

Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of James D. Peterson, of Wisconsin, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Wisconsin.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Mazie Hirono, Dianne Feinstein, Al Franken, Jack Reed, Amy Klobuchar, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Sheldon Whitehouse, Benjamin L. Cardin, Tom Harkin, Barbara Boxer, Richard Blumenthal, Edward J. Markey, Richard J. Durbin, Charles E. Schumer, Elizabeth Warren.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF NANCY J. ROSENSTENGEL TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 657.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Nancy J. Rosenstengel, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Illinois.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. I send a cloture motion to the desk, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to report the cloture motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Nancy J. Rosenstengel, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Illinois.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Mazie Hirono, Dianne Feinstein, Al Franken, Jack Reed, Amy Klobuchar, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Sheldon Whitehouse, Benjamin L. Cardin, Tom Harkin, Barbara Boxer, Richard Blumenthal, Edward J. Markey, Richard J. Durbin, Charles E. Schumer, Elizabeth Warren.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF ROBIN S. ROSENBAUM TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 690.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robin S. Rosenbaum, of Florida, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. If the cloture motion is at the desk, I ask that it be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to report the cloture motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Robin S. Rosenbaum, of Florida, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Mazie Hirono, Dianne Feinstein, Al Franken, Jack Reed, Amy Klobuchar, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Sheldon Whitehouse, Benjamin L. Cardin, Tom Harkin, Barbara Boxer, Richard Blumenthal, Edward J. Markey, Richard J. Durbin, Charles E. Schumer, Elizabeth Warren.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, because of the conversation with Senator McCONNELL and me, the time ran much longer than it normally does, so I ask unanimous consent that the vote occur at 11:15 rather than 11. Senator DURBIN is here, as well as Senator WARREN, with Senators CORNYN and MORAN, so we will divide the time equally until then.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

Under the previous order, the time until 11:15 a.m. will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The assistant majority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I note on the floor the presence of Senators MORAN, CORNYN, and WARREN. May I enter into a consent agreement as to the sequence of speaking? I ask unanimous consent that after I have spoken, Senator WARREN be recognized next on the Democratic side, and I ask which Republican Senator would like to be included and in what order?

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, responding to the question of the distinguished majority whip, through the Chair, it would help if we could alternate between sides, if that is acceptable.

Mr. DURBIN. It is agreed. Who would be first on the Republican side?

Mr. CORNYN. My understanding is Senator MORAN would be first. Then we would go to the Democratic side and then back to me.

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I was going to ask for a specific time for each, but I am going to try to be brief and yield more time for comments from others because I am sure time will be expiring.

The issue we are trying to move to is called the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act. Whenever we talk about energy and the environment, the Senate is up for grabs. There is a divided opinion as to what to do with the energy policy of America. There are sincere and profound differences between the two political parties. We recently had an all-night session talking about the issue of global warming and climate change and there was a real division between Democrats and Republicans about this issue.

I had a statement early in the session, and I come to the floor and renew it today in the hopes one of my two friends on the other side of the aisle can respond to this. My statement is this: The only major political party in the world that denies the existence of global warming and climate change is the Republican Party of the United States of America. I am waiting for some Republican to come forward and refute me. Someone said there is a small party in Australia that doesn't accept global warming and climate change. That may be true, but I am looking for evidence of another major political party, other than the Republican Party of the United States of America, which denies the fact that our human activity on Earth and the pollution we are creating is changing the world in which we are living.

I think there is ample evidence. Incidentally, 98 percent of the scientists

who look at it conclude the same—that we are going through climate change in this world. Look around. Glaciers are melting, the weather is changing, we have more extreme weather events, and our planet is heating up. Some people say: That is just an act of God. It happens every few centuries. That is the way it goes.

I don't think so. I think what we are doing on Earth has something to do with it.

This debate could go on all day and there would be severe differences of opinion on each side of the aisle as to whether what I have said is true, but here is something we should not disagree on—the pending legislation. This bipartisan piece of legislation steps aside from that hot issue—no pun intended—and asks if we can't all agree that energy efficiency is good. Well, sure. Whether one thinks there is an environmental impact of using energy or not, it costs less if you have energy efficiency to heat a home or run a business.

What we are trying to do, thanks to the leadership of Senator SHAHEEN of New Hampshire and Senator PORTMAN of Ohio, Democrat and Republican, is to have a bipartisan approach to it. What they have done is amazing. They took a bill, which frankly was supposed to come up last year and failed because of some problems on the floor, and made it even better and stronger and more bipartisan, with a long series of bipartisan amendments added to the bill to make it better in terms of trying to encourage energy efficiency in the buildings across America, manufacturing new techniques for energy efficiency, and requiring the Federal Government, when it builds a building, to think about energy efficiency.

All of these are bipartisan in nature. Yet we are tied up in knots on the floor of the Senate as to whether we can even consider this bipartisan bill. That is a shame because, quite honestly, when we have a good bipartisan measure on an issue such as energy efficiency, which steps aside from underlying controversial issues, we should move on it. I worry about that. There are some on the other side who say: We don't have enough amendments. There are more we want to add. There is more we want to debate. There is nothing wrong with that, but let us not sacrifice this bill this time.

What is at stake with this bill? It is not just the good ideas of energy efficiency but 190,000 jobs in America. When we start putting in better windows in buildings, when we start putting in better HVAC systems, and all the other things that are going to create energy efficiency, it puts Americans to work. If the Republicans stop us from moving to this bill today, if they stop us from considering this bill this week, it will be at the expense of American jobs. That is wrong.

Now that we have a bipartisan bill, and a strong bill, for goodness' sake, let us put the procedural fights aside.

There is a Republican Senator who stopped this bill last week from coming up because he wants to debate—are you ready—ObamaCare. Fifty times the House of Representatives has voted to repeal ObamaCare. It is going nowhere. Yet they continue to come back to it. So this Senator said we can't take up energy efficiency because he wants to debate one aspect of ObamaCare again.

Please, save it for another day. Let us do something in a bipartisan fashion that can guarantee 190,000 people in America a good-paying job.

Wouldn't that be something we can talk about when we come home at the end of the week instead of the fact that the Senate once again broke down into a partisan squabble.

I urge my colleagues on the other side, save some of these really great and not-so-great ideas for another day. Let's pass this bill. It is strong, it is bipartisan, and it really tries to get something done in the Senate, which, sadly, is a rare occurrence.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

VA BACKLOG

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, there is no group of Americans whom I hold in higher regard than our Nation's veterans. Their service and sacrifice have allowed us to live in the strongest, freest, greatest country in the world.

American veterans have fought tyrants and terrorists to keep our country safe and secure. Yet even after they return from war, veterans today continue to fight tough battles here at home. Many veterans find themselves struggling to find a job, they face difficulties accessing quality health care services—especially in rural areas such as mine at home in Kansas—and all too many veterans must wait long periods of time for benefit claims to be processed by the VA.

As of April 2014 the backlog stood at 596,061 outstanding claims, and 53 percent of those have been waiting longer than 125 days for an answer from the VA. It takes approximately 266 days for most new claims to receive an answer.

If a veteran is unhappy with the outcome of their claim, they can file an appeal. The backlog for appeals is more than 272,000—in backlogs alone. Some have waited more than 1,500 days—more than 4 years—to get a response on their appeal.

These numbers represent real people. They are not just statistics. They are not just average, everyday Americans. They are our veterans whom we claim we hold in the highest regard and esteem.

Americans who served our country are waiting to receive the benefits they earned. At a time when more and more troops are transitioning out of the military—and the needs are clear for our aging veterans—I am especially concerned that we are not keeping our promise to those who served our country.

As I travel across Kansas and meet veterans in their communities across

our State, I hear the stories about their VA claims process—from systemic issues with the back-and-forth of how the claims are handled, to absurd waiting times in Washington. I hear from veterans organizations that come from Kansas—the American Legion, Disabled Veterans of America, Concerned Veterans of America, and Veterans of Foreign Wars—and they bring their stories of other veterans to me, outlining the problems the veterans back home are facing. The reality is that our veterans are losing hope that the VA will care for them.

Americans recently heard the story about a whistleblower in Phoenix, AZ, at the VA in which there was a secret waiting list of veterans who had waited more than 7 months to see a doctor in order to avoid VA policies on reporting extended delays. The VA hospital figured out how to hide those claims for 7 months so that they weren't reported.

Incidents of mismanagement and even death caused by the failures of the VA are far more numerous than we see in the news. Reports continue to pop up across the country, from Atlanta to Memphis, from St. Louis to Florida. The claims backlog, medical malpractice, mismanagement of cases, lack of oversight, and unethical environment all contribute to the VA's failure.

It has become abundantly clear that the dysfunction within the VA extends from the top to the bottom—at the highest headquarters and at each VISN and down to the local level in some medical facilities. Community-based outpatient clinics and regional benefit offices are part of the problem. The VA suffers from a culture that accepts mediocrity, leaving too many veterans without the care they need. Our veterans deserve better, and they deserve the best our Nation knows how to offer.

I highlight today the broken VA system and challenge the Department of Veterans Affairs to change. We need accountability and transformation within the VA system and its culture, top to bottom, all across the country. We must break the cycle of dysfunction today and take the steps necessary to make certain our veterans are no longer victims of their own government's bureaucracy.

Here are some examples from across our State:

Jack Cobos, a Kansan who sought medical attention at the Topeka VA hospital emergency room, is told his chest pains are related to muscles around his heart. He is sent home. A week later he returns and is transported to another emergency room. Ultimately, Jack dies of a heart attack—he never recovers—and we now pay tribute to that veteran who failed to receive the care he needed in a timely fashion.

One year later the same Topeka emergency room closed its doors to

veterans seeking emergency treatment. And I am still waiting on a response from the VA to explain the closure of an emergency room at the VA hospital in Topeka, KS.

An outpatient clinic in Liberal has been without a primary care provider for more than 3 years. While others try to fill in the gap, there is nothing to date that the VA has done to solve the underlying problems. There is still no primary care provider.

I recently spoke about claims backlogs with a Kansas veteran involved in the American Legion named Dave Thomas from Leavenworth. He has waited since he filed his claim in 1970 and only this past year received an answer. He received a 90-percent disability rating from the VA, but it took 44 years for him to receive that answer.

A veteran with Parkinson's disease was told recently—he filed his claim in March of last year. He was told this past week that it will now be processed only because his claim is now over a year old. You have to wait a year before you are in line in order for you to receive the process of your claim that you deserved more than 1 year ago. How can the VA establish a wait time benchmark of 1 year for veterans' claims to get the attention they deserve?

It is so disappointing to hear these stories. I know it is unacceptable. Whether a veteran served in 1941, 1951, 1971, 1991, 2001, 2011, or is currently serving, we owe the Nation's veterans our absolute best after their military service is complete. Unfortunately, the VA system continues on a glidepath of dysfunction and is only, at best, playing defense.

The VA's failure is not a matter of resources. That is always the easy answer: more money. But just last week President Obama himself said:

We've resourced the Veterans Affairs office more in terms of increases than any other department or agency in my government.

VA funding levels have increased well more than 60 percent since 2009. Each year there have been incremental increases of 3, 4, or 5 percent, and this year the request from the President's budget is for a 6.5-percent increase over last year's spending. Yet our veterans continue to struggle and are not getting the treatment they earned and deserve, and they are not getting their benefits.

Republicans and Democrats have agreed on fully funding the VA to serve year after year, but this increase in spending results in no better service from the Department. To date, these increases have not in any way increased the service or support our veterans deserve and need. This is a problem with leadership and a lack of will to change.

I have been a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee for 18 years, both in the House and Senate. I chaired the Health Subcommittee in the House. I have worked with nine VA Secretaries. This is an issue on which I al-

ways thought we were making progress. Today it is so disappointing to report to my colleagues in the Senate that this Department is dysfunctional, and the services get worse, not better.

We need accountability at the VA. The 44-year-old claims process of Dave Thomas and the untimely passing of Jack Cobos should not be forgotten, and the Department needs to make meaningful changes so that these cases and cases like these will never happen again.

While we continue to push legislative action, it is time to hold people accountable in order to enforce meaningful change. GAO reports, inspector general reports, and VA whistleblowers all call for action. A list I find now of eight press and IG reports—from CNN, to FOX News, to military.com, to our IG, to the Washington Examiner—all report what we would not believe could ever happen within the VA in the United States of America.

Veterans are waiting for action. Yet the VA continues to operate in the same old bureaucratic fashion, settling for mediocrity and continued disservice to our Nation's heroes.

It is clear that accountability at VA is absent. Oversight doesn't mean much. And I sincerely and seriously question whether the leadership of the VA is capable and willing to enforce change. There is a difference between wanting change and leading it to happen.

Today I am demanding accountability and true transformation within the VA system and its culture, from top to bottom, and all across the country. Secretary Shinseki seemingly is unwilling or unable to do so, and change must be made at the top. I ask the Secretary to submit his resignation, and I ask President Obama to accept that resignation.

We must never forget that our Nation has responsibility to its veterans. That means receiving the care and support they earned.

God bless our veterans and all those serving at home and abroad and all their families. We need a Department of Veterans Affairs that is worthy of your sacrifice.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

(The remarks of Ms. WARREN pertaining to the Introduction of S. 2292 are printed in today's RECORD under "Introduction of Senate Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Ms. WARREN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I am on the floor today to discuss the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act—which is why we call it Shaheen-Portman; it is a faster way to refer to it.

It is a bill I coauthored with Senator ROB PORTMAN from Ohio, and it rep-

resents more than 3 years of meetings, negotiations, compromise, and broad stakeholder outreach in an effort to craft the most effective piece of energy legislation with the greatest chance of passing both Chambers of Congress and of being signed into law. My partner in this effort, Senator PORTMAN, was here on the floor last night talking about why this is a bipartisan bill that can pass not only this Chamber but the House and be signed into law.

It is a bipartisan effort that reflects an affordable approach to boost the use of energy efficiency technologies in our economy. Efficiency is the cheapest, fastest way to reduce our energy use. Energy-saving techniques and technologies lower costs; they free up capital that allows businesses to expand and our economy to grow.

In addition to being an energy bill, it is a jobs bill. We can start improving our efficiency now by installing ready, proven technologies such as modern heating systems, computer-controlled thermostats, low-energy lighting. Efficiency is no longer about putting on a sweater and turning down the thermostat. It is about making use of these technologies that are available today.

There are substantial opportunities which exist across all sectors of our economy that would allow us to conserve energy, to create good-paying private sector jobs, and to reduce pollution.

Our bill reduces the barriers to efficiency in the major energy-consuming sectors of our economy. It does that through buildings, which constitute about 40 percent of our use; through industrial efficiency, where we assist the manufacturing sector which consumes more energy than any other sector of the U.S. economy—we help them implement energy-efficient production technologies; and through the Federal Government, which as I think all of us know, is the single largest user of energy in the country.

The legislation encourages the Federal Government to adopt more efficient building standards, smart-metering technology, to look at our data centers and see how we can reduce the costs there.

Again, this bill will help create private sector jobs. It will save businesses and consumers money. It will reduce pollution and it will make our country more energy efficient.

A recent study by experts of the American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy found that by 2030 Shaheen-Portman, if it passes, has the potential to create 192,000 domestic jobs, to save consumers and businesses over \$16 billion a year, and to reduce carbon pollution by the equivalent of taking 22 million cars off the road. The bill does this without any mandates, without raising the deficit. All authorizations are offset and it even produces a \$12 million deficit reduction, according to the Congressional Budget Office.

I have had the opportunity over the last 3½ years as we have been working

on this bill to visit businesses across New Hampshire that are making use of energy-efficient technology, and what I have heard from those businesses is they have adopted these energy efficiencies because it allows them to save money, it allows them to be competitive, it allows them to add jobs in their sectors. I think that is why this legislation enjoys such strong support from industry, from trade associations, and from labor groups as well as efficiency and environmental advocates.

As the Presiding Officer knows, it is not often that we have groups such as the National Association of Manufacturers and the National Wildlife Federation supporting the same piece of legislation. I have a number of letters that have been sent by many of these organizations that illustrate the ever-growing support for the bill. The signatures on these letters go on and on, and they are signed by everyone from the Edison Electric Institute, the American Gas Association, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Earth Day Network, and the National Association of State Energy Offices.

At this time, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have these letters printed in the RECORD.

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

APRIL 30, 2014.

Hon. HARRY REID,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Republican Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

MAJORITY LEADER REID AND REPUBLICAN LEADER MCCONNELL: We the undersigned, representing hundreds of thousands of U.S. jobs, write to request that The Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act of 2014 (S. 2262) be considered by the full Senate as soon as possible.

This sensible, bipartisan legislation enjoys broad support in the business community. The bill's sponsors have worked with industry every step of the way in crafting and vetting this legislation. The reintroduced bill has generated even greater consensus among a growing stakeholder coalition that covers diverse economic sectors and environmental organizations. The enhancements have only strengthened—and broadened—the support of the U.S. business community, while multiplying the energy security and environmental benefits that will accrue from this landmark energy efficiency legislation.

Energy efficiency enjoys broad, bipartisan support as a recent study commissioned by the National Electrical Manufacturers Association and the National Association of Manufacturers demonstrated. Nine in ten of those polled support using energy efficient products and believe it is important to include energy efficiency as part of our country's energy solutions. 74 percent of those polled support investing taxpayers' dollars on energy efficient technologies, innovations and programs if it would save consumers more money. Finally, 69 percent of those polled are more likely to support investing taxpayers' dollars on energy efficiency if those investments will not raise taxes or add to the federal deficit and do not involve government mandates on consumers.

S. 2262 places no new mandates on U.S. businesses or consumers. All new authoriza-

tions are fully offset. Provisions in this legislation will promote energy savings in commercial buildings and industrial facilities, which together consume nearly 50 percent of the nation's primary energy. The bill will also reduce energy costs within the federal government, our nation's largest energy consumer, saving taxpayers money.

S. 2262 will also boost the competitiveness of U.S. manufacturers and real estate by creating jobs in the manufacturing, contracting, construction, installation, distribution, design, and service sectors.

For these reasons, the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources roundly endorsed the legislation with a strong bipartisan vote of 19-3. The legislation continues to gain additional cosponsors with Sens. Landrieu, Coons, Warner, Franken, Manchin, Collins, Ayotte, Wicker, Hoeven, Isakson, Murkowski and Bennett. The House recently passed several provisions contained in S. 2262 by a vote of 375-36, another strong showing of support for energy efficiency.

Now is the time to act on this important legislation and we ask that S. 2262 be brought to the Senate floor as soon as possible.

AMERICAN CHEMISTRY COUNCIL,
Washington, DC, May 5, 2014.

Hon. HARRY REID,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Republican Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

MAJORITY LEADER REID AND REPUBLICAN LEADER MCCONNELL: As an industry that creates many of the advanced solutions that help society save energy, we support the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act (S. 2262) and urge the Senate's consideration and adoption as quickly as possible. Enactment of this bipartisan legislation can elevate the role of energy efficiency in a comprehensive, "all of the above" national energy policy.

American chemistry is a leader in energy efficiency. Our companies invent and make materials and technologies that empower people around the world to save energy and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. High-performance building insulation and windows, solar panels, wind turbines, even lightweight packaging and auto parts that reduce energy needs in shipping and transportation all start with chemistry.

In addition to supplying energy-saving products, we know that being energy-efficient in our own operations helps reduce costs and expand U.S. production and jobs. This commitment has led to a 49 percent improvement in the U.S. chemical industry's energy efficiency since 1974. ACC member companies report on energy efficiency and other measures through Responsible Care® an environmental, health, and safety performance program.

S. 2262 will achieve energy savings across the economy, including homes, buildings, industry, and the federal government. We encourage the Senate to approve this important legislation as a key step toward a strong, secure, and sustainable energy future.

Sincerely,

CAL DOOLEY,
President and CEO.

APRIL 28, 2014.

Hon. HARRY REID,
Majority Leader, The Capitol,
Washington, DC.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Minority Leader, The Capitol,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER REID AND MINORITY LEADER MCCONNELL: As a broad coalition

of energy efficiency and environmental organizations, small and large businesses, trade associations, and public interest groups, we urge you to bring the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act (S. 2074) to the floor for a vote as soon as possible.

S. 2074, introduced on February 27, 2014 by Senator Jeanne Shaheen and Senator Rob Portman, would help meet America's goals of increasing energy productivity, enhancing energy security, reducing harmful emissions, and promoting economic growth in a financially responsible manner. The new version of this bipartisan bill addresses energy savings in the federal government—the nation's largest energy consumer—and includes new provisions that expand energy efficiency savings and benefits to all sectors of the U.S. economy, from schools and homes, to commercial buildings, industry, and manufacturing.

Energy efficiency is the quickest, cheapest, and cleanest way to tackle domestic energy demand. Wasted energy not only weakens our national competitiveness on a global scale, but also compounds the financial burdens of businesses and consumers. An analysis of the new bill by the American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy (ACEEE) estimates that by 2030, the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act would create more than 190,000 jobs, save consumers \$16 billion a year, and cut carbon dioxide by the equivalent of taking 22 million cars off the road.

Energy efficiency has always been a bipartisan issue. By fully deploying the power of energy efficiency, we can help create new jobs, save energy and money, and reduce carbon emissions. This legislation affords Congress the opportunity to assist the economy without undue cost or regulatory burden.

For these reasons, we urge you to schedule the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act for a vote in the near future so that Americans can begin reaping the many benefits of energy efficiency.

ALLIANCE TO SAVE ENERGY,
Washington, DC, May 5, 2014.

DEAR SENATOR: The Alliance To Save Energy strongly supports S. 2262, the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act, also known as Shaheen-Portman. When the bill comes to the floor this week, the Alliance urges you to vote for cloture and to vote for the underlying bill.

Energy efficiency is the quickest, cheapest, and cleanest way to reduce domestic energy consumption. Well-designed programs such as those contained in the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act will help American families and businesses lower their energy costs. Moreover, energy efficiency policies offer Americans protection from rising energy costs caused by political instability abroad, and move us towards greater energy security.

This bipartisan bill addresses energy savings in the federal government—the nation's largest energy consumer—and includes provisions that expand energy efficiency savings and benefits to all sectors of the U.S. economy, from schools and homes, to commercial buildings, industry, and manufacturing.

More specifically, Shaheen-Portman contains provisions that will create a national strategy to increase the use of energy efficiency through a model building energy code; promote the development of energy efficient supply-chains for companies; encourage the federal government to adopt and implement energy saving policies and programs; improve federal data center efficiency; support the deployment of energy efficient technologies in schools; improve commercial building efficiency; and promote the benchmarking and disclosure of buildings'

energy use, among a number of other initiatives.

Rather than squandering taxpayers' dollars on needless energy costs, S. 2262 implements practical, cost effective measures to tackle federal energy consumption, while creating jobs and reducing emissions. It is estimated that by 2030, Shaheen-Portman will create more than 190,000 jobs, save consumers \$16 billion a year, and cut carbon dioxide emissions by the equivalent of taking 22 million cars off the road.

The American public wants bipartisan policies that will spur economic growth and create jobs. There is consensus that efficiency is the cheapest and fastest way to start reducing demand for the energy we currently use. We believe the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act represents our best chance to improve our demand-side energy policy.

Again, we urge you to vote for cloture and to vote for the underlying bill so that Americans can begin reaping the many benefits of energy efficiency. If you have any questions or need more background information, please have your staff contact Elizabeth Tate at the Alliance To Save Energy.

Sincerely,

KATERI CALLAHAN,
President, Alliance To Save Energy.

ADVANCED ENERGY ECONOMY,
MAY 5, 2014.

Hon. HARRY REID,
Senate Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Senate Minority Leader, U.S. Senate, Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR REID AND SENATOR MCCONNELL: On behalf of Advanced Energy Economy, a national association of businesses and business leaders who are making the global energy system more secure, clean, and affordable, I am writing to encourage you to bring bipartisan energy efficiency legislation (S. 2074) cosponsored by Senator Jeanne Shaheen and Senator Rob Portman to the Senate floor.

This bipartisan national strategy to increase energy efficiency in the residential, commercial, and industrial sectors of our economy reflects and accelerates the trend toward greater energy efficiency many businesses are embracing. Reducing costs for businesses and consumers and increasing U.S. competitiveness by making our use of energy more efficient is at the core of comprehensive energy policy.

The Senate has an opportunity to join the House in passing bipartisan legislation that moves us toward a more energy-efficient economy. S. 2074 highlights the many ways we can increase energy efficiency. The bill addresses building codes, financing, technical assistance, and rebate programs, all positive steps toward saving money through improved energy efficiency. All of these steps are important to our business members, who stand ready to provide the technologies and services that improve energy efficiency throughout the economy. We strongly support the bill and look forward to working with you as it continues through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

GRAHAM RICHARD,
CEO, Advanced Energy Economy.

NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC
COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,

MAY 5, 2014.

DEAR SENATOR: The National Rural Electric Cooperative Association strongly supports S. 2262, the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act sponsored by Senators Shaheen and Portman. When the bill

comes to the floor this week, NRECA urges you to vote for cloture and the underlying bill.

Approximately 250 co-ops in 34 states operate voluntary demand response programs using electric resistance water heaters that allow co-ops to reduce demand for electricity during peak hours. In parts of the country, these water heaters also allow co-ops to integrate renewable energy sources like wind and effectively store that energy.

In several major energy bills, Congress has declared the promotion of demand response an important federal policy. A 2012 report by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) recognized co-ops' leadership in demand response. It is through the use of large capacity electric resistance water heaters that co-ops are able to meet such federal goals.

Electric co-ops have a straightforward mission: to provide reliable electric service to their consumer-owners at the lowest cost possible. However, on March 22, 2010, the Department of Energy (DoE) issued a new efficiency standard for water heaters that will effectively end our very successful demand response programs beginning next April.

S. 2262 will allow us to continue to use water heaters in money- and energy-saving demand response programs by establishing a new category of efficiency standard for water heaters used in demand response programs. We have worked closely with Congressional leaders, DoE, other utilities, energy efficiency and environmental advocacy groups, and water heater manufacturers over the past several years to develop this common-sense approach to help continue the beneficial use of electric resistance water heaters.

Importantly, S. 2262 also includes consensus language to resolve Section 433 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007, that if not addressed would prohibit federal facilities from using electricity generated from the use of fossil fuels.

Again, when the bill comes to the floor this week, we urge your support. If you have any questions or need more background information, please have your staff contact Julie Barkemeyer at NRECA at 703-907-5809 or julie.barkemeyer@nreca.coop.

Sincerely,

JO ANN EMERSON.

NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION,
MAY 5, 2014.

DEAR SENATOR, On behalf of the National Wildlife Federation (NWF), and our over four million members and supporters nationwide, I urge you to support passage of the bipartisan Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act (S. 2262) and oppose any controversial amendments or associated legislation that does not meet the broadly agreed upon goal of this bill to save money, save energy, and cut carbon pollution. This includes a vote to approve the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline.

A product of cooperation and consensus under the leadership of the bill's sponsors and Energy Committee leadership, S. 2262 applies a common-sense approach to adopting efficiency measures for buildings, industry, and the federal government that will promote significant cost-savings while helping to protect the health of our communities and wildlife threatened by climate change. Should amendments be adopted that do not reflect the same consensus principle that went into producing the current bill, or undermine current efforts by the federal government to reduce carbon pollution, NWF will be forced to oppose the legislation. We encourage you to oppose amendments that would erode the Environmental Protection Agency's ability to regulate carbon pollu-

tion, block federal agencies from considering the social cost of carbon when assessing the costs and benefits of major projects, or undermine the National Environmental Policy Act.

The Shaheen-Portman energy efficiency bill would be a big step in the right direction. Reducing energy consumption through efficiency measures is not only an important part of carbon reduction strategies, but also provides wildlife and habitat benefits by reducing energy-production related pressure on America's wildlife and pristine lands. These benefits must not be undermined by including controversial amendments or tying the passage of S. 2262 to the approval of the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline.

The Keystone XL tar sands pipeline would force America's wildlife and communities to accept all the risk of oil spills, contaminated water supplies, and climate-fueled extreme weather like superstorm Sandy, and for what reward? Higher Midwest gas prices and a handful of jobs.

The Shaheen-Portman energy efficiency bill, on the other hand, is estimated to create 136,000 new jobs by 2025. By 2030, the bill will also net annual savings of \$13.7 billion and lower CO₂ emissions and other air pollutants by the equivalent of taking 22 million cars off the road. These clear benefits must not be eroded by harmful amendments or a mandated approval of the polluting Keystone XL tar sands pipeline.

Now is the time to implement common sense measures, like efficiency standards, to create jobs, save money and reduce carbon pollution. The National Wildlife Federation urges you to support S. 2262, oppose any amendments or linked legislation that will undermine the consensus and bipartisan cooperation that the bill represents.

Sincerely,

JIM LYON,
*Vice President for Conservation Policy,
National Wildlife Federation.*

BUSINESS ROUNDTABLE,
Washington, DC, May 5, 2014.

Hon. HARRY REID,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,

Minority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR LEADERS REID AND MCCONNELL: On behalf of the more than 200 CEO members of Business Roundtable, who lead major American companies operating in every sector of the U.S. economy, I write to convey Business Roundtable's strong support for the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act of 2014, S. 2262, and respectfully request that this vital legislation be brought to the Senate floor for a vote as expeditiously as possible.

America's CEOs have consistently called upon Congress and the Administration to adopt a more strategic approach to energy policy that would capitalize on U.S. strengths to promote economic growth, job creation, and enhanced energy security. In our report, *Taking Action on Energy: A CEO Vision for America's Energy Future*, Business Roundtable laid out a comprehensive plan to boost U.S. energy security and ensure a steady supply of reliable, affordable energy to power increased growth. As noted in that report, energy efficiency improvements over the last quarter century are an American success story and a win-win for the U.S. economy.

A Business Roundtable report released last month, *Grow, Sustain: Celebrating Success*, highlights the sustainability achievements of Roundtable member companies, including remarkable progress in more efficient energy use. Private-sector innovation and CEO leadership have helped yield a 1.9 percent annual reduction in U.S. energy use per dollar of

economic output (GDP) between 1992 and 2012. These steady energy efficiency improvements are a major strategic advantage for the United States.

Enacting S. 2262 would be an important step toward accelerating U.S. energy efficiency gains and facilitating America's emergence as a global energy superpower. Senate passage of this vital legislation would be a victory for all Americans. We urge you to support S. 2262.

Thank you for your attention to this important issue.

Sincerely,

DAVID M. COTE,
Chairman and Chief
Executive Officer,
Honeywell, Chair,
Energy and Environment
Committee,
Business Round-
table.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I think this nontraditional alliance clearly illustrates the sizable and diverse demand for this energy efficiency jobs bill and, simply put, the time is now for the Senate to take up and pass this bipartisan, commonsense proposal to grow our economy and create good-paying jobs for decades. We cannot let our extraneous debates about amendments or nonamendments, what amendments to include, which amendments not to include, to get in the way of getting this legislation done, because this creates jobs, it saves consumers money, and it saves on pollution.

One of the great things about the bill, which I hope we are going to take up in a few minutes, is it includes 10 additional bipartisan amendments. Since our bill was taken up and pulled back from the floor in September, Senator PORTMAN and I have worked closely with Senators from both sides of the aisle to add 10 new bipartisan provisions that expand current sections of our bill.

The new bill has a section that puts in place commonsense and consensus-reached regulatory relief provisions that maintain the underlying principle of advancing energy efficiency in the private sector. As a result of these provisions, the legislation has more energy savings, more job creation, and more carbon dioxide reductions than the previous version of the bill.

I want to briefly talk a little bit about some of the bipartisan amendments, because I think they point out the improvements in the legislation.

Tenant Star builds on the success of EPA's long-running voluntary ENERGY STAR Program for commercial buildings and it creates a similar tenant-oriented certification for leased spaces. Again, it is voluntary. Commercial building tenants who design, construct, and operate their leased spaces in ways that maximize energy efficiency would receive the same kind of public recognition through Tenant Star that ENERGY STAR has produced for so many buildings and businesses.

This bill also includes a provision for energy-efficient schools. Senator SUSAN COLLINS and Senator MARK

UDALL have an amendment included that would help schools' energy efficiency and streamline the government's programs to make them run more productively. This would help schools across the country that finance energy efficiency projects to make their buildings operate in a more sustainable fashion.

The legislation also includes Senator BENNET's and Senator ISAKSON's amendment, called the SAVE Act, which would improve the accuracy of mortgage underwriting by including energy efficiency as a factor in determining the value and affordability of homes. It includes a proposal by Senators HOEVEN and PRYOR to create a regulatory exemption for thermal storage water heaters so rural cooperatives and others could continue to use certain large water heaters for their successful demand-response programs.

In addition to what is in this legislation, we have seen in the last several months the House pass energy efficiency legislation, including a number of the provisions that are in the bill we will be taking up today. In fact, the House recently passed an energy efficiency package by an overwhelming 375-36 margin. Those provisions passed by the House are in the version we are introducing of Shaheen-Portman, and it shows how much support for energy efficiency there is throughout the Congress.

We have a real opportunity to pass this legislation. This is a bipartisan, affordable, widely supported bill and, most importantly, an effective first step to address our Nation's very real energy needs.

I thank Senator PORTMAN for his partnership in bringing the bill to the floor. I thank the majority and minority leaders as well as the new energy Chair, Senator LANDRIEU, and Ranking Member MURKOWSKI for their support, and thank former Energy and Natural Resources chairman, Senator RON WYDEN, for his support.

I also thank the legislation's additional cosponsors: Senators AYOTTE, BENNET, COLLINS, the Presiding Officer, Senator COONS, as well as Senators FRANKEN, HOEVEN, ISAKSON, WARNER, and WICKER. I think the list of bipartisan cosponsors indicates the breadth of support for this legislation, that it shows the ideological breadth of support for it.

I look forward to working with Senate leadership and with all of my colleagues in the Senate, because we can pass this legislation, we can create these jobs, we can save consumers money, and we can reduce pollution.

Thank you very much, Mr. President. I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 368, S. 2262, a bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

Harry Reid, Jeanne Shaheen, Michael F. Bennet, Richard J. Durbin, Christopher A. Coons, Bill Nelson, Tom Harkin, Martin Heinrich, Patrick J. Leahy, Richard Blumenthal, Tim Kaine, Patty Murray, Tom Udall, Joe Manchin III, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Angus S. King, Jr., Mark R. Warner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 368, S. 2262, a bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN).

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 79, nays 20, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 131 Leg.]

YEAS—79

Alexander	Gillibrand	Murkowski
Ayotte	Graham	Murphy
Baldwin	Grassley	Murray
Barrasso	Hagan	Nelson
Begich	Harkin	Portman
Bennet	Heinrich	Pryor
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Reed
Blunt	Heller	Reid
Booker	Hirono	Rockefeller
Boxer	Hoeben	Sanders
Brown	Isakson	Schatz
Burr	Johanns	Schumer
Cantwell	Johnson (SD)	Shaheen
Cardin	Kaine	Stabenow
Carper	King	Tester
Casey	Kirk	Thune
Chambliss	Klobuchar	Toomey
Coats	Landrieu	Udall (CO)
Cochran	Leahy	Udall (NM)
Collins	Levin	Walsh
Coons	Manchin	Warner
Corker	Markey	Warren
Donnelly	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Durbin	McConnell	Wicker
Enzi	Menendez	Wyden
Feinstein	Merkley	
Franken	Mikulski	

NAYS—20

Coburn	Inhofe	Roberts
Cornyn	Johnson (WI)	Rubio
Crapo	Lee	Scott
Cruz	McCain	Sessions
Fischer	Moran	Shelby
Flake	Paul	Vitter
Hatch	Risch	

NOT VOTING—1

Boozman

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 79, the nays are 20. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The Senator from Vermont.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST—S. 933

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, next week we are going to commemorate National Police Week, a time when the Nation pays tribute to the sacrifices made by all those who serve in law enforcement, particularly those officers who have lost their lives in the line of duty. These law enforcement officers risk their lives every day to protect our communities.

We often speak eloquently on both sides of the aisle here about supporting law enforcement and their families. These tributes are important. They are well deserved. But the police officers in our communities deserve more than speeches; they deserve action and real support. We owe it to all who serve to help protect those who protect us. One important, tangible way to do so is to help provide them with lifesaving bulletproof vests.

For more than 15 years the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program has helped to provide bulletproof vests to law enforcement officers around the country. Republican Senator Ben Nighthorse-Campbell of Colorado and I worked across the aisle to design a program that helps local law enforcement agencies purchase bulletproof vests. We both had a background in law enforcement, and we drew on that. Mr. President, let me show you what has happened. Since 1987, this program has enabled over 13,000 State and local enforcement agencies to purchase over 1 million vests.

No one can dispute that this program saves lives. I will never forget a law enforcement officer who testified before our committee. He had his mother and father and his wife and children sitting behind him in the Judiciary Committee. The distinguished Presiding Officer knows how often we have witnesses speaking and their families are there.

He said: I love law enforcement. I love law enforcement. The only thing I love more than law enforcement is my family. But there came a day as an officer when I thought I would never see my family again.

It was when he stopped somebody in a routine traffic stop. The man came out of the car and shot him twice in the chest. He reached down underneath the witness table and pulled up the vest. You could see the two bullets still stuck in the vest.

He said: I got a cracked rib out of it, but I saw my mother and father and my wife and children. I saw them when I was at the hospital, where they were treating me for the cracked rib. I saw them there. They did not have to go to the morgue to see me.

That story is repeated all the time. No one disputes that this program saves lives. That is why Congress has historically acted quickly and decisively to support the bulletproof vests program. Between 2000 and 2010, the program enjoyed widespread bipartisan support. It was reauthorized three times by unanimous consent. This time around, every single Democratic Senator supports passage of the bill. It is also cosponsored by Senators HAGAN, CARDIN, LANDRIEU, SHAHEEN, PRYOR, and FRANKEN, to name just a few cosponsors. It has many other strong supporters of law enforcement, including the Fraternal Order of Police, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the National Sheriffs' Association, the Major County Sheriffs' Association, and the National Association of Police Organizations.

For reasons I still do not understand, the bill is being blocked on the Republican side. Not a single Republican cosponsor has stepped forward. I cannot understand this. This has never been a partisan issue. It should not be a partisan issue. We are doing this to protect the lives of police officers.

Senator GRASSLEY and I developed a bipartisan reauthorization that included improvements to the program. One important change is that agencies are now given a grant preference for purchasing vests that are uniquely fitted to women officers. There are far more women as police officers today than there were even when Senator Ben Nighthorse-Campbell and I first introduced this bill.

The program is now stronger than ever. I think the vast majority of Senators want to see this program reauthorized. I do not know why Republican Senators have blocked it, especially when we are now protecting, as we had not before, women police officers too. I do not know how we can turn our backs on our police officers.

I would also urge support for the National Blue Alert Act, which was reported by the Judiciary Committee with a strong bipartisan vote. It is sponsored by Senators CARDIN and GRAHAM. I am a proud cosponsor. The bipartisan Justice for All Reauthorization Act, which I coauthored with Republican Senator JOHN CORNYN and which reauthorizes important programs such as the Paul Coverdell Forensic Science Improvement Grant Program—named after a former Republican Senator—is another important bill to law enforcement that we should approve without further delay. It actually defies common sense that any Senator would object to these pieces of legislation.

Next week I will attend, as I almost always do, the National Peace Officers Memorial Service, and there will be a wreath-laying at the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial, which now contains the names of over 20,000 fallen officers. I remember shortly after I became State's attorney going to the funeral of one of those fallen of-

ficers. I have never forgotten that—even though it was decades ago—the long line of police cars, with blue lights flashing. Snow was coming down, and the blue lights reflected off the snowflakes. The names, unfortunately, do not just stop with those over 20,000 fallen officers. The names of 286 fallen officers will be added to its walls, serving as another somber reminder of the brave men and women of law enforcement who risk their lives each and every day. They work tirelessly to keep our communities safe. They deserve our best efforts to do the same for them.

I am, in a moment, going to ask consent that the Senate pass S. 933, the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program Reauthorization Act of 2013. It has always been bipartisan. We should not let ideology put officers' lives at risk now. I commend the fact that every single Democratic Senator supports it and we can honor the service of those who keep us safe by protecting their lives with bulletproof vests.

Frankly, if somebody stands with law enforcement, now is the time to stand with them. I can assure you—and they will assure you—it matters here, and it matters to them.

So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 162, S. 933, the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program Reauthorization Act; that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Thank you.

The most senior Member of our body understands the differences he and I have on a lot of issues. Most of what he said is true in his statement about the sacrifices and the effectiveness. Where we have a difference of agreement and a difference of understanding is in the enumerated powers of the Constitution of the United States.

The fact is that every individual in this country today owes \$50,000 just on the debt, and every family is responsible for \$1,100,000 in unfunded liabilities that your children and you will ultimately pay for.

This is not about vests. This is about continuing to do the same thing that got our country in trouble. This is a \$120 million authorization with no offset, no cutting of spending anywhere else. If it is a priority, we ought to cut spending somewhere else. But, more importantly, the Constitution lists the enumerated powers, and there is no role for the Federal Government in terms of funding local police departments. It would be nice to do if we were in surplus. We could ignore the enumerated powers. But we are not in surplus. We are borrowing tons of money

every year. We are going to borrow \$580 billion this year—\$580 billion against the future. And the small thing—this is small. It is only \$120 million. I do not object to our police officers having vests. I want them all to have vests. I want all the women to have vests. But it is not a role for the Federal Government. It is a role for my hometown police department in Muskogee, OK. The taxpayers there should protect our police officers.

Our Founders were very clear, and the reason this country is in trouble is we continue to practice outside the parameters of a limited government and take away the responsibility and obligations of State and local communities.

On that basis, I raise an objection and do not agree.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. LEAHY. Well, Mr. President, I am sorry to hear this. I hear people who supported a useless war in Iraq, and they will talk about how much money we spend. It was the first time in America's history—

Mr. COBURN. Will the Senator yield for a moment, just for a question?

Is the Senator aware that I never voted for any of the money for that spending?

(Ms. HEITKAMP assumed the Chair.)

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, if the Senator will go back to what I said, it did not refer to him.

I worry about those, however, who voted for that war and did not vote to stop that war and voted for the very first time that this country has ever gone to war in its history without a tax to pay for it. We voted for it on a credit card—an unnecessary war, a war that hurt the interests of the United States, and it will eventually cost us \$2 trillion. Nobody—nobody—talks about paying for that. But to protect the police officers, who are on the street every day protecting us, oh, we cannot do that. We cannot do that, even though we have done so before.

I could name the six police officers who were killed in Oklahoma. I am not going to. I am not trying to make this personal. But the Presiding Officer understands law enforcement. She supported this. Everybody on this side of the aisle supports it. It is to protect our police officers.

We will spend \$2 trillion on a useless war, but we will not spend a tiny fraction of 1 percent—one one-thousandth of 1 percent—to support our men and women, especially when we now have a provision in here to protect women police officers as well as men police officers. What could be more—what could be more—nonpartisan than this? That is why Senator Ben Nighthorse-Campbell and I joined together, why Republicans and Democrats have joined together.

I am proud that every Democratic Senator is in favor of this legislation. I wish the Republicans would lift their objection. We should pass this bill. If

you stand with law enforcement, then you need to stand with them when it matters most. I can assure you—and they can assure you—it matters here, and it matters now.

I yield the floor. I think I have expressed my dismay that the other side of the aisle would not stand up to protect these police officers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, I come to the floor to speak about the issue that is before us now on the floor, the energy efficiency act, led by Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN.

The issue the Senators from Oklahoma and Vermont just spoke about is extremely important, and there will be, I am sure, appropriate time to debate that issue. I thank Senator LEAHY for his extraordinary leadership for the safety and support of our police officers, for the many, literally dozens of years—decades—he has served, and he continues to do a magnificent job, and I will be supporting him in those efforts.

But I came to the floor to speak today about the bill that is now before us, with a vote of 79 votes—a very strong bipartisan signal that Republicans and Democrats would like to debate an energy efficiency bill that came out of the Energy Committee on a vote of 19 to 3.

I just became the chair of this committee, but I have served on it now for almost 18 years and just a few weeks ago became the chair. I have had the privilege to work with Republican and Democratic chairs of this committee. I am excited about the opportunity to try to find a path forward with the Presiding Officer, who has been, although not a member of the committee, an absolutely outstanding leader on energy issues since arriving in the Senate, and really look forward to working with her and Members from both sides of the aisle to actually deliver what I think the American people want: a sensible mainstream energy policy for America that increases domestic energy production, efficiency, and conservation; creates millions of jobs right here at home; makes us more energy secure and energy independent; and works with our friends, not our enemies.

I think we can get it done. I have been in the Senate long enough to know that things aren't easy, but I refuse to be cynical. I refuse to be, woe is me, the world is coming to an end, which I hear a lot around here. I think there are a lot of positive things going on in the country.

In the Presiding Officer's home State, North Dakota, I think there is zero unemployment. I think we come in second at about 4.5 percent unemployment in Louisiana because we are busy working—not fighting but working—together to produce energy jobs for the country.

I was very proud to support this efficiency bill in committee. I would like, of course, to see some additional things

added to it, but to move it forward—I voted for it to move this bill forward to the floor.

When I became the chair of the committee, I had committed to RON WYDEN, the former chair, and LISA MURKOWSKI, the ranking member—which it is really their work, along with Senators SHAHEEN and PORTMAN, two outstanding members of the committee—to see what I could do to move this bill forward.

I wanted to talk a minute about why this is important and frame this in a way that our Members can understand it.

First—I am going to talk about the bill itself in a minute, but let me just step back and say this: There have been 302 bills filed in this Congress that relate to energy that have been sent to our committee for review. I am sad to say, and I think my constituents and others will be disappointed to hear, that only 13 of those bills have become law. I want to repeat that: 302 bills have been referred to the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources since the beginning of this Congress and only 13 have become law. One of the reasons I wanted to bring the energy efficiency bill to the floor is because I think we need to make that 14.

I think this record is pretty dismal, and this is not a negative statement to the leadership of the committee prior to my being there. It is rather a reflection on the lack of cooperation that we are getting either at the committee level or in the Senate. It most certainly is not a reflection on the talents of the former chairman, RON WYDEN, and LISA MURKOWSKI, who couldn't have worked—and this is sort of the sad underpinning. You couldn't find two leaders who tried to work together more than these two. I know because I have sat next to them on that committee for 18 years and I have watched them. I am an eyewitness to their cordial, respectful conversations, both on and off the committee, when the cameras were on and when the cameras were off. Nobody can question this or deny it because everyone knows it is true, and there are many eyewitnesses besides myself.

The question becomes, if a committee has two people who are working well together, a committee that is as important in jurisdiction as Energy and Natural Resources is in this country, how is it possible that we can only get 13 out of 302 bills passed? That is a very interesting question. Why couldn't we get 14 done this week? That is why I brought this bill to the floor or asked for it to come to the floor, particularly because it is important to both Democrats and Republicans.

Let's talk for a minute about how important this bill is. I have 10 pages of a single-spaced list of businesses, organizations that support this Shaheen-Portman bill, which I will submit for the RECORD. Remember, it came out of committee, one of the few of the 300 filed, on a 19-to-3 vote.

There are roughly 200 organizations and businesses. I am going to submit all of their names for the RECORD, but I just wanted to read a few, to understand the breadth of support for this bill before I talk about what this bill does. They are: Alcoa, American Air, Inc., Aspen Skiing Company, BAE Systems, Caterpillar Inc., Dow Corning, Eastern Mountain Sports, Intel, International Paper, Owens Corning, Raytheon Company—one of the largest in the world, Solar Turbines Incorporated, Universal Lighting, American Jewish Committee, Christian Coalition, ConservAmerica, Earth Day Network, the National Wildlife Federation, the American Chemistry Council, American Lighting Association, Consumer Federation of America, League of Women Voters, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and the U.S. Conference of Mayors.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the list of endorsements.

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

THE ENERGY SAVINGS AND INDUSTRIAL COMPETITIVENESS ACT (SHAHEEN-PORTMAN) ENDORSEMENTS

BUSINESSES:

A.O. Smith; Aberdeen Mechanical; ABM Energy; Acuity Brands Lighting; Alcoa; American Air, Inc.; American Power Conversion; Anvil Knitwear; Aspen Skiing Company; AT&T; Autodesk; Avon Lake Sheet Metal Co.; BAE Systems; Baldor; BASF; Bayer; Best Buy; BJB Electric L.P.; The Brewer-Garrett Co.; Bosch; Capital E; Capstone Turbine Corporation; Caterpillar Inc.; Castle Heating & Air, Inc.

Cliff Bar; CLC Associates; Cooper; Coulomb Technologies; Creston Electronics; D. L. Page, Inc.; Danfoss; Deco Lighting; Direct Energy; Dow Corning; Duct Fabricators, Incorporated; DwellTek Home Energy Solutions; Eastern Mountain Sports; Eaton Corporation; eBay Inc.; ECOTality; EDA Architecture; Eileen Fisher; eMeter; Energy Platforms; EnerNOC; EnLink GeoEnergy; FlexEnergy; Frank & Fric, Inc.; Fresh Energy; Fulton & Associates Balance Company; G&W Electric; Geauga Mechanical Co., Inc.; General Electric; Gilbert Industries, INC.

Guardian Industries; Graftech; Green Strategies, Inc.; HAVE, Inc.; Honeywell; HUBBELL INCORPORATED; Imperial Heating & Cooling, Inc.; Industrial First, Inc.; Infineon Technologies; Ingersoll Rand; Intel; International Paper; Itron; JELD-WEN; Johns Manville; Johnson Controls; Kaiserman Company; Knauf Insulation; LEDnovation; Legrand; Lennox International; Leviton; Levi Strauss and Co.; Linde; Litetronics International Inc.; LumenOptix; Luminus Devices, Inc.; Lutron; Luxury Heating Co.; Magnaray.

Masco Corporation; Middle Atlantic; Miles Mechanical, Inc.; Nalco, an Ecolab Company; National Grid USA; Nexans USA Inc.; Northern Ohio Roofing & Sheet Metal Inc.; Orion Energy Systems; OSRAM SYLVANIA; Owens Corning; Owens Illinois; Panasonic Corporation of North America; Philips Electronics; PPG; Professional Balance Company (dba PBC, Inc.); Quanex; RAB Lighting; Raytheon Company; Recycled Energy Development; Regal-Beloit; RESNET; Rinnai America Corporation; Robert Bosch LLC; Robertshaw Controls Company dba. Invensys Controls; Rockwell Automation; RPM; Safety-Kleen

Systems, Inc.; Saint-Gobain; Schneider Electric; Schweitzer Dipple, Inc.

Sibley, Inc.; Siemens Corporation; Sika Corporation; SimplexGrinnell; Solar Turbines Incorporated; SPRI, Inc.; Stonyfield Farm; Symantec; T. H. Martin Inc.; TE Connectivity; TECO Westinghouse Motor Company; Tendril; TerraLUX; The Dow Chemical Company; The Stella Group, Ltd.; Thomas & Betts; Trane; TRI-C Sheet Metal, Inc.; United Technologies Corporation; Universal Lighting; Ushio America; Vantage; Veka Inc.; Vinyl Siding Institute; Watkins Manufacturing; WattStopper; Westinghouse Lighting Corporation; Whillam Roofing Co., Inc.; Whirlpool Corporation.

FAITH BASED ORGANIZATIONS

American Jewish Committee, Christian Coalition, Interfaith Power and Light, Union for Reform Judaism.

ENVIRONMENTAL ADVOCATES

Clean Air-Cool Planet, Clean Water Action, Climate Solutions, Conservation Law Foundation, Conservation Services Group, ConservAmerica, Earth Day Network, Environment America, Environment Northeast, Environmental Defense Fund, Environmental and Energy Study Institute, Environmental Law and Policy Center, League of Conservation Voters, Massachusetts Climate Action Network, National Wildlife Federation, Natural Resources Defense Council, Sierra Club, World Wildlife Fund, The Wilderness Society, Oregon Environmental Council, Earthjustice.

TRADE ASSOCIATIONS/THINK TANKS

Adhesive and Sealant Council, Air-Conditioning, Heating and Refrigeration Institute, Alliance for Industrial Efficiency, Alliance to Save Energy, American Architectural Manufacturers Association, American Chemical Society, American Chemistry Council, American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy, American Institute of Architects, American Lighting Association, American Public Power Association, Appliance Standards Awareness Project, ASHRAE, Association of Pool & Spa Professionals, Association of State Energy Research and Technology Transfer Institutions (ASERTTT), Bipartisan Policy Center, Business Council for Sustainable Energy, Business for Innovative Climate and Energy Policy, Business Roundtable, Boulder Green Building Guild, Cellulose Insulation Manufacturers Association, Center for the Celebration of Creation, Center for Environmental Innovation in Roofing, Citizens for Pennsylvania's Future (PennFuture), Combined Heat and Power Association, Consumer Federation of America, Consumers Union, Copper Development Association, Council of North American Insulation Manufacturers Association, Digital Energy & Sustainability Solutions Campaign (DESSC), Efficiency First.

Energy Future Coalition, Federal Performance Contracting Coalition, Friends Committee on National Legislation, Geothermal Exchange Organization, Green Building Initiative, Habitat for Humanity International, Illuminating Engineering Society, Industrial Energy Efficiency Coalition, Industrial Minerals Association, Information Technology Industry Council (ITIC), Institute for Market Transformation, Institute for Sustainable Communities, International Association of Lighting Designers, International Association of Plumbing and Mechanical Officials, International Copper Association, Ltd., International District Energy Association, Large Public Power Council, League of Women Voters, Midwest Energy Efficiency Alliance (MEEA), NAIOP, the Commercial Real Estate Development Association, National Association for State Community Services Programs (NASCSPP), National As-

sociation of Energy Service Companies (NAESCO), National Association of Manufacturers, National Association of State Energy Officials (NASEO), National Community Action Foundation, National Electrical Manufacturers Association, National Restaurant Association, National Roofing Contracting Association (NRCA), National Small Business Association (NSBA), National U.S. Clean Heat & Power Association.

New England Council, New England Fuel Institute, North Carolina Chamber, Northeast Energy Efficiency Partnerships (NEEP), Northwest Energy Coalition, Northwest Energy Efficiency Alliance, Northwest Energy Efficiency Council, Ohio Business Council for a Clean Economy, Ohio Chemistry Technology Council, Ohio Manufacturers Association, Ohio Petroleum Marketers & Convenience Store Association, Oil Heat Council of New Hampshire, Oil & Energy Service Professionals, Oregon Environmental Council, Outdoor Industry Association, Petroleum Marketers Association of America, PEW Charitable Trusts, Plumbing Manufacturers International, Polyisocyanurate Insulation Manufacturers Association (PIMA), Rebuilding Together, Sheet Metal and Air Conditioning Contractor's National Association (SMACNA), Solar Energy Industries Association, Southeast Energy Efficiency Alliance (SEEA), Southern Alliance for Clean Energy, SPI: The Plastics Industry Trade Association, The Aluminum Association, The Vinyl Institute, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, U.S. Conference of Mayors, U.S. Green Buildings Council, Utah Clean Energy, Union of Concerned Scientists, Vinyl Building Council, Window and Door Manufacturers Association.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I could go on and on, but the point I think is clear. There are organizations from the left, the right, the center, large and small, business coalitions, consumer coalitions, saying act now on energy efficiency.

We may not be able to, and I doubt sincerely that in the next 4 days on floor of the Senate we can draft an energy policy for America. That would be a bar set a little too high for what we will be able to do between Tuesday and Friday.

But we could do two important things for the country: pass this energy efficiency bill and pass the Keystone Pipeline, something I am proud to vote for. You will vote for it. It is a piece of the energy infrastructure this country needs, this country deserves, and we need to move forward on it.

So in the spirit of balance, compromise, fairness, and common sense—which we are not finding around here very often—I thought: Let's see. We have an energy efficiency bill that is supported by an extraordinarily broad and deep coalition of businesspeople and supported by two of the most respected Members of this body.

May I remind everyone, JEANNE SHAHEEN was a Governor before she was a Senator. She has been serving for decades in public office and is well known and well respected.

BOB PORTMAN is not only a Senator from Ohio but was formerly the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, OMB, so he understands about finance, cost, and savings. I don't think either he or JEANNE SHAHEEN would have put their names on this bill,

which they have been working on now for 5 years. This is not an election-year bill, as some would call it. This is a 5-year, very hard effort by these two wonderful legislators to provide a bill the country needs. So why aren't we all jumping up and down voting for it? That is a good question.

ROB PORTMAN, who was also the U.S. Trade Representative under the Bush administration and saw firsthand when Congress passed very poorly thought-out bills or made mistakes in bills we passed, and seeing so many jobs leaving to go to China and India, probably jumped on a chance to create jobs in America. Thank goodness for ROB PORTMAN. That is what our energy efficiency bill does. It creates jobs for America.

When I go home and I am out in my parishes, whether it is Tangipahoa Parish or Richland Parish or De Soto Parish or Caddo Parish or East Baton Rouge or Orleans Parish, people look at me and say: Senator, I don't know why everybody is yelling and screaming in Washington. I don't know why everybody is yelling and screaming about the President or this or that. Would you please tell them we want high-paying jobs.

Yes, raising the minimum wage is important. I am voting for the minimum wage. People don't want to make the minimum wage. They want to make \$40-, \$50-, \$60-, \$70,000 a year. They want an income for their families so their kids can go to school, go to college, so they can live in their homes and retire securely. Do you think you can do that at a minimum wage, whether it is \$7 an hour or \$10 an hour? No.

We have a bill on the floor that is going to create American jobs with American manufacturers—maybe not all U.S. technology because frankly we get good energy efficiency technology from around the world, but Americans are very good at this—very good at it. In fact, it is so good that in an old graph—which I am going to have updated and blown up because no one can see this but me, unfortunately, because it is so small. If the cameras can pick it up—and I am going to have it updated by this afternoon—we can see that it says, "Energy Efficiency: America's Greatest Energy Resource."

Energy efficiency supplies 52 percent of our overall resources, petroleum is 35, natural gas is 23, coal is 19, and nuclear is 8.

Think about energy efficiency as our Nation's greatest resource. Energy savings from efficiency are real and save Americans money. Since 1970, energy efficiency improvements have reduced U.S. energy costs by about \$700 billion from what it would have been otherwise.

When we think about energy saved, it is the cleanest energy. It is completely or almost completely American because we are the ones saving it. We may import a little of that technology from other places, but it is all Amer-

ican, all day, all clean. Why aren't we doing it?

The other side—and I know Senator THUNE is going to speak in a minute—said energy efficiency is not enough for us. We want to build the Keystone Pipeline, so I agree. I agree. I think it is time to do both; to do this energy efficiency bill, to build the Keystone Pipeline. Why? Not because I don't respect the process but because the process is over—5 years, 5 studies as required by law. Five studies were completed, the last of which was a State Department study that concluded it is actually environmentally safer to transport oil from Canada, from the oil sands in Canada to the refineries along the gulf coast to provide energy for this Nation and create anywhere from 30- to 50,000 jobs, depending on conservative or liberal facts, talking points, to create jobs and to put America and Canada closer together. We already are together but even closer together to be a North American energy powerhouse.

Canada has very high—as the Presiding Officer knows because she visited the oil sands. I am looking forward to going as soon as I can, but I do know, because she shared her experiences with me, that it is very spectacular to see the environmental safeguards Canada has used to produce this resource that is so important to them in the Alberta Province and to us.

Why not have an energy efficiency bill that is very popular with Democrats and supported by Republicans and then an energy piece, just a piece, not the whole energy policy of the world, not the whole energy policy of the United States but two important pillars, efficiency and production, put them together, try to find compromise and move it forward on these two pieces of legislation. Then we can get it over to the House, let the House decide if they will do it, and move it to the President's desk separately because the President has powers in the Constitution, and we have our own powers.

One would think that would make a lot of sense, and this is what I was hoping to do by asking the leadership to allow the Shaheen-Portman bill to come to the floor. But evidently, as balanced, as fair as that sounds, I think it is unfortunately probably not going to be sufficient to move this issue forward. We shall see. We are going to open this for debate.

I wish the debate could be about energy efficiency and the importance of this bill, things that might improve this bill relative to energy efficiency and not on other matters that both sides know do not have this kind of broad-based support.

Some of the matters colleagues want to file as amendments that are pending, or those I know of that might come to the floor, have not even come through our committee. This bill did come through the committee on a 19-to-3 vote. While the Keystone Pipeline has not yet come through committee, it can come to this floor and there may

be enough votes to pass it—very, very close. We have about 57 to 58 votes, as I stand here. We need two or three or four more. We might get those votes as the debate goes on and as people listen to the importance of promoting America as an energy superpower.

I will talk more about that later in the week. I have a lot more to say about the importance of the Keystone Pipeline. But for right now, I want to ask colleagues on both sides of the aisle to really think about the benefits to their districts, to their people, and to our country, to support the energy efficiency bill and to agree on a vote on the Keystone Pipeline in hopes of getting a balanced effort moving forward.

There will be time to talk about other issues that are much more controversial. Although I support many of them, they are much more controversial, if you can believe it, than these two. Even though Keystone is controversial, we still have almost 60 votes, so it is worth trying for. So that is my pitch—to try to be as cooperative as we can.

I think Leader REID has been extremely reasonable in allowing the efficiency bill to come to the floor, knowing there are lots—hundreds—of amendments that could be talked about and that are extraneous to this issue. Technically, he is agreeing to a stand-alone vote on Keystone, which is a big concession for the leader of a party where the majority of our Members, unfortunately, aren't supporting it. I support it, Senator BEGICH supports it, Senator TESTER supports it, and Senator HERTKAMP supports it. But my friends on the Republican side should understand that when BOEHNER says he can't take up an issue unless a majority of his caucus is for it, they all jump up and down and say: Go Speaker BOEHNER, yes. That is the way to go. Yet when HARRY REID stands up and says, listen, I am going as far as I can go here—the majority of my caucus doesn't even support Keystone, but I am going to allow a vote on it—my Republican colleagues want to just push that aside as if he is not cooperating. It is disingenuous, it is hypocritical, and it is unfair.

Now, Harry can fight his own battles. He doesn't need me to fight them for him. But let me just say to the other side that I don't want to hear anything from you all: Well, we can't get that done because even though we have the votes in the House, we don't have a majority of Republicans. This is about Republicans and Democrats sometimes crossing the aisle to do what is right for our country and not being held hostage by the side wings of our parties. I wish I had a little more help around here doing that.

Anyway, we will give it the old college try and try to get this energy efficiency bill through and get an up-or-down vote on the Keystone Pipeline. If people cooperate, we will get it done. If not, we will have had only 13 bills passed out of this Congress from the

energy committee, and we will have to roll up our sleeves and go back to work and figure out a better approach. This is the best one I could come up with. It may work; it may not.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks, the Senator from Wyoming Mr. BARRASSO be recognized, followed by the Senator from Arkansas Mr. PRYOR.

Madam President, I modify the unanimous consent request and ask that Senator PRYOR be recognized at the conclusion of my remarks, followed by Senator BARRASSO.

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

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, yesterday USA Today and the Pew Research Center released a new poll that found Americans, by more than a 2-to-1 margin, were dissatisfied with the direction the country is going. Sixty-two percent of Americans rate their personal financial situation as poor or fair. A whopping 65 percent want the next President to pursue policies different from those of the current President.

What I would suggest is that the American people are tired—they are tired of seeing their bills go up while their paychecks don't. They are tired of having to work harder just to stay in place—to say nothing of getting ahead. They are tired of economic promises that are often repeated but never fulfilled.

Our economy has supposedly been in recovery for years, but it is a recovery that feels a lot like a recession to ordinary hardworking Americans. More than 10 million Americans are unemployed, and more than one-third of them have been out of work for more than 6 months.

While unemployment finally declined last month, the decline was driven more by the fact that 806,000 Americans dropped out of the workforce entirely than by any meaningful surge in the number of those who are employed. Had the number of Americans participating in the labor force stayed flat last month, the unemployment rate would have actually gone up, not down. In fact, if the labor force participation rate today were the same as it was when President Obama took office, our Nation would have an unemployment rate of 10.4 percent.

So what is happening is more and more people are leaving the labor force. They are completely discouraged. But the labor force participation rate has fallen, and one of the main reasons it has fallen is because so many Americans have grown so discouraged that they have given up looking for work entirely.

Our country has experienced recessions before, but we have always bounced back. But our recovery from this recession has been so slow—at

times, seemingly nonexistent—that many are wondering if the last 5 years of sluggish growth and recession-level unemployment could be the new normal. And they are right; it could be, if we continue the policies of the last 5 years.

The widespread dissatisfaction with the economy reflected in the Pew poll may not be what Democrats want to see, but it is the natural outcome of their policies. They have spent 5 years pursuing policies that have not only been unsuccessful in creating jobs but have all too frequently actually hurt job creation.

Take ObamaCare. It is hard to even know where to start when talking about the damage ObamaCare is wreaking on the jobs and the economy. There is the ObamaCare tax on lifesaving medical devices, such as pacemakers and insulin pumps, which has cost thousands of jobs in this industry already and is going to cost thousands more. There is the 30-hour workweek rule, which has forced businesses, State and local governments, and nonprofits to cut the hours of workers in this country. There is the employer mandate, which has caused many businesses to rethink their plans to expand and hire new workers. Then, of course, there is the burden the law places on small businesses.

The title of an article that appeared in the Las Vegas Review Journal over the weekend summed it up nicely, and the headline went like this: "Own a small business? Brace for ObamaCare pain." This article pointed out something that is often overlooked in discussions of the law—that the people who will suffer the most from the small business health plan cancellations that ObamaCare will cause in Nevada and around the country are those who can least afford it—the kind of people the law was supposed to help.

To quote from the article:

Some workers are at higher risk than others of losing company-sponsored coverage. Professional, white-collar companies such as law or engineering firms will bite the bullet and renew at higher prices. . . . But moderately skilled or low-skilled people making \$8 to \$14 an hour working for landscaping businesses, fire prevention firms or fencing companies could lose work-based coverage because the plans cost so much relative to salaries.

That is right, Madam President. It is low-income workers in places like Nevada who stand in the greatest danger of losing their employer-sponsored coverage. That is frequently the story when it comes to the Democrats' so-called job-creating policies. Democrats like to suggest that Republicans are indifferent to workers' plight, and that only Democrats really have a plan to offer help. But in fact the Democrats' plans to help often pose the most danger to low-income workers.

There is ObamaCare, of course, as I mentioned, but there is also the minimum wage proposal, which the Congressional Budget Office says will eliminate up to 1 million jobs. Those 1

million jobs that will be eliminated are not doctors' jobs and they are not lawyers' jobs. They are positions held by low-income workers who will be the first to suffer when employers have to cut back on hiring or on hours as a result of the minimum wage hike.

Then, of course, there is the Keystone Pipeline, which we are talking a little about today, and which the President has resolutely refused to approve, despite the fact that it would support, according to his own State Department estimates, 42,000 jobs without spending a dime of taxpayer money.

The people who will be hurt the worst by the President's decision to bow to the relentless pressure of far-left environmentalists are the workers who would actually build the pipeline and the restaurants and small businesses who would benefit from pipeline workers' business during construction.

It is not just Keystone. Almost all of the President's energy policies would do serious damage to our economy and to working Americans. Take the restrictions on ground-level ozone levels the President's EPA is scheduled to release by December of this year.

In 2010, the EPA proposed lowering the permitted ozone levels from 75 parts per billion to 60 to 70 parts per billion. Energy industry estimates suggest that lowering the ground-level ozone concentration to 60 parts per billion would cost businesses—get this—more than \$1 trillion per year—\$1 trillion per year—between 2020 and 2030. Job losses as a result of this measure would total a staggering 7.3 million by 2020, devastating entire industries—most especially U.S. manufacturing. My own State of South Dakota would lose tens of thousands of jobs in manufacturing, natural resources and mining, and construction.

Take a look at what this would actually do. These are the areas under these proposals that have been put forward. Today there are probably a couple hundred counties in the country that are not in compliance, in what we call nonattainment areas—mostly urban, heavily populated areas. But if we take a look at what their proposal would do on this map, this map represents those who would be affected if we went to 60 parts per billion as opposed to the 75 parts per billion today.

So instead of focusing on those counties in this country that are not currently in attainment and getting them to full attainment first, we are talking about expanding dramatically the impact this would have all across the country.

Look at my State of South Dakota, for example. We have areas that wouldn't be in attainment. We don't think of South Dakota as being a place where we have problems with clean air and ozone issues, but this is clearly a regulation which, if put into effect, would cost the economy literally billions and billions of dollars—in one estimate \$1 trillion per year between 2020 and 2030.

If we look at where this hurts people the most, again, it is the people who are in the lower and middle-income range—people whose budgets are more heavily affected by hikes in their energy bills.

Today the President will hold press events to raise the alarm about climate change and push for more job-killing, industry crippling energy policies, but it will be interesting to see if he spares a line or two for the millions of Americans whose jobs will be lost and whose household budgets will be shattered as a result of his proposals.

This week the Senate is going to be considering the Shaheen-Portman energy legislation. I plan to introduce three amendments to check EPA overreach and to protect American workers from the devastating effects of the EPA's ground-level ozone and greenhouse gas proposal.

The first amendment will require Congress to vote up or down on any EPA regulation that has an annual cost of more than \$1 billion. Pretty straightforward. Let the people's representatives vote. If they are going to put regulations out there that are going to cost more than \$1 billion, let us have Congress vote on those.

The second amendment would prohibit the EPA from finalizing greenhouse gas regulations for new and existing power plants if the Department of Energy and the GAO determine those regulations will raise energy prices or cost jobs. So if the Department of Energy and the GAO determine the regulations will not impact jobs or energy prices, the EPA can go forward and finalize those regulations.

It is time to be honest with the American people about the cost of these regulations. Taken together, these two amendments are a strong step toward placing a check on EPA's regulatory train wreck.

The final amendment I will offer is specific to the administration's upcoming proposal on ground-level ozone, which as I just mentioned is the most expensive regulation in EPA's history. The cost of this regulation is so great that when the EPA first proposed lower levels in 2010, the White House delayed those regulations until after the President's reelection.

My amendment is straightforward.

First, it would require the EPA to consider the costs and feasibility of new ozone regulations. Many Americans would be surprised to know the EPA isn't even allowed to consider costs when setting these new regulations. My amendment would fix that.

Additionally, my amendment would force the EPA to focus on the worst areas for smog before dramatically expanding this regulation to the rest of the country. As I mentioned on the map here, 221 counties across 27 States don't even meet the current standard of 75 parts per billion. It makes sense to focus on these urban areas before expanding ozone regulations to places such as western South Dakota, where we clearly don't have a smog problem.

Under my amendment, 85 percent of these counties would have to achieve full compliance with the existing standard before the EPA can move forward with a lower level which dramatically expands the reach of ozone regulations. I hope the Senate will get the chance to vote on these proposals.

I also hope the Senate will get a chance to vote on the Keystone amendment so we can get those 42,000 jobs opened to American workers.

It has been a long time since we have had a real energy debate in the Senate. But given our sluggish economy and the danger the President's energy proposals pose to any future growth, I am hoping the majority leader will decide it is time for a debate.

The election-year agenda offered by Democrats and the President is just more of the same job-killing, growth-stifling legislation that Democrats have been offering for the past 5 years. Like the legislation the Democrats and the President have offered for the last 5 years, it will do the worst injury to those Americans who can least afford it.

Pundits may warn that our current economic malaise is the new normal, but it doesn't have to be that way. We can get the economy going again. We can lift the heavy burden of government regulation and free businesses to grow and create jobs. We can make it easier, not harder, for middle-class workers to find stability and for lower income workers to make it into the middle class.

According to the Pew/USA Today poll, 65 percent of Americans want the next President to pursue different policies. It is still a couple more years until the next Presidential election, but there is no reason Congress can't start pursuing different policies today. The American people have been struggling for long enough.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

OPERATION RAZORBACK-GUATEMALA

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, I thank my colleague who allowed me to jump in front of him in the line. I appreciate that.

I am sorry for my voice today. I sound a little bit like Daffy Duck, but I have a cold, and I am working through that right now.

I rise today to speak for a few minutes about something in this country we take for granted—and that is electricity.

Ever since the Rural Electrification Act back in the 1930s passed, for the most part every person in this country has had access to electricity. I know there are a few exceptions, but basically that program has worked extremely well and continues to work. As the Presiding Officer, who comes from a rural State, knows, sometimes we have investor-owned facilities, sometimes we have these cooperative type utilities, and sometimes we have even municipalities.

I rise today to focus on something the Arkansas electric cooperatives have been involved in, and I thank 25 power linemen in the 12 electric coops in Arkansas who recently completed a mission to electrify two remote Guatemalan villages. Combined with a 2013 project, Arkansas electric cooperative linemen have assisted in providing electric service to more than 770 rural Guatemalan residents who otherwise would not have electricity. This is the first time these people have ever had electricity in their lives.

This rural electrification initiative is part of Arkansas's Operation Razorback-Guatemala that started in 2012 in cooperation with the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association International. After a year of planning, the linemen arrived in Guatemala on March 26 and then traveled approximately 9 hours to the remote villages of Las Flores and La Hacienda to "light up" the land. I commend them for giving their time, energy, and know-how to improve the lives of hundreds of Guatemalans who before this did not even know—because electricity is a critical element to improving the quality of life—the quality of health care, the quality of education, and some of the basics that, again, we often take for granted in this country—such as clean water and many other vital services.

This area in Guatemala processes and exports coffee beans that end up at companies such as NESCAFE, McDonald's, Starbucks, and other coffee outlets. This new reliable access to electricity will help these villagers increase the quantity and quality of their locally grown coffee, resulting in economic prosperity and a better quality of life for present and future generations. So they will be even more connected with the global economy because of what these people from the Arkansas electric coops did to help these folks.

Senator BOOZMAN could not be here today; otherwise, he would be here sitting at his desk saying a few words. But he did pass on for me a brief statement he wanted me to read:

We are proud of Electric Cooperatives of Arkansas's willingness to support people around the world who need safe, affordable and reliable electricity. Operation Razorback has been a real success that will result in improved economic prosperity, a higher quality of life and more opportunities for Guatemalans today and for future generations. Sharing our knowledge, expertise and technology will make a lasting impact. These Guatemalan villages will never be the same thanks to the progress made by the volunteers of Electric Cooperatives of Arkansas.

We have a few of those people with us today, and I wish to recognize them: Duane Highley, who is the CEO; Kirkley Thomas, who is the vice president of the Arkansas Electric Cooperative Corporation in Arkansas; Mel Coleman, CEO of the North Arkansas Electric Cooperative; Paul Garrison, one of the linemen who actually went on the trip.

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.

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