to function. This is about consent of the governed. That is the very premise upon which the legitimacy of the Federal Government exists; that is, that the people—"We the People"—all 300 and some-odd million of us, have an opportunity to participate in the governing process by voting, by petitioning our elected representatives, and by advocating that certain policies be embraced in Washington. You are not promised you will win every time, but you are guaranteed a right as an American citizen to participate in the process. Yet that is being denied at its most fundamental level when the majority leader decides to run this as an autocracy or a dicta-

torship or decides to impose his own gag rule on the proper functioning of what used to be called the world's greatest deliberative body but is no more.

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

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### CONDEMNING ABDUCTION OF FEMALE STUDENTS IN NIGERIA

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Foreign Relations Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 433 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 433) condemning the abduction of female students by armed militants from the Government Girls Secondary School in the northeastern province of Borno in the Federal Republic of Nigeria.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to a voice vote on the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 433) was agreed to.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I further ask the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

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

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of May 1, 2014, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, am I correct in assuming that we have now agreed to this resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I want to thank my friends. It looks as though the Chamber is empty here, but everyone had to sign off on this measure, and I want to explain what we just did. We passed a very important resolution expressing our support for the young girls who were kidnapped in Nigeria.

As I think the world is learning, this is a horrific situation. Kidnapping certainly has no place in any village, in any region, or in any country—not in our country. We know how we feel. We have seen kidnappings recently of