

reduce our Nation's CO₂ emissions while also saving taxpayers money. This is the kind of policy everyone should be able to agree to. The bill also provides resources to train workers on energy-efficient building design and operation, a crucial component of making sure advances in energy efficiency translate into real, well-paying jobs. In addition, the bill provides incentives for more energy-efficient manufacturing and the development and deployment of new technologies.

Finally, the bill would establish a Supply Star Program which will help provide support to companies looking to improve the efficiency of their supply chains. This program could be particularly helpful to Hawaii, where transportation of goods from the mainland and other places can be very costly.

While individually these provisions may sound like modest proposals or changes, when taken together, the policies in this bill make significant progress toward reducing energy costs. That is good for consumers and businesses, driving innovation, reducing environmental harm, and positioning the United States as a leader in clean energy technology and jobs.

It goes without saying that the cost of energy is an important consideration for families and businesses across our country. When energy costs go up, they can be a drag on the economy. We see this very clearly in Hawaii, where we are uniquely impacted by the price of oil.

In 2011, Hawaii's energy expenditures totaled \$7.6 billion—almost equal to 11 percent of our entire State economy. In addition, no other State uses oil to generate electricity to the extent we do in Hawaii. As a result, we have electricity prices that average 34 cents per kilowatt hour. That is over three times the price on the mainland.

Moreover, 96 percent of the money we spend on energy leaves our islands to buy oil from places outside of Hawaii. That is money that could be better used to create jobs, bolster paychecks or to make investments in Hawaii's future.

Obviously, our State's energy security and economic potential is severely undermined by a reliance on fossil fuels. While breaking that reliance is a challenge, it is also an opportunity. Hawaii has set some of the Nation's most aggressive goals for generating renewable energy and improving energy efficiency. We are working to show that renewable energy and energy efficiency technologies are not just good for the environment, they can be an engine for economic growth and innovation. That is what makes the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act such an important bill. At its core, this legislation is about updating Federal energy efficiency policies to better meet the needs of today's marketplace.

For example, updating voluntary building codes will give States and

tribes the opportunity to reduce their energy use while also giving the private sector signals that there will be demand for innovation. The use of energy savings performance contracts is an example. Energy savings performance contracts are private agreements that make energy and water efficiency retrofits more affordable. A third-party company covers the cost of the upgrade, and it is repaid over time from the resulting savings in energy costs.

Thanks to the State of Hawaii's commitment to improving energy efficiency, Hawaii is the Nation's No. 1 user of energy savings performance contracts. In fact, just a few weeks ago the State of Hawaii was awarded the Energy Services Coalition's Race to the Top Award which recognizes the State's commitment to pursuing energy savings through performance contracting. This is the second year in a row that Hawaii has won this award.

These are the types of innovative financing models and partnerships that can happen when there is clear, sustained demand for improving energy efficiency.

Another aspect to keep in mind is that even something as unglamorous sounding as improving building codes or advancing energy-efficient construction techniques can have a profound impact on the lives of families across the country.

In 2011, Hawaii's first net-zero affordable housing community of Kaupuni Village opened on Oahu. The 19 single-family homes and community center at Kaupuni Village were constructed to maximize energy efficiency and use renewables to achieve net-zero energy performance. The development has earned a LEED Platinum status. Each home in the community was designed with optimal building envelope design, high-efficiency lighting, natural ventilation, solar water heating, and ENERGY STAR appliances.

Kaupuni Village also provides affordable homes to Native Hawaiians—a population that has faced many challenges in achieving independence, home ownership, and economic success. These homes were completed at an average cost of less than half the median sales price of homes on Oahu, which are some of the Nation's highest home costs.

Thanks to technical assistance from the National Renewable Energy Lab, or NREL, this partisanship between the Department of Hawaiian Homelands, Hawaiian Electric Company, the State of Hawaii, and private and Federal partners is a model for other communities.

Homeowners in Kaupuni Village are able to conserve energy and save money by optimizing their high-tech homes while also maintaining a lifestyle firmly rooted in traditions that go back thousands of years.

Homeowner Keala Young described her new life at Kaupuni Village by saying:

We grow our own vegetables. We raise our own fresh-water tilapia.

We are passionate about net-zero living. There is so much pride in our home and our community. We feel we can be an example to others.

These are the types of stories I imagine every Member of the Senate wants to tell in order to help bring about stories of strong communities, happy, vibrant families, and new opportunities that create a bright future.

The Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act is bipartisan legislation that can help to make those stories real for more people in Hawaii and across the country.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. 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 therein.

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

MCC COMPACT FOR EL SALVADOR

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, on September 12 I made a statement in this Chamber about the vote earlier that day by the board of directors of the Millennium Challenge Corporation to approve a second compact for El Salvador.

As I said then, that vote was expected, and it began the final phase of discussions between the United States and El Salvador on a compact which, if funded, could result in investments totaling \$277 million from the United States and \$85 million from El Salvador.

I share the view of the MCC board that the compact, if implemented fully, would improve the lives of the Salvadoran people, but I also noted that when the MCC was established a decade ago it was not intended to be just another foreign aid program. Rather, an MCC compact provides a kind of stamp of approval by the United States indicating that the government of the compact country has demonstrated a commitment to integrity, to good governance and respect for the rule of law, and to addressing the needs of its people. I said this should be doubly so for a second compact.

While El Salvador can point to some success in these areas, it remains a country of weak democratic institutions where the independence of the judiciary has been attacked, corruption

is widespread, and transnational criminal organizations and money laundering have flourished. Nobody knows this better than the Salvadoran people.

I urged the MCC, the Department of State, and the Government of El Salvador, prior to a final decision to provide the funds for a second compact, to do more to address these problems which is necessary for the rule of law and economic growth in that country. Regrettably, rather than acknowledge the need to address these problems more convincingly, the reaction of top Salvadoran officials was to accuse me of being “misinformed” about their country and of meddling in their affairs. They reacted similarly when U.S. Ambassador Aponte expressed some of the same concerns.

For over 20 years, I have been a friend of El Salvador. I actively supported the negotiations that ended the civil war. I worked to help El Salvador recover from that war, and I supported the first MCC compact which was financed with \$461 million from the Appropriations subcommittee that I chair. I obtained emergency funding to help that country rebuild after devastating floods. And over the past decade I have watched as the Salvadoran people were victimized by increasing levels of crime and violence, a corrupt police force, and some individuals in positions of authority who cared more about enriching themselves or protecting their privileges than improving the lives of the people. So it is disappointing that Salvadoran officials reacted as they did to my remarks last week.

As I said then, I appreciate that MCC CEO Yohannes, U.S. Ambassador Aponte, and other State Department officials have echoed some of the concerns I have raised.

The budget of the Millennium Challenge Corporation, which I have long supported, and the funds for a second compact for El Salvador—for those who may not be aware or have forgotten—comes from the Congress. It should not be taken for granted.

I hope President Funes and his government will reconsider their response to these concerns—for the good of the Salvadoran people and if they want a second MCC compact to be funded.

REMEMBERING BRIGADIER GENERAL DOUGLAS KINNARD

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to pay tribute to retired BG Douglas Kinnard, a former University of Vermont professor and retired general officer who passed away on July 29 of this year at the age of 91.

Long before I came to know General Kinnard, he had built a reputation as a wise and thoughtful soldier. Respected for his leadership and integrity on and off the battlefield, he honorably served our country in three wars, including two tours in Vietnam, despite his misgivings about American strategy and

involvement in the conflict. Having graduated from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point on D-day during World War II, Douglas Kinnard rose to the rank of brigadier general before retiring from the Army to pursue his doctor of philosophy at Princeton University.

It is no surprise given his intellect and objectivity that when he went searching for his first faculty job, he found a home at the University of Vermont. Those who have worked with General Kinnard have praised him as an imposing figure that was “always open and fair” and an “enjoyable colleague” who taught his students about real patriotism from his own experience.

I am grateful that the University of Vermont was able to benefit from the many gifts General Kinnard brought with him to his work in Burlington and throughout the country. Marcelle and I send our condolences to his wife Wade and son Frederick. I will miss his steady counsel, which he provided me throughout my Senate career. The many soldiers, students, and colleagues who were fortunate to have known him throughout his long and industrious life will not soon forget his impact.

The Burlington Free Press recently paid tribute to General Kinnard and his many contributions. I ask unanimous consent that a recent Free Press article entitled “Remembering UVM prof., ex-Army general Douglas Kinnard” be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Burlington Free Press, Aug. 7, 2013]

THE TWO ACCOMPLISHED CAREERS OF DOUGLAS KINNARD, 1921–2013

(By Tim Johnson)

In 1977, midway through his faculty career at the University of Vermont, ex-Army man Douglas Kinnard was invited to appear on “Good Morning America” to talk about the Vietnam War with his former commanding officer, William Westmoreland.

The appearance preceded the publication of Kinnard’s book, “The War Managers,” which drew on a detailed survey Kinnard had sent to all the American generals in Vietnam in 1974, a year before U.S. forces finally withdrew. The survey revealed, among other things, that about 70 percent of the generals thought the war’s objectives were unclear, and that more than half thought the war shouldn’t have been fought with American troops.

Mark Stoler, a UVM historian who knew Kinnard, recalls watching the show and thinking that Westmoreland looked uncomfortable while Kinnard remained unruffled. “He just sat there, smiling,” said Stoler, who recalled that Kinnard had “an incredibly sharp mind” and was eminently clear-headed about that controversial episode in American military history.

Kinnard, who died of pneumonia last week in Pennsylvania at age 91, spent about a decade in UVM’s Political Science Department during the 70s and 80s, in what for him was a second career following 26 years as an Army officer and service in three wars. He won the respect of his UVM peers partly because of his intellect: He did, after all, com-

plete his Ph.D. work at Princeton in just three years, following his retirement in 1970 as a brigadier general.

“Very capable, very serious,” said Garrison Nelson, professor of political science. “A remarkably well-organized guy. A good teacher and a relatively high grader, as I recall. I have very fond memories of Doug.”

Kinnard was also prolific. His first book on President Eisenhower, an adaptation of his doctoral thesis, was also published in 1977. “The Secretary of Defense” also came out during his UVM tenure, in 1980, and he wrote about Vietnam again later in “The Certain Trumpet: Maxwell Taylor and the American Experience in Vietnam.”

Among Kinnard’s eight books were two memoirs, the first of which details his life’s remarkably humble beginnings. “Abandoned” by a broken family at age 4 and placed in an orphanage in Paterson, N.J., he was moved into a boarding house after several months and raised by an extended Catholic family.

“He had to take care of himself,” said his son, Frederick Kinnard, in a phone interview. “He was an adult before age 5. He lived with an old Irish spinster above a saloon.”

Kinnard made his way through Paterson’s St. Joseph Grammar School and Eastside High, became an Eagle Scout, and eventually won an appointment to West Point. He didn’t aspire to be a soldier, he told an interviewer in 1977, but chose West Point partly because it was close to home.

“It was a good way to go to college,” he said. “I really wasn’t thinking about a military career.” The Army became his career, however, with a series of promotions. He graduated on June 6, 1944—D Day—and was dispatched to Europe where, as an artillery lieutenant and forward observer, he was awarded the Bronze Star for Heroic Achievement. During the Korean War, he served in an artillery unit, and later was assigned to the Pentagon and to NATO headquarters in France.

Kinnard did two tours in Vietnam. The first, beginning in 1966, was as chief of operations analysis under Gen. Westmoreland. When he returned to the United States he was promoted to brigadier general, but he was having doubts about the war and mulling a career in academia. Of the war, he told an interviewer for the Princeton Independent in 2004:

“The more I dealt with [the war and U.S. strategy], the more skeptical I became, especially about the assumption underpinning [General] Westmoreland’s and American strategy: that if we punished the enemy enough, he would negotiate an end favorable to us. I was convinced that we really did not understand the enemy or his motivations, or even his strategy. The premise that our punishment would bring us victory was to build a strategy on a house of cards.”

Kinnard wanted to retire but the Army refused and sent him to Vietnam again, in 1969, this time commanding artillerymen. The Independent interviewer asked him how he felt about being sent back to Vietnam, given his doubts about the war.

“You must understand that I had already applied for retirement, and that was turned down,” he said. “So when the decision was made that I would definitely go back, then I had to concern myself with my job and not worry about my personal feelings. As Commanding General of Force Artillery, I commanded eight thousand troops in sixty firebases from the Cambodian border to the South China Sea. I had to visit those people daily and get involved in the planning, so I had to toss my personal feelings—gone! Nothing can stand in the way of the welfare of your troops. Your job is to defeat the enemy; your job is to take care of your