



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 6, 2014

No. 67

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, we will remember Your works and Your wonders of old, meditating on Your mighty acts that bless us each day.

Lord, You have ordained that in the leadership of nations the care of the many will rest upon the shoulders of the few. Give our Senators this day the understanding, humility, and faith to be ambassadors of reconciliation. Lord, help them to have no anxiety about anything, as they trust You to empower them to do their best. Cleanse the inner fountains of their hearts from all that may defile them, sustaining them always with Your mercy and grace.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 368, S. 2262, which is the Shaheen-Portman energy efficiency legislation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 368, S. 2262, a bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, the time until 11 a.m. will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

At 11 o'clock this morning there will be a cloture vote on the motion to proceed to the energy efficiency bill.

The Senate will recess, as we do on virtually every Tuesday, from 12:30 p.m. to 2:15 p.m. for our weekly caucus meetings. I would advise all Senators that at 2:15 p.m. today we will do our congressional photo that we do every 2 years. So I hope everyone will make sure they are here on time so we have everyone in the photo.

Additionally, there will be a Members-only briefing, a closed briefing, tonight at 5:30 regarding Ukraine. I hope everyone would come to that. There are some things going on in Ukraine we should all know about.

SLIPPERY PROGRESS

Mr. President, being from Nevada and having traveled the State, as I have, in rural Nevada, we have rodeos. I have been to a few rural rodeos in my life. They are always a lot of fun, and it is a unique form of entertainment. It is good for everybody, for families.

One of the things a number of these rodeos have around the country are greased-pig contests. For all those who do not know what a greased-pig contest is, here is what it is: The organizers get a little pig—a piglet—and they cover this little animal with tons of grease. It is a greasy little pig. Then they turn the kids loose. They invite these children to chase one of these pigs. Pigs are a little slippery to begin with, but if you cover them with grease, they are really slippery.

These kids run around the arena trying to grab this pig. They grab it and

fall. They have a great time. The children run as fast as they can. Some of them get smart and do not run so fast. They wait until the pig turns around—and they do a lot of times. But they try to scoop up this scurrying pig. It is really quite a spectacle, and it is a lot of fun to watch. There is no pain to the pig. It is kind of a painless ordeal for the pig. But it is a lot of fun, as I said.

It is obvious what happens every time they grab the pig. They slip. The pig goes on about its business, running. They fall into the dirt. They come out covered with grease and dirt. But eventually—eventually—one of these kids will wind up with the pig. Sometimes two kids grab the pig. They understand what happens, and they put the pig in one of their arms, and someone comes and takes the pig. But they have a good time.

The vast majority of the kids never touch the pig. They go away empty-handed, for sure. And that is regardless of how hard they try.

The reason I mention this, oftentimes working with my Senate Republican colleagues, it reminds me of chasing one of these little pigs in a greased-pig contest. Regardless of all of our efforts, anytime we get close to making progress, it seems as though we watch it slip out of our hands and the Republicans scamper away.

Take, for example, the legislation that is currently before the Senate—the Shaheen-Portman energy efficiency bill. This bill has bipartisan support. We tried to do the bill a year ago. Frankly, at that time the bill was good, but not nearly as good as it is now. It is a very substantive piece of legislation.

From the time last year to today, the committee—under the direction, then, of Senator WYDEN, who was chair of the committee, working with all the members on that committee—put other things in the bill, and the bill that is now before the Senate is much stronger than it was a year ago.

• This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S2681

This legislation will make our country more energy independent and protect our environment. It will spur the use of energy efficiency technologies in private homes and commercial buildings, at no cost to taxpayers. It is an energy efficiency bill, and it has bipartisan support.

This legislation will make our country more energy independent and protect our environment. It will also save consumers and taxpayers money, and lots of it. It will do it by lowering their energy bills, saving about \$16 billion a year—that is what they tell us—and it will create up to 200,000 jobs that cannot be exported.

I have commended a number of times—and I will do it again—Senators SHAHEEN and PORTMAN for their persistence in bringing this bill to the floor. This is a fine piece of legislation. But it seems, for the second time within a year, passage of this bipartisan legislation is in question because Senate Republicans keep changing their requests. This time around the minority party seems intent on a repeat performance of last year.

Remember last year. The same thing. We want this; we want this. But the clincher we were told was that—last year—they would not vote on the bill unless we brought a bill sponsored by the Senator from Louisiana—the name was not LANDRIEU; it would be the junior Senator from Louisiana—saying: I demand a vote, before we do this legislation, on doing away with the health insurance Senate staff have. Can you imagine that. But that was his demand, and it is his demand again. He called to tell me that.

In order to allow us to vote on this bill, I was told before the break that the Republicans wanted a vote on Keystone—a sense-of-the-Senate resolution. I thought about it, and I came back to them before the recess and said: OK, we will do that. We come back after the break, and they come to me and say: Well, we have changed our mind. What we want now is a straight up-or-down vote on the legislation. That is not the agreement we had. But, anyway, I said: OK, we will do that.

Well, now we are told that there are up to five amendments they want. And yesterday—last evening—I was told there is another one I never heard of. This is something about geothermal, but the extent of it I do not understand. But it is always something else.

We have these new provisions that have been added to the bill to make this legislation even stronger than last year.

To add further to the absurdity of what we are doing here, again the junior Senator from Louisiana wants a vote on taking away health care for our staffs. I said to him: But why would you do that? He said: Well, the higher paid employees, they can probably afford to get it themselves. I am paraphrasing because I remember the telephone conversation. He said—no, I am sorry; here it is—the lower waged sala-

ried employees in the Senate, they will get subsidies—a lot of them. I said: What about those who do not? He said: They could buy their own insurance.

These men and women who work in the Senate work very hard. They should be treated as other employees around the country. Their employer should help them with their insurance. But it appears as if it is a virtual reenactment of last September. It seems as though this is nothing but a game of diversion and obstruction to many Senate Republicans.

But it is not a game. Every time a group of Republicans feigns interest in bipartisanship, only to scramble away at the last moment, it is part of a calculated political scheme.

We know on the very night of President Obama's first inauguration, a group of Republican political consultants—there is some dispute as to who called the meeting, whether it was Frank Lutz or Karl Rove, but a meeting was held—gathered, the Republicans gathered, to discuss their plans for regaining power after President Obama won the election.

They devised a plan to oppose all legislation and all nominees in order to make President Obama and Democrats look ineffective—to make our country, I assume, look more ineffective. But their No. 1 goal was to make sure President Obama was not reelected.

They failed with that, but they have not failed at obstructing, filibustering, and stopping the legislative process. Instead of working with us to pass meaningful legislation that helps American families, Republican leadership has shown more interest in agreeing to nothing. So as Senate Republicans continue to play hard to get with Democrats who are working in good faith, the American people's frustration grows.

This bill presents a unique opportunity for all my Republican colleagues—a chance to work with us in crafting and passing bipartisan legislation that will help the country.

I and my 54 Democratic colleagues have been flexible throughout this process, and we hope to reach an agreement that gives both sides most of what they want. But time is running out on this good piece of legislation—running out again.

So I invite all of my Republican colleagues to work with us in good faith. Help us pass a bill which creates jobs, saves money, and puts our country on the track to energy independence.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOKER). The Republican leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Please go ahead.

ENERGY AMENDMENTS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, let me briefly make a few observations about some of the majority leader's opening comments this morning.

As he knows full well, Senator VITTER dropped his request for an

ObamaCare amendment days ago, before the weekend. I think it is important for everybody to understand, the minority in the Senate has had eight votes since July—eight votes since July—on amendments that we wished to vote on.

We have not had a fulsome energy debate in the Senate since 2007—7 years ago. What we are asking for here is four or five amendments related to the subject of energy—one of the biggest issues in our country. That is hardly obstructionism. It is laughable to suggest that it is obstructionism for the minority to be given four or five amendments on issues related to the underlying bill, particularly since we have only had eight amendment votes on amendments that we wanted to vote on since last July, and we have not had a fulsome, broad-ranging energy debate since 2007.

So I would say to my friend, the majority leader, I do not think there is anything at all unreasonable about what we are requesting. Far from obstructionism, it is about time we had a debate on energy. We are having an energy boom in this country. It is important to our constituents all across the land. Forty-five Republicans represent millions of Americans. We wish to have a chance to have our voices heard occasionally. Eight amendments for the minority since July? This is not the way the Senate ought to be run.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Responding to my friend, the reason we haven't had debates in the Senate on legislation is because Republicans won't let us get on bills.

Let's take the bill that we are talking about today. Could we step back just a minute and try to do something that is good for the country? Shaheen-Portman is a good bill for America from last year to this year.

My friend can say all he wants about the junior Senator from Louisiana. Everyone knows what he has done on legislation in the past. He called me and told me that we weren't going to move forward on this bill unless he got a vote—what I just talked about. But from the last time we did this bill, these are the amendments that are incorporated in this bill: Collins-Mark Udall on energy efficient schools; Bennet-Ayotte, Better Buildings; Franken amendment to require Federally leased buildings to benchmark energy use data; Mark Udall-Risch, amendment to promote energy efficiency in data centers; Whitehouse-Collins—every one of these bipartisan—on low-income housing retrofits; Landrieu-Wicker amendment on Energy STAR third-party testing; Landrieu-Wicker-Pryor amendment on Federal green buildings; Hoeven-Pryor amendment on water heaters; Hoeven-Manchin and Isakson-Bennet amendments on energy efficiency in Federal and residential buildings; and the Sessions-Pryor amendment on third-party testing.

Last month SHAHEEN and PORTMAN introduced a new version of their bill

incorporating all of these changes. The bill has 14 cosponsors, seven on each side. It is sponsored on the Republican side by Senators PORTMAN, AYOTTE, COLLINS, HOEVEN, ISAKSON, MURKOWSKI, and WICKER; and on the Democratic side by Senators SHAHEEN, BENNET, COONS, FRANKEN, LANDRIEU, MANCHIN, and WARNER.

It will be hard to find a more bipartisan, consensus piece of legislation. All of all of this is a bipartisan piece of legislation, but always it is a shell game. OK, we have got it here. I am trying to figure out where I put that shell. Is it here? Where is that dollar? Is it here?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Would the majority leader yield for a question?

Mr. REID. I will yield in just 1 second.

This is what I talked about earlier. We have been going 5 years with this—5 years—trying to stop anything Obama wants to do. Obama would like to see this passed and so would a bipartisan group of Senators. But for 5 years we have put up with this. It doesn't matter what it is. If Obama wants it, they are against it.

We can have all this sweet talk about how the Senate shall operate. The Senate shall operate by allowing legislation to go forward. This is a perfect example but, no, no—I have told them, if they want a vote on Keystone, they have a vote on Keystone. That is not good enough for them. They add four or five other amendments.

It is never quite enough. So we can see what is going to happen. They are going to let us on the bill today, and they are going to say: Because we don't get our amendments, we are not going to vote to get off the bill.

It has happened time and time again. We waste hours on this.

With all this happy talk about how the Senate should operate—remember, we changed the rules. Why did we do that? Because we had scores of judges that we had to wait for them to give us permission to move to.

We changed the rules. We don't in any way apologize to anybody for having changed the rules.

This is where we are. Legislation is at a standstill, and we have on the books now 140 nominations that are held up. They have held everybody up. We get a few here and a few there.

But the one thing I can't hold up any more are judges. We are moving on the judges. We are going to get the judges done.

If they want to continue blocking ambassadors—we have the Secretary of State, the former chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, who is going to Angola. We don't have an ambassador there. We don't have an ambassador to Peru. In scores of countries we don't have an American representative there.

There are some political appointments. We can talk about those separately. Every President has political appointments, but I am not pushing

this. What I am pushing is the fact that we have these career Foreign Service officers who have waited an entire lifetime. They have worked in these countries in very difficult situations. They have been political officers, they have been economic officers, and now they get a chance to be an ambassador. It is like going to the Super Bowl in the diplomacy world, and they are not going to get that.

I think that the American people understand what is going on. That is why, as a result of polls we have seen, people understand the game the Republicans have played for 5 years. The people are going to have to decide this November as to whether they want another 2 years of obstruction as we have seen it.

This is good legislative policy. The Shaheen-Portman bill would be good for the country, but as usual we have a lot that is good for the country—and we have had it. We don't get much done in the Senate.

Give us some amendments. This is what they say every time because no matter what we do, it is not good enough.

Shaheen-Portman is a good bill. We have 10 new provisions in it. That is not good enough.

We can give them a vote on Keystone—that is not good enough, and that is the way it always is. So there are no surprises to me in what they have done today and what they will probably do on Wednesday or Thursday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. My friend the majority leader wandered rather far afield. The subject for today is whether it would be inappropriate at 10:20 a.m. on a Tuesday for the minority to have four or five amendments of its choosing, sometime during the course of the week.

It is great that some amendments have been accepted by Members on my side. I am happy about that. The majority picked the ones they were willing to accept and accepted them. I think that is great.

But what about the rest of the Members of the minority, who are not suggesting that we would drop unusual amendments or amendments on an entirely different subject—four or five amendments during the course of the week, with relatively short time agreements, related to the subject of energy.

It strikes me that is simply not unacceptable. We have had eight votes on amendments of our choosing since last July—eight. This is not the way to run the Senate.

The minority represents a lot of Americans, millions and millions of Americans. We are entitled to have our ideas debated and voted on in the Senate as well, ones that we want to vote on, not ones that the majority leader picks for us.

That is the point. We don't think what we are asking is in any way unreasonable. It is certainly consistent

with the traditions of the Senate, particularly since we have only had 8 votes on amendments of our choosing in the last 7 or 8 months. I mean, goodness gracious. There is a way to finish this bill. It does enjoy broad bipartisan support.

The majority leader mentioned the President. I don't know that his name has come up in connection with this. We are simply asking for the opportunity to debate and vote on important energy amendments on an energy bill during the pendency of the week. That is all we are asking.

I wish to go on. I understand later the majority leader is going to do some procedural matters, so let me go on and make my opening statement.

ENERGY

Later today we expect the President to talk about the weather at the White House. Presumably, he will use the platform to renew his call for a national energy tax, and I am sure he will get loud cheers from liberal elites, from the kinds of people who leave a giant carbon footprint and then lecture everybody else about low-flow toilets.

But the vast majority of middle-class Kentuckians I represent actually have to worry about paying utility bills, putting food on table, and finding a job in this terrible economy. They are less interested in just doing something on energy. They want to do the smart thing.

What they want are practical solutions to the problems and stresses they are dealing with every single day. That is what we should be focusing on this week because this debate shouldn't be about alleviating the guilt complexes of the liberal elite. It should be about actually achieving the best outcome for the environment, for energy security and, most importantly, for the people we were sent here to represent.

One thing that seems clear is this. Even if we were to enact the kinds of national energy regulations the President seems to want so badly, it would be unlikely to meaningfully impact global emissions anyway unless other major industrial nations do the same. That means getting countries such as China and India on board.

The President knows that. The President also knows that much of the pain of imposing such regulations would be borne by our own middle class.

That is why this discussion has become so cynical, and it is part of the reason the President's own party couldn't even pass a national energy tax when it had complete control of Washington's Congress back in 2009 and 2010. If the American people weren't willing to go along with considerable domestic pain for negligible global gain then, it is foolish to think they would assent to a bad idea now.

Remember, even the President's own party in the Senate wouldn't bring up the President's proposal for a national energy tax despite their overnight speeches and complaints about every-one else.

Of course, none of this has stopped the President from trying to get his way anyway. That is why we have seen this administration's attempt to do an end run around the legislative process to try to impose a similar agenda through executive fiat.

It needs to be stopped. The President's regulations are hurting people, often people who are already struggling and vulnerable—the very people the President claims he wants to help.

Our constituents are being hurt because of a cynical political agenda, because of a war on coal and other sources off American energy that the far left like and the Democratic Party is simply demanding.

The middle class doesn't even have a meaningful say in this discussion because the President has decided the Congress the people elect doesn't really matter anymore. Republicans are trying to change that this week.

We have asked the majority leader to allow votes on energy amendments that would let our constituents have a say for once. My constituents in Kentucky should be able to weigh in on an EPA rule that would negatively impact existing and future coal plants. Kentuckians deserve a real say on ongoing regulatory efforts to tie up mining permits and the red tape that is stifling the creation of good jobs in coal country.

Our constituents should finally be truly heard on the Keystone Pipeline they overwhelmingly support. The American people deserve a real debate on how we can best tap our own extraordinary natural resources to achieve energy independence at home and how we can help our allies overseas through increased exports of American energy.

These are the proposals we should be voting on this very week, proposals that can help our economy, boost the middle class and jobs while strengthening our national security and lessening our dependence on foreign sources of energy.

But we can't move forward if the Democrats who run the Senate keep trying to protect the President at the expense of serving their constituents. We know they are getting pressure from the White House to shut down a real debate on energy. One of the President's aides yesterday made it clear that it will be leaning on Democratic Senators to "get the right outcome."

In other words, this is to do the White House's political bidding and to once again ensure that struggling middle-class Americans get the short end of the stick from the Democrats here in Washington.

The American middle class is hurting, absolutely hurting. By a 2 to 1 margin Americans say the country's economic conditions are poor. Only about one-quarter say there are enough jobs available where they live, and they have been suffering from years of spiking electricity prices that would only get worse if the President's agenda were fully realized.

These are the people who deserve our attention. They are the ones who are struggling, not the far left, not the activists who yell the loudest and appear to care the least about who their ideas actually hurt, and not the President's political fixtures in the White House. These are not the people on whom we should be focusing.

It is time—way past time—to start paying attention to the people who actually sent us to the Senate. They deserve a robust debate about how to develop policies that can actually lead to lower utility bills that can put coal families back to work, that can help create well-paying jobs, that can help increase energy security, and that can help prevent energy from being used as a tool of war and oppression by global adversaries.

That is why we were sent to the Senate to debate these kinds of things.

If Democrats have good ideas on energy too, this is the time to share theirs.

What is wrong with having amendments from both sides on this bill. We want to hear everybody's serious ideas.

The American people have waited 7 long years, as I said earlier, for a serious energy debate in the Democratic-run Senate—7 years. It is about time they got it, and this is the perfect week to do it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. To belittle the President of the United States for wanting to talk about climate change is pretty obviously wrong. One can mischaracterize all they want the fact that President Obama recognizes climate is changing worldwide, but it is truly a mischaracterization if anyone thinks this is not something that is serious.

It always appears when we get into a serious debate about a subject, whether it is energy efficiency or climate change, the Republicans want to change the subject, to divert or to obstruct. So what is the Republican answer to this climate change, which is real: more oil production—that is one of their solutions—block regulations to protect health and the environment, deny climate change is happening at all.

The senior Senator from Oklahoma says it is a hoax. It is not a hoax. It is real, and I am very happy the President is saying something about this.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF INDIRA TALWANI TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 655.

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 Indira Talwani, of Massachusetts, to be United States District Judge for the District of Massachusetts.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. I ask the cloture motion 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 Indira Talwani, of Massachusetts, to be United States District Judge for the District of Massachusetts.

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 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 JAMES D. PETERSON TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

Mr. REID. I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 656.

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 James D. Peterson, of Wisconsin, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Wisconsin.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there is a cloture motion at the desk and 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 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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Speaking of which, I hope my friends across the aisle—who frequently argue that we must have government-imposed CO₂ reductions, even if it kills jobs and raises the price of energy for consumers—appreciate that this same natural gas and energy revolution that we have talked about has itself—all by itself—resulted in a significant decline in CO₂ emissions. That is by virtue of this same innovation that has created all this natural gas—cheaper, more affordable energy—to help drive our economy and help create more jobs. At the same time it has reduced CO₂ emissions. Between 2005 and 2012, U.S. emissions dropped by more than 10 percent. Indeed, emissions dropped more in the United States than in Europe, which already has in place some draconian measures, such as a cap-and-trade rule, a carbon tax, and those sorts of policies. It has dropped more in America without those because of this innovation and this natural gas renaissance.

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

Despite this progress, the majority leader insists that we are still not doing enough to curb CO₂ emissions. But do you know what. He refuses to bring a bill to the floor that would actually, according to his scenario, do something about it—the so-called cap-and-trade bill. I do not support that because I think it would raise energy costs, it would have negligible benefits, and it is really just throwing a bone to some of the most radical people in America when it comes to our environment and exploring and producing American energy. But cap and trade failed to command sufficient Senate approval even when our Democratic friends controlled 60 votes, which in the Senate is unassailable in the sense that you can do that purely on a party-line vote. But the reason it did not pass was pretty simple, and our Democratic friends understand this as well. The costs of cap and trade vastly outweigh

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CONDEMNING ABDUCTION OF FEMALE STUDENTS IN NIGERIA

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

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The preamble was agreed to.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

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

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

women held in captivity. There should be no room anywhere for kidnapping. Today we heard new reports that the suspected Boko Haram gunmen kidnapped eight more girls from the Nigerian village overnight. So clearly the voices of the civilized world must rise and be louder than the terrorists who are taking away basic human rights.

Senator LANDRIEU's resolution we just passed has many supporters on it, including myself. I am also pleased to hear today the administration has committed to acting with the Nigerian Government.

As a mother and grandmother, my heart is with all those mothers and grandmothers and dads and grandfathers who want their daughters and granddaughters to come home safely. We cannot stay silent in the face of these unspeakable crimes. We are not silent today as a U.S. Senate.

I am so proud we have agreed to this resolution. I want to commend my friend Senator MIKULSKI. She and Senator COLLINS have worked on a letter we are sending to the administration. I am about to go outside to be part of a vigil, an event that has been organized by the Congressional African Staff Association as well as the Congressional Hispanic Staff Association and the Congressional Black Associates, and I am so proud of the Senate for standing for these girls. We will do everything we possibly can to get them home to their families.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Boxer resolution calling for international action and aggressive action from our own government in terms of the rescue of 276 Nigerian girls who were kidnapped from a boarding school their parents paid for them to be able to go to so they could learn.

It is an outrage that these 276 girls have been captured by the terrorist group Boko Haram. It is an outrage against these girls and an outrage in the international community, and we need to speak as a nation—women and men together—saying, what is this where a girl can't go to school simply because she is a girl?

There is strong evidence that, as we speak, these girls are being sold into forced marriages and sexual slavery.

We, the women of the Senate, have written a letter on a bipartisan basis calling for the President to have the Boko Haram group placed on the international Al-Qaeda terrorist list and calling for sanctions to be imposed against them. We are heartened by the fact that the President is sending a team to help the Government of Nigeria find these girls, bring them home safely to their mothers and fathers, get the bad guys, and send an international message: Leave girls and boys alone.

There are additional rumors coming out that schools where boys had been attending, simply because they are in Western-based education, are being

burned down and that the boys' lives are in danger. What kind of world is it where a parent, based on parental choice, can't send a child to school without thinking they could be kidnapped, abused, sold into sexual slavery, and so on?

We encourage the efforts by the U.S. Government to support the capacity of the Government of Nigeria to provide security for these schools and to hold these organizations accountable. We urge timely civilian assistance from the United States and allied nations in rescuing these girls.

Many of us believe there should be a regional African coalition to go in which knows the terrain to find these girls. But our President is sending military and law enforcement people to advise the Government of Nigeria, which has been slow to respond. It is not my place to criticize another President, but I wish they would have been more aggressive in a more timely way. Now we are where we are, so I hope we pass the Boxer resolution calling for international help.

I believe we in the Senate, on a bipartisan basis, should join the international voice calling for the rescue of these girls, the return of them home safely to their mothers and fathers, to capture and punish the bad guys, and that there be an international effort to let children of the world be able to go to the school their parents choose for them to go.

I thank Senator BOXER. We are going to be working together. The women of the Senate are going to be meeting with Secretary Kerry, and I believe this is an issue worthy of our attention, worthy of our time, and worthy of our vote.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter of support be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, May 6, 2014.

President BARACK OBAMA,
The White House, Pennsylvania Avenue NW,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As the women of the United States Senate, we are writing to you today deeply disturbed by the abduction and mistreatment of more than 200 girls by the terrorist group Boko Haram from the Government Secondary School in Chibok, Nigeria. Boko Haram has threatened to sell the girls as slaves, and some may have already been sold into child marriages. We condemn these appalling actions in the strongest possible terms, and we agree with you that the abduction of these girls is an outrage. The girls were targeted by Boko Haram simply because they wanted to go to school and pursue knowledge, and we believe the U.S. must respond quickly and definitively.

In the face of the brazen nature of this horrific attack, the international community must impose further sanctions on this terrorist organization. Boko Haram is a threat to innocent civilians in Nigeria, to regional security, and to U.S. national interests. The National Counterterrorism Center (NCTC) has found that Boko Haram has engaged in multiple attacks on Westerners and repeat-

edly targeted students at schools and universities, threatening the ability of young Nigerians, particularly women, to attend school.

While we applaud the initial U.S. condemnation of the kidnapping, we believe there is much more that the U.S. government should do to make clear that such an attack will not be tolerated. We urge you to press for the addition of Boko Haram and Ansaru to the United Nations Security Council's al-Qa'ida Sanctions List, the mechanism by which international sanctions are imposed on al-Qa'ida and al-Qa'ida-linked organizations. Their addition to the List would compel a greater number of countries to sanction Boko Haram, joining several countries, such as the United States, which have already done so. General David Rodriguez, Commander of U.S. Africa Command, identified Boko Haram as an al-Qa'ida affiliate, and the Department of State reported that the group has links to al-Qa'ida in the Islamic Maghreb when it designated Boko Haram as a Foreign Terrorist Organization.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. We look forward to working together until girls and women worldwide can pursue an education without fear of violence or intimidation.

Sincerely,

BARBARA A. MIKULSKI,

U.S. Senator.

SUSAN M. COLLINS,

U.S. Senator.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

COLLEGE AFFORDABILITY

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about one of the great crises facing our country; that is, the high cost of college, and the fact that hundreds and thousands of young people who are bright and wish to get a higher education have now decided that, because they do not want to leave school deeply in debt, they are not going to go to college. What a loss that is, not only to the individuals and the enhancement of their own lives, but it is a loss to our Nation because in a highly competitive global economy we need the best educated workforce possible. The fact that college is becoming a distant dream—an unreachable dream—for millions of families is a horrendous situation which this Congress must address.

Over the last 10 years, the cost of attending a public 4-year college has increased by nearly 35 percent at a time when middle-class incomes have remained flat and, in fact, many families have seen a decline in their incomes. Of the students who do go to college, hundreds of thousands graduate with significant debt—on average, over \$27,000.

This morning I was talking to a staffer of mine who is \$119,000 in debt. And what was her crime? How did she accrue that debt? Did she go on a spending spree? Did she lose her money in a gambling casino? Her crime was that she wanted to go to law school, and she

came out of law school \$150,000 in debt. Today that is down to \$119,000. I have talked to doctors and dentists who are now several hundred thousand dollars in debt.

The important point to make is there was once a time in the United States when that kind of college and graduate school indebtedness did not exist. Only a few decades ago this country made a commitment to our students that if you worked hard, if you studied hard, and if you wanted to pursue a higher education, you could do so at little or no cost. That was what we used to do. Unfortunately, in that very important area we have regressed, and regressed significantly.

Until the 1970s, at the City University of New York, one of the important and best educational systems in the country, the cost was completely free. The University of California system, one of the largest and best university systems in the world, did not begin charging tuition until the 1980s. In fact, in 1965, average tuition at a 4-year public university was \$243.

We know we are living in a highly competitive global economy, and if our Nation is to succeed, we need to have the best educated workforce in the entire world. But the sad truth is we are now competing against other nations around the world that make it much easier for their young people to go to college and graduate school than is the case in the United States of America.

According to a report released last year by the OECD—the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development—the United States was one of the few advanced countries in the world that did not increase its public investment in education over the last decade.

From 2008 to 2010, most advanced countries experienced significant economic decline as a result of the Wall Street collapse. Despite that, the vast majority of countries increased educational spending by 5 percent or more. The United States was one of the few nations to decrease overall educational spending.

I live about 1 hour away from Canada in northern Vermont. In Canada, average annual tuition fees were \$4,200 in 2010—roughly half of what they were in the United States—and yet the OECD says Canada is one of the most expensive countries for a student to go to school.

Germany, an international competitor of ours, is in the process of phasing out all tuition fees. Even when German universities did charge tuition, it was roughly \$1,300 per student.

According to the European Commission in 2012, the following countries do not charge their students any tuition—and these are countries we are competing against. These are countries where young people go to college without any out-of-pocket expenses. Those countries are Austria, Denmark, Finland, Norway, Scotland, and Sweden.

In Europe, university systems enjoy a very high level of public funding. The

EU average is 77 percent. In other words, in countries throughout Europe—Austria, Belgium, Denmark, and all of the rest—what governments understand is that investing in higher education is terribly important for the individual students and their families. But, in addition, it is enormously important for the competitive capabilities of those countries.

So countries such as Austria, Belgium, Denmark, each put in more than 88 percent of public funding into their universities. In the United States, the number is 36 percent. Countries all over the world that don't provide free higher education pump significantly more into their university systems than we do.

The result is several very significant points. First, we have many working-class and middle-class young people who are looking at the economic picture we face as a nation and looking at their own lives, and they are saying: Do I want to go to college and leave school \$50,000 or \$60,000 in debt? How am I going to pay off that debt once I leave school?

Many of these young people, tragically, are saying: I don't want to take that risk. I don't want to leave school deeply in debt. I will not go to college.

What a tragic situation that is for our entire country, because we are losing the intellectual potential of all of those young men and women.

Second, those who do go to college are coming out of school with an incredible chain of indebtedness around their neck, which impacts every aspect of their lives. It determines what kind of jobs they will get. Will they do the job they had hoped to do their whole lives—their life's dream, the work they were looking forward to doing or are they going to gravitate to those jobs which simply pay them a lot of money and enable them to pay off their debt?

For the first time in our country's history, American families have more student debt than credit card debt, and that is an extraordinary reality. All over this country families are struggling with debt in a way they never have before. The average loan balance for American graduates has increased by 70 percent since 2004. Average student debt is now near \$27,000. In Vermont, it is even higher at \$28,000. One in eight borrowers is carrying more than \$50,000 in student debt. The percentage of families in the United States with outstanding student debt increased from 33 percent in 2005 to 45 percent in 2010.

The bottom line here is we have a huge crisis which is impacting millions of individual families and individual young people. But from a national perspective, it is a crisis which is impacting our competitiveness in the global economy.

There was once a time, not so many years ago, when we had the best educated workforce in the world and we had a higher percentage of college graduates than any other country on Earth.

That is not the case today. I think we have got to do some very hard thinking about the crisis regarding college affordability and the crisis regarding student debt. If this country is to remain internationally competitive in the global economy, we need some bold ideas in terms of how we address these crises.

I can tell you that in Vermont, as I speak to young people around my State, this is the issue foremost on their minds. The young people in high school are wondering about how they can afford to go to college. The students in college are worried about how they are going to pay off their college debt. Our job must be to say to every young person in this country that if you are a serious student, if you study hard, you are going to be able to get a higher education regardless of the income of your family, and you are going to be able to get the best education our Nation can provide you based on your ability and not on the income of your family.

This is an issue of enormous importance to individuals around the country, but it is an issue of huge consequence for the economic future of this country. So in the coming weeks I will be introducing legislation—I know there is a lot of other good legislation that is going to be coming to the floor—because this is an issue of huge consequence, and it is an issue that must be addressed.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Thank you, Mr. President.

We are on the measure again, the Shaheen-Portman energy efficiency bill, also known as the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act—an efficiency bill. This should not be this difficult for us. When we talk about the benefits of an all-of-the-above energy policy—the benefits that can come to us as a nation when we are more resilient with our energy sources, when we are able to access our domestic energy sources, whether they be our fossil fuels, our renewables, or nuclear—we all talk about it in good, strong terms because, quite honestly, energy makes us a stronger nation, having access to our energy resources.

I have defined a good, strong energy policy as one that allows energy to be more abundant, affordable, clean, diverse, and secure. An energy policy is also about the energy we do not consume. It is about the energy we save because we are more efficient.

It seems we have gotten to a point, at least with some aspects of this discussion, where somehow or other the

efficiency side of the energy discussion is a partisan debate; that Republicans do not support energy efficiency. I cannot think of a more conservative principle than conserving energy. This is something we should be embracing, and it is something, in terms of legislation that is sound, that is good to move forward, something that I support.

This bipartisan efficiency bill has been refined. It has been strengthened. It has been improved over the past 3 years. There have been plenty of eyes upon this legislation. There has been plenty of debate about it. We have a total of 13 Senators who are now on board with it, an equal number of Republicans and Democrats. So I am pleased we have this legislation back on the floor again.

The last time this legislation came before us was in September. I spoke then about the importance, the relevance to today, the many good reasons the Senate should support it. I am not going to necessarily repeat all of those points this afternoon, but I do want to highlight quickly a couple of the main points.

The first is going directly to the policy side of it. Energy efficiency should be a broader part of our Nation's energy policy. It is good for our economy. It is good for the environment. It enables us to waste less, to use our resources more wisely. Who can object to this? Who could possibly say this is not a good thing we should encourage?

And there is more. Think about what it does to help create jobs and deliver financial benefits. Study after study shows we can save billions of dollars every year through reasonable efficiency improvements. Whether we are talking about small appliances or large buildings, there are opportunities for gains in efficiencies throughout the system.

The second reason for support of the bill is it envisions a more limited role for the Federal Government. When I think about efficiency, I think the Federal Government should seek to fulfill three key roles. It can act as a facilitator of information that consumers and businesses need. It can serve as a breaker of barriers that discourage or prevent rational efficiency improvements. As the largest consumer of energy in our country, it can lead by example by taking steps to reduce its own energy usage.

This legislation helps us make progress in all of these areas, but it is appropriately tailored as well. It has a number of voluntary provisions. It does not contain any new mandates for the private sector. I think that is worthy of repeating. There are no new mandates in this bill.

When the legislation was first introduced some time ago, there was some concern about impact on building codes. But the provision related to model building codes is voluntary. It is not mandatory. No one has to benefit from it if they do not want to.

The third reason to support the bill is the cost—or, really, the lack of cost.

We all know we are operating in a time of high deficits and record debt. The good news is this efficiency bill actually subtracts from our spending rather than adding to it. The CBO has indicated it will yield a modest savings of about \$12 million over the 10-year window. Again, this is good from a policy perspective. It is good from a fiscal perspective.

Then the last point is one I want to make in support of process. We have followed regular order, as well as “regular order” can be defined around here, but we have done that from the beginning with this legislation. Those of us who serve on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee reported it on an overwhelming bipartisan basis back in 2011, and then again in 2013. So it has gone through a fulsome committee process. Improvements were suggested and have been thoughtfully considered and incorporated. Many, many of the ideas are now incorporated in the text we have in front of us.

Then, finally, a few words about the amendments that are being filed to this bill.

When we last had this bill before the Senate, we were unable to reach agreement on amendments. We got bogged down and the bill was pulled from the floor. The Senate moved on to other matters. We are back again now, and I really do not want to see a repeat of that experience. Quite honestly, we do not need to.

It is certainly true a lot of amendments have been filed to the bill. We had more than 100 last September. That should not be evidence that somehow this bill is flawed. But what it recognizes is there is this pent-up demand for a discussion on the issue of energy. There is a pent-up demand to bring forward ideas and concepts and innovation and policy when it comes to energy debate.

It has been more than 6 years since we have had anything more than a brief debate. When you think about what has happened in the energy sector in the past 6 years, I say to the Presiding Officer, you are sitting in the chair coming from a State that has seen an amazing—an amazing—boom when it comes to natural gas production in your State. You have seen technologies come in that are able to access areas where you did not even know you had the resource.

Think about the changes we have seen in the energy sector in 6 years. Six years ago we were talking about building LNG import terminals—terminals so we could bring LNG in from other countries. Now we are pressing the case for greater LNG exports. We are trying to build out more facilities so we can move this abundant resource from our shores to help our friends and allies around the world.

Six years ago, if I had stood on this floor and suggested to you we were going to have a debate about the export of our crude oil from this country, you would have laughed me off the

floor. Nobody was talking about it. But look at what is happening, coming out of the Bakken up in North Dakota, what is coming out of Texas and New Mexico and out of California, Colorado, out of States in the Midwest. We are producing like we have not produced in ages. We are doing so because we have the benefit of good, strong technologies that are allowing us to access a resource safely and making sure we are being good stewards of the land while we are doing it, and creating jobs and opportunities.

So when you think about what has happened in 6 years, and the fact that we have not had a real debate and conversation about energy, it is no wonder people want to present amendments. But we are in a situation now where there is real debate about whether we are going to have any amendments at all.

We have been sitting here in the Senate since last July—almost a year—and there have been nine amendments allowed of the Republicans' choosing to be heard, to be entertained, to be taken up on the floor of the Senate.

We are not asking for an unreasonable number. Given everything that is going on in the world, everything that is happening in the energy sector, it is understood why we would want an opportunity to present amendments. But we are not asking for the Moon here. Out of all the amendments filed to the bill, we are seeking votes on four of them. If we were to take just 15 minutes per vote, with a little extra time for statements in support or opposition, we could work those out in an afternoon.

There is no reason we need to stretch this out. Our other option is to spend the next several days arguing about whether we are going to vote at all. We are sent to the Senate to do good work, and this is a venue where the work is demanding attention, so let's get to it.

Let's advance these measures. Let's get to the debate about whether it is LNG export opportunities, whether it is the advantage from many different perspectives about the Keystone XL Pipeline, and about what more we can be doing as a nation to be a world leader with our energy resources, accessing our resources for the good of Americans, the creation of jobs to strengthen our economy, to help our trade deficit, to help our friends, and to help our allies. We can be in a position to do so much more, but we have to be able to get beyond the discussion, the debate about whether we are just going to talk about whether we are going to talk about it or whether we are going to get to it.

I am hopeful that throughout the afternoon, throughout tomorrow, and throughout the balance of the week we will have an opportunity to discuss and to vote on amendments that are energy-related amendments that will help move this country in a more positive direction when it comes to our energy policy and attach that to a fundamental anchor of a good, strong energy

policy, which is energy efficiency, and that is what the Shaheen-Portman bill allows us to do.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

I want to pivot for a moment and move off the issue of energy efficiency. I wish to speak for a few more minutes this afternoon about National Police Week.

National Police Week is a week to honor our fallen law enforcement officers. It occurs next week. Next week in Washington, DC, we will see police vehicles from all over the Nation. We will see officers in uniform, perhaps some with young kids in tow, flooding the Metro system. The survivors of law enforcement tragedies will gather in Alexandria, VA, for the annual meeting of Concerns of Police Survivors.

On Tuesday night, tens of thousands will gather at the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial, and they will read by candlelight the names inscribed on the memorial walls this year. On Thursday, the National Peace Officers Memorial Day Service will convene on the west front of the Capitol. These are all very moving tributes to our fallen, those who have served in the line of duty and who honor us all.

For the past 11 years, I have made it a habit of honoring the fallen during National Police Week, regardless of whether any Alaska law enforcement agency suffered a line-of-duty death during that preceding year.

At times I have made note of a sad coincidence, a sad coincidence that law enforcement tragedies in the twos and threes often seem to occur in close proximity to the annual National Police Week observance.

About this time 8 years ago, the National Capital Region was grieving the loss of Michael Garbarino and Vicky Armel, the first Fairfax County police officers to die from gunfire in the line of duty. In April 2009, Pittsburgh lost three of its finest.

This year, as we anticipate the arrival of National Police Week, Alaska carries that tragic burden. Last week my home State lost two members of the Alaska State Troopers in a single incident.

On May 1, Alaska State troopers Sergeant Scott Johnson and Trooper Gabe Rich flew from Fairbanks to the village of Tanana. Tanana is an Athabascan Indian community and there are about 238 people. Tanana sits at the confluence of the Yukon and Tanana Rivers. It is a strong community, it is a resilient community, but it is a community that is truly suffering right now.

Similar to most of the Alaska Native villages, the only full-time law enforcement presence in Tanana is a single, unarmed village public safety officer. Law enforcement backup, when they are needed and called in, will fly to Tanana. Tanana is not accessible by roads, so basically the only way in and out is to fly in and out, coming in from Fairbanks, so it is about a 1-hour flight away.

The village public safety officer asked for trooper assistance to respond to an individual who had been waving a gun in the village. With no backup, other than the unarmed village public safety officer, Sergeant Johnson and Trooper Rich attempted to serve a warrant on the offender. Both officers were shot and killed. The 19-year-old son of the individual who was the subject of the warrant is now charged with the shooting.

This is a horrible tragedy for Tanana, a tragedy for Alaska, and a tragedy for the entire law enforcement community.

Tanana is, as I mentioned, a small village. It is an isolated village. It has been a very resilient village. It is a very proud and a very kind-hearted community. The Athabascan word for Tanana, known as "Nuchalawoya," means "wedding of the rivers," and the village has played a very central role in Athabascan culture for thousands of years.

But like many Alaska Native villages, it suffers from drug and alcohol problems. Last October there was a group of young people from the village of Tanana, and they traveled to the Alaska Federation of Natives convention.

It is the largest gathering of Alaska Natives in the State, and they did a very brave and heroic thing. They assembled on stage in front of 4,000 to 5,000 people to tell Alaskans that they had had enough of the pain and the violence, and they were determined to make their community a healthier place. It was an amazing moment. It was inspiring. There was not a sound to be heard in the huge Carlson Center in Fairbanks as these young people spoke.

So inspiring were the words of these young kids that I wrote Attorney General Holder and I asked that his department invest prevention resources in the village and others like it that were trying to turn things around, trying to face the ugly side of what happens in a small community when we have domestic violence and child sexual assault brought on by drugs and alcohol.

Tanana is absolutely devastated by what happened last week. In the words of Cynthia Erickson, who is the youth leader of the young people I mentioned, last week's incident amounts to two steps back in Tanana's effort to heal itself, but the healing process must begin and now is the time for it to begin.

We remember fallen law enforcement officers for the way they lived their lives. Vivian Eney Cross, who is the widow of a fallen U.S. Capitol police officer, said:

It is not how these officers died that made them heroes, it is how they lived.

In that spirit I wish to share with the Senate a little about the lives of our two fallen Alaskan heroes.

Sergeant Johnson was born in Fairbanks, and he grew up in the small community of Tok, which is 150-plus miles out of Fairbanks on the road sys-

tem. He went to school in the Tok community, and he was a wrestler. He joined the Alaska State Troopers in 1993 after serving as a North Slope Borough police officer.

Sergeant Johnson spent his entire 20-year trooper career in Fairbanks, where he rose through the ranks to supervise the Areawide Narcotics Team and ultimately the Interior Rural Unit. Sergeant Johnson also was an accomplished canine handler and a leader of the regional SWAT team. We call it SERT in Alaska, the Special Emergency Reaction Team.

His final assignment was leader of the Interior Rural Unit, a team of four who respond to incidents in 23 Native villages. Sergeant Johnson assumed that role this year. His territory covered hundreds of miles end-to-end. Again, these are hundreds of miles without road access.

Sergeant Johnson was 45 years old. He is survived by his wife, daughters aged 16, 14, and 12, and also survived by his parents and siblings.

Trooper Gabe Rich was born in Pennsylvania. He moved to Fairbanks shortly after he was born. He graduated from Lathrop High School in 2006. He was 26 years old at the time of his death.

Trooper Rich spent 4 years working as a patrolman with the North Pole Police Department before deciding to become an Alaska State Trooper in 2011. He is survived by his fiancé, their 1-year-old son, and his parents. He was in the process of adopting his fiancé's 8-year-old boy.

Sergeant Johnson and Trooper Rich were known to those who watched the popular National Geographic series "Alaska State Troopers." Undoubtedly, those who have watched the two in action are also grieving the loss, along with the people of Tanana and all of Alaska.

I think I speak for all in this body when I say we are shocked and we are saddened by the events in Tanana last week. On behalf of a grateful Senate and a grateful nation, I take this opportunity to extend my condolences to all who held Sergeant Johnson and Trooper Rich deep in their hearts.

With that, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. We are going to have, as indicated, a briefing on Ukraine at 5:30 this evening. I alert all Senators we will do our utmost to start at 5:30, and we must end at 6:30. We need everybody on time. If I am there on time, I am going to start it on time, and I will do my utmost to be there on time. People can be called upon for questions in the order they show up at the meeting.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that at 5:30 p.m., the Senate recess until 6:30 p.m. tonight for the purpose of an all-Senators briefing.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection.

KIDNAPPING OF SCHOOLGIRLS IN NIGERIA

Mr. REID. I have had a number of titles, as all we Senators have over the years, but the title that means the most to me has always been "Dad," "Father." It is so important that my five children recognize me as their dad.

My oldest child is a daughter, Lana, but I also have 12 granddaughters. As a father and grandfather, I can't imagine the horror of having one of these girls abducted, kidnapped, and stolen—even though Nigeria is thousands of miles away from where we sit today.

My nightmare, our nightmare—we are always worrying about our girls—is a reality in Nigeria.

On the night of April 14, more than 250 girls—I don't know the exact number—were stolen from a school by a terrorist group called Boko Haram. These kidnappers, a cowardly group of men—thugs and terrorists—have announced their attention to sell the girls in the marketplace.

It was only yesterday the leader of this organization was on television saying we have them and we are going to sell them. How would that make a mother or dad, family member feel? It is sickening to think these girls are at the mercy of these slavers. These are terrible reports. Some say—some of the reports we get—some of the girls have already been sold into Chad and Cameroon. I hope that is wrong.

So I, with my colleagues, join with the rest of the world in renouncing these heinous acts.

We must remember that this crime is only one of the many acts of terrorism of this awful group Boko Haram. They have done it before against children, against civilians.

Today the United States offered its assistance to rescue these girls. Great Britain has done the same, and other countries have as well. Nigeria, in my opinion, has been reticent to receive help. That is not my opinion, but that is what the public reports say. We want to help rescue these girls. We have some assets the Nigerians don't have, as do the Brits and others who want to help.

I am concerned the Nigerian Government's response to this crime and to dealing with Boko Haram is very tepid. Nigeria has missed opportunities to collaborate with international partners to fight terrorism in this instance and other instances. Instead of carrying out its own operation—which has been very clumsy, and there has been a disregard for human rights—they should let us help. Let the world community help.

The Nigerian Government has been disastrously slow in responding to these incidents—not on this one but on others. I urge the Nigerian Government to use all of its resources and accept international assistance to bring the abductors to justice. The world is watching. Return these daughters to their families.

Today we adopted S. Res. 433, which condemned this abduction, to add our

voices to those calling for their release. I especially thank Senator MARY LANDRIEU of Louisiana and all other cosponsors for their hard work on this legislation. The Senate, along with the rest of the world, will continue to do all we can to help our Nigerian friends. We continue to hope and pray for the safe return of these girls to their moms and dads.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time in recess count postclosure on the legislation that is now being considered.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mrs. MCCASKILL. Mr. President, I very rarely am motivated to come to the floor simultaneously with current events, thinking that it is important to reflect and learn as much as possible about a subject before one begins to orate about it on the Senate floor. I am making an exception, however, because of the extraordinarily heinous acts that have occurred in the country of Nigeria.

I think it takes everyone's breath away in the United States of America that a terrorist organization—Boko Haram—would attack a secondary school in northeastern Nigeria and kidnap 200 girls. Most of these girls are not that much younger than my daughters. These were young women who wanted nothing more than to get an education. We are now told these terrorists have proudly proclaimed they will enslave these young women, they will sell them as slaves. They are proudly taking credit for this despicable and inhumane act.

I thank Senator MIKULSKI and Senator COLLINS for organizing a letter to the President to urge him to include Boko Haram in the United Nations Al Qaeda sanctions list. I thank the other Senators who introduced the resolution we passed this afternoon condemning this attack. But we have to do more.

It concerns me, honestly, that this is occurring in a country where the leader not too long ago signed into law a measure that anyone entering into a homosexual relationship can be imprisoned for up to 14 years. In this same country we have a terrorist organization capturing young women and enslaving them for dollars to be child brides, proudly proclaiming that it is a sin for these young women to want to get an education, that this action was necessary to purge them of their sins and marry them off.

I understand it takes all kinds of people to make up this great world. I understand there are all kinds of beliefs.

But it is very hard for me to get my arms around the notion that there could be any faith that would believe kidnapping young women by the hundreds and selling them as indentured slaves to men could ever be part of any kind of faith that we should recognize. These are not people of faith; these are heinous criminals. I believe our country should look at them as arch-enemies of who we are as a nation and what we stand for as a government.

The name of this organization means "Western education is a sin." Respect for young women is not a sin. Wanting an education is not a sin. The opportunity to better oneself is not a sin.

These incredible crimes that have been committed should not go unanswered, and I think it is incumbent on our Nation, with the great resources we have, to make sure we send the appropriate message to the world that this is Al Qaeda and this is our enemy—not just to our values and our way of life but, importantly, an enemy to innocent young women.

I wanted to come to the floor to make this statement because I cannot imagine how the parents of these young girls must be feeling and how helpless the feeling must be. I can only hope and pray that the Government of Nigeria realizes this is a moment of truth for them. Will they stand up to this kind of extremism that is not faith? They do a disservice to their professed faith by these actions. Can this country stand up to them, can we help them stand up to them and, most importantly, can we do anything to save these young women?

When I go to bed tonight I will, in my faith, thank God for my family and my children, and I will also ask for prayers for these young women in hopes they can be rescued, that they can be reunited with their desire to get educated, and that their families will not have to spend days wondering if they will ever see their children again or if their children will even survive.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support S. 2262, the Shaheen-Portman Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act of 2014. The reason I do so is because I have long felt we can't be for an all-of-the-above energy policy if we aren't promoting state-of-the-art approaches in terms of energy efficiency.

I think the Presiding Officer and I both know it isn't even a speech here in the Senate on energy policy unless the Senator says they are for an all-of-the-above at least three times every 15, 20 minutes. So I think what Senator

SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN are doing is making it clear right at the start that an all-of-the-above energy policy is their approach and their effort to pull as many as possible colleagues into innovative approaches in terms of promoting energy efficiency.

Senators SHAHEEN and PORTMAN have been tirelessly pursuing this legislation for 3 years now. I had a chance as the former Chair of the Energy Committee to watch what they have been doing. I will walk back a bit to make sure colleagues understand how constructive their efforts have been, both substantively and in terms of promoting collaboration here in the Senate, in hopes that these commonsense energy proposals for creating good jobs and a cleaner and healthier environment will prevail on a bipartisan basis here in the Senate.

With our colleague from Alaska, Senator MURKOWSKI, I have had a front-row seat over the last couple years to watch Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN in action and support their efforts. I think we should all be very appreciative of the job our new Chair, Senator LANDRIEU, is doing—again, in concert with Senator MURKOWSKI—because the two of them continue the committee's tradition, No. 1, of working in a bipartisan way but, No. 2, trying again to promote collaboration here within the Senate to promote an energy approach, which I think is not only common sense but it is absolutely essential in order to be able to go on to the other energy policy issues that surely are likely to be more contentious than energy efficiency.

To walk back a bit through what has happened, I think our colleagues know an earlier version of this legislation passed our Energy and Natural Resources Committee last year by an overwhelming bipartisan majority. It was then considered on the floor this past September, but it was blocked by demands for a vote on a health care amendment which had nothing to do with the premise of the underlying bill. I happen to oppose that amendment, but however a Senator feels, it has nothing to do with energy efficiency and productivity.

When the bill stalled on the Senate floor last fall, it looked pretty grim for the cause of energy efficiency, and essentially people were questioning the Senate's ability to consider an act on a range of energy issues which confront our country. I think a lot of people would have thrown in the towel at that point. They would have said: We put in all of this work and effort to win such a strong bipartisan vote in the Senate; then we were ready to go to the floor and faced unrelated issues. And I could see why the sponsors would give up. But Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN are not throw-in-the-towel type of Senators, and in effect they doubled down and went back to work on some of the most challenging issues.

So at that point, after the unfortunate setback of last September, they in

effect doubled down and worked to bring an even broader range of Members and stakeholders together here in the Senate to form a consensus and make this bill even better, improve the array of commonsense approaches taken to promote energy efficiency, and increase the chance of the best possible energy efficiency bill becoming law.

I wish to highlight at this point how challenging this work was and how pleased I was the Senate was able to get together.

At that point one of the most challenging issues dealt with the question of the then-existing requirements that new Federal buildings be designed to phase out their use of fossil-fuel-generated energy by 2030. This is important for a variety of reasons. Of course, the Federal Government is a major property owner in our country, No. 1. And No. 2, I think we all look to the Federal Government at a minimum to try to set some examples in terms of trying to deal with these issues.

In other words, it is fine for Washington, DC, to say: Everybody else would do X, Y, and Z. But if they come back and say the Federal Government is not willing to set an example, it is pretty hard to have any credibility in terms of that particular field of public policy. The reality was that while well meaning, the existing requirement that new Federal Government buildings be designed to phase out their use of fossil-fuel-generated energy by 2030 was not working particularly well by anyone's calculus.

We had folks in the natural gas industry raising questions about whether they would be able to participate. They made the point—one that I think certainly has validity—that natural gas is 50 percent cleaner than the other fossil fuels. They were saying: Well, how are we going to be able to play a role with heating in Federal buildings, which, of course, as I indicated, is very significant both because the Federal Government owns so much property and because of the example the Federal Government sets.

So reaching an agreement on how to balance repeal of this provision in existing law—well meaning, but not working very well—with the addition of provisions to enhance efficiency in Federal buildings involved innumerable meetings—meetings that I participated in personally and others were involved in that went on literally for months with all of the stakeholders—the electric and gas utility industries, the environmental advocacy organizations, the energy efficiency groups—all of them in discussions that took place over conference calls and in-person meeting after meeting.

I would submit that had those groups not been able to come together—and I believe they deserve great credit because they did—I think it may have been right at that point very difficult to advance this bill because we would have generated, for the first time, sig-

nificant opposition around the core issue. Whether it be environmental groups or electric and gas groups, we would have had significant friction over an important public policy issue, which is how to promote renewable energy to the greatest extent possible in new Federal Government buildings.

I will say to colleagues who may be following this, a number of times in these discussions I thought things were going to blow up. I thought one or more of these groups would walk out and say: We will take our chances on the floor; we believe we are going to win, and if it takes this bill down, so be it. But they stayed at the table and they worked out an agreement.

As a result of their agreement—environmental organizations, those in the advocacy of energy efficiency and a variety of industry groups—the effort produced a significantly better bill, and a bill that now includes some very important and powerful additions.

For example, as a result of rewriting the provision that new Federal Government buildings be designed to phase out the use of fossil-fuel-generated energy, very substantial financial savings were generated so as to be able to include some very sensible and potentially far-reaching changes in the energy efficiency field. For example, as a result of that agreement it is possible to take some of the financial savings generated in that redo of the requirements for renewable fuels in Federal energy building and include in the legislation that is now before the Senate, the SAVE Act, a bipartisan proposal championed by our colleagues Senator ISAKSON and Senator BENNET. This provision would for the first time facilitate the accounting of energy efficiency in residential mortgages. A report by the American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy and the Institute for Market Transformation estimates that this proposal alone would create 83,000 new jobs in home construction, renovation, and manufacturing by 2020. These are jobs for American workers that cannot be outsourced. The agreement on Federal building efficiency would also extend the 3 percent-per-year Federal building efficiency target through 2017 and expand the coverage of this efficiency target from new buildings to include major renovations as well.

So what we have is a good bill that got out of committee. It was a good bill last September that I would have liked to have seen pass this body at that time. After it was not possible to move it forward, we had the chief sponsors, Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN, work continually to try to advance this legislation and broaden its appeal. When they bumped up against a really serious problem, which was to fix this policy with respect to the requirements for renewable energy in Federal buildings, they worked with a variety of groups and organizations and were able to make the bill better.

I wish to thank a number of Senators who were behind this effort to redo the

requirements for new Federal buildings—in particular, our colleagues on this side of the aisle, Senator MANCHIN and Senator WHITEHOUSE, and on the other side of the aisle I wish to thank Senator HOEVEN. They were very involved in the nuts and bolts of redoing this legislation. Suffice it to say that the three of them would be the first to say they don't agree on every possible energy policy subject matter. Yet the three of them came together, worked with this coalition of groups I have described, and made significant improvements in the already good bill after September. As a result of their work, we have generated financial savings that made it possible to include the Isakson-Bennet legislation on residential mortgages, which is a very significant and positive development in the energy efficiency field.

This is not a small matter, taking bold steps to improve energy efficiency in residential mortgages the way our colleagues Senator ISAKSON and Senator BENNET have done in a bipartisan fashion. The reason this efficiency legislation is back is because it is sensible and has bipartisan appeal. It is about cutting waste and creating jobs. Passing this legislation would be the biggest step in years toward tapping the enormous potential of energy efficiency, which is the most sensible and cheapest energy source America has.

Here are the most relevant figures with respect to the benefits of this bill. The bill will save about 2.8 billion megawatt hours of electricity by 2030, according to the American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy. To translate this into something people can put their arms around, if we are going to generate 2.8 billion megawatt hours—and that is the projection for this bill—our country would have to build 10 new nuclear powerplants, at a cost of billions of dollars each, and run them for more than 20 years. An additional provision of the bill updates and promotes voluntary model building codes, making residential and commercial buildings more efficient through the installation of new equipment, insulation, and other efficiency technologies. There is money to be saved and there is energy to be saved. That is the kind of work this legislation accomplishes.

What I have described is possibly not the most flashy of stories we might be contemplating here in Washington. It might not be at the top of every single account on the nightly news, but businesses understand how valuable this is. Businesses understand that there is money to be made here. That is why more than 250 companies and associations endorse the bill, including the chamber of commerce, which I think would be the first to state that they don't see themselves as a bleeding heart environmental organization. I was struck by a headline in *forbes.com* not long ago that read "The Shaheen-Portman Energy Savings Act: It's the economy, stupid." *Forbes*, a prominent business publication, got it right.

If Congress can pass this bill, it would immediately become one of the largest job-creating efforts the Senate will enact this year, creating an estimated 192,000 new jobs by 2030. It can also make a tremendous difference in our country's economic competitiveness, bringing savings to businesses and families, reducing demands on our electric grid, and reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

Having watched the development of this legislation as the former chair of the Energy Committee and now chair of the Finance Committee, I think every Member of the Senate understands how important it is to secure a cleaner, more efficient, job-creating energy future. This legislation provides that opportunity. It was a good bill when the Senate considered it last September, it is an even better bill tonight, and to a great extent it is made better because colleagues such as Senator JOE MANCHIN and Senator SHELTON WHITEHOUSE and Senator HOEVEN have worked together on a very contentious matter involving renewable energy in Federal buildings. It is the latest demonstration of good will and comity that has dominated this debate, at least as it relates to the substance of discussing energy efficiency legislation.

I thank our chair Senator LANDRIEU for the first-rate job she has done not only on this but on the matters before the Energy Committee. I also thank my good friend and colleague Senator MURKOWSKI for the same sorts of efforts she made to work with me as the chair and Senator LANDRIEU. I think those efforts are going to pay off. Let's make sure they pay off immediately with the Senate this week moving forward and passing the bipartisan Shaheen-Portman legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUMENTHAL). The Senator from Georgia.

TRIBUTE TO LARRY WALKER, JR.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about a dear friend of mine who last Friday, at the joint spring meeting in Las Vegas, received the American Bar Association's Solo, Small Firm and General Practice Division's 2014 Lifetime Achievement Award.

Larry Walker is a lawyer in Perry, GA. He is a lifetime resident of Perry and went back to his hometown of Perry to practice in 1965. I am so proud that Larry has been recognized by his peers—of which I am one, as a practicing lawyer in Georgia before I came into government. Larry epitomizes what lawyers look to when you think of someone who is a good lawyer.

The award he received recognizes solo and small firm attorneys who are widely accepted by their peers as having significant lifetime distinction, exceptional achievement, and distinction in an exemplary way. Winners are viewed by other solo and small firm practitioners as epitomizing the ideals

of the legal profession of solo and small firm practitioners.

Larry began his law career, as I say, in 1965 when he came back to Perry to practice law. He became a judge of the Perry Municipal Court at the age of 23. In 1972 Larry ran for the General Assembly of Georgia and won the seat that was formerly held by soon-to-be Senator Sam Nunn. He served in the General Assembly until 2005. In 1986 he was elected majority leader of the Georgia House of Representatives and served in that capacity for 16 years. He was the founding member of Walker, Hulbert, Gray & Moore and served as chair of the State Legislative Leaders Foundation. Larry also represented Georgia's Eighth Congressional District on the Georgia Department of Transportation from 2007 to 2009, and in August of 2009 he was appointed by then-Governor Sonny Perdue to the University System of Georgia Board of Regents, where he continues to serve today.

Larry writes a weekly column for the Houston, GA, Home Journal and is the author of a book entitled "Life on the Gnat Line," a composition of Larry's widely read columns on family, everything southern, reading, politics, and, of course, just folks. Larry is a frequent speaker at various community and State events, including continuing legal education seminars.

Larry has been my dear friend for over 30 years. He is not just a great lawyer, he is a great guy. He and I have had the opportunity to knock down a quail bird or two in the woods of South Georgia. We have had discussions late into the night over politics and life in general. Larry is one of those individuals who make life fun and who are a pleasure to be around, and that is why I am so excited the American Bar Association has seen fit to recognize Larry's talents, his hard work, his dedication, and his integrity to the law profession. He has been successful not because he moved to his hometown where he was well known; he has been successful because he is looked at as someone who possesses all the finest characteristics a lawyer can hope to have.

I am indeed privileged to call him a dear friend. I am indeed privileged to have an opportunity to say to Larry and to his wife Janice, congratulations. This kind of award shows that people all across this great country recognize you, Larry, for the great work you have done in our profession for all of these years since you first hung out your shingle in June of 1965.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands in recess until 6:30 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 5:30 p.m., recessed until 6:30 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. BLUMENTHAL).

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN, I ask unanimous consent that he and I and the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. ENZI, and the Senator from North Dakota, Ms. HEITKAMP, be permitted to engage in a colloquy.

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

MARKETPLACE FAIRNESS ACT

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, this colloquy is for the purpose of marking an important day in the Senate because it was on this day 1 year ago that the Senate overwhelmingly passed the Marketplace Fairness Act. We did this by an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote. Sixty-nine Senators, including about half of our Republican caucus, 21 Republicans, supported an 11-page bill—a rarity in this body—that is about just two words, and the words are “States rights.”

The Marketplace Fairness Act, simply described, gives States the right to decide for themselves whether to collect or not collect State sales taxes that are already owed. This ability to collect taxes that are already owed would give States the option to reduce existing taxes or to avoid a new tax or to pay for services without raising taxes.

The Marketplace Fairness Act closes a tax loophole that prefers some businesses over other businesses and some taxpayers over other taxpayers. Out-of-State businesses are being subsidized because they don't have to collect sales taxes—taxes that are owed—and local businesses do. As a result, some taxpayers are being subsidized because some pay sales taxes and others do not even though they may owe the taxes. That is not right, and it is not fair. This legislation, which passed the Senate 1 year ago, gives States the option to decide whether to change that.

One of the best ways to lower State taxes is for the Federal Government to allow States to collect State sales taxes from everyone who owes the tax and not just from some of the people who owe the tax.

We have an honor roll of conservatives who do not think States ought to have to play “Mother May I?” with the Federal Government on this question. For example, Al Cardenas, chairman of the American Conservative Union; Art Laffer, President Reagan's favorite economist; Charles Krauthammer; Representative PAUL RYAN; Governor Mike Pence, a former Member of the House of Representatives; Governor Chris Christie; former Governor Jeb Bush; former Governor Mitch Daniels; and the late William F. Buckley, not to mention Governor Bill Haslam of the State of Tennessee,

agree that recognizing the power of State legislators to make these decisions for themselves is consistent with the 10th amendment and our constitutional framework.

In our State of Tennessee, the Marketplace Fairness Act is an insurance policy against a State income tax. We don't have a State income tax and we don't want a State income tax.

The House of Representatives has not yet acted on this bill. The bill that was passed a year ago today by the Senate was an overwhelming bipartisan vote. We are hopeful that the House will soon either enact our bill, which we have sent to them, or send us their version of the bill so we can confer and send a result to the President of the United States.

State and local governments have been waiting on Congress to solve this problem for more than 20 years—since 1992 when the Supreme Court said Congress has the ultimate power to resolve the issue. Now is the time to act on this legislation. We are ready to work with the House to enact that legislation this year.

In conclusion, I will read the comments of Al Cardenas, chairman of the American Conservative Union and former chairman of the Florida Republican Party. When talking about the Marketplace Fairness Act, Mr. Cardenas said,

When it comes to state sales tax, it is time to address the area where federally mandated prejudice is most egregious—the policy towards Internet sales, the decades-old inequity between online and in-person sales as outdated and unfair.

Again, that was Al Cardenas, chairman of the American Conservative Union, speaking in support of the Marketplace Fairness Act.

I am pleased that of the four Senators who will be on the floor during this colloquy, two are already here. I see the Senator from North Dakota, and I see the Senator from Wyoming. If it is all right with the Senator from Wyoming, I will defer to the Senator from North Dakota. While the Senator may be a little modest about this—I hope she is not—she actually started it all. She has a better view of the Marketplace Fairness Act than just about anyone because of her service in the State government of North Dakota. She has an ability to explain in plain and simple language why the fair and right thing to do is to recognize the rights of States to make these decisions for themselves. Her ability to do that has been a crucial part of our debate and is one of the reasons why we had such overwhelming bipartisan support in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, first I want to say what an honor it has been for me to participate in any amount of leadership on this issue here on the floor of the Senate with such incredible leaders as Senator ALEXANDER, Senator ENZI, and Senator DURBIN, who have

long recognized the injustice that is being done to Main Street businesses and the problems we have in terms of States rights and making sure we maintain a system that recognizes the value of States rights and the value of a State prerogative so they can make their own taxing decisions without interference from the U.S. Senate or anyone in the Federal Government.

As Senator ALEXANDER has explained, when I first came to this body, Senator DURBIN suggested to his staff that they try to find out where I would be on this issue because my predecessor, Senator Dorgan, had been very active with this coalition of leaders on addressing this problem, and his staff suggested that he might want to read the caption on the Quill case since there was the name “HEIDI HEITKAMP” in that caption.

The reality is that back in the late 1980s and early 1990s, we saw this phenomenon of increased catalog sales. I am not talking about companies such as Sears that had a physical presence in the community and could thereby collect sales taxes but more and more boutique types of catalogs. There was more and more competition coming from catalogs.

I had more and more Main Street businesses coming to me as the tax commissioner asking: How is this fair? How is it fair that I started my little business—whether it was a wallpaper business or a fabric business, whatever it was—and people come to my store and look at my sample books that I actually have to pay for, test out the quality of the fabric, take a lot number, and leave and order it from the catalog?

That was a pretty horrible thing to happen to Main Street businesses back in the late 1980s.

Can you imagine walking into a Main Street business now and not only getting advice and information on how the product operates and what the warranties are—not to mention all the training these Main Street businesses have given their employees—but then taking a snapshot of a barcode so you can order it on the Internet right there in the store? I can only imagine how discouraging this is for Main Street businesses. It is unfair to Main Street businesses when they are asked to support their communities, such as putting the ad in the little high school newspaper or contributing to a football billboard or the local fire department so they can serve their communities.

If you think of all the things Main Street businesses do, they are not just involved in retail, they are involved in communities. Yet those Main Street businesses are not asking for an unfair advantage; they are asking for fairness and equity. They are asking that when sales tax rates have gone up from 8 percent to 9 percent because the base dwindles—you have to raise the rate in order to collect the same amount of money—they are being basically taxed out of the marketplace through this

unfair advantage that remote sellers have against them by not having the obligation to collect a tax that is honestly already owed.

I want to reiterate a couple of points Senator ALEXANDER was making because I think it is so important. One of the arguments we hear consistently about marketplace fairness is that it is a Federal imposition of a tax. Nothing could be further from the truth. This is a tax that is already owed. This is a tax that is owed to the States. It is owed by the people who make these purchases—a sales and use tax. We are doing nothing more than telling every State: If you want to pursue Main Street fairness, you have a path forward.

If a State doesn't want to tax or put a collection responsibility on remote sellers, there is nothing in this bill that requires them to do that.

This is a States rights bill, but it is also a fairness to Main Street businesses bill. It is a bill that would make sure that the promise of an equitable tax system in this country is fulfilled. This bill is a promise that if you play by the rules and do everything the way you should as a business, no one is going to get an advantage over you, and we are going to level the playing field. There is no level playing field when somebody has a 10-percent advantage over you simply because you actually invested in a community, put up bricks and mortar, trained a sales force, and yet you are going to be the disadvantaged one.

When we started this a year ago, we were joined by all manner of retailers, but I will never forget the story of a young woman who had a dream. She loves animals and pets. She trained herself in pet nutrition and opened a pet nutrition store in Missouri—it might have been Kansas or Missouri because it was in the Kansas City area. When you combine State and local taxes where her business is located, the tax rate was 9 percent. People would come to her store and explain the ailment or condition of their pets, and her very excellent sales staff would tell them what product was best for their cat or dog. She knew when they walked out, they simply ordered it on the Internet because she could not give them a 10-percent discount. That is what happened in her business.

We told her that if she had a small Internet business with \$1 million in sales, she would have to collect taxes too. She said: I would be so happy to collect a sales tax if I had \$1 million in Internet sales; that would mean I was winning.

If you think about that and the mom-and-pop businesses—just a couple of kind of myth-breaking things about how this is truly going to affect small business. This is not going to have any effect at all on any business if we pass the bill we passed that has gross sales below \$1 million. We have a threshold.

The other myth is that they are going to be subjected to millions of au-

ditions and millions of tax rates. The streamlined process has proven over and over that this is not higher math. We can get this done.

I have a story from the time we did the original Quill case. It got a lot of national attention, and there was a lot of discussion about this. I had a reporter from the Omaha World Herald call me. He said he had just called a major retailer to order some new shirts, and the retailer he was talking to had been very active in opposing the Quill case and very active in opposing what we were trying to do. One of their arguments was that they could not possibly know the tax rate on that shirt in his jurisdiction. When he ordered his shirt, he told the person on the other end of the phone his size, and that person said: You know, maybe you want to check because last time you ordered, it was a size 15.

This reporter said to me: If they can know my shirt size, they could probably figure out the tax rate of the jurisdiction I live in.

Think about it. It has only gotten easier.

One of our major retailers, which is adamant about how this would be the most horrible and onerous thing, offers a package for \$15 if anyone wants to collect the tax.

The other fallacy here and one of the myths I want to break is that if I went to sell my old used lawnmower on the Internet, I would be subjected to sales tax. I think it is only natural that this body doesn't have a lot of experience in sales taxation. It is not what we do. It is what State and local governments do. It is what people who had my former job do. However, there is such a thing as casual sales. If are you not in the business of being a retailer in every State, you have no collection responsibility. It is only retailers, only people who are in the business of retailing and only people who have retail sales over \$1 million who would be affected. And we have streamlined the process. We have made this possible. It is a small thing to ask for us to take an action in this body and in the House of Representatives to tell Main Street businesses that they still matter in the marketplace and that we are going to listen to them and we are going to do everything we can to get them fairness and justice in our tax system.

So, again, I congratulate the excellent leadership that has come before me on this floor on this issue. I pledge once again to do everything we can to get this marketplace fairness done in this Congress so that our Main Street businesses don't have to wait a day longer for tax justice in this country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thank the Senator from North Dakota for her eloquent statement and for her leadership. I am delighted that she has gone from being a caption on a lawsuit to a Senator who can help us pass this bill. In

just a moment I will yield the leadership of this colloquy to the assistant Democratic leader, but I wish to say a word about the next Senator speaking and about Senator DURBIN as well.

Senator MIKE ENZI is the real pioneer on the Marketplace Fairness Act. He knows what he is talking about. He is a shoestore owner from Wyoming. He knows what it is like for someone to come in and try on a pair of shoes and then go home and order them on the Internet and disadvantage a smalltown owner of a shoestore as compared with an out-of-State business. He has diligently and systematically lead this fight the whole time, and it was due to that diligence that the Senate had this overwhelming bipartisan achievement one year ago today. I thank him for his leadership.

Now I recognize the assistant Democratic leader. The truth of the matter is, the way the Senate works, we would never have been able to pass this in the Senate with such fine fashion if it hadn't been for the leadership of the assistant Democratic leader, Senator DURBIN of Illinois. I thank him very much for his leadership and congratulate him for it, and I am glad to turn the leadership of the colloquy over to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I thank Senator ALEXANDER for the leadership he has shown on this bill. We had a much more extensive bill designed, and I worked on it for all of the years he mentioned, which is all the years I have been here, 17 years. We made some progress every single time it came up, but there were misconceptions with it. Senator ALEXANDER suggested the solution that is the true solution for this bill. He changed it to a very brief States rights bill, not a Federal bill. This doesn't have any requirements for any State, but it has an ability for States to make up their own mind.

So I rise today with my colleagues from Illinois, Tennessee, and North Dakota to recognize the anniversary of this significant event. One year ago today, with a show of strong bipartisan support, the Senate took an important step forward to level the playing field for all retailers that collect sales taxes. But it is not really about the retailers; it is about the people who work in those stores. We are talking about middle America. They can't afford to have the employees unless they make the sales, and if they just do the sales pitch and then it is ordered online, there is no revenue the employee brought in, and if there is a prolonged period when there is no revenue, the business doesn't need the employee. This bill is about supporting the jobs we have in our towns. It is about the people who are our neighbors who work in the stores and the people who have the stores that participate in all of the community events.

As the Senator from North Dakota said—and she is probably the only one

who has worked on this bill longer than I have because she was involved in it in State government when she was in North Dakota. I appreciate her expertise on this bill. Without some of the explanations she was able to give on the history of this bill, we wouldn't have been able to get it done.

Of course, Senator DURBIN and I have been speaking for what seems like years now trying to explain how this bill works, taking into consideration any concerns people had and trying to overcome those concerns. I couldn't guess how many hundreds of meetings there have been over trying to get this bill right and to get it fair, all so the States still have the revenue they need to operate without imposing perhaps a personal income tax. In the case of Virginia, I think they are not going to raise the gas tax if this bill passes. So this is a States rights bill. It takes money to the States, and it is money that is really owed right now.

I did a little checking. Wyoming started collecting their sales tax in 1935, and it has been virtually unchanged since that time. There is a provision in the sales tax law that requires a form, so that if someone buys something from out of State and didn't pay sales and use tax on it, they are supposed to fill out this form before the end of the month and send the sales and use tax with the form to the State government to pay it.

One of the surprises I discovered is there is about \$1½ million a year collected in Wyoming that way—people obeying the law. But that is pretty tough to keep track of and especially if one doesn't make out-of-State purchases every day. So the State, of course, imposed on local retailers the requirement that they collect sales tax, and then people don't have to fill out that form. They don't have to send it in before the end of the month.

So they made it a lot easier by making the retailers collect the money. Unfortunately, they weren't able to make all of the retailers collect the money. Because of a court case, they aren't able to do it out of State, and that is very important because it is a huge loss of revenue. I think Wyoming actually loses about \$23 million a year because of purchases over the Internet where no sales tax is paid.

On May 6, 2013, this Chamber passed the Marketplace Fairness Act, and we passed it with 69 votes. Some of the votes we had were as high as 76 votes. That is very significant around here. Sixty-nine is an incredible number for the Senate to produce on any bill. It came from a majority of both sides of the aisle, which is important. I wish to remind my colleagues that this bill is about fairness. It is about leveling the playing field between brick-and-mortar and online companies, and it is about collecting that tax that is already due. It is not about raising taxes. It isn't about taxing the Internet, and it isn't about taxing Internet access. I think we are all opposed to that. But we are

in favor of the States, if they wish, to be able to collect the taxes they have imposed on the people who live in their State. So it is a States rights bill.

In a nutshell, the Marketplace Fairness Act is a straightforward, 11-page bill that brings clarity to a vexing area of sales tax collection inequity. Online sales often go without collection of the sales tax from the point of purchase, while the Main Street stores and the other brick-and-mortar stores in town typically face established collection procedures—no choice, regular reports.

Wyoming shouldn't subsidize online retailers that operate and sell to people in our State. Neither should Illinois or North Dakota or Tennessee or any other State that has sales tax laws. But right now, online retailers can offer lower prices than the local businesses that hire the local people who pay the property taxes and that participate in the community events; the most important thing being those local jobs, simply because they do not have to charge the same sales tax out of State that all our local merchants do.

Sales taxes are important. They pay for the roads we drive on. They pay for the schools our kids go to. In Wyoming, with the particularly small towns, they rely on sales tax for the fire protection and the police protection. When people ask me about the sales tax bill, I ask them what county they are from and, if it is a small town, I say: Check with your fire department and see if, without sales tax, they would be able to function. When people understand it is part of their fire protection and part of their law enforcement protection, they are much more interested in it and understand why the sales tax needs to be collected. I don't want to see a situation where other taxes will have to be raised to cover basic local services because the online retailers are not collecting the sales taxes that are owed on the products they sell.

I remember going into a camera store—I try to get into some stores on the weekend and find out what kinds of decisions they have to make, particularly decisions that have to do with the Federal Government. I was in the camera store and the fellow was explaining he had just lost a sale. The sales tax rate in that town is 6 percent. A man came in to buy a camera, and the camera was \$2,000. But this owner of the store—the only employee of the store—took the time to help him with all of the different gadgets and how to operate it, and showed him what he needed and how to do it. Then the customer took a picture of the bar code and ordered it online because he saved \$120. Technically, he still owed \$120 to his State. Whether he filled out one of those forms and got it in by the end of the month, I doubt it, but that is the law. If a State meets the simplification requirements outlined in the bill, it may choose to require collection of sales taxes that are already due at the point of purchase, including sales con-

ducted through e-commerce. Congress is not forcing States to do anything because the Federal Government should not have the role or authority in telling a State how to manage its finances. This bill specifically says that it is up to the States to enforce the law, and it is 100 percent optional. If the States do act, they are collecting taxes that are already due by the consumers.

I have been working on this sales tax fairness or marketplace fairness issue—or any of the number of names we have had on it through the years as we gained more and more support and as people came to understand more and more of what was involved—since 1997. As a former small business owner, it is important to ensure parity for all retailers by modernizing rules for sales tax collection in a way that respects technology advances and the existing practices of large and small and more traditional businesses, and this bill accomplishes that. It uniquely balances the interests of all businesses and respects the existing laws and rights of states.

The Senator from North Dakota mentioned there is a \$1 million exclusion. This is to help out small businesses, new start-up businesses. If you have a start-up business or a small business, until you have sold \$1 million online or through a catalog in a given year, you don't have to comply with this. But once you hit that \$1 million mark, you can consider yourself a success. We know that is a very small percentage of the Nation, but an important part of the total sales of the Nation. I think that is why one year ago, 68 of our Senators joined me in supporting that Marketplace Fairness Act.

This evening, my lead cosponsors and I are again taking a stand in favor of good public policy for our Nation's retailers while highlighting the need to fix some long-standing sales tax system complexities. By balancing this collection inequity, the Marketplace Fairness Act would help States ensure the viability of the sales tax as a major revenue source for State budgets. We found in Wyoming that it often constitutes 40 percent of a municipality's revenue. It also would close opportunities that encourage tax avoidance.

Beyond the walls of Congress, the Marketplace Fairness Act has received broad support. Trade associations, Governors, mayors, legislators, and numerous businesses have expressed support for the legislation.

But there is work still to be done. Our colleagues in the House need to pass the Marketplace Fairness Act. I know some Members in the other Chamber are working on this issue. A companion Marketplace Fairness Act has been introduced. A hearing has been held, and new Members are engaged in the issue. I appreciate those efforts, and I hope our colleagues in the House will pick up the baton and complete the effort to guarantee sales tax fairness. This is the year to finish the work. Our States and businesses and

employees in those businesses cannot wait longer. Enacting the Marketplace Fairness Act is the right thing to do.

In conclusion, I wish to thank everyone associated with this bill for their hard work and efforts in getting us to this point: our countless supporters across the country, the 68 Senators who joined me to vote for a bill a year ago, the 29 cosponsors of the bill for their support, and especially my colleagues who joined me tonight for their unwavering support of this bill. I can't thank Senator ALEXANDER, Senator HEITKAMP, and Senator DURBIN enough for their efforts. I am going to yield the floor and turn it over to Senator DURBIN who has been a real champion and one of the best explainers of the parts of this bill that I have ever run into. I really appreciate his efforts and his help. We wouldn't be this far were it not for his efforts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELLY). The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I wish to thank my colleague from Wyoming. The most frequently asked question, no matter where I appear in Illinois or at fundraising events, is, Why can't you folks get along in Washington. What is it like to be in a place where everybody is at one another's throats and you can't accomplish anything? Why can't you do things on a bipartisan basis? What is it like today, and how do you compare it to what it was like a few years ago?

I say to them there are times when we do come together and do something important. This is one of those times—the Marketplace Fairness Act.

It was 1 year ago that Senator ENZI led the fight on this. I do not know exactly when he started it, but I was happy to join in, in his effort, when Senator Byron Dorgan retired. I called Senator ENZI and said: I would like to step in and help you with this bill. He said: Let's do it. We brought in LAMAR ALEXANDER, who made some valuable contributions to it. Then along comes HEDI HEITKAMP, the new Senator from North Dakota. Was she ever ready for this fight—a former sales tax commissioner in that State and a former attorney general. She knew this issue inside and out. She has been a terrific ally.

So there were the four of us. What an odd grouping: two Republicans, two Democrats from literally all over the United States. We worked together, and 1 year ago today we passed this basic bill, the marketplace fairness bill. The reason for passing it was just look at the name of it: fairness.

I think about two people when I think about this bill. One of them is the mayor of Normal, IL. His name is Chris Koos, a great friend of mine and a terrific mayor. Chris, in addition to being the mayor, runs a shop where he sells running shoes and bicycles and lots of running equipment and stuff.

So I visited his shop, a great little shop. He is a terrific businessperson. He told me a story, which I have heard

over and over, about people coming in, picking out the bicycle, picking out the shoes. That is perfect. Let me try them on. Let me get out and ride this. Then they say: I will get back to you. And he never sees them again. They turn around and buy the product on the Internet. So Chris is running a showroom as much as a business. There is no fairness there.

When those sales are made on the Internet, instead of in Chris Koos's shop, there is no revenue coming back to the city of Normal, IL, or McLean County. That is Chris's story, but it is the story of thousands, maybe millions, of businesses across America that are losing out now to Internet competition that is not collecting the sales tax that is supposed to be paid.

Then I met another man. I will not disclose the name of his company, but he is a major retailer in the United States. He came to visit me in my office in February or March, and he said: I want to tell you, in this last Christmas season, which is the biggest time of the year for my big-box business, we had a downturn of 8 percent in sales. Based on our projections, we thought for sure we would have more sales. We had a downturn of 8 percent. He said: I lost them to the Internet. Senator, I can't stay in business this way. I can't run a showroom for people who want to sell things on the Internet.

What we are talking about is the basic collection of sales tax for purchases on the Internet. In my State—in virtually all the States with a sales tax—there is a legal obligation to pay it. I did not realize that until a few years ago. My bookkeeper was doing my family tax return for my wife and myself. She called and said: Senator, do you want to pay the taxes you owe on Internet purchases? I said: Yes, I think I want to pay the taxes I owe. She said: Well, how much did you buy on the Internet? I said: I will try to put it together. I called her back, gave her a number. She said: Here is the calculation. On your State income tax return we will declare that you are going to pay X dollars that you owe for Illinois sales tax for purchases you made on the Internet. When I said: Is that what I am supposed to do? She said: Yes. We did it. We have done it every year since.

It turns out only 5 percent of Illinois taxpayers fill in that line on a State income tax return. I am guessing more than 5 percent of taxpayers make Internet purchases. But folks do not know their obligation, they do not follow through on their obligation, and the losers are, of course, our State and local units of government.

This bill says, if Illinois, if Indiana, if Wyoming wishes, on a voluntary basis, they may use this bill to start collecting sales tax when it comes to Internet sales into their State. It is voluntary. The States have to decide to do it. It is not a new tax. This has been said over and over: It is the existing sales tax wherever it may be—in your

State, county or city—existing sales tax.

The bill provides if you are an Internet seller and have less than \$1 million worth of sales in a given year—whether it is Grandma Donnelly's applesauce or whatever it happens to be—you are not covered by this, but if you have more than \$1 million, yes, you have to collect the sales tax.

How can you collect it? First, the States have to provide you with the software so your business does not run into the expense of how to collect it. You say: I bet that is an elaborate undertaking. You can buy the basic software to identify the sales tax based on the consumer's address for about \$15 for the basic package or maybe a couple hundred dollars at the most.

But in this situation the States are going to help the Internet retailers in developing the software so that when someone makes a purchase from Chicago, IL, or Springfield, IL, whoever is selling to me on the Internet will then forward that sales tax to the Illinois Department of Revenue. End of story. It is just that simple.

What it does, of course, is level the playing field for bricks-and-mortar businesses, providing a new source of revenue that should be collected and is owed legally in these States to the local units of government.

We passed this with enormous support from the retail community. It is not surprising. And it just was not the shop owners. It is people who understand the importance of this. This has been said over and over: These bricks-and-mortar shops around America do so much more than just sell a product. They are citizens in the community, corporate business citizens in the community. They participate. When the local high school is having their graduation program and they want somebody to help sponsor it, they will go down to the local sporting goods store for a helping hand on the program. That happens over and over. Whether it is Khoury League or Pop Warner, they are in there helping in the communities.

Isn't it important and fair that they be treated fairly here? Sixty-nine Members of the Senate thought so. Democrats and Republicans voted for it—Senator ENZI and I, Senator ALEXANDER and Senator HEITKAMP. We had 29 cosponsors of this bill who sat down and said: Let's pass it.

We passed it. We sent it to the House of Representatives, and nothing has happened—nothing. There have been some statements made over there, and I hope those statements lead to action, but it is time for them to pick up this bill and this responsibility. If they have a better approach, let's see it. Let's work on it. Let's do it on a bipartisan basis. Let's come up with an approach that works.

I cannot tell you how many different businesses have come through my door—from Sears, Roebuck down to just basic mom-and-pop businesses—

and said: What are we going to do about the House of Representatives? They just will not take up this measure.

I hope they will. They still have time to do it. We have waited 1 year. I do not want to wait much longer. In an election year, it will be almost impossible to do it.

So I hope we can get this done. It is going to mean that local businesses that are important and the backbone of our community are going to have the resources they need because the sales will take place that otherwise are not taking place today, and the local units of government will receive the proceeds from the sales tax that is collected.

One of the major marketplace retailers on the Internet is Amazon. Amazon may be the biggest. They support this bill. If you ask them why, they say: We don't want to fight this battle in 50 States and all the different cities and counties as to how much sales tax. Let's just make it uniform across the country.

That is what the bill does. So Amazon supports this. They are prepared to collect that sales tax and remit it to the States. They do not believe it is an onerous burden that they are going to face. I hope others will join them.

As I have said, 1 year ago today Members of the Senate did something we don't do enough. We put aside the partisan differences that cause so much gridlock around here and came together to pass bipartisan legislation—the Marketplace Fairness Act. On this day last year 69 Members of the Senate agreed that we need to help create jobs, invest in our communities, and keep Main Street alive and able to compete.

The Marketplace Fairness Act levels the playing field for retailers by allowing States to treat brick-and-mortar retailers the same as remote retailers in the collection of State and local sales and use taxes.

Those that benefit under our current system—retailers that have a 5- to 10-percent price advantage over their competitors on Main Street—want to continue the status quo. But it is not fair to the thousands of Main Street businesses that have worked hard to grow their businesses only to become showrooms because of this price advantage. People come in, look around, even try on merchandise, and then leave and buy the product online.

This happens many times because sales and use taxes are not collected when a product is purchased online, so it seems cheaper. But we all know the tax is still owed by the customer. In Illinois about 5 percent of customers end up paying that tax.

Abt Electronics, a retailer in Glenview, IL, knows about this challenge all too well. It is president, Michael Abt, said that “often times with consumer electronics, the profit margin is 10 percent or less . . . when an online competitor doesn't collect taxes and then offers free shipping, it's a huge advantage for the competition.”

Abt is one of the lucky ones—it is a fine example of a successful American business that has continued to grow since opening in 1936 and supports about 1,100 jobs. It also has an online presence so it can reach even more customers.

But there are others that haven't been so lucky.

Soccer Plus in Palatine is an example of what happens when it becomes too difficult to compete with online retailers that have a 5- to 10-percent price advantage.

A year ago when Soccer Plus went out of business we lost good-paying jobs. And Palatine lost a business that was a part of our community.

There is nothing we can do now for Soccer Plus. But we can still help thousands of retailers avoid the same fate as Soccer Plus by leveling the playing field for Main Street retailers.

Since the Senate passed the Marketplace Fairness Act 1 year ago, the inequity between Main Street retailers and online retailers has only increased as e-commerce has grown.

Online retail spending grew 14 percent last year alone, to \$263.3 billion, and is estimated to reach over \$300 billion in 2014.

Unlike 20 years ago, or even 10 years ago, we are no longer talking about a few online retailers without access to the technology necessary to collect sales and use taxes. We are talking about hundreds of retailers, many of which are large billion-dollar businesses that have a price advantage over small Main Street businesses because they don't collect sales and use taxes.

It is time we update our laws so they match our 21st century marketplace.

Retailers in Illinois can now reach customers all over the country through this new marketplace and software has been developed to calculate sales and use tax for every jurisdiction in the country—yes, all 6,000 of them.

It is time to end this idea that technology can't handle calculating sales and use taxes. Many retailers are already using this technology to collect and remit these taxes and similar technology to calculate shipping costs. This is especially true when talking about online retailers who by their very definition use technology to sell their products.

The internet and e-commerce is no longer a baby in its crib. The baby is all grown up, running at full speed, and using outdated laws to threaten Main Street businesses.

The Senate passed a bill to update our laws and correct this inequity 1 year ago. The bill was supported by over 280 business, State, local, and labor organizations, both progressives and conservatives alike.

Yet the House has done little more than hold a hearing which was added to the long list of hearings already held on this issue over the last 20 years.

Each week that the House doesn't act is another week that Congress is picking winners and losers—the losers

being Main Street retailers, the jobs these retailers provide, and the communities these businesses support.

Recently, 1,064 of these businesses sent a letter urging Chairman Goodlatte to move legislation to address the inequity they face every day. Many of these businesses were from the chairman's home State of Virginia.

How long can we expect our small businesses that are partners in our communities to stay in business when we are tying one hand behind their back?

I urge them to hold on as long as possible, but the only real solution is for Congress to act.

I strongly urge my colleagues in the House, Chairman GOODLATTE, and others, to give Main Street retailers a fighting chance by passing sales tax fairness legislation as soon as possible.

We welcome the opportunity to work with our House colleagues so that one day soon we can offer businesses and States a solution to level the playing field for retailers that is simple and fair.

In closing, I want to recognize the work Senators ENZI, ALEXANDER, and HEITKAMP have done on this issue.

Senator ENZI introduced the first bill more than a decade ago to level the playing field because he understands firsthand, being a former retailer, how unfair this is for Main Street retailers.

Last year when we passed the Marketplace Fairness Act we came one step closer to leveling this playing field by allowing States to require both brick and mortar retailers and online retailers to play by the same set of rules.

It will ensure that Main Street businesses, like Abt, have a fighting chance and no more stores will have to close because of the current inequity they face.

Again, I urge the House to pass sales tax fairness legislation. I hope that the House Judiciary Committee will move forward in the coming weeks and offer any help I can give.

I am not going to take much longer. I think we have covered the subject well, and I thank Senator ENZI from Wyoming, as well as Senator HEITKAMP from North Dakota, and especially Senator ALEXANDER from Tennessee for kicking this off.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this article by Donnie Eatherly. Donnie is the president of P&E Distributors in Tennessee. He is also a member of the Alliance for Main Street Fairness Small Business Advisory Board. He wrote this article on May 6 that is entitled: “It's Time To Level The Playing Field For Main Street Businesses,” and it is a good article. It says, in the simplest terms, what he, as a businessman, sees this issue to mean.

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

(Commentary, May 6, 2014)

IT'S TIME TO LEVEL THE PLAYING FIELD FOR
MAIN STREET BUSINESSES

(By Donnie Eatherly)

Small-business owners like myself have for years urged Congress to create a level playing field that will allow us to compete with our online-only competitors. One year ago this week, the Senate overwhelmingly passed legislation that would accomplish this goal, and we're counting on the Republican-led House of Representatives to do the same.

Thanks to an antiquated tax loophole, large out-of-state online retailers can avoid collecting state sales tax on purchases made by residents in my state, which gives them a significant 9.75 percent competitive advantage over traditional brick-and-mortar shops that follow the law and collect those taxes.

To fix this unfair system, a bipartisan group of 69 senators last year passed the Marketplace Fairness Act, a common-sense reform that would ensure all businesses play by the same rules. Unfortunately, the legislation has stalled in the House.

As each week passes with no action, brick-and-mortar businesses continue losing sales to a common practice known as "showrooming," in which customers browse and test items at local stores and then head home to buy them online knowing they will not have to pay state sales tax.

For many small businesses such as mine, every sale counts and losing this revenue hurts our ability to grow our businesses and hire new employees. We cannot wait any longer for a federal solution to this problem.

Main Street business owners are not asking for a handout, and we're certainly not afraid of competition from the big guys. But it simply does not make sense for out-of-state online retailers to enjoy such a big competitive edge over local businesses that give back to their communities.

Despite what some have said about the Marketplace Fairness Act, this is not a new tax, nor does it create any taxes. These taxes are already on the books, and the legislation would simply give states the necessary tools to collect them. As conservative Republican Rep. Steve Womack of Arkansas has said, "It's not new, it's due!"

Not only does this level the playing field for all businesses, but it would also put additional revenues in state coffers to fund vital services such as education and public safety. Importantly, the legislation also includes a \$1 million exemption on remote sales so to put that into perspective, over 99 percent of all online sellers will not be affected by this legislation in any way. In other words, all the mom and pop stores who do business on the Internet don't have to worry about it.

Additionally, for the less than 1 percent of online sellers who will be subject to collecting sales and use taxes under this bill, the legislation requires each participating state to provide free tax software that will allow them to quickly and efficiently calculate, collect and remit sales tax. The proposal also includes liability protections for sellers and limits against audits.

This reform is long overdue, and Main Street businesses cannot wait any longer for help. For those who believe in state's rights and the basic principle of limited government, we should all agree that Washington, D.C., should no longer be in the business of picking winners and losers in the marketplace.

It's time for the House of Representatives to stand up for the small businesses in their districts, follow the Senate's lead and finally pass marketplace fairness.

Mr. DURBIN. So let's get together. We did it in the Senate on a bipartisan

basis, with a big vote—some 69 votes. We can do it in the House of Representatives. Let's get something done this year that is going to help businesses across America be profitable and hire more people, put more folks to work across the United States.

At this time, I yield the floor to my friend from Wyoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Illinois for his excellent explanation. I have been joining him and watching him do that for several years. It would be nice to get this finished.

There are a few things we may not have mentioned that are sometimes raised when people ask me about marketplace fairness. One of them is from small towns. They say: We have to go on the Internet because there is not enough selection in our town and we can get things we cannot buy in town and some of the things we can get at a lower price by going out of town.

I always ask them, when they are figuring that lower price, are they figuring it without sales tax or with sales tax, because it is not truly a lower price if what you are doing is just cheating your local merchant out of the right to collect the sales tax—which he does not get paid for anyway—and submitting it, when the out-of-State retailer does not have to do that.

As to the revenue that companies are voluntarily collecting now—and there are a number of them that recognize it is difficult for everybody to keep track of their purchases, so they voluntarily collect it—the question I have had is, Does that money they voluntarily collect go back to the States? Yes, it absolutely does, and it will work that way under the bill as well. It is not money that you are just sending to wherever you ordered it from. You are sending it to where it was ordered from, and then they are sending it back to States.

That is what these programs the Senator from Illinois mentioned do. They keep track of what State all the purchases were from. Here is how difficult that is. When you call in your order or you do it online, at some point you have to put in an address with a ZIP Code. That ZIP Code is all the program needs in order to be able to assess your tax. That is how those programs are designed. So if you have to give an address, you have to give the ZIP Code. If you have to give the ZIP Code, they already know what the tax is going to be. So there is no difficulty for any size retailer to be able to figure out what the tax is they are supposed to be doing.

Another argument I hear is the online place provides free shipping. I want you to know your local retailer provides free shipping and immediate pickup. Somebody had to pay the shipping on it. It got to the store, and you can pick it up right there, instantly. You do not have to wait 2 or 3 days or

pay a special rate to get it overnight. You can get it right then.

One of the things that is discouraging for retailers is, if you waited on somebody and they got the barcode and they ordered it online and it came in and it was not exactly what they wanted, then they come to you and say: Well, this is the brand you are selling. Won't you take it back?

Let's see, they did not make anything on it, they used a whole bunch of time, and now they want you to put it in your inventory. That is very discouraging.

So think about those local clerks. They are your friends and neighbors who are being hired locally who really depend on a job. If everything gets ordered online, they will not have a job. Your friends will have to move, and you will not have as much selection as you have right now in your local store.

Again, I wish to thank all those who voted for it, all those who have worked on it, and all those who are considering voting for it the next time they get it because I know we have picked up some momentum since we did it last time. There are people who have heard from their communities now who say: Well, I did not vote right last time, but I will get it right next time. I am looking forward to that, and I am looking for the House to finish it and send it to the President.

Thanks again, I say to Senator DURBIN, for his tremendous effort.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

CONGRATULATING KEN DUGAN

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to honor and recognize the career of Ken Dugan, center director of the Sierra Nevada Job Corps. Ken is retiring this month after spending 39 years in the Job Corps program, 36 of which as a center director. Throughout this time, Ken has worked tirelessly to help improve the lives of at-risk teenagers and young adults through vocational and academic training.

When Ken started his first assignment with the San Jose Job Corps in 1975, he never envisioned that almost 4 decades later he would be retiring with the organization. However, Job Corps and its mission soon became a way of life for him. After stints as center director at the San Jose and Hawaii Job Corps centers, we in Nevada were extremely fortunate to have Ken take over as center director for the Sierra Nevada Job Corps, the only Job Corps center in the State. During his 19 years

with Sierra Nevada, Ken oversaw the relocation and new construction of the center, the third time he had done so with a center. The new center, with Ken at its head, has greatly enhanced the living and learning environment for thousands of students over the years.

During his unprecedented 36-year tenure as a center director, the Job Corps centers Ken has run have been honored with numerous performance awards from the U.S. Department of Labor, not to mention Recognition of Performance and Community Value awards by the legislatures and Congressional delegations of California, Hawaii, and Nevada. On behalf of the U.S. Senate, I commend Ken Dugan on a lifetime of public service, and wish him the best in all his future endeavors.

AROOSTOOK ASPIRATIONS INITIATIVE

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I would like to engage my fellow Senator from Maine in a colloquy regarding a new citizen-led education enterprise in our great State, the Aroostook Aspirations Initiative, AAI.

Aroostook County, where I was born and raised, is defined by an extraordinary work ethic and the enduring spirit of its people. It is Maine's northernmost and largest county, and its economy depends on an able and educated workforce. Too often, the goals of hard-working students in Aroostook County are impeded by the costs of higher education and the complexities of choosing a career. Thanks to the extraordinary commitment of Ray and Sandy Gauvin, those obstacles are being addressed in dramatic and dynamic ways.

Cognizant of the needs of students and indebted to a community that enabled their own success, the Gauvins have designed a multifaceted program aimed not only at educating but also empowering students in Aroostook County. Through AAI, they have established a scholarship fund, launched by their own generous donation, for high school students seeking postsecondary education. These scholarships target economically disadvantaged and first-generation college students throughout the county. AAI collaborates with the University of Maine at Presque Isle and at Fort Kent, the Northern Maine Community College, Husson University, area businesses and entrepreneurs to offer seminars to guide students throughout their postsecondary education. Students can also team up with Aroostook County employers through a cooperative internship program that gives them practical experience in careers they would like to pursue. These internships help lay the foundation for invaluable relationships with professional mentors.

I am extremely proud of the Gauvins, the business leaders with whom they have joined forces, and the accom-

plished students they have supported and will continue to assist through this wonderful program. I am confident that this initiative will enrich Aroostook County, its families, its future workforce, and its economy.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the comments of the senior Senator from Maine. I, too, am proud to commend the Aroostook Aspirations Initiative, AAI, and the Gauvin County Scholarship Fund for their efforts to increase educational and economic opportunity in Aroostook County. AAI's partnerships with all 16 of the county's high schools and all 4 of the county's institutions of higher education serve as a model of what forward-thinking private citizens, schools, colleges, universities, and businesses can accomplish when they set out to better their communities.

The initiative takes on the goal of increasing access to education for first-generation college students and those from lower income families, clearly critical in its own right as a matter of fairness and pairs it with measures designed to harness the benefits these students will bring to the local economy. Scholarship recipients are directed to local colleges and universities, allowing them to forge connections with local business leaders through AAI-coordinated internships. As a capstone, AAI matches scholarship recipients with mentors who help them craft business plans in their senior year of college, ensuring that each graduate has a roadmap as they enter the workforce. The first group of scholarship recipients will graduate in 2015, and I look forward to observing their accomplishments and the added energy they will bring to their communities.

None of this would be possible without the vision and generosity of Ray and Sandy Gauvin, along with that of the businesses, schools, colleges, and community organizations that have heeded their call in supporting AAI. The Gauvins' personal experience, as a first-generation college student and a career teacher, respectively, clearly inspired the effort they have spearheaded. As they noted in an interview with the Bangor Daily News, they believe "education is the great equalizer," and I could not agree more. I thank the Gauvins and the initiative's business and education partners for stepping up to support the county's next generation of leaders. I cannot wait to see, with their communities behind them, what these students will achieve.

REMEMBERING THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, last week, Armenians and friends of Armenians around the world solemnly remembered the horrific dislocation and slaughter that began in 1915 and resulted in more than 1.5 million deaths and another half million Armenians driven from their ancient homeland.

The Armenian Genocide was carried out by the Ottoman Empire in its waning years amidst the chaos of World War I. For what was an undeniably gruesome period in human history, Theodore Roosevelt called the Armenian Genocide "the greatest crime of the war."

It is this terrible chapter, more than any other single event, that led to the Armenian diaspora, including in the United States and my home State of Rhode Island. For generations, the Armenian community has been a strong and hardworking part of our Rhode Island family, producing great leaders in both government and business. Whether at flag raising ceremonies, church festivals, the wonderful St. Vartanantz Annual Bazaar at Rhodes on the Pawtuxet, or at commemorations of the Armenian Genocide at the monument in the North Burial Ground in Providence, Armenians are part of the fabric of Rhode Island.

Since achieving independence after the fall of the Soviet Union, Armenia has at last established a foothold for democracy in the Caucasus after centuries of outside domination and totalitarian rule. I have long supported foreign assistance to Armenia to help grow its economy and strengthen its Democratic institutions, and I will continue to do so.

But perhaps the most meaningful thing we can do for Armenia and for Armenians in Rhode Island is to help cast a light on that brutal genocide 99 years ago. To this day, too many people are unaware of this tragedy, due in part to the unwillingness of some to call it what it was. But make no mistake; the slaughter of innocent Armenians was genocide, plain and simple. Indeed, our modern term "genocide" was first coined to describe both the Jewish Holocaust and the plight of the Armenians under Ottoman persecution.

Along with my Rhode Island colleague Senator JACK REED, I have proudly cosponsored resolutions in the Senate condemning the genocide and calling on the President of the United States to ensure that U.S. foreign policy appropriately and without equivocation reflects the realities of the Armenian Genocide. This solemn recognition is important not only to so many Armenians in Rhode Island and throughout the world, but to our human obligation to the truth.

IMMIGRATION RULE CHANGE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today, the Departments of Homeland Security and Commerce announced a proposed rule change that would extend employment authorizations to spouses of certain H-1B workers. The rule says that spouses who have already begun the process of seeking legal permanent resident status through employment, or those who have been granted an extension beyond their 6-year limit of stay in the country, are eligible for employment authorizations.

On a call with media today, Homeland Security Deputy Secretary Mayorkas said that the intent of this regulation is to make it more attractive for foreign workers to come to and stay in the United States. Under current law, Congress authorized 85,000 H-1B visas to be available each year for high-skilled workers. Yet, with this sweeping rule, more workers will be allowed to come, work, and compete with U.S. workers in high-skilled fields despite the well-documented fraud in the H-1B program. The Department believes that the rule change will allow more than 97,000 people to obtain employment authorization in the first year alone.

While we're all interested in attracting the best and the brightest foreign workers to the United States, the Obama administration clearly doesn't seem concerned with the millions of unemployed Americans, and those who have been forced out of their jobs because companies prefer to hire lower-paid workers from abroad.

In addition to their lack of compassion and understanding for American workers, it is disturbing that the administration is once again circumventing Congress and implementing their own rules. As with other unilateral actions this administration has taken, I question their legal authority to issue this rule.

In 2001, Congress explicitly laid out in statute that the Secretary could provide work authorizations to certain spouses of foreign workers. Congress said that work authorizations could be given to spouses of LI, intercompany transfers, and E, treaty traders/investors, visa holders. Congress did not, at that time, give spouses of H-1B visa holders the permission to work. It could have, but it did not.

The administration may claim that it has broad authority to issue work authorizations to anyone in the United States. If the executive branch has such broad authority, then why would Congress explicitly lay out the category of visa holders and foreign nationals who could work in the U.S.?

And, what will come next? Where will this administration stop? What other categories of individuals will be granted work authorizations? The rule allows spouses of "certain" H-1B visa holders to work. What about the others? Why didn't the administration do a more comprehensive rule for all H-1B spouses? Maybe the Department realized they were already pushing the envelope with its authority. Will the administration push back against advocates of other nonimmigrant categories, or refuse to expand the rule to all spouses of H-1B visa holders?

What is frustrating about this rule is that it flies in the face of the immigration bill that the Senate passed last summer. The bill, if passed, would allow spouses of H-1B holders to work. Section 4102 of S. 744 would give the Secretary of Homeland Security the authority to issue work authorization

to those who are accompanying or following to join a principal H-1B worker. Inclusion of this provision signals that the Secretary does not currently have authority.

Originally, the bill written by the Gang of Eight, only gave that authority to the Secretary if the home country of the foreign national did the same for U.S. workers. The Gang of Eight's bill said, "The Secretary of Homeland Security shall authorize the alien spouse to engage in employment in the United States only if such spouse is a national of a foreign country that permits reciprocal employment."

The intent of the authors of the Senate bill was to ensure that American spouses were treated equally. The rule does not take this into consideration.

The Obama administration claims it wants immigration reform, but they can not wait for Congress. They act on their own. And, they do it to the detriment of American workers. We need to get immigration reform right, and doing ad-hoc rules that fly in the face of the statute are not helpful to the process. What is next? Will the President unilaterally legalize the undocumented population because he can not have his way with Congress? President Obama has to prove that he can be trusted. Otherwise, American workers and the American people will continue to lose out because of his policies.

TRIBUTE TO DAVID THIBODEAUX

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I wish to ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the distinguished coach and sports enthusiast, Mr. David "Big Daddy" Clyde Thibodeaux. Coach Thibodeaux is best known throughout his hometown of Acadiana as "Big Daddy" for his warm and fatherly spirit to his family and former players alike. Mr. Thibodeaux served with distinction as head coach of both the Stone Junkies Softball Team and AAU Team Louisiana. In 2005, Coach Thibodeaux was awarded for his remarkable coaching career when he was inducted into the AAU Louisiana Hall of Fame.

Coach Thibodeaux disseminated his sage knowledge of the game to more than just his players. Through his work as a sports announcer, Coach Thibodeaux also imparted his wisdom of basketball and football with sports fans from around the country. Over the course of his announcing career Coach Thibodeaux broadcast live on KPEL's ESPN 1420 Radio, Friday Night Football, Big Time Sports Show on Sundays, and Kevin Foote's Wednesday Football Show in the morning, as well as the online show of PrepBallers.net. His love of people and sports was evident to everyone who met Coach Thibodeaux, and his life embodied a career of service to others and God.

David Thibodeaux is survived by his wife, Rose A. Thibodeaux; his son Derrick and Niema LeBlanc Sr., of Petal, MS; his daughter, Adrienne and

Johnathan Goodie of Breaux Bridge; two step brothers, Raymond Green of New Iberia and Colby Green of Dallas, TX; his uncle, Yancy Thibodeaux of Reno, NV; his brother-in-law, Nolan Hamilton Sr. of New Iberia; his nephew and godchild, Nolan Hamilton Jr., of New Iberia; six grandchildren, Dayton LeBlanc, Braylen Goodie, Derrick LeBlanc Jr., Carmyn Goodie, Kennedy LeBlanc, and Jalen Goodie; two nieces, Patience Thibodeaux and Setonya Mouton; nephew, Gregory Martin Thibodeaux Jr.; great niece, Zaylen Mouton; great nephew, Zyren Lastrapes; and his aunt, Janzina Thibodeaux.

It is with my heartfelt and greatest sincerity that I ask my colleagues to join me, along with David "Big Daddy" Thibodeaux's family, in recognizing the life and many accomplishments of this incredible coach, mentor, and friend, as well as his lasting impact throughout the State of Louisiana.

SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY AT BATON ROUGE CENTENNIAL

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, today I wish to honor Southern University located in Baton Rouge, LA, as it celebrates its 100th anniversary. Southern University at Baton Rouge was established on March 9, 1914, when Southern University moved from New Orleans to Scott's Bluff, overlooking the Mississippi River in the northern section of Baton Rouge. The University opened its doors just outside of Baton Rouge with nine professors and just one central building to 47 students. The original building, now called the Archives and Information Center, housed the administration, all classrooms, and even served as an all-girls dorm. The original campus is now a part of the Louisiana African American Heritage Trail.

Southern University remains the only land-grant school in the State of Louisiana and now has more than 200 buildings worth more than \$200 million. This year's Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge, SUBR, Centennial Celebration will honor Southern's historical contributions as well as acknowledge exceptional alumni in a variety of fields, including its first president, Dr. Joseph Samuel Clark. The Jaguar Nation of Southern University is well-known for its role in the civil rights movement in the State of Louisiana and for its nationally recognized marching band nicknamed, "the Human Jukebox."

Undergirding all of the centennial events will be an ambitious fundraising effort that will solicit financial support from corporations, foundations, businesses, religious organizations, alumni, university retirees, former and current board members, former system presidents and chancellors, former student campus leaders and athletes, current faculty, staff and students, elected and appointed officials, community leaders, and the public in general. The

funds generated will be credited to a scholarship fund to assist qualified SUBR students.

Today, Southern University at Baton Rouge enrolls more than 7,000 across 44 undergraduate degree programs. Southern also offers 30 post-graduate degree programs including six doctoral programs and an ABA-accredited law school program. It is with my heartfelt and greatest sincerity that I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Southern University at Baton Rouge as it celebrates its 100th Anniversary.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

CLAY COUNTY, IOWA

• Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, the strength of my State of Iowa lies in its vibrant local communities, where citizens come together to foster economic development, make smart investments to expand opportunity, and take the initiative to improve the health and well-being of residents. Over the decades, I have witnessed the growth and revitalization of so many communities across my State. And it has been deeply gratifying to see how my work in Congress has supported these local efforts.

I have always believed in accountability for public officials, and this, my final year in the Senate, is an appropriate time to give an accounting of my work across four decades representing Iowa in Congress. I take pride in accomplishments that have been national in scope—for instance, passing the Americans with Disabilities Act and spearheading successful farm bills. But I take a very special pride in projects that have made a big difference in local communities across my State.

Today, I would like to give an accounting of my work with leaders and residents of Clay County to build a legacy of a stronger local economy, better schools and educational opportunities, and a healthier, safer community.

Between 2001 and 2013, the creative leadership in your community has worked with me to secure funding in Clay County worth over \$20 million and successfully acquired financial assistance from programs I have fought hard to support, which have provided more than \$997,000 to the local economy.

Of course my favorite memory of working together has to be their work through Main Street Iowa to renovate the Spencer Community Theater. In 1982, this building was transformed from the vacant Spencer Grocer Building into the Spencer City Theatre, a center for arts, culture, and community gathering. This funding has allowed for the space to again be transformed. With these renovations, the Spencer City Theatre is now a facility that can better serve the Clay County community.

Among the highlights:

Main Street Iowa: One of the greatest challenges we face—in Iowa and all

across America—is preserving the character and vitality of our small towns and rural communities. This isn't just about economics; It is also about maintaining our identity as Iowans. Main Street Iowa helps preserve Iowa's heart and soul by providing funds to revitalize downtown business districts. This program has allowed towns like Spencer to use that money to leverage other investments to jump-start change and renewal. I am so pleased that Clay County has earned \$50,000 through this program. These grants build much more than buildings. They build up the spirit and morale of people in our small towns and local communities.

School grants: Every child in Iowa deserves to be educated in a classroom that is safe, accessible, and modern. That is why, for the past decade and a half, I have secured funding for the innovative Iowa Demonstration Construction Grant Program—better known among educators in Iowa as Harkin grants for public schools construction and renovation. Across 15 years, Harkin grants worth more than \$132 million have helped school districts to fund a range of renovation and repair efforts—everything from updating fire safety systems to building new schools. In many cases, these Federal dollars have served as the needed incentive to leverage local public and private dollars, so it often has a tremendous multiplier effect within a school district. Over the years, Clay County has received \$797,135 in Harkin Grants. Similarly, schools in Clay County have received funds that I designated for Iowa Star Schools for technology totaling \$110,000.

Agricultural and rural development: Because I grew up in a small town in rural Iowa, I have always been a loyal friend and fierce advocate for family farmers and rural communities. I have been a member of the House or Senate Agriculture Committee for 40 years—including more than 10 years as chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee. Across the decades, I have championed farm policies for Iowans that include effective farm income protection and commodity programs; strong, progressive conservation assistance for agricultural producers; renewable energy opportunities; and robust economic development in our rural communities. Since 1991, through various programs authorized through the farm bill, Clay County has received more than \$14 million from a variety of farm bill programs.

Keeping Iowa communities safe: I also firmly believe that our first responders need to be appropriately trained and equipped, able to respond to both local emergencies and to statewide challenges such as for instance, the methamphetamine epidemic. Since 2001, Clay County's fire departments have received over \$705,345 for firefighter safety and operations equipment.

Disability Rights: Growing up, I loved and admired my brother Frank,

who was deaf. But I was deeply disturbed by the discrimination and obstacles he faced every day. That is why I have always been a passionate advocate for full equality for people with disabilities. As the primary author of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and the ADA Amendments Act, I have had four guiding goals for our fellow citizens with disabilities: equal opportunity, full participation, independent living and economic self-sufficiency. Nearly a quarter century since passage of the ADA, I see remarkable changes in communities everywhere I go in Iowa—not just in curb cuts or closed captioned television but in the full participation of people with disabilities in our society and economy, folks who at long last have the opportunity to contribute their talents and to be fully included. These changes have increased economic opportunities for all citizens of Clay County, both those with and without disabilities. And they make us proud to be a part of a community and country that respects the worth and civil rights of all of our citizens.

This is at least a partial accounting of my work on behalf of Iowa, and specifically Clay County, during my time in Congress. In every case, this work has been about partnerships, cooperation, and empowering folks at the State and local level, including in Clay County, to fulfill their own dreams and initiatives. And, of course, this work is never complete. Even after I retire from the Senate, I have no intention of retiring from the fight for a better, fairer, richer Iowa. I will always be profoundly grateful for the opportunity to serve the people of Iowa as their Senator.●

SAC COUNTY, IOWA

• Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, the strength of my State of Iowa lies in its vibrant local communities, where citizens come together to foster economic development, make smart investments to expand opportunity and take the initiative to improve the health and well-being of residents. Over the decades, I have witnessed the growth and revitalization of so many communities across my State. And it has been deeply gratifying to see how my work in Congress has supported these local efforts.

I have always believed in accountability for public officials, and this, my final year in the Senate, is an appropriate time to give an accounting of my work across four decades representing Iowa in Congress. I take pride in accomplishments that have been national in scope—for instance, passing the Americans with Disabilities Act and spearheading successful farm bills. But I take a very special pride in projects that have made a big difference in local communities across my State.

Today, I would like to give an accounting of my work with leaders and

residents of Sac County to build a legacy of a stronger local economy, better schools and educational opportunities, and a healthier, safer community.

Between 2001 and 2013, the creative leadership in your community has worked with me to successfully acquire financial assistance from programs I have fought hard to support, which have provided more than \$5.6 million to the local economy.

Of course my favorite memory of working together has to be Sac County's excellent work to secure funding for firefighting equipment through Federal Emergency Management Agency, FEMA, fire grants. I look forward to seeing how Fremont County has implemented this important funding in their community.

Among the highlights:

Investing in Iowa's economic development through targeted community projects: In Northwest Iowa, we have worked together to grow the economy by making targeted investments in important economic development projects including improved roads and bridges, modernized sewer and water systems, and better housing options for residents of Sac County. In many cases, I have secured Federal funding that has leveraged local investments and served as a catalyst for a whole ripple effect of positive, creative changes. For example, working with mayors, city council members, and local economic development officials in Sac County, I have fought for funding for small airport funding at the Federal Aviation Administration, which allowed community leaders to successfully acquire over \$1.5 million in airport improvements, helping to create jobs and expand economic opportunities.

School grants: Every child in Iowa deserves to be educated in a classroom that is safe, accessible, and modern. That is why, for the past decade and a half, I have secured funding for the innovative Iowa Demonstration Construction Grant Program—better known among educators in Iowa as Harkin grants for public schools construction and renovation. Across 15 years, Harkin grants worth more than \$132 million have helped school districts to fund a range of renovation and repair efforts—everything from updating fire safety systems to building new schools. In many cases, these Federal dollars have served as the needed incentive to leverage local public and private dollars, so it often has a tremendous multiplier effect within a school district. Over the years, Sac County has received \$158,167 in Harkin grants. Similarly, schools in Sac County have received funds that I designated for Iowa Star Schools for technology totaling \$99,430.

Agricultural and rural development: Because I grew up in a small town in rural Iowa, I have always been a loyal friend and fierce advocate for family farmers and rural communities. I have been a member of the House or Senate Agriculture Committee for 40 years—

including more than 10 years as chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee. Across the decades, I have championed farm policies for Iowans that include effective farm income protection and commodity programs; strong, progressive conservation assistance for agricultural producers; renewable energy opportunities; and robust economic development in our rural communities. Since 1991, through various programs authorized through the farm bill, Sac County has received more than \$3.1 million from a variety of farm bill programs.

Keeping Iowa communities safe: I also firmly believe that our first responders need to be appropriately trained and equipped, able to respond to both local emergencies and to statewide challenges such as, for instance, the methamphetamine epidemic. Since 2001, Sac County's fire departments have received over \$585,000 for firefighter safety and operations equipment.

Disability Rights: Growing up, I loved and admired my brother Frank, who was deaf. But I was deeply disturbed by the discrimination and obstacles he faced every day. That is why I have always been a passionate advocate for full equality for people with disabilities. As the primary author of the Americans with Disabilities Act, ADA, and the ADA Amendments Act, I have had four guiding goals for our fellow citizens with disabilities: equal opportunity, full participation, independent living, and economic self-sufficiency. Nearly a quarter century since passage of the ADA, I see remarkable changes in communities everywhere I go in Iowa—not just in curb cuts or closed captioned television but in the full participation of people with disabilities in our society and economy, folks who at long last have the opportunity to contribute their talents and to be fully included. These changes have increased economic opportunities for all citizens of Sac County, both those with and without disabilities. And they make us proud to be a part of a community and country that respects the worth and civil rights of all of our citizens.

This is at least a partial accounting of my work on behalf of Iowa, and specifically Sac County, during my time in Congress. In every case, this work has been about partnerships, cooperation, and empowering folks at the State and local level, including in Sac County, to fulfill their own dreams and initiatives. And, of course, this work is never complete. Even after I retire from the Senate, I have no intention of retiring from the fight for a better, fairer, richer Iowa. I will always be profoundly grateful for the opportunity to serve the people of Iowa as their Senator.●

REMEMBERING JOE DINI

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I rise in remembrance of Joe Dini, a true Ne-

vada statesman and dedicated public servant.

Joe found his calling leading Nevada's citizens in the legislature through more than 20 years of public service. Elected for an unprecedented eight sessions, he is remembered as a friend and a gentleman by both his colleagues and me. His leadership and exemplary contributions to the State of Nevada are, and continue to remain, unmatched.

A quiet and humble man with an aptitude for compromise, Joe unquestionably sustained our State throughout his long tenure. Supporting Nevada's economic backbone through his involvement in the gaming industry, Joe expanded Nevada's economy and presence among the Nation. As a legislator, his focus was not only on issues of importance in his rural district, such as agriculture and water policy, but also on issues of necessity in the entire State regarding education, health care, and, of course, his legacy, the bistate Tahoe Regional Planning Agency.

Moreover, his loyalty and dedication to his community civics was exceptional. Knowing and fighting for his constituency's concerns, all while searching for what was best for Nevada, despite rifts in political ideologies, are two things Nevadans will never forget about Joe.

Born in 1929, rising from modest beginnings, Joe, the son of an Italian immigrant saloonkeeper, was raised in Yerington, a very small, rural community in Nevada. Yet through achievement of self and service, he became one of the most influential Nevadans in our State's rich history. His motivation and selflessness embodies the "Battle Born" State. With his passing, Nevada lost a great man who is immortalized for encouraging respect among his community and fellow assemblymen.

My entire family extends our thoughts and condolences to Joe's loved ones, and we thank them for their service as well.

I ask my colleagues to join me in remembering Assemblyman Dini for his unwavering loyalty and dedication to Nevada.●

COMMENDING NEW JERSEY HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS

● Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I wish to honor 59 high school seniors in Camden County, NJ for their commendable decision to enlist in the United States Armed Forces. Of these 59, 18 have elected to join the United States Army: Troy Anderson, Cody Andreczski, Jacob Bauscher, Ennajee Brisbane, Juliana Davis, Nicholas Dzindzio, Kristopher Espinal, Tyler Fisher, Glenn Gray, Rajven Herrera, Austin Hughes, Velez Lopez Velez, Anthony Nigro, Chandler Pons, Tyron Robinson, Orlando Santos, Joshua White, and Gordon Zenzola. Five have joined the United States Navy: Raul Paneto, Spencer Wiggin, Taquayla Wilson, Angel Gonzalez, and Kenneth

Ralph. Five have elected to join the United States Air Force: Ryan Swift, Ryan Bauer, Alam Nazmul, Christian Burgos, and Alex Thach. Nineteen have elected to join the United States Marine Corps: Michael Porch, Thomas Hutchison, Johnny Nunez, Jerome Williamston, Jordan Freeman, David Zane, Anthony Reed, Emily Krowicki, Randy Nguyen, Nicholas Celenza, Ian MacKenzie, William Hemphill, Steven Charyszyn, James Pitcher, Ryan Gustafson, Douglas Bardalesarevalo, Ezekiel Williams, Kyle Azzari, and Michael Hurley. And 12 have elected to join the New Jersey National Guard: Caitlyn Mount, Clarimar Rodriguez-Vargas, Zachary Blome, Christopher Foschini, Michael Lombardo, Kevin Chartina, Patrick Martina, Patrick O'Hanlon, Kristie Siegman, Christopher Robinson, Kylah Thomas, and Charles Reiss.

These 59 will also be honored on May 20, 2014 at an "Our Community Salutes South Jersey" recognition ceremony in Voorhees Township, NJ.

The future of our Nation remains strong because of young men and women like these 59 individuals who have decided to step forward and commit themselves to the defense of our Nation and to upholding the ideals upon which it was founded. Indeed, these New Jerseyans represent the very best of America, and they should rest assured that the full support of the Senate as well as the American people, are with them in whatever challenges may lie ahead.

It is thanks to the dedication of untold numbers of patriots like these 59 that we are able to meet here today, in the Senate, and openly debate the best solutions to the many and diverse problems that confront our country. It is thanks to their sacrifices that the United States of America remains a beacon of hope and freedom throughout the world. We owe them, along with all those who serve our country, a deep debt of gratitude.●

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-5580. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "alpha-Alkyl-omega-Hydroxypoly (Oxypropylene) and/or Poly (Oxyethylene) Polymers Where the Alkyl Chain Contains a Minimum of Six Carbons etc.; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance; Technical Correction" (FRL No. 9907-59) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5581. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fenoxaprop-ethyl; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9909-72) received in the Of-

fice of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5582. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Tebuconazole; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9909-31) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5583. A communication from the Acting Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Importation of Cape Gooseberry From Colombia Into the United States" (RIN0579-AD79) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5584. A communication from the Associate General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, three (3) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5585. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Irish Potatoes Grown in Certain Designated Counties in Idaho, and Malheur County, Oregon; Decreased Assessment Rate" (Docket No. AMS-FV-13-0093) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5586. A communication from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary for Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 30, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5587. A communication from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Deputy Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 30, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5588. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to transactions involving U.S. exports to China; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5589. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a section of the Arms Export Control Act (RSAT 13-3700); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-5590. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2014-0049—2014-0053); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-5591. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Secretary of the Army's recommendation to authorize the Willamette River Floodplain Restoration Project, Lower Coast Fork and the Middle Fork, Oregon; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5592. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Secretary of the Army's recommendation to authorize the Neuse River Basin Ecosystem Restoration Project, North Carolina; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5593. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Region 4 States; Visibility Protection Infrastructure Requirements for the 1997 and 2006 Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standards" (FRL No. 9910-42-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5594. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Virginia; Regional Haze Five-Year Progress Report State Implementation Plan" (FRL No. 9910-34-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5595. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Delaware; Regional Haze Five-Year Progress Report State Implementation Plan" (FRL No. 9910-33-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5596. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Determination of Attainment of the 2006 24-Hour Fine Particulate Matter Standard for the Pittsburgh-Beaver Valley Nonattainment Area" (FRL No. 9910-32-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5597. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: 2013 Cellulosic Biofuel Standard" (FRL No. 9910-18-OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5598. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Washington; Puget Sound Ozone Maintenance Plan" (FRL No. 9910-02-Region 10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5599. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California San Francisco Bay Area and Chico Nonattainment Areas; Fine Particulate Matter Emissions Inventories; Correction" (FRL No. 9909-16-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5600. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Identification of Nonattainment Classification and Deadlines for Submission of State Implementation Plan (SIP) Provisions for the 1997 Fine Particle (PM_{2.5}) National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) and 2006 PM_{2.5} NAAQS" (FRL No. 9909-93-OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5601. A communication from the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Agency's Strategic Plan for fiscal years 2014 through 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5602. A joint communication from the Director of National Intelligence and the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to foreign counterspace programs; to the Select Committee on Intelligence.

EC-5603. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994 (USERRA) Quarterly Report to Congress; Second Quarter of Fiscal Year 2014"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-5604. A communication from the Deputy Director, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medicare Program; Prospective Payment System for Federally Qualified Health Centers; Changes to Contracting Policies for Rural Health Clinics; and Changes to Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments of 1988 Enforcement Actions for Proficiency Testing Referral" ((RIN0938-AR62) (CMS-1443-FC)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5605. A communication from the Public Printer, Government Printing Office, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office's Annual Report for fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CARPER, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1611. A bill to require certain agencies to conduct assessments of data centers and develop data center consolidation and optimization plans (Rept. No. 113-157).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Mr. COONS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. SAND-

ERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 2291. A bill to require that Peace Corps volunteers be subject to the same limitations regarding coverage of abortion services as employees of the Peace Corps with respect to coverage of such services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. REED, Ms. LANDRIEU, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BROWN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BEGICH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 2292. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for the refinancing of certain Federal student loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 2293. A bill to clarify the status of the North Country, Ice Age, and New England National Scenic Trails as units of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. Kaine (for himself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 2294. A bill to require a survey of the preferences of members of the Armed Forces regarding military pay and benefits; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. COONS, Mr. JOHANNES, Mr. WALSH, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. LEE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 2295. A bill to establish the National Commission on the Future of the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. BENNET, Mr. VITTER, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. COONS, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BURR, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. Res. 438. A resolution congratulating the students, parents, teachers, and administrators of charter schools across the United States for their ongoing contributions to education, and supporting the ideals and goals of the 15th annual National Charter Schools Week, to be held May 4 through May 10, 2014; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. BLUNT):

S. Res. 439. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Safe Digging Month; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 370

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 370, a bill to improve and expand geographic literacy among kindergarten through grade 12 students in the United States by improving professional development programs for kindergarten through grade 12 teachers offered through institutions of higher education.

S. 375

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 375, a bill to require Senate candidates to file designations, statements, and reports in electronic form.

S. 462

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 462, a bill to enhance the strategic partnership between the United States and Israel.

S. 654

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 654, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for collegiate housing and infrastructure grants.

S. 933

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine), the Senator from Montana (Mr. WALSH), the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 933, a bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to extend the authorization of the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program through fiscal year 2018.

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 933, *supra*.

S. 942

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 942, a bill to eliminate discrimination and promote women's health and economic security by ensuring reasonable workplace accommodations for workers whose ability to perform the functions of a job are limited by pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition.

S. 1012

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1012, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve operations of recovery auditors under the Medicare integrity program, to increase transparency and accuracy in audits conducted by contractors, and for other purposes.

S. 1143

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. WALSH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1143, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to physician supervision of therapeutic hospital outpatient services.

S. 1174

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1174, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the 65th Infantry Regiment, known as the Borinqueneers.

S. 1188

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1188, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the definition of full-time employee for purposes of the individual mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 1239

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1239, a bill to expand the research and awareness activities of the National Institute of Arthritis and Musculoskeletal and Skin Diseases and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention with respect to scleroderma, and for other purposes.

S. 1406

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1406, a bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to designate additional unlawful acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1622

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1622, a bill to establish the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children, and for other purposes.

S. 1645

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 1645, a bill to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States.

S. 1697

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1697, a bill to support early learning.

S. 1728

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Montana

(Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1728, a bill to amend the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act to improve ballot accessibility to uniformed services voters and overseas voters, and for other purposes.

S. 1862

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1862, a bill to grant the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the Monuments Men, in recognition of their heroic role in the preservation, protection, and restitution of monuments, works of art, and artifacts of cultural importance during and following World War II.

S. 2004

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2004, a bill to ensure the safety of all users of the transportation system, including pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users, children, older individuals, and individuals with disabilities, as they travel on and across federally funded streets and highways.

S. 2013

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2013, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the removal of Senior Executive Service employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs for performance, and for other purposes.

S. 2037

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. WALSH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2037, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to remove the 96-hour physician certification requirement for inpatient critical access hospital services.

S. 2154

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2154, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the Emergency Medical Services for Children Program.

S. 2177

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2177, a bill to establish an Office of Forensic Science and a Forensic Science Board, to strengthen and promote confidence in the criminal justice system by ensuring scientific validity, reliability, and accuracy in forensic testing, and for other purposes.

S. 2192

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota

(Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2192, a bill to amend the National Alzheimer's Project Act to require the Director of the National Institutes of Health to prepare and submit, directly to the President for review and transmittal to Congress, an annual budget estimate (including an estimate of the number and type of personnel needs for the Institutes) for the initiatives of the National Institutes of Health pursuant to such an Act.

S. 2208

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2208, a bill to allow the Secretary of the Treasury to rely on State examinations for certain financial institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 2231

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2231, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide an individual with a mental health assessment before the individual enlists in the Armed Forces or is commissioned as an officer in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 2270

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2270, a bill to clarify the application of certain leverage and risk-based requirements under the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act.

S. 2277

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2277, a bill to prevent further Russian aggression toward Ukraine and other sovereign states in Europe and Eurasia, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 19

At the request of Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 19, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections.

S. RES. 225

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 225, a resolution to express the sense of the Senate that Congress should establish a joint select committee to investigate and report on the attack on the United States diplomatic facility and American personnel in Benghazi, Libya, on September 11, 2012.

S. RES. 353

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr.

BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 353, a resolution designating September 2014 as "National Brain Aneurysm Awareness Month".

S. RES. 364

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 364, a resolution expressing support for the internal rebuilding, resettlement, and reconciliation within Sri Lanka that are necessary to ensure a lasting peace.

S. RES. 421

At the request of Mr. CHAMBLISS, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 421, a resolution expressing the gratitude and appreciation of the Senate for the acts of heroism and military achievement by the members of the United States Armed Forces who participated in the June 6, 1944, amphibious landing at Normandy, France, and commending them for leadership and valor in an operation that helped bring an end to World War II.

At the request of Mr. MORAN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 421, *supra*.

S. RES. 433

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARASSO) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 433, a resolution condemning the abduction of female students by armed militants from the Government Girls Secondary School in the northeastern province of Borno in the Federal Republic of Nigeria.

At the request of Mr. UDALL of Colorado, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 433, *supra*.

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 433, *supra*.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. REED, Ms. LANDRIEU, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BROWN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mrs. SHAHEEN,

Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BEGICH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 2292. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for the refinancing of certain Federal student loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to announce the introduction of emergency legislation to provide relief to students and young graduates who are drowning in debt. Make no mistake. This is an emergency. Student loan debt is exploding, and it threatens the stability of our young people and the future of our economy.

Outstanding student loan debt now totals \$1.2 trillion, and each year students are taking on more and more debt. In 2012 an astonishing 71 percent of college seniors owed student loans. From 2004 to 2012 the average student loan balance increased by 70 percent. Millions of young people are struggling to keep up with student loan payments.

The economic impact is real. Federal watchdog agencies such as the Federal Reserve, the Treasury, and the Consumer Protection Bureau are all sounding the alarm. Every day this exploding debt stops more and more young people from moving out of their parents' homes, from saving for a downpayment, from buying a home, from buying cars, from starting small businesses, from saving for retirement, from making the purchases that keep this economy moving forward.

It doesn't have to be this way. Congress set interest rates on student loans at artificially high rates that generate extra money for the government. The GAO recently projected that the government will bring in \$66 billion just on the slice of student loans from 2007 to 2012. Those are the kinds of profits that would make a Fortune 500 CEO proud.

We should cut those interest rates and we should cut those government profits. We should give our young people a break and boost our economy. This morning two dozens Senators joined to introduce the Bank on Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act which will do just that. The idea is simple. With interest rates near historic lows, homeowners, businesses, and even local governments have refinanced their debts, but many people who took out student loans before July 1 of last year are locked into a rate of nearly 7 percent. Older loans run 8 percent, 9 percent, and even higher. We need to bring those rates down, and we need to do it now.

Bank on Students would give student loan borrowers the opportunity to lower their interest rates on old loans to match the rates the government of-

fers to new borrowers today; that is, 3.86 percent for undergraduate loans, 5.41 percent for graduate loans, and 6.41 percent for PLUS loans. I want to be clear—those rates are still higher than what it costs the government to run its student loan program. Our work will not be done until we have eliminated all of the profits from the student loan program, but this legislation is an important step in that direction.

Forty million borrowers in this country have student loan debt, and many of those individuals could save hundreds or even thousands of dollars a year with this bill. They need this help now.

Last year nearly every Republican in Congress—in the House and in the Senate—voted for the exact same loan rates that are in this legislation. Republican leaders, such as Speaker of the House JOHN BOEHNER, embraced 3.86 percent for new undergraduate borrowers as "consistent" with Republican policy proposals. OK, it may not be my preferred rate, but if Republicans believe that 3.86 percent is good enough for new undergraduate borrowers, then it should be good enough for existing undergraduate borrowers who also worked hard to get an education and need to refinance their loans. Let's bring down this rate for all our kids because there is no reason on Earth to say that some kids can get a better deal when they all worked hard to do exactly what we wanted them to do—get an education.

This legislation won't add a single dime to our deficit. The Bank on Students legislation adopts the Buffett rule, which limits tax loopholes for millionaires and billionaires, and it requires that every dollar we bring in as a result of that change go directly to supporting lower interest rates on existing student loans. It is simple: Invest in billionaires or invest in students.

Refinancing won't fix everything that is broken in our higher education system. We need to bring down the cost of college and we need more accountability for how schools spend Federal dollars. Many of my Democratic colleagues have introduced or are introducing legislation aimed at lowering the overall cost of college, and I support those efforts.

The need for comprehensive reform must not blind us to the urgency of addressing the massive debt that is already crushing young people. This is a question of economics, but it is also a question of values. These young people are saddled with student loan debt not because they went to the mall and ran up charges on a credit card. They worked hard and learned new skills that would benefit the country and help us build a stronger America. They deserve a fair shot at an affordable education.

This is personal for me. I was the first person in my family to graduate from college. I went to a commuter college where the tuition was \$50 a semester, and it opened a million doors

for me. I got a fair shot because I grew up in an America that made it a priority to invest in young people.

I believe in an America that puts students ahead of billionaires, an America that puts education within reach of every kid who works hard, an America that will give every kid a fair shot at building a future.

By Mr. Kaine (for himself and Mr. Cornyn):

S. 2294. A bill to require a survey of the preferences of members of the Armed Forces regarding military pay and benefits; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President, today I am introducing, with Senator Cornyn, the Servicemembers' Compensation Empowerment Act of 2014. This bipartisan legislation will direct the Department of Defense's (DoD) Military Retirement and Modernization Commission to formally survey military personnel on pay and benefits, and to take relative preferences into account as the Commission prepares its recommendations.

Virginia is more connected to the military than any other State. As I have traveled throughout the Commonwealth, I have had the opportunity to meet and discuss military benefits with servicemembers, veterans, and their families. The overriding concern on the part of our military and their families is sequestration. It has forced the military to allow the budget to drive strategy, rather than strategy to drive our budget. As a member of both the Senate Armed Services and Budget Committees, I firmly believe that all budget proposals should be considered carefully in light of the need for deficit reduction, the need to maintain a strong military, and the responsibility we have to support our servicemembers with resources to complete their mission.

The Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission was established by the fiscal year 2013 National Defense Authorization Act, to conduct a review of military compensation and retirement systems and to make recommendations to enable the quality of life of our military and their families and achieve fiscal sustainability for the future. As of now, no official study has been conducted by the Commission to determine the relative value of compensation and benefit programs to the military personnel who depend on them. Under my legislation, the Commission would be required to survey randomly selected members of the military concerning basic pay, housing allowances, bonuses and special pay, dependent healthcare and retirement pay and report its results to Congress.

Servicemembers deserve to have their voices heard as changes to the pay and benefits packages they depend on most are considered. By formally surveying military personnel on the benefits they value most, we can en-

sure the Military Retirement and Modernization Commission and members of Congress have the best possible understanding of how cost-saving proposals would impact our servicemembers and their families, allowing them to make decisions with evidence-based analysis.

This bill gives servicemembers a voice in the process, and will assure that reforms will take a scientific study into account. We must balance the competing needs to control rising costs with ensuring we meet the needs of military personnel and their families.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 438—CONGRATULATING THE STUDENTS, PARENTS, TEACHERS, AND ADMINISTRATORS OF CHARTER SCHOOLS ACROSS THE UNITED STATES FOR THEIR ONGOING CONTRIBUTIONS TO EDUCATION, AND SUPPORTING THE IDEALS AND GOALS OF THE 15TH ANNUAL NATIONAL CHARTER SCHOOLS WEEK, TO BE HELD MAY 4 THROUGH MAY 10, 2014

Ms. Landrieu (for herself, Mr. Alexander, Mrs. Feinstein, Mr. Carpenter, Mr. Durbin, Mr. McCain, Mr. Kirk, Mr. Bennet, Mr. Vitter, Mr. Rubio, Mr. Coons, Mr. Isakson, Mr. Burr, Mr. Cornyn, Mr. Graham, and Mr. Scott) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:—

S. RES. 438

Whereas charter schools are public schools that do not charge tuition and enroll any student who wants to attend a charter school, often through a random lottery when too many students want to attend a single charter school;

Whereas high-performing charter schools deliver a high-quality public education and challenge all students to reach their potential for academic success;

Whereas charter schools promote innovation and excellence in public education;

Whereas charter schools throughout the United States provide millions of families with diverse and innovative educational options for their children;

Whereas high-performing charter schools are dramatically increasing student achievement and college-going rates;

Whereas charter schools are authorized by a designated public entity and—

(1) respond to the needs of communities, families, and students in the United States; and

(2) promote the principles of quality, accountability, choice, and innovation;

Whereas in exchange for flexibility and autonomy, charter schools are held accountable by the public authorizers of such charter schools for improving student achievement and for sound financial and operational management;

Whereas charter schools are required to meet the student achievement accountability requirements under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.) in the same manner as traditional public schools;

Whereas charter schools often set higher expectations for students, beyond the re-

quirements under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.), to ensure that such charter schools are of high quality and truly accountable to the public;

Whereas 42 States and the District of Columbia have enacted laws authorizing charter schools;

Whereas more than 6,400 charter schools serve more than 2,500,000 children;

Whereas in the United States—

(1) in 135 school districts, more than 10 percent of public school students are enrolled in charter schools;

(2) in 32 school districts, at least 20 percent of public school students are enrolled in charter schools; and

(3) in 7 districts, at least 30 percent of public school students are enrolled in charter schools;

Whereas charter schools improve the achievement of students enrolled in such charter schools and collaborate with traditional public schools to improve public education for all students;

Whereas charter schools—

(1) give parents the freedom to choose public schools;

(2) routinely measure parental satisfaction levels; and

(3) must prove their ongoing success to parents, policymakers, and the communities served by such charter schools;

Whereas approximately 920,000 students were on waiting lists to attend charter schools before the beginning of the 2012–2013 academic year; and

Whereas the 15th annual National Charter Schools Week is scheduled to be celebrated the week of May 4 through May 10, 2014: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the students, families, teachers, and administrators of charter schools across the United States for—

(A) their ongoing contributions to education;

(B) their impressive strides in closing the academic achievement gap in schools in the United States, particularly schools with some of the most disadvantaged students in both rural and urban communities; and

(C) improving and strengthening the public school system in the United States;

(2) supports the ideals and goals of the 15th annual National Charter Schools Week, a week-long celebration to be held the week of May 4 through May 10, 2014, in communities throughout the United States; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to hold appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities during National Charter Schools Week to demonstrate support for charter schools.

SENATE RESOLUTION 439—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL SAFE DIGGING MONTH

Mr. Blumenthal (for himself, Mr. Rockefeller, Mr. Thune, and Mr. Blunt) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 439

Whereas each year, the underground utility infrastructure of the United States, including pipelines, electric, gas, telecommunications, water, sewer, and cable television lines, is jeopardized by unintentional damage caused by those who fail to have underground lines located prior to digging;

Whereas some utility lines are buried only a few inches underground, making the lines easy to strike, even during shallow digging projects;

Whereas digging prior to locating underground utility lines often results in unintended consequences, such as service interruption, environmental damage, personal injury, and even death;

Whereas the month of April marks the beginning of the peak period during which excavation projects are carried out around the United States;

Whereas in 2002, Congress required the Department of Transportation and the Federal Communications Commission to establish a 3-digit, nationwide, toll-free number to be used by State “One Call” systems to provide information on underground utility lines;

Whereas in 2005, the Federal Communications Commission designated “811” as the nationwide “One Call” number for homeowners and excavators to use to obtain information on underground utility lines before conducting excavation activities;

Whereas “One Call” has helped reduce the number of digging damages caused by failure to call before digging from 48 percent in 2004 to 25 percent in 2012;

Whereas the 1,600 members of the Common Ground Alliance, who are dedicated to ensuring public safety, environmental protection, and the integrity of services, promote the national “Call Before You Dig” campaign to increase public awareness about the importance of homeowners and excavators calling 811 to find out the exact location of underground lines;

Whereas the Pipeline Safety, Regulatory Certainty, and Job Creation Act of 2011 affirmed and expanded the “One Call” program by eliminating exemptions given to local and State government agencies and their contractors on notifying “One Call” centers before digging; and

Whereas the Common Ground Alliance has designated April as “National Safe Digging Month” to increase awareness of safe digging practices across the United States and to celebrate the anniversary of 811, the national “Call Before You Dig” number: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of National Safe Digging Month; and

(2) encourages all homeowners and excavators throughout the United States to call 811 before digging.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2985. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2262, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2986. Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mr. TOOMEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2262, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2987. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2262, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2988. Mr. BEGICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2262, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2989. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself and Mr. CHAMBLISS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2262, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2990. Mr. BARRASSO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2262, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2991. Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. MCCONNELL, Ms. MURKOWSKI,

Mr. BEGICH, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WARNER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. THUNE, Mr. WALSH, Mr. JOHANNIS, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. TESTER, Mr. INHOFE, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. ENZI, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. LEE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. COATS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. COBURN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. CORKER, Mr. HATCH, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. VITTER, Mr. RISCH, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BURR, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HELLER, Mr. PAUL, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. AYOTTE, and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2262, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2992. Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. HELLER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2262, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2993. Mrs. GILLIBRAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2262, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2994. Mr. KING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2262, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2995. Mr. COONS (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. REED) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2262, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2996. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2262, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2997. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2262, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2998. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2262, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2999. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2262, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3000. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2262, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3001. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2262, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3002. Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. SESSIONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2262, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3003. Mr. COBURN (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2262, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3004. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2262, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3005. Mr. COBURN (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2262, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3006. Mr. COBURN (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2262, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3007. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2262, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3008. Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. VITTER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. INHOFE, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. WICKER, Mr. JOHANNIS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. ENZI, Mr. RISCH, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MORAN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. COCHRAN, and Mr. CORNYN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2262, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3009. Mr. UDALL, of New Mexico (for himself and Mr. UDALL of Colorado) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2262, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2985. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2262, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE VI—ENERGY FREEDOM AND ECONOMIC PROSPERITY ACT OF 2014

Subtitle A—Short Title; etc.

SEC. 601. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCE TO 1986 CODE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This title may be cited as the “Energy Freedom and Economic Prosperity Act of 2014”.

(b) REFERENCE TO 1986 CODE.—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this title an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

Subtitle B—Repeal of Energy Tax Subsidies

SEC. 611. EARLY TERMINATION OF CREDIT FOR QUALIFIED FUEL CELL MOTOR VEHICLES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 30B is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Subparagraph (A) of section 24(b)(3) is amended by striking “, 30B”.

(2) Paragraph (2) of section 25B(g) is amended by striking “, 30B,”.

(3) Subsection (b) of section 38 is amended by striking paragraph (25).

(4) Subsection (a) of section 1016 is amended by striking paragraph (35) and by redesignating paragraphs (36) and (37) as paragraphs (35) and (36), respectively.

(5) Subsection (m) of section 6501 is amended by striking “, 30B(h)(9)”.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subpart B of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 is amended by striking the item relating to section 30B.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to property placed in service after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 612. EARLY TERMINATION OF NEW QUALIFIED PLUG-IN ELECTRIC DRIVE MOTOR VEHICLES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 30D is repealed.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to vehicles placed in service after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 613. REPEAL OF CREDIT FOR ALCOHOL USED AS FUEL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 40 is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Subsection (b) of section 38 is amended by striking paragraph (3).

(2) Subsection (c) of section 196 is amended by striking paragraph (3) and by redesignating paragraphs (4) through (14) as paragraphs (3) through (13), respectively.

(3) Paragraph (1) of section 4101(a) is amended by striking “, and every person producing cellulosic biofuel (as defined in section 40(b)(6)(E))”.

(4) Paragraph (1) of section 4104(a) is amended by striking “, 40”.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to fuel sold or used after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 614. REPEAL OF ENHANCED OIL RECOVERY CREDIT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 43 is repealed.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) Subsection (b) of section 38 is amended by striking paragraph (6).

(2) Paragraph (4) of section 45Q(d) is amended by inserting “(as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Energy Freedom and Economic Prosperity Act of 2014)” after “section 43(c)(2)”.

(3) Subsection (c) of section 196, as amended by sections 105 and 106 of this Act, is amended by striking paragraph (5) and by redesignating paragraphs (6) through (12) as paragraphs (5) through (11), respectively.

(c) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections for subpart D of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 is amended by striking the item relating to section 43.

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to costs paid or incurred after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 615. REPEAL OF CREDIT FOR PRODUCING OIL AND GAS FROM MARGINAL WELLS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 45I is repealed.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Subsection (b) of section 38 is amended by striking paragraph (19).

(c) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections for subpart D of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 is amended by striking the item relating to section 45I.

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to production in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 616. TERMINATION OF CREDIT FOR PRODUCTION FROM ADVANCED NUCLEAR POWER FACILITIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subparagraph (B) of section 45J(d)(1) is amended by striking “January 1, 2021” and inserting “January 1, 2015”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to property placed in service after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 617. REPEAL OF CREDIT FOR CARBON DIOXIDE SEQUESTRATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 45Q is repealed.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this section shall apply to carbon dioxide captured after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 618. TERMINATION OF ENERGY CREDIT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 48 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) **TERMINATION.**—No credit shall be allowed under subsection (a) for any period after December 31, 2014.”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to property placed in service after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 619. REPEAL OF QUALIFYING ADVANCED COAL PROJECT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 48A is repealed.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 46 is amended by striking paragraph (3) and by redesignating paragraphs (4), (5), and (6) as paragraphs (3), (4), and (5), respectively.

(c) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections for subpart E of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 is amended by striking the item relating to section 48A.

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to property placed in service after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 620. REPEAL OF QUALIFYING GASIFICATION PROJECT CREDIT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 48B is repealed.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 46, as amended by this Act, is amended by striking paragraph (3) and by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively.

(c) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections for subpart E of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 is amended by striking the item relating to section 48B.

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to property placed in service after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 621. REPEAL OF QUALIFYING ADVANCED ENERGY PROJECT CREDIT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 48C is repealed.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 46, as amended by this Act, is amended by striking paragraph (3) and by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (3).

(c) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections for subpart E of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 is amended by striking the item relating to section 48C.

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to property placed in service after December 31, 2014.

Subtitle C—Reduction of Corporate Income Tax Rate

SEC. 631. CORPORATE INCOME TAX RATE REDUCED.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe, in lieu of the rates of tax under paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 11(b), section 1201(a), and paragraphs (1), (2), and (6) of section 1445(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, such rates of tax as the Secretary estimates would result in—

(1) a decrease in revenue to the Treasury for taxable years beginning during the 10-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, equal to

(2) the increase in revenue for such taxable years by reason of the amendments made by title I of this Act.

(b) **MAINTENANCE OF GRADUATED RATES.**—In prescribing the tax rates under subsection (a), the Secretary shall ensure that each rate modified under such subsection is reduced by a uniform percentage.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The rates prescribed by the Secretary under subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years beginning more than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 2986. Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mr. TOOMEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2262, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD CREATE A TAX OR FEE ON CARBON EMISSIONS.

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or conference report that includes a Federal tax or fee imposed on carbon emissions from any product or entity that is a direct or indirect source of the emissions.

(b) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—

(1) **WAIVER.**—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) **APPEAL.**—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly

chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 2987. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2262, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

Subtitle F—Energy Consumers Relief

SEC. 451. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Energy Consumers Relief Act of 2014”.

SEC. 452. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) **ADMINISTRATOR.**—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(2) **COVERED ENERGY-RELATED RULE.**—The term “covered energy-related rule” means a rule of the Environmental Protection Agency that—

(A) regulates any aspect of the production, supply, distribution, or use of energy or provides for that regulation by States or other governmental entities; and

(B) is estimated by the Administrator or the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to impose direct costs and indirect costs, in the aggregate, of more than \$1,000,000,000.

(3) **DIRECT COSTS.**—The term “direct costs” has the meaning given the term in chapter 8 of the document of the Environmental Protection Agency entitled “Guidelines for Preparing Economic Analyses” and dated December 17, 2010.

(4) **INDIRECT COSTS.**—The term “indirect costs” has the meaning given the term in chapter 8 of the document of the Environmental Protection Agency entitled “Guidelines for Preparing Economic Analyses” and dated December 17, 2010.

(5) **RULE.**—The term “rule” has the meaning given the term in section 551 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 453. PROHIBITION AGAINST FINALIZING CERTAIN ENERGY-RELATED RULES THAT WILL CAUSE SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE EFFECTS TO THE ECONOMY.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator shall not promulgate as final any covered energy-related rule if the Secretary determines under section 454(d) that the rule will result in significant adverse effects to the economy.

SEC. 454. REPORTS AND DETERMINATIONS PRIOR TO PROMULGATING AS FINAL CERTAIN ENERGY-RELATED RULES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Before promulgating as final any covered energy-related rule, the Administrator shall carry out the activities described in subsections (c) through (d).

(b) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—For each covered energy-related rule, the Administrator shall submit to Congress a report (and transmit a copy to the Secretary) containing—

(1) a copy of the rule;

(2) a concise general statement relating to the rule;

(3) an estimate of the total costs of the rule, including the direct costs and indirect costs of the rule;

(4) an estimate of—

(A) the total benefits of the rule; and

(B) when those benefits are expected to be realized;

(5) a description of the modeling, the assumptions, and the limitations due to uncertainty, speculation, or lack of information associated with the estimates under paragraph (4);

(6) an estimate of the increases in energy prices, including potential increases in gasoline or electricity prices for consumers, that may result from implementation or enforcement of the rule; and

(7) a detailed description of the employment effects, including potential job losses and shifts in employment, that may result from implementation or enforcement of the rule.

(c) **INITIAL DETERMINATION ON INCREASES AND IMPACTS.**—The Secretary, in consultation with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and the Administrator of the Energy Information Administration, shall prepare an independent analysis to determine whether the covered energy-related rule will cause—

(1) any increase in energy prices for consumers, including low-income households, small businesses, and manufacturers;

(2) any impact on fuel diversity of the electricity generation portfolio of the United States or on national, regional, or local electric reliability;

(3) any adverse effect on energy supply, distribution, or use due to the economic or technical infeasibility of implementing the rule; or

(4) any other adverse effect on energy supply, distribution, or use (including a shortfall in supply and increased use of foreign supplies).

(d) **SUBSEQUENT DETERMINATION ON ADVERSE EFFECTS TO THE ECONOMY.**—If the Secretary determines, under subsection (c), that the rule will result in an increase, impact, or effect described in that subsection, then the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, and the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, shall—

(1) determine whether the rule will result in significant adverse effects to the economy, taking into consideration—

(A) the costs and benefits of the rule and limitations in calculating those costs and benefits due to uncertainty, speculation, or lack of information; and

(B) the positive and negative impacts of the rule on economic indicators, including those related to gross domestic product, unemployment, wages, consumer prices, and business and manufacturing activity; and

(2) publish the results of that determination in the Federal Register.

SA 2988. Mr. BEGICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2262, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. ____ . CREDIT FOR CONVERSION OF HOME HEATING USING OIL FUEL TO USING NATURAL GAS OR BIOMASS FEEDSTOCKS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subsection (a) of section 25C of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to nonbusiness energy property) is amended by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (1), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting “, and”, and by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) the amount of the qualifying heating conversion expenditures paid or incurred by the taxpayer during such taxable year.”.

(b) **DOLLAR LIMITATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—

(A) **LIMITATION.**—Subsection (b) of section 25C of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) **LIMITATION ON QUALIFYING HEATING CONVERSION EXPENDITURES.**—The amount of

the credit allowed under this section by reason of paragraph (3) of subsection (a) for any taxable year with respect to any taxpayer shall not exceed \$5,000.”.

(B) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Paragraph (1) of section 25C(b) of such Code is amended by inserting “by reason of paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a)” after “The credit allowed under this section”.

(2) **NO DOUBLE COUNTING.**—Section 25C(e) of such Code (relating to special rules) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) **NO DOUBLE COUNTING.**—No amount taken into account for purposes of determining a credit under this section by reason of paragraph (3) of subsection (a) shall be taken into account for purposes of determining a credit under this section by reason of paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a).”.

(c) **QUALIFYING HEATING CONVERSION EXPENDITURES.**—Section 25C of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to residential energy property expenditures) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(h) **QUALIFYING HEATING CONVERSION EXPENDITURES.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The term ‘qualifying heating conversion expenditures’ means expenditures made by the taxpayer for qualified heating conversion property which—

“(A) meets the requirements of subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (d)(1), and

“(B) is used as a heating or cooling system on a building or structure located in a community (as determined under section 19(a)(1) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936) in which the average residential expenditure for home energy is more than 200 percent of the national average residential expenditure for home energy (as determined by the Energy Information Agency using the most recent data available).

“(2) **AMOUNTS INCLUDED.**—The term ‘qualifying heating conversion expenditures’ includes expenditures—

“(A) for labor costs properly allocable to the onsite preparation, assembly, or original installation of property described in paragraph (1), including fuel service connection installation costs specifically related to fuel service to the qualified energy property used in such conversion, and

“(B) the removal of the fuel oil equipment (including any storage tank) for such a building or structure.

“(3) **EXCLUSIONS.**—Such term does not include expenditures for soil cleanup.

“(4) **QUALIFIED HEATING CONVERSION PROPERTY.**—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term ‘qualified heating conversion property’ means property which—

“(A) is placed in service before January 1, 2019,

“(B) meets the performance and quality standards described in subsection (d)(2)(B), and

“(C) is a product which qualifies under the Energy Star program and meets the requirements for such property under such program.”.

(d) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Subsection (g) of section 25C of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to termination) is amended by striking “This section” and inserting “Paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a)”.

(e) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to property placed in service after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 2989. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself and Mr. CHAMBLISS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2262, to

promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II, insert the following:

Subtitle E—Smart Water Resource Management Pilot Program

SEC. 241. SMART WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **ELIGIBLE ENTITY.**—The term “eligible entity” means—

(A) a utility;

(B) a municipality;

(C) a water district; and

(D) any other authority that provides water, wastewater, or water reuse services.

(2) **SMART WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PILOT PROGRAM.**—The term “smart water resource management pilot program” or “pilot program” means the pilot program established under subsection (b).

(b) **SMART WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PILOT PROGRAM.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall establish and carry out a smart water resource management pilot program in accordance with this section.

(2) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of the smart water resource management pilot program is to award grants to eligible entities to demonstrate novel and innovative technology-based solutions that will—

(A) increase the energy and water efficiency of water, wastewater, and water reuse systems;

(B) improve water, wastewater, and water reuse systems to help communities across the United States make significant progress in conserving water, saving energy, and reducing costs; and

(C) support the implementation of innovative processes and the installation of advanced automated systems that provide real-time data on energy and water.

(3) **PROJECT SELECTION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall make competitive, merit-reviewed grants under the pilot program to not less than 3, but not more than 5, eligible entities.

(B) **SELECTION CRITERIA.**—In selecting an eligible entity to receive a grant under the pilot program, the Secretary shall consider—

(i) energy and cost savings;

(ii) the novelty of the technology to be used;

(iii) the degree to which the project integrates next-generation sensors, software, analytics, and management tools;

(iv) the anticipated cost-effectiveness of the pilot project in terms of energy efficiency savings, water savings or reuse, and infrastructure costs averted;

(v) whether the technology can be deployed in a variety of geographic regions and the degree to which the technology can be implemented on a smaller or larger scale; and

(vi) whether the project will be completed in 5 years or less.

(C) **APPLICATIONS.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to clause (ii), an eligible entity seeking a grant under the pilot program shall submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary determines to be necessary.

(ii) **CONTENTS.**—An application under clause (i) shall, at a minimum, include—

(I) a description of the project;

(II) a description of the technology to be used in the project;

(III) the anticipated results, including energy and water savings, of the project;

(IV) a comprehensive budget for the project;

(V) the names of the project lead organization and any partners;

(VI) the number of users to be served by the project; and

(VII) any other information that the Secretary determines to be necessary to complete the review and selection of a grant recipient.

(4) ADMINISTRATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 300 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall select grant recipients under this section.

(B) EVALUATIONS.—The Secretary shall annually carry out an evaluation of each project for which a grant is provided under this section that—

(i) evaluates the progress and impact of the project; and

(ii) assesses the degree to which the project is meeting the goals of the pilot program.

(C) TECHNICAL AND POLICY ASSISTANCE.—On the request of a grant recipient, the Secretary shall provide technical and policy assistance.

(D) BEST PRACTICES.—The Secretary shall make available to the public—

(i) a copy of each evaluation carried out under subparagraph (B); and

(ii) a description of any best practices identified by the Secretary as a result of those evaluations.

(E) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress a report containing the results of each evaluation carried out under subparagraph (B).

(c) FUNDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall use not less than \$7,500,000 of amounts made available to the Secretary to carry out this section.

(2) PRIORITIZATION.—In funding activities under this section, the Secretary shall prioritize funding in the following manner:

(A) Any unobligated amounts made available to the Secretary to carry out energy efficiency and renewable energy activities.

(B) Any unobligated amounts (other than those described in subparagraph (A)) made available to the Secretary.

SA 2990. Mr. BARRASSO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2262, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

DIVISION B—INDIAN TRIBAL ENERGY DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 2001. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the “Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self-Determination Act Amendments of 2014”.

TITLE XXI—INDIAN TRIBAL ENERGY DEVELOPMENT AND SELF-DETERMINATION ACT AMENDMENTS

SEC. 2101. INDIAN TRIBAL ENERGY RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2602(a) of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (25 U.S.C. 3502(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(B) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(E) consult with each applicable Indian tribe before adopting or approving a well spacing program or plan applicable to the energy resources of that Indian tribe or the members of that Indian tribe.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) PLANNING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the program established by paragraph (1), the Sec-

retary shall provide technical assistance to interested Indian tribes to develop energy plans, including—

“(i) plans for electrification;

“(ii) plans for oil and gas permitting, renewable energy permitting, energy efficiency, electricity generation, transmission planning, water planning, and other planning relating to energy issues;

“(iii) plans for the development of energy resources and to ensure the protection of natural, historic, and cultural resources; and

“(iv) any other plans that would assist an Indian tribe in the development or use of energy resources.

“(B) COOPERATION.—In establishing the program under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall work in cooperation with the Office of Indian Energy Policy and Programs of the Department of Energy.”.

(b) DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY INDIAN ENERGY EDUCATION PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—Section 2602(b)(2) of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (25 U.S.C. 3502(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “, intertribal organization,” after “Indian tribe”;

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (C) and (D) as subparagraphs (D) and (E), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

“(C) activities to increase the capacity of Indian tribes to manage energy development and energy efficiency programs.”.

(c) DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM.—Section 2602(c) of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (25 U.S.C. 3502(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting “or a tribal energy development organization” after “Indian tribe”;

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “guarantee” and inserting “guaranteed”;

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking “or”;

(C) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) a tribal energy development organization, from funds of the tribal energy development organization.”; and

(3) in paragraph (5), by striking “The Secretary of Energy may” and inserting “Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self-Determination Act Amendments of 2014, the Secretary of Energy shall”.

SEC. 2102. INDIAN TRIBAL ENERGY RESOURCE REGULATION.

Section 2603(c) of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (25 U.S.C. 3503(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “on the request of an Indian tribe, the Indian tribe” and inserting “on the request of an Indian tribe or a tribal energy development organization, the Indian tribe or tribal energy development organization”; and

(2) in paragraph (2)(B), by inserting “or tribal energy development organization” after “Indian tribe”.

SEC. 2103. TRIBAL ENERGY RESOURCE AGREEMENTS.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Section 2604 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (25 U.S.C. 3504) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “or” after the semicolon at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) by striking clause (i) and inserting the following:

“(i) an electric production, generation, transmission, or distribution facility (in-

cluding a facility that produces electricity from renewable energy resources) located on tribal land; or”; and

(II) in clause (ii)—

(aa) by inserting “, at least a portion of which have been” after “energy resources”;

(bb) by inserting “or produced from” after “developed on”; and

(cc) by striking “and” after the semicolon at the end and inserting “or”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) pooling, unitization, or communitization of the energy mineral resources of the Indian tribe located on tribal land with any other energy mineral resource (including energy mineral resources owned by the Indian tribe or an individual Indian in fee, trust, or restricted status or by any other persons or entities) if the owner of the resources has consented or consents to the pooling, unitization, or communitization of the other resources under any lease or agreement; and”; and

(B) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) a lease or business agreement described in paragraph (1) shall not require review by, or the approval of, the Secretary under section 2103 of the Revised Statutes (25 U.S.C. 81), or any other provision of law, if the lease or business agreement—

“(A) was executed—

“(i) in accordance with the requirements of a tribal energy resource agreement in effect under subsection (e) (including the periodic review and evaluation of the activities of the Indian tribe under the agreement, to be conducted pursuant to subparagraphs (D) and (E) of subsection (e)(2)); or

“(ii) by the Indian tribe and a tribal energy development organization—

“(I) for which the Indian tribe has obtained certification pursuant to subsection (h); and

“(II) the majority of the interest in which is, and continues to be throughout the full term or renewal term (if any) of the lease or business agreement, owned and controlled by the Indian tribe (or the Indian tribe and 1 or more other Indian tribes); and

“(B) has a term that does not exceed—

“(i) 30 years; or

“(ii) in the case of a lease for the production of oil resources, gas resources, or both, 10 years and as long thereafter as oil or gas is produced in paying quantities.”;

(2) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) RIGHTS-OF-WAY.—An Indian tribe may grant a right-of-way over tribal land without review or approval by the Secretary if the right-of-way—

“(1) serves—

“(A) an electric production, generation, transmission, or distribution facility (including a facility that produces electricity from renewable energy resources) located on tribal land;

“(B) a facility located on tribal land that extracts, produces, processes, or refines energy resources; or

“(C) the purposes, or facilitates in carrying out the purposes, of any lease or agreement entered into for energy resource development on tribal land; and

“(2) was executed—

“(A) in accordance with the requirements of a tribal energy resource agreement in effect under subsection (e) (including the periodic review and evaluation of the activities of the Indian tribe under the agreement, to be conducted pursuant to subparagraphs (D) and (E) of subsection (e)(2)); or

“(B) by the Indian tribe and a tribal energy development organization—

“(i) for which the Indian tribe has obtained certification pursuant to subsection (h); and

“(ii) the majority of the interest in which is, and continues to be throughout the full

term or renewal term (if any) of the right-of-way, owned and controlled by the Indian tribe (or the Indian tribe and 1 or more other Indian tribes); and

“(3) has a term that does not exceed 30 years.”;

(3) by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following:

“(d) **VALIDITY.**—No lease or business agreement entered into, or right-of-way granted, pursuant to this section shall be valid unless the lease, business agreement, or right-of-way is authorized by subsection (a) or (b).”;

(4) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “(2)(A)” and all that follows through the end of subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(2) **PROCEDURE.**—

“(A) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—On the date that is 271 days after the date on which the Secretary receives a tribal energy resource agreement from an Indian tribe under paragraph (1), the tribal energy resource agreement shall take effect, unless the Secretary disapproves the tribal energy resource agreement under subparagraph (B).

“(ii) **REVISED TRIBAL ENERGY RESOURCE AGREEMENT.**—On the date that is 91 days after the date on which the Secretary receives a revised tribal energy resource agreement from an Indian tribe under paragraph (4)(B), the revised tribal energy resource agreement shall take effect, unless the Secretary disapproves the revised tribal energy resource agreement under subparagraph (B).”;

(i) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking “(B)” and all that follows through “if—” and inserting the following:

“(B) **DISAPPROVAL.**—The Secretary shall disapprove a tribal energy resource agreement submitted pursuant to paragraph (1) or (4)(B) only if—”;

(II) by striking clause (i) and inserting the following:

“(i) the Secretary determines that the Indian tribe has not demonstrated that the Indian tribe has sufficient capacity to regulate the development of the specific 1 or more energy resources identified for development under the tribal energy resource agreement submitted by the Indian tribe.”;

(III) by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (iv) and indenting appropriately;

(IV) by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following:

“(ii) a provision of the tribal energy resource agreement would violate applicable Federal law (including regulations) or a treaty applicable to the Indian tribe;

“(iii) the tribal energy resource agreement does not include 1 or more provisions required under subparagraph (D); or”;

(V) in clause (iv) (as redesignated by subparagraph (III))—

(aa) in the matter preceding subclause (I), by striking “includes” and all that follows through “section—” and inserting “does not include provisions that, with respect to any lease, business agreement, or right-of-way to which the tribal energy resource agreement applies—”; and

(bb) in subclause (XVI)(bb), by striking “or tribal”;

(iii) in subparagraph (C)—

(I) in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting “the approval of” after “with respect to”;

(II) by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following:

“(ii) the identification of mitigation measures, if any, that, in the discretion of the Indian tribe, the Indian tribe might propose for incorporation into the lease, business agreement, or right-of-way.”;

(III) in clause (iii)(I), by striking “proposed action” and inserting “approval of the lease, business agreement, or right-of-way”;

(IV) in clause (iv), by striking “and” at the end;

(V) in clause (v), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(VI) by adding at the end the following:

“(vi) the identification of specific classes or categories of actions, if any, determined by the Indian tribe not to have significant environmental effects.”;

(iv) in subparagraph (D)(ii), by striking “subparagraph (B)(iii)(XVI)” and inserting “subparagraph (B)(iv)(XV)”; and

(v) by adding at the end the following:

“(F) A tribal energy resource agreement that takes effect pursuant to this subsection shall remain in effect to the extent any provision of the tribal energy resource agreement is consistent with applicable Federal law (including regulations), unless the tribal energy resource agreement is—

“(i) rescinded by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (7)(D)(iii)(II); or

“(ii) voluntarily rescinded by the Indian tribe pursuant to the regulations promulgated under paragraph (8)(B) (or successor regulations).

“(G)(i) The Secretary shall make a capacity determination under subparagraph (B)(i) not later than 120 days after the date on which the Indian tribe submits to the Secretary the tribal energy resource agreement of the Indian tribe pursuant to paragraph (1), unless the Secretary and the Indian tribe mutually agree to an extension of the time period for making the determination.

“(ii) Any determination that the Indian tribe lacks the requisite capacity shall be treated as a disapproval under paragraph (4) and, not later than 10 days after the date of the determination, the Secretary shall provide to the Indian tribe—

“(I) a detailed, written explanation of each reason for the determination; and

“(II) a description of the steps that the Indian tribe should take to demonstrate sufficient capacity.

“(H) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, an Indian tribe shall be considered to have demonstrated sufficient capacity under subparagraph (B)(i) to regulate the development of the specific 1 or more energy resources of the Indian tribe identified for development under the tribal energy resource agreement submitted by the Indian tribe pursuant to paragraph (1) if—

“(i) the Secretary determines that—

“(I) the Indian tribe has carried out a contract or compact under title I or IV of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450 et seq.); and

“(II) for a period of not less than 3 consecutive years ending on the date on which the Indian tribe submits the tribal energy resource agreement of the Indian tribe pursuant to paragraph (1) or (4)(B), the contract or compact—

“(aa) has been carried out by the Indian tribe without material audit exceptions (or without any material audit exceptions that were not corrected within the 3-year period); and

“(bb) has included programs or activities relating to the management of tribal land; or

“(ii) the Secretary fails to make the determination within the time allowed under subparagraph (G)(i) (including any extension of time agreed to under that subparagraph).”;

(B) in paragraph (4), by striking “date of disapproval” and all that follows through the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting the following: “date of disapproval, provide the Indian tribe with—

“(A) a detailed, written explanation of—

“(i) each reason for the disapproval; and

“(ii) the revisions or changes to the tribal energy resource agreement necessary to address each reason; and

“(B) an opportunity to revise and resubmit the tribal energy resource agreement.”;

(C) in paragraph (6)—

(i) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) by striking “(B) Subject to” and inserting the following:

“(B) Subject only to”; and

(II) by striking “subparagraph (D)” and inserting “subparagraphs (C) and (D)”;

(ii) in subparagraph (C), in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting “to perform the obligations of the Secretary under this section and” before “to ensure”; and

(iii) in subparagraph (D), by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) Nothing in this section absolves, limits, or otherwise affects the liability, if any, of the United States for any—

“(I) term of any lease, business agreement, or right-of-way under this section that is not a negotiated term; or

“(II) losses that are not the result of a negotiated term, including losses resulting from the failure of the Secretary to perform an obligation of the Secretary under this section.”; and

(D) in paragraph (7)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “has demonstrated” and inserting “the Secretary determines has demonstrated with substantial evidence”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “any tribal remedy” and inserting “all remedies (if any) provided under the laws of the Indian tribe”;

(iii) in subparagraph (D)—

(I) in clause (i), by striking “determine” and all that follows through the end of the clause and inserting the following: “determine—

“(I) whether the petitioner is an interested party; and

“(II) if the petitioner is an interested party, whether the Indian tribe is not in compliance with the tribal energy resource agreement as alleged in the petition.”;

(II) in clause (ii), by striking “determination” and inserting “determinations”; and

(III) in clause (iii), in the matter preceding subclause (I) by striking “agreement” the first place it appears and all that follows through “, including” and inserting “agreement pursuant to clause (i), the Secretary shall only take such action as the Secretary determines necessary to address the claims of noncompliance made in the petition, including”;

(iv) in subparagraph (E)(i), by striking “the manner in which” and inserting “, with respect to each claim made in the petition, how”; and

(v) by adding at the end the following:

“(G) Notwithstanding any other provision of this paragraph, the Secretary shall dismiss any petition from an interested party that has agreed with the Indian tribe to a resolution of the claims presented in the petition of that party.”;

(5) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (j); and

(6) by inserting after subsection (f) the following:

“(g) **FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE IN LIEU OF ACTIVITIES BY THE SECRETARY.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Any amounts that the Secretary would otherwise expend to operate or carry out any program, function, service, or activity (or any portion of a program, function, service, or activity) of the Department that, as a result of an Indian tribe carrying out activities under a tribal energy resource agreement, the Secretary does not expend, the Secretary shall, at the request of

the Indian tribe, make available to the Indian tribe in accordance with this subsection.

“(2) ANNUAL FUNDING AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary shall make the amounts described in paragraph (1) available to an Indian tribe through an annual written funding agreement that is negotiated and entered into with the Indian tribe that is separate from the tribal energy resource agreement.

“(3) EFFECT OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1)—

“(A) the provision of amounts to an Indian tribe under this subsection is subject to the availability of appropriations; and

“(B) the Secretary shall not be required to reduce amounts for programs, functions, services, or activities that serve any other Indian tribe to make amounts available to an Indian tribe under this subsection.

“(4) DETERMINATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall calculate the amounts under paragraph (1) in accordance with the regulations adopted under section 2103(b) of the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self-Determination Act Amendments of 2014.

“(B) APPLICABILITY.—The effective date or implementation of a tribal energy resource agreement under this section shall not be delayed or otherwise affected by—

“(i) a delay in the promulgation of regulations under section 2103(b) of the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self-Determination Act Amendments of 2014;

“(ii) the period of time needed by the Secretary to make the calculation required under paragraph (1); or

“(iii) the adoption of a funding agreement under paragraph (2).

“(h) CERTIFICATION OF TRIBAL ENERGY DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date on which an Indian tribe submits an application for certification of a tribal energy development organization in accordance with regulations promulgated under section 2103(b) of the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self-Determination Act Amendments of 2014, the Secretary shall approve or disapprove the application.

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall approve an application for certification if—

“(A)(i) the Indian tribe has carried out a contract or compact under title I or IV of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450 et seq.); and

“(ii) for a period of not less than 3 consecutive years ending on the date on which the Indian tribe submits the application, the contract or compact—

“(I) has been carried out by the Indian tribe without material audit exceptions (or without any material audit exceptions that were not corrected within the 3-year period); and

“(II) has included programs or activities relating to the management of tribal land; and

“(B)(i) the tribal energy development organization is organized under the laws of the Indian tribe and subject to the jurisdiction and authority of the Indian tribe;

“(ii) the majority of the interest in the tribal energy development organization is owned and controlled by the Indian tribe (or the Indian tribe and 1 or more other Indian tribes); and

“(iii) the organizing document of the tribal energy development organization requires that the Indian tribe (or the Indian tribe and 1 or more other Indian tribes) own and control at all times a majority of the interest in the tribal energy development organization.

“(3) ACTION BY SECRETARY.—If the Secretary approves an application for certification pursuant to paragraph (2), the Sec-

retary shall, not more than 10 days after making the determination—

“(A) issue a certification stating that—

“(i) the tribal energy development organization is organized under the laws of the Indian tribe and subject to the jurisdiction and authority of the Indian tribe;

“(ii) the majority of the interest in the tribal energy development organization is owned and controlled by the Indian tribe (or the Indian tribe and 1 or more other Indian tribes);

“(iii) the organizing document of the tribal energy development organization requires that the Indian tribe (or the Indian tribe and 1 or more other Indian tribes) own and control at all times a majority of the interest in the tribal energy development organization; and

“(iv) the certification is issued pursuant to this subsection;

“(B) deliver a copy of the certification to the Indian tribe; and

“(C) publish the certification in the Federal Register.

“(i) SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY.—Nothing in this section waives the sovereign immunity of an Indian tribe.”

(b) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self-Determination Act Amendments of 2014, the Secretary shall promulgate or update any regulations that are necessary to implement this section, including provisions to implement—

(1) section 2604(g) of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (25 U.S.C. 3504(g)) including the manner in which the Secretary, at the request of an Indian tribe, shall—

(A) identify the programs, functions, services, and activities (or any portions of programs, functions, services, or activities) that the Secretary will not have to operate or carry out as a result of the Indian tribe carrying out activities under a tribal energy resource agreement;

(B) identify the amounts that the Secretary would have otherwise expended to operate or carry out each program, function, service, and activity (or any portion of a program, function, service, or activity) identified pursuant to subparagraph (A); and

(C) provide to the Indian tribe a list of the programs, functions, services, and activities (or any portions of programs, functions, services, or activities) identified pursuant to subparagraph (A) and the amounts associated with each program, function, service, and activity (or any portion of a program, function, service, or activity) identified pursuant to subparagraph (B); and

(2) section 2604(h) of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (25 U.S.C. 3504(h)), including the process to be followed by, and any applicable criteria and documentation required for, an Indian tribe to request and obtain the certification described in that section.

SEC. 2104. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR INDIAN TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS.

Section 2602(b) of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (25 U.S.C. 3502(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (6) as paragraphs (4) through (7), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) TECHNICAL AND SCIENTIFIC RESOURCES.—In addition to providing grants to Indian tribes under this subsection, the Secretary shall collaborate with the Directors of the National Laboratories in making the full array of technical and scientific resources of the Department of Energy available for tribal energy activities and projects.”

SEC. 2105. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) DEFINITION OF TRIBAL ENERGY DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION.—Section 2601 of the En-

ergy Policy Act of 1992 (25 U.S.C. 3501) is amended by striking paragraph (11) and inserting the following:

“(11) The term ‘tribal energy development organization’ means—

“(A) any enterprise, partnership, consortium, corporation, or other type of business organization that is engaged in the development of energy resources and is wholly owned by an Indian tribe (including an organization incorporated pursuant to section 17 of the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 (25 U.S.C. 477) or section 3 of the Act of June 26, 1936 (25 U.S.C. 503) (commonly known as the ‘Oklahoma Indian Welfare Act’)); or

“(B) any organization of 2 or more entities, at least 1 of which is an Indian tribe, that has the written consent of the governing bodies of all Indian tribes participating in the organization to apply for a grant, loan, or other assistance under section 2602 or to enter into a lease or business agreement with, or acquire a right-of-way from, an Indian tribe pursuant to subsection (a)(2)(A)(ii) or (b)(2)(B) of section 2604.”

(b) INDIAN TRIBAL ENERGY RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT.—Section 2602 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (25 U.S.C. 3502) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “tribal energy resource development organizations” and inserting “tribal energy development organizations”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “tribal energy resource development organizations” each place it appears and inserting “tribal energy development organizations”; and

(2) in subsection (b)(2), by striking “tribal energy resource development organization” and inserting “tribal energy development organization”.

(c) WIND AND HYDROPOWER FEASIBILITY STUDY.—Section 2606(c)(3) of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (25 U.S.C. 3506(c)(3)) is amended by striking “energy resource development” and inserting “energy development”.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 2604(e) of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (25 U.S.C. 3504(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “(1) On the date” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—On the date”; and

(B) by striking “for approval”;

(2) in paragraph (2)(B)(iv) (as redesignated by section 2103(a)(4)(A)(ii)(III))—

(A) in subclause (XIV), by inserting “and” after the semicolon at the end;

(B) by striking subclause (XV); and

(C) by redesignating subclause (XVI) as subclause (XV);

(3) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking “(3) The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(3) NOTICE AND COMMENT; SECRETARIAL REVIEW.—The Secretary”; and

(B) by striking “for approval”;

(4) in paragraph (4), by striking “(4) If the Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(4) ACTION IN CASE OF DISAPPROVAL.—If the Secretary”; and

(5) in paragraph (5)—

(A) by striking “(5) If an Indian tribe” and inserting the following:

“(5) PROVISION OF DOCUMENTS TO SECRETARY.—If an Indian tribe”; and

(B) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “approved” and inserting “in effect”;

(6) in paragraph (6)—

(A) by striking “(6)(A) In carrying out” and inserting the following:

“(6) SECRETARIAL OBLIGATIONS AND EFFECT OF SECTION.—

“(A) In carrying out”; and

(B) in subparagraph (A), by indenting clauses (i) and (ii) appropriately;

(C) in subparagraph (B), by striking “approved” and inserting “in effect”; and

(D) in subparagraph (D)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking “an approved tribal energy resource agreement” and inserting “a tribal energy resource agreement in effect under this section”; and

(ii) in clause (ii), by striking “approved by the Secretary” and inserting “in effect”; and

(7) in paragraph (7)—

(A) by striking “(7)(A) In this paragraph” and inserting the following:

“(7) PETITIONS BY INTERESTED PARTIES.—

“(A) In this paragraph”;

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking “approved by the Secretary” and inserting “in effect”;

(C) in subparagraph (B), by striking “approved by the Secretary” and inserting “in effect”; and

(D) in subparagraph (D)(iii)—

(i) in subclause (I), by striking “approved”; and

(ii) in subclause (II)—

(I) by striking “approval of” in the first place it appears; and

(II) by striking “subsection (a) or (b)” and inserting “subsection (a)(2)(A)(i) or (b)(2)(A)”.

TITLE XXII—MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS

SEC. 2201. ISSUANCE OF PRELIMINARY PERMITS OR LICENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7(a) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 800(a)) is amended by striking “States and municipalities” and inserting “States, Indian tribes, and municipalities”.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall not affect—

(1) any preliminary permit or original license issued before the date of enactment of the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self-Determination Act Amendments of 2014; or

(2) an application for an original license, if the Commission has issued a notice accepting that application for filing pursuant to section 4.32(d) of title 18, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations), before the date of enactment of the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self-Determination Act Amendments of 2014.

(c) DEFINITION OF INDIAN TRIBE.—For purposes of section 7(a) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 800(a)) (as amended by subsection (a)), the term “Indian tribe” has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b).

SEC. 2202. TRIBAL BIOMASS DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to establish a biomass demonstration project for federally recognized Indian tribes and Alaska Native corporations to promote biomass energy production.

(b) TRIBAL BIOMASS DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.—The Tribal Forest Protection Act of 2004 (Public Law 108–278; 118 Stat. 868) is amended—

(1) in section 2(a), by striking “In this section” and inserting “In this Act”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 3. TRIBAL BIOMASS DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.

“(a) STEWARDSHIP CONTRACTS OR SIMILAR AGREEMENTS.—For each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019, the Secretary shall enter into stewardship contracts or similar agreements (excluding direct service contracts) with Indian tribes to carry out demonstration projects to promote biomass energy production (including biofuel, heat, and electricity generation) on Indian forest land and in nearby communities by providing reliable supplies of woody biomass from Federal land.

“(b) DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.—In each fiscal year for which projects are authorized, at least 4 new demonstration projects that meet the eligibility criteria described in subsection (c) shall be carried out under contracts or agreements described in subsection (a).

“(c) ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA.—To be eligible to enter into a contract or agreement under this section, an Indian tribe shall submit to the Secretary an application—

“(1) containing such information as the Secretary may require; and

“(2) that includes a description of—

“(A) the Indian forest land or rangeland under the jurisdiction of the Indian tribe; and

“(B) the demonstration project proposed to be carried out by the Indian tribe.

“(d) SELECTION.—In evaluating the applications submitted under subsection (c), the Secretary shall—

“(1) take into consideration—

“(A) the factors set forth in paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 2(e); and

“(B) whether a proposed project would—

“(i) increase the availability or reliability of local or regional energy;

“(ii) enhance the economic development of the Indian tribe;

“(iii) result in or improve the connection of electric power transmission facilities serving the Indian tribe with other electric transmission facilities;

“(iv) improve the forest health or watersheds of Federal land or Indian forest land or rangeland;

“(v) demonstrate new investments in infrastructure; or

“(vi) otherwise promote the use of woody biomass; and

“(2) exclude from consideration any merchantable logs that have been identified by the Secretary for commercial sale.

“(e) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary shall—

“(1) ensure that the criteria described in subsection (c) are publicly available by not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this section; and

“(2) to the maximum extent practicable, consult with Indian tribes and appropriate intertribal organizations likely to be affected in developing the application and otherwise carrying out this section.

“(f) REPORT.—Not later than September 20, 2017, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report that describes, with respect to the reporting period—

“(1) each individual tribal application received under this section; and

“(2) each contract and agreement entered into pursuant to this section.

“(g) INCORPORATION OF MANAGEMENT PLANS.—In carrying out a contract or agreement under this section, on receipt of a request from an Indian tribe, the Secretary shall incorporate into the contract or agreement, to the maximum extent practicable, management plans (including forest management and integrated resource management plans) in effect on the Indian forest land or rangeland of the respective Indian tribe.

“(h) TERM.—A contract or agreement entered into under this section—

“(1) shall be for a term of not more than 20 years; and

“(2) may be renewed in accordance with this section for not more than an additional 10 years.”.

(c) ALASKA NATIVE CORPORATION BIOMASS DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) ALASKA NATIVE CORPORATION.—The term “Alaska Native corporation” has the meaning given the term “Native Corporation” in section 3 of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1602).

(B) FEDERAL LAND.—The term “Federal land” means—

(i) land of the National Forest System (as defined in section 11(a) of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1609(a))) administered by the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service; and

(ii) public lands (as defined in section 103 of the Federal Land Policy Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1702)), the surface of which is administered by the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management.

(C) FOREST LAND.—The term “forest land” means land that—

(i) is conveyed to an Alaska Native corporation pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.); and

(ii) (I) is considered chiefly valuable for the production of forest products or to maintain watershed or other land values enhanced by a forest cover (including commercial and noncommercial timberland and woodland), regardless of whether a formal inspection and land classification action has been taken; or

(II) formerly had a forest or vegetative cover that is capable of restoration.

(D) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means—

(i) the Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to land under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service; and

(ii) the Secretary of the Interior, with respect to land under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management.

(2) AGREEMENTS.—For each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019, the Secretary shall enter into a stewardship contract or similar agreement (excluding a direct service contract) with 1 or more Alaska Native corporations to carry out a demonstration project to promote biomass energy production (including biofuel, heat, and electricity generation) on forest land of the Alaska Native corporations and in nearby communities by providing reliable supplies of woody biomass from Federal land.

(3) DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.—In each fiscal year for which projects are authorized, at least 1 new demonstration project that meets the eligibility criteria described in paragraph (4) shall be carried out under contracts or agreements described in paragraph (2).

(4) ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA.—To be eligible to enter into a contract or agreement under this subsection, an Alaska Native corporation shall submit to the Secretary an application—

(A) containing such information as the Secretary may require; and

(B) that includes a description of—

(i) the forest land or rangeland under the jurisdiction of the Alaska Native corporation; and

(ii) the demonstration project proposed to be carried out by the Alaska Native corporation.

(5) SELECTION.—In evaluating the applications submitted under paragraph (4), the Secretary shall—

(A) take into consideration whether a proposed project would—

(i) increase the availability or reliability of local or regional energy;

(ii) enhance the economic development of the Alaska Native corporation;

(iii) result in or improve the connection of electric power transmission facilities serving the Alaska Native corporation with other electric transmission facilities;

(iv) improve the forest health or watersheds of Federal land or Alaska Native corporation forest land or rangeland;

(v) demonstrate new investments in infrastructure; or

(vi) otherwise promote the use of woody biomass; and

(B) exclude from consideration any merchantable logs that have been identified by the Secretary for commercial sale.

(6) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary shall—

(A) ensure that the criteria described in paragraph (4) are publicly available by not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this subsection; and

(B) to the maximum extent practicable, consult with Alaska Native corporations and appropriate Alaska Native organizations likely to be affected in developing the application and otherwise carrying out this subsection.

(7) REPORT.—Not later than September 20, 2017, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report that describes, with respect to the reporting period—

(A) each individual application received under this subsection; and

(B) each contract and agreement entered into pursuant to this subsection.

(8) TERM.—A contract or agreement entered into under this subsection—

(A) shall be for a term of not more than 20 years; and

(B) may be renewed in accordance with this subsection for not more than an additional 10 years.

SEC. 2203. WEATHERIZATION PROGRAM.

Section 413(d) of the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6863(d)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) RESERVATION OF AMOUNTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B) and notwithstanding any other provision of this part, the Secretary shall reserve from amounts that would otherwise be allocated to a State under this part not less than 100 percent, but not more than 150 percent, of an amount which bears the same proportion to the allocation of that State for the applicable fiscal year as the population of all low-income members of an Indian tribe in that State bears to the population of all low-income individuals in that State.

“(B) RESTRICTIONS.—Subparagraph (A) shall apply only if—

“(i) the tribal organization serving the low-income members of the applicable Indian tribe requests that the Secretary make a grant directly; and

“(ii) the Secretary determines that the low-income members of the applicable Indian tribe would be equally or better served by making a grant directly than a grant made to the State in which the low-income members reside.”;

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking “The sums” and inserting “ADMINISTRATION.—The amounts”;

(B) by striking “on the basis of his determination”;

(C) by striking “individuals for whom such a determination has been made” and inserting “low-income members of the Indian tribe”; and

(D) by striking “he” and inserting “the Secretary”; and

(3) in paragraph (3), by striking “In order” and inserting “APPLICATION.—In order”.

SEC. 2204. APPRAISALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title XXVI of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (25 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 2607. APPRAISALS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—For any transaction that requires approval of the Secretary and involves mineral or energy resources held in trust by the United States for the benefit of

an Indian tribe or by an Indian tribe subject to Federal restrictions against alienation, any appraisal relating to fair market value of those resources required to be prepared under applicable law may be prepared by—

“(1) the Secretary;

“(2) the affected Indian tribe; or

“(3) a certified, third-party appraiser pursuant to a contract with the Indian tribe.

“(b) SECRETARIAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL.—Not later than 45 days after the date on which the Secretary receives an appraisal prepared by or for an Indian tribe under paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

“(1) review the appraisal; and

“(2) approve the appraisal unless the Secretary determines that the appraisal fails to meet the standards set forth in regulations promulgated under subsection (d).

“(c) NOTICE OF DISAPPROVAL.—If the Secretary determines that an appraisal submitted for approval under subsection (b) should be disapproved, the Secretary shall give written notice of the disapproval to the Indian tribe and a description of—

“(1) each reason for the disapproval; and

“(2) how the appraisal should be corrected or otherwise cured to meet the applicable standards set forth in the regulations promulgated under subsection (d).

“(d) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall promulgate regulations to carry out this section, including standards the Secretary shall use for approving or disapproving the appraisal described in subsection (a).”.

SEC. 2205. LEASES OF RESTRICTED LANDS FOR NAVAJO NATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (e)(1) of the first section of the Act of August 9, 1955 (commonly known as the “Long-Term Leasing Act”) (25 U.S.C. 415(e)(1)), is amended—

(1) by striking “, except a lease for” and inserting “, including a lease for”;

(2) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(A) in the case of a business or agricultural lease, 99 years;”;

(3) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) in the case of a lease for the exploration, development, or extraction of any mineral resource (including geothermal resources), 25 years, except that—

“(i) any such lease may include an option to renew for 1 additional term of not to exceed 25 years; and

“(ii) any such lease for the exploration, development, or extraction of an oil or gas resource shall be for a term of not to exceed 10 years, plus such additional period as the Navajo Nation determines to be appropriate in any case in which an oil or gas resource is produced in a paying quantity.”.

(b) GAO REPORT.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall prepare and submit to Congress a report describing the progress made in carrying out the amendment made by subsection (a)(4).

SA 2991. Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. MCCONNELL, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WARNER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. THUNE, Mr. WALSH, Mr. JOHANNIS, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. TESTER, Mr. INHOFE, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. ENZI, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. LEE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. COATS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr.

KIRK, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. COBURN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. CORKER, Mr. HATCH, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. VITTER, Mr. RISCH, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BURR, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HELLER, Mr. PAUL, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. AYOTTE, and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2262, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the beginning of title V, insert the following:

SEC. 5. KEYSTONE XL APPROVAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, L.P. may construct, connect, operate, and maintain the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in the application filed on May 4, 2012, by TransCanada Corporation to the Department of State (including any subsequent revision to the pipeline route within the State of Nebraska required or authorized by the State of Nebraska).

(b) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.—The Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement issued by the Secretary of State in January 2014, regarding the pipeline referred to in subsection (a), and the environmental analysis, consultation, and review described in that document (including appendices) shall be considered to fully satisfy—

(1) all requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); and

(2) any other provision of law that requires Federal agency consultation or review (including the consultation or review required under section 7(a) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536(a))) with respect to the pipeline and facilities referred to in subsection (a).

(c) PERMITS.—Any Federal permit or authorization issued before the date of enactment of this Act for the pipeline and cross-border facilities referred to in subsection (a) shall remain in effect.

(d) FEDERAL JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Any legal challenge to a Federal agency action regarding the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in subsection (a), and the related facilities in the United States, that are approved by this Act, and any permit, right-of-way, or other action taken to construct or complete the project pursuant to Federal law, shall only be subject to judicial review on direct appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

(e) PRIVATE PROPERTY SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this Act alters any Federal, State, or local process or condition in effect on the date of enactment of this Act that is necessary to secure access from an owner of private property to construct the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in subsection (a).

SA 2992. Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. HELLER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2262, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

Subtitle F—Public Land Renewable Energy Development

SEC. 451. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Public Land Renewable Energy Development Act of 2014”.

PART I—GEOTHERMAL ENERGY**SEC. 461. EXTENSION OF FUNDING FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF GEOTHERMAL STEAM ACT OF 1970.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 234(a) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15873(a)) is amended by striking “in the first 5 fiscal years beginning after the date of enactment of this Act” and inserting “through fiscal year 2020”.

(b) AUTHORIZATION.—Section 234(b) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15873(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking “Amounts” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Amounts”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) AUTHORIZATION.—Effective for fiscal year 2015 and each fiscal year thereafter, amounts deposited under subsection (a) shall be available to the Secretary of the Interior for expenditure, subject to appropriation and without fiscal year limitation, to implement the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 (30 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.) and this Act.”.

PART II—DEVELOPMENT OF SOLAR AND WIND ENERGY ON PUBLIC LAND**SEC. 471. DEFINITIONS.**

In this part:

(1) COVERED LAND.—The term “covered land” means land that is—

(A)(i) public land administered by the Secretary; or

(ii) National Forest System land administered by the Secretary of Agriculture; and

(B) not excluded from the development of solar or wind energy under—

(i) a land use plan established under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.);

(ii) a land use plan established under the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 1600 et seq.); or

(iii) other law.

(2) PILOT PROGRAM.—The term “pilot program” means the wind and solar leasing pilot program established under section 473(a).

(3) PUBLIC LAND.—The term “public land” has the meaning given the term “public lands” in section 103 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1702).

(4) SECRETARIES.—The term “Secretaries” means—

(A) in the case of public land administered by the Secretary, the Secretary; and

(B) in the case of National Forest System land administered by the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Agriculture.

(5) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 472. PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS AND LAND USE PLANNING.

(a) NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM LAND.—As soon as practicable but not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall—

(1) prepare and publish in the Federal Register a notice of intent to prepare a programmatic environmental impact statement in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) to analyze the potential impacts of—

(A) a program to develop solar and wind energy on National Forest System land administered by the Secretary of Agriculture; and

(B) any necessary amendments to land use plans for the land; and

(2) amend any land use plans as appropriate to provide for the development of renewable energy in areas considered appropriate by the Secretary of Agriculture immediately on completion of the programmatic environmental impact statement.

(b) EFFECT ON PROCESSING APPLICATIONS.—The requirement for completion of programmatic environmental impact statements under this section shall not result in any delay in processing or approving applications for wind or solar development on National Forest System land.

(c) MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.—

(1) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, shall conduct a study, and prepare a report, for States that have not completed the analysis that—

(A) identifies locations on land withdrawn from the public domain and reserved for military purposes that—

(i) exhibit a high potential for solar, wind, geothermal, or other renewable energy production;

(ii) are disturbed or otherwise have comparatively low value for other resources; and

(iii) could be developed for renewable energy production in a manner consistent with all present and reasonably foreseeable military training and operational missions and research, development, testing, and evaluation requirements; and

(B) describes the administration of public land withdrawn for military purposes for the development of commercial-scale renewable energy projects, including the legal authorities governing authorization for that use.

(2) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS.—Not later than 1 year after the completion of the study required by paragraph (1), the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, shall prepare and publish in the Federal Register a notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact analysis document to support a program to develop renewable energy on withdrawn military land identified in the study as suitable for the production.

(3) REPORTS.—On completion of the report, the Secretary and the Secretary of Defense shall jointly submit the report required by paragraph (1) to—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives; and

(D) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 473. DEVELOPMENT OF SOLAR AND WIND ENERGY ON PUBLIC LAND.**(a) PILOT PROGRAM.—**

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish a wind and solar leasing pilot program on covered land administered by the Secretary.

(2) SELECTION OF SITES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date the pilot program is established under this subsection, the Secretary shall (taking into consideration the multiple resource values of the land) select 2 sites that are appropriate for the development of a solar energy project, and 2 sites that are appropriate for the development of a wind energy project, on covered land administered by the Secretary as part of the pilot program.

(B) SITE SELECTION.—In carrying out subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall seek to select sites—

(i) for which there is likely to be a high level of industry interest;

(ii) that have a comparatively low value for other resources; and

(iii) that are representative of sites on which solar or wind energy is likely to be developed on covered land.

(C) INELIGIBLE SITES.—The Secretary shall not select as part of the pilot program any

site for which a notice of intent has been issued.

(3) QUALIFICATIONS.—Prior to any lease sale, the Secretary shall establish qualifications for bidders that ensure bidders—

(A) are able to expeditiously develop a wind or solar energy project on the site for lease;

(B) possess—

(i) financial resources necessary to complete a project;

(ii) knowledge of the applicable technology; and

(iii) such other qualifications as are determined appropriate by the Secretary; and

(C) meet the eligibility requirements for leasing under the first section of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181).

(4) LEASE SALES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (D)(ii), not later than 180 days after the date sites are selected under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall offer each site for competitive leasing to qualified bidders under such terms and conditions as are required by the Secretary.

(B) BIDDING SYSTEMS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—In offering the sites for lease, the Secretary may vary the bidding systems to be used at each lease sale, to ensure a fair return to the public, including—

(I) cash bonus bids with a requirement for payment of the royalty established under this subtitle;

(II) variable royalty bids based on a percentage of the gross proceeds from the sale of electricity produced from the lease, except that the royalty shall not be less than the royalty required under this subtitle, together with a fixed cash bonus; and

(III) such other bidding system as ensures a fair return to the public consistent with the royalty established under this subtitle.

(ii) ROUND.—The Secretary shall limit bidding to 1 round in any lease sale.

(iii) EXPENDITURES.—In any case in which the land that is subject to lease has 1 or more pending applications for the development of wind or solar energy at the time of the lease sale, the Secretary shall give credit toward any bid submitted by the applicant for expenditures of the applicant considered by the Secretary to be qualified and necessary for the preparation of the application.

(C) REVENUES.—Bonus bids, royalties, rentals, fees, or other payments collected by the Secretary under this section shall be subject to section 474.

(D) LEASE TERMS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—As part of the pilot program, the Secretary may vary the length of the lease terms and establish such other lease terms and conditions as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(ii) DATA COLLECTION.—As part of the pilot program, the Secretary shall—

(I) offer on a noncompetitive basis on at least 1 site a short-term lease for data collection; and

(II) on the expiration of the short-term lease, offer on a competitive basis a long-term lease, giving credit toward the bonus bid to the holder of the short-term lease for any qualified expenditures to collect data to develop the site during the short-term lease.

(5) COMPLIANCE WITH LAWS.—In offering for lease the selected sites under paragraph (4), the Secretary shall comply with all applicable environmental and other laws.

(6) REPORT.—The Secretary shall—

(A) compile a report of the results of each lease sale under the pilot program, including—

(i) the level of competitive interest;

(ii) a summary of bids and revenues received; and

(iii) any other factors that may have impacted the lease sale process; and

(B) not later than 90 days after the final lease sale, submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives the report described in subparagraph (A).

(7) RIGHTS-OF-WAY.—During the pendency of the pilot program, the Secretary shall continue to issue rights-of-way, in compliance with authority in effect on the date of enactment of this Act, for available sites not selected for the pilot program.

(b) SECRETARIAL DETERMINATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretaries shall make a joint determination on whether to establish a leasing program under this section for wind or solar energy, or both, on all covered land.

(2) SYSTEM.—If the Secretaries determine that a leasing program should be established, the program shall apply to all covered land in accordance with this subtitle and other provisions of law applicable to public land or National Forest System land.

(3) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretaries shall establish a leasing program unless the Secretaries determine that the program—

(A) is not in the public interest; and

(B) does not provide an effective means of developing wind or solar energy.

(4) CONSULTATION.—In making the determinations required under this subsection, the Secretaries shall consult with—

(A) the heads of other relevant Federal agencies;

(B) interested States, Indian tribes, and local governments;

(C) representatives of the solar and wind industries;

(D) representatives of the environment, conservation, and outdoor sporting communities;

(E) other users of the covered land; and

(F) the public.

(5) CONSIDERATIONS.—In making the determinations required under this subsection, the Secretaries shall consider the results of the pilot program.

(6) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which any determination is made to establish a leasing program, the Secretaries shall jointly promulgate final regulations to implement the program.

(7) REPORT.—If the Secretaries determine that a leasing program should not be established, not later than 60 days after the date of the determination, the Secretaries shall jointly submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report describing the basis and findings for the determination.

(c) TRANSITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretaries determine under subsection (b) that a leasing program should be established for covered land, until the program is established and final regulations for the program are issued—

(A) the Secretary shall continue to accept applications for rights-of-way on covered land, and provide for the issuance of rights-of-way on covered land within the jurisdiction of the Secretary for the development of wind or solar energy pursuant to each requirement described in title V of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1761 et seq.) and other applicable law; and

(B) the Secretary of Agriculture shall continue to accept applications for authorizations, and provide for the issuance of the authorizations, for the development of wind or solar energy on covered land within the jurisdiction of the Secretary pursuant to applicable law.

(2) EXISTING RIGHTS-OF-WAY AND AUTHORIZATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Effective beginning on the date on which the wind or solar leasing programs are established and final regulations are issued, the Secretaries shall not renew an existing right-of-way or other authorization for wind or solar energy development at the end of the term of the right-of-way or authorization.

(B) LEASE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), at the end of the term of the right-of-way or other authorization for the wind or solar energy project, the Secretary or, in the case of National Forest System land, the Secretary of Agriculture, shall grant, without a competitive process, a lease to the holder of the right-of-way or other authorization for the same covered land as was authorized under the right-of-way or other authorization if (as determined by the Secretary concerned)—

(I) the holder of the right-of-way or other authorization has met the requirements of diligent development; and

(II) issuance of the lease is in the public interest and consistent with applicable law.

(ii) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—Any lease described in clause (i) shall be subject to—

(I) terms and conditions that are consistent with this subtitle and the regulations issued under this subtitle; and

(II) the regulations in effect on the date of renewal and any other terms and conditions that the Secretary considers necessary to protect the public interest.

(3) PENDING RIGHTS-OF-WAY.—Effective beginning on the date on which the wind or solar leasing programs are established and final regulations for the programs are issued, the Secretary or, with respect to National Forest System land, the Secretary of Agriculture shall provide any applicant that has filed a plan of development for a right-of-way or, in the case of National Forest System land, for an applicable authorization, for a wind or solar energy project with an option to acquire a lease on a noncompetitive basis, under such terms and conditions as are required by this subtitle, applicable regulations, and the Secretary concerned, for the same covered land included in the plan of development if—

(A) the plan of development has been determined by the Secretary concerned to be adequate for the initiation of environmental review;

(B) granting the lease is consistent with all applicable land use planning, environmental, and other laws;

(C) the applicant has made a good faith effort to obtain a right-of-way or, in the case of National Forest System land, other authorization, for the project; and

(D) issuance of the lease is in the public interest.

(d) LEASING PROGRAM.—If the Secretaries determine under subsection (b) that a leasing program should be established, the program shall be established in accordance with subsections (e) through (k).

(e) COMPETITIVE LEASES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), leases for wind or solar energy development under this section shall be issued on a competitive basis with a single round of bidding in any lease sale.

(2) EXCEPTIONS.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply if the Secretary or, with respect to National Forest System land, the Secretary of Agriculture determines that—

(A) no competitive interest exists for the covered land;

(B) the public interest would not be served by the competitive issuance of a lease;

(C) the lease is for the placement and operation of a meteorological or data collection facility or for the development or demonstration of a new wind or solar technology and has a term of not more than 5 years; or

(D) the covered land is eligible to be granted a noncompetitive lease under subsection (c).

(f) PAYMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretaries shall jointly establish—

(A) fees, rentals, bonuses, or other payments to ensure a fair return to the United States for any lease issued under this section; and

(B) royalties pursuant to section 475 that apply to all leases issued under this section.

(2) BONUS BIDS.—The Secretaries may grant credit toward any bonus bid for a qualified expenditure by the holder of a lease described in subsection (e)(2)(C) in any competitive lease sale held for a long-term lease covering the same land covered by the lease described in subsection (e)(2)(C).

(g) QUALIFICATIONS.—Prior to any lease sale, the Secretary shall establish qualifications for bidders that ensure bidders meet the requirements described in subsection (a)(3).

(h) REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretaries shall ensure that any activity under a leasing program is carried out in a manner that—

(1) is consistent with all applicable land use planning, environmental, and other laws; and

(2) provides for—

(A) safety;

(B) protection of the environment and fish and wildlife habitat;

(C) mitigation of impacts;

(D) prevention of waste;

(E) diligent development of the resource, with specific milestones to be met by the lessee as determined by the Secretaries;

(F) coordination with applicable Federal agencies;

(G) a fair return to the United States for any lease;

(H) use of best management practices, including planning and practices for mitigation of impacts;

(I) public notice and comment on any proposal submitted for a lease under this section;

(J) oversight, inspection, research, monitoring, and enforcement relating to a lease under this section;

(K) the quantity of acreage to be commensurate with the size of the project covered by a lease; and

(L) efficient use of water resources.

(i) LEASE DURATION, SUSPENSION, AND CANCELLATION.—

(1) DURATION.—A lease under this section shall be for—

(A) an initial term of 25 years; and

(B) any additional period after the initial term during which electricity is being produced annually in commercial quantities from the lease.

(2) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary shall establish terms and conditions for the issuance, transfer, renewal, suspension, and cancellation of a lease under this section.

(3) READJUSTMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Royalties, rentals, and other terms and conditions of a lease under this section shall be subject to readjustment—

(i) on the date that is 15 years after the date on which the lease is issued; and

(ii) every 10 years thereafter.

(B) LEASE.—Each lease issued under this subtitle shall provide for readjustment in accordance with subparagraph (A).

(j) SURFACE-DISTURBING ACTIVITIES.—The Secretaries shall—

(1) regulate all surface-disturbing activities conducted pursuant to any lease issued under this section; and

(2) require any necessary reclamation and other actions under the lease as are required

in the interest of conservation of surface resources.

(k) SECURITY.—The Secretaries shall require the holder of a lease issued under this section—

(1) to furnish a surety bond or other form of security, as prescribed by the Secretaries;

(2) to provide for the reclamation and restoration of the area covered by the lease; and

(3) to comply with such other requirements as the Secretaries consider necessary to protect the interests of the public and the United States.

(l) PERIODIC REVIEW.—Not less frequently than once every 5 years, the Secretary shall conduct a review of the adequacy of the surety bond or other form of security provided by the holder of a lease issued under this section.

SEC. 474. DISPOSITION OF REVENUES.

(a) DISPOSITION OF REVENUES.—Of the amounts collected as bonus bids, royalties, rentals, fees, or other payments under a right-of-way, permit, lease, or other authorization for the development of wind or solar energy on covered land—

(1) 25 percent shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury to the State within the boundaries of which the income is derived;

(2) 25 percent shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury to the 1 or more counties within the boundaries of which the income is derived;

(3) 15 percent shall—

(A) for the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and ending on date the date that is 15 years after the date of enactment of this Act, be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to help facilitate the processing of renewable energy permits by the Bureau of Land Management, including the transfer of the funds by the Bureau of Land Management to other Federal agencies and State agencies to facilitate the processing of renewable energy permits on Federal land; and

(B) beginning on the date that is 15 years after the date of enactment of this Act, be deposited in the Fund; and

(4) 35 percent shall be deposited in the Renewable Energy Resource Conservation Fund established by subsection (c).

(b) PAYMENTS TO STATES AND COUNTIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), amounts paid to States and counties under subsection (a) shall be used consistent with section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 191).

(2) IMPACTS ON FEDERAL LAND.—Not less than 33 percent of the amount paid to a State shall be used on an annual basis for the purposes described in subsection (c)(2)(A).

(c) RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCE CONSERVATION FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the Treasury a fund, to be known as the “Renewable Energy Resource Conservation Fund”, to be administered by the Secretary for use in regions impacted by the development of wind or solar energy.

(2) USE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Amounts in the Fund shall be available to the Secretary, who may make amounts available to the Secretary of Agriculture and to other Federal or State agencies, as appropriate, for the purposes of—

(i) addressing and offsetting the impacts of wind or solar development on Federal land, including restoring and protecting—

(I) fish and wildlife habitat for affected species;

(II) fish and wildlife corridors for affected species; and

(III) water resources in areas impacted by wind or solar energy development;

(ii) securing recreational access to Federal land through an easement, right-of-way, or fee title acquisition from willing sellers for the purpose of providing enhanced public access to existing Federal land that is inaccessible or significantly restricted; and

(iii) carrying out activities authorized under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 4601-4 et seq.) in the State.

(B) ADVISORY BOARD.—The Secretary shall establish an independent advisory board composed of key stakeholders and technical experts to provide recommendations and guidance on the disposition of any amounts expended from the Fund.

(3) MITIGATION REQUIREMENTS.—The expenditure of funds under this subsection shall be in addition to any mitigation requirements imposed pursuant to any law, regulation, or term or condition of any lease, right-of-way, or other authorization.

(4) INVESTMENT OF FUND.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Any amounts deposited in the Fund shall earn interest in an amount determined by the Secretary of the Treasury on the basis of the current average market yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities.

(B) USE.—Any interest earned under subparagraph (A) may be expended in accordance with this subsection.

SEC. 475. ROYALTIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretaries shall require as a term and condition of any lease, right-of-way, permit, or other authorization for the development of wind or solar energy on covered land the payment of a royalty established by the Secretaries pursuant to a joint rulemaking that shall be a percentage of the gross proceeds from the sale of electricity at a rate that—

(1) encourages production of solar or wind energy;

(2) ensures a fair return to the public comparable to the return that would be obtained on State and private land; and

(3) encourages the maximum energy generation while disturbing the least quantity of covered land and other natural resources, including water.

(b) AMOUNT.—The royalty on electricity produced using wind or solar resources shall be—

(1) not less than 1 percent, and not more than 2.5 percent, of the gross proceeds from the sale of electricity produced from the resources during the first 10 years of production; and

(2) not less than 2 percent, and not more than 5 percent, of the gross proceeds from the sale of electricity produced from the resources during each year after that initial 10-year period.

(c) DIFFERENT ROYALTY RATES.—The Secretaries may establish—

(1) a different royalty rate for wind or solar energy generation; and

(2) a reduced royalty rate for projects located within a zone identified for development of solar or wind energy.

(d) ROYALTY IN LIEU OF RENT.—During the period of production, a royalty shall be collected in lieu of any rent for the land from which the electricity is produced.

(e) ROYALTY RELIEF.—To promote the generation of renewable energy, the Secretaries may reduce any royalty otherwise required on a showing by clear and convincing evidence by the person holding a lease, right-of-way, permit, or other authorization for the development of wind or solar energy on covered land under which the generation of energy is or will be produced in commercial quantities that—

(1) collection of the full royalty would unreasonably burden energy generation; and

(2) the royalty reduction is in the public interest.

(f) PERIODIC REVIEW AND REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act and every 5 years thereafter, the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, shall—

(A) complete a review of collections and impacts of the royalty and fees provided under this subtitle; and

(B) submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report describing the results of the review.

(2) TOPICS.—The report shall address—

(A) the total revenues received (by category) on an annual basis as royalties from wind, solar, and geothermal development and production (specified by energy source) on covered land;

(B) whether the revenues received for the development of wind, solar, and geothermal development are comparable to the revenues received for similar development on State and private land;

(C) any impact on the development of wind, solar, and geothermal development and production on covered land as a result of the royalties; and

(D) any recommendations with respect to changes in Federal law (including regulations) relating to the amount or method of collection (including auditing, compliance, and enforcement) of the royalties.

(g) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretaries shall jointly issue final regulations to carry out this section.

SEC. 476. ENFORCEMENT OF ROYALTY AND PAYMENT PROVISIONS.

(a) DUTIES OF THE SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall establish a comprehensive inspection, collection, fiscal, and production accounting and auditing system—

(1) to accurately determine royalties, rentals, interest, fines, penalties, fees, deposits, and other payments owed under this subtitle; and

(2) to collect and account for the payments in a timely manner.

(b) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER LAW.—The Federal Oil and Gas Royalty Management Act of 1982 (30 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) (including the civil and criminal enforcement provisions of that Act) shall apply to leases, permits, rights-of-way, or other authorizations issued for the development of solar or wind energy on covered land and the holders and operators of the leases, permits, rights-of-way, or other authorizations (and designees) under this title, except that in applying that Act—

(1) “wind or solar leases, permits, rights-of-way, or other authorizations” shall be substituted for “oil and gas leases”;

(2) “electricity generated from wind or solar resources” shall be substituted for “oil and gas” (when used as nouns);

(3) “lease, permit, right-of-way, or other authorization for the development of wind or solar energy” shall be substituted for “lease” and “lease for oil and gas” (when used as nouns); and

(4) “lessee, permittee, right-of-way holder, or holder of an authorization for the development of wind or solar energy” shall be substituted for “lessee”.

SEC. 477. ENFORCEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Sections 302(c) and 303 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1732(c), 1733) shall apply to activities conducted on covered land under this title.

(b) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS.—Nothing in this title reduces or

limits the enforcement authority vested in the Secretary or the Attorney General by any other law.

SEC. 478. SEGREGATION FROM APPROPRIATION UNDER MINING AND FEDERAL LAND LAWS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—On covered land identified by the Secretary or the Secretary of Agriculture for the development of solar or wind power under this title or other applicable law, the Secretary or the Secretary of Agriculture may temporarily segregate the identified land from appropriation under the mining and public land laws.

(b) ADMINISTRATION.—Segregation of covered land under this section—

(1) may only be made for a period not to exceed 10 years; and

(2) shall be subject to valid existing rights as of the date of the segregation.

SEC. 479. REPORT.

(a) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretaries shall carry out a study on the siting, development, and management of projects to determine the feasibility of carrying out a conservation banking program on land administered by the Secretaries.

(2) CONTENTS.—The study under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) identify areas in which—

(i) privately owned land is not available to offset the impacts of solar or wind energy development on federally administered land; or

(ii) mitigation investments on federally administered land are likely to provide greater conservation value for impacts of solar or wind energy development on federally administered land; and

(B) examine—

(i) the effectiveness of laws (including regulations) and policies in effect on the date of enactment of this Act in facilitating the development of conservation banks;

(ii) the advantages and disadvantages of using conservation banks on Federal land to mitigate impacts to natural resources on private land; and

(iii) any changes in Federal law (including regulations) or policy necessary to further develop a Federal conservation banking program.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretaries shall jointly submit to Congress a report that includes—

(1) the recommendations of the Secretaries relating to—

(A) the most effective system for Federal land described in subsection (a)(2)(A) to meet the goals of facilitating the development of a conservation banking program on Federal land; and

(B) any change to Federal law (including regulations) or policy necessary to address more effectively the siting, development, and management of conservation banking programs on Federal land to mitigate impacts to natural resources on private land; and

(2) any administrative action to be taken by the Secretaries in response to the recommendations.

(c) AVAILABILITY TO THE PUBLIC.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the report described in subsection (b) is submitted to Congress, the Secretaries shall make the results of the study available to the public.

SEC. 480. APPLICABILITY OF LAW.

(a) RENTAL FEE EXEMPTION.—Wind or solar generation projects with a capacity of 20 megawatts or more that are issued a lease, right-of-way, permit, or other authorization under applicable law shall not be subject to the rental fee exemption for rights-of-way under section 504(g) of the Federal Land Pol-

icy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1764(g)).

(b) FEES, CHARGES, AND COMMISSIONS.—Section 304 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1734) shall apply to an application made under section 473.

SA 2993. Mrs. GILLIBRAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2262, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title V, add the following:

SECTION 504. USE OF FEDERAL DISASTER RELIEF AND EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE FOR ENERGY-EFFICIENT PRODUCTS AND STRUCTURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5141 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 327. USE OF ASSISTANCE FOR ENERGY-EFFICIENT PRODUCTS AND STRUCTURES.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘energy-efficient product’ means a product that—

“(A) meets or exceeds the requirements for designation under an Energy Star program established under section 324A of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act of 1975 (42 U.S.C. 6294a); or

“(B) meets or exceeds the requirements for designation as being among the highest 25 percent of equivalent products for energy efficiency under the Federal Energy Management Program; and

“(2) the term ‘energy-efficient structure’ means a residential structure, a public facility, or a private nonprofit facility that meets or exceeds the requirements of American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers Standard 90.1-2010 or the 2013 International Energy Conservation Code, or any successor thereto.

“(b) USE OF ASSISTANCE.—A recipient of assistance relating to a major disaster or emergency may use the assistance to replace or repair a damaged product or structure with an energy-efficient product or energy-efficient structure.”.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to assistance made available under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act that is expended on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 2994. Mr. KING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2262, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the beginning of title V, insert the following:

SEC. 5 . FUEL SWITCHING UNDER WEATHERIZATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Section 415(c)(1) of the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6865(c)(1)) is amended by striking subparagraph (E) and inserting the following:

“(E) the cost of making heating and cooling modifications, including replacement (including, at the option of the State, non-renewable fuel switching when replacing furnaces or appliances if the new unit is more efficient than the replaced unit).”.

SA 2995. Mr. COONS (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. REED) submitted an

amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2262, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

DIVISION B—WEATHERIZATION AND STATE ENERGY PROGRAMS

SEC. 2001. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the “Weatherization Enhancement and Local Energy Efficiency Investment and Accountability Act”.

SEC. 2002. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the State energy program established under part D of title III of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6321 et seq.) (referred to in this section as “SEP”) and the Weatherization Assistance Program for Low-Income Persons established under part A of title IV of the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6861 et seq.) (referred to in this section as “WAP”) have proven to be beneficial, long-term partnerships among Federal, State, and local partners;

(2) the SEP and the WAP have been reauthorized on a bipartisan basis over many years to address changing national, regional, and State circumstances and needs, especially through—

(A) the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6201 et seq.);

(B) the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6801 et seq.);

(C) the State Energy Efficiency Programs Improvement Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-440; 104 Stat. 1006);

(D) the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13201 et seq.);

(E) the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15801 et seq.); and

(F) the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17001 et seq.);

(3) the SEP, also known as the “State energy conservation program”—

(A) was first created in 1975 to implement a State-based, national program in support of energy efficiency, renewable energy, economic development, energy emergency preparedness, and energy policy; and

(B) has come to operate in every sector of the economy in support of the private sector to improve productivity and has dramatically reduced the cost of government through energy savings at the State and local levels;

(4) Federal laboratory studies have concluded that, for every Federal dollar invested through the SEP, more than \$7 is saved in energy costs and almost \$11 in non-Federal funds is leveraged;

(5) the WAP—

(A) was first created in 1976 to assist low-income families in response to the first oil embargo;

(B) has become the largest residential energy conservation program in the United States, with more than 7,100,000 homes weatherized since the WAP was created;

(C) saves an estimated 35 percent of consumption in the typical weatherized home, yielding average annual savings of \$437 per year in home energy costs;

(D) has created thousands of jobs in both the construction sector and in the supply chain of materials suppliers, vendors, and manufacturers who supply the WAP;

(E) returns \$2.51 in energy savings for every Federal dollar spent in energy and nonenergy benefits over the life of weatherized homes;

(F) serves as a foundation for residential energy efficiency retrofit standards, technical skills, and workforce training for the

emerging broader market and reduces residential and power plant emissions of carbon dioxide by 2.65 metric tons each year per home; and

(G) has decreased national energy consumption by the equivalent of 24,100,000 barrels of oil annually;

(6) the WAP can be enhanced with the addition of a targeted portion of the Federal funds through an innovative program that supports projects performed by qualified nonprofit organizations that have a demonstrated capacity to build, renovate, repair, or improve the energy efficiency of a significant number of low-income homes, building on the success of the existing program without replacing the existing WAP network or creating a separate delivery mechanism for basic WAP services;

(7) the WAP has increased energy efficiency opportunities by promoting new, competitive public-private sector models of retrofitting low-income homes through new Federal partnerships;

(8) improved monitoring and reporting of the work product of the WAP has yielded benefits, and expanding independent verification of efficiency work will support the long-term goals of the WAP;

(9) reports of the Government Accountability Office in 2011, Inspector General's of the Department of Energy, and State auditors have identified State-level deficiencies in monitoring efforts that can be addressed in a manner that will ensure that WAP funds are used more effectively;

(10) through the history of the WAP, the WAP has evolved with improvements in efficiency technology, including, in the 1990s, many States adopting advanced home energy audits, which has led to great returns on investment; and

(11) as the home energy efficiency industry has become more performance-based, the WAP should continue to use those advances in technology and the professional workforce.

TITLE XXI—WEATHERIZATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

SEC. 2101. REAUTHORIZATION OF WEATHERIZATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Section 422 of the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6872) is amended by striking "appropriated—" and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting "appropriated \$450,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019."

SEC. 2102. GRANTS FOR NEW, SELF-SUSTAINING LOW-INCOME, SINGLE-FAMILY AND MULTIFAMILY HOUSING ENERGY RETROFIT MODEL PROGRAMS TO ELIGIBLE MULTISTATE HOUSING AND ENERGY NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS.

The Energy Conservation and Production Act is amended by inserting after section 414B (42 U.S.C. 6864b) the following:

"SEC. 414C. GRANTS FOR NEW, SELF-SUSTAINING LOW-INCOME, SINGLE-FAMILY AND MULTIFAMILY HOUSING ENERGY RETROFIT MODEL PROGRAMS TO ELIGIBLE MULTISTATE HOUSING AND ENERGY NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS.

"(a) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section are—

"(1) to expand the number of low-income, single-family and multifamily homes that receive energy efficiency retrofits;

"(2) to promote innovation and new models of retrofitting low-income homes through new Federal partnerships with covered organizations that leverage substantial donations, donated materials, volunteer labor, homeowner labor equity, and other private sector resources;

"(3) to assist the covered organizations in demonstrating, evaluating, improving, and

replicating widely the model low-income energy retrofit programs of the covered organizations; and

"(4) to ensure that the covered organizations make the energy retrofit programs of the covered organizations self-sustaining by the time grant funds have been expended.

"(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

"(1) COVERED ORGANIZATION.—The term 'covered organization' means an organization that—

"(A) is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from taxation under 501(a) of that Code; and

"(B) has an established record of constructing, renovating, repairing, or making energy efficient a total of not less than 250 owner-occupied, single-family or multifamily homes per year for low-income households, either directly or through affiliates, chapters, or other direct partners (using the most recent year for which data are available).

"(2) LOW-INCOME.—The term 'low-income' means an income level that is not more than 200 percent of the poverty level (as determined in accordance with criteria established by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget) applicable to a family of the size involved, except that the Secretary may establish a higher or lower level if the Secretary determines that a higher or lower level is necessary to carry out this section.

"(3) WEATHERIZATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR LOW-INCOME PERSONS.—The term 'Weatherization Assistance Program for Low-Income Persons' means the program established under this part (including part 440 of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations).

"(c) COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall make grants to covered organizations through a national competitive process for use in accordance with this section.

"(d) AWARD FACTORS.—In making grants under this section, the Secretary shall consider—

"(1) the number of low-income homes the applicant—

"(A) has built, renovated, repaired, or made more energy efficient as of the date of the application; and

"(B) can reasonably be projected to build, renovate, repair, or make energy efficient during the 10-year period beginning on the date of the application;

"(2) the qualifications, experience, and past performance of the applicant, including experience successfully managing and administering Federal funds;

"(3) the number and diversity of States and climates in which the applicant works as of the date of the application;

"(4) the amount of non-Federal funds, donated or discounted materials, discounted or volunteer skilled labor, volunteer unskilled labor, homeowner labor equity, and other resources the applicant will provide;

"(5) the extent to which the applicant could successfully replicate the energy retrofit program of the applicant and sustain the program after the grant funds have been expended;

"(6) regional diversity;

"(7) urban, suburban, and rural localities; and

"(8) such other factors as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

"(e) APPLICATIONS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall request proposals from covered organizations.

"(2) ADMINISTRATION.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, an applicant shall submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and con-

taining such information as the Secretary may require.

"(3) AWARDS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of issuance of a request for proposals, the Secretary shall award grants under this section.

"(f) ELIGIBLE USES OF GRANT FUNDS.—A grant under this section may be used for—

"(1) energy efficiency audits, cost-effective retrofit, and related activities in different climatic regions of the United States;

"(2) energy efficiency materials and supplies;

"(3) organizational capacity—

"(A) to significantly increase the number of energy retrofits;

"(B) to replicate an energy retrofit program in other States; and

"(C) to ensure that the program is self-sustaining after the Federal grant funds are expended;

"(4) energy efficiency, audit and retrofit training, and ongoing technical assistance;

"(5) information to homeowners on proper maintenance and energy savings behaviors;

"(6) quality control and improvement;

"(7) data collection, measurement, and verification;

"(8) program monitoring, oversight, evaluation, and reporting;

"(9) management and administration (up to a maximum of 10 percent of the total grant);

"(10) labor and training activities; and

"(11) such other activities as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

"(g) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—The amount of a grant provided under this section shall not exceed—

"(1) if the amount made available to carry out this section for a fiscal year is \$225,000,000 or more, \$5,000,000; and

"(2) if the amount made available to carry out this section for a fiscal year is less than \$225,000,000, \$1,500,000.

"(h) GUIDELINES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall issue guidelines to implement the grant program established under this section.

"(2) ADMINISTRATION.—The guidelines—

"(A) shall not apply to the Weatherization Assistance Program for Low-Income Persons, in whole or major part; but

"(B) may rely on applicable provisions of law governing the Weatherization Assistance Program for Low-Income Persons to establish—

"(i) standards for allowable expenditures;

"(ii) a minimum savings-to-investment ratio;

"(iii) standards—

"(I) to carry out training programs;

"(II) to conduct energy audits and program activities;

"(III) to provide technical assistance;

"(IV) to monitor program activities; and

"(V) to verify energy and cost savings;

"(iv) liability insurance requirements; and

"(v) recordkeeping requirements, which shall include reporting to the Office of Weatherization and Intergovernmental Programs of the Department of Energy applicable data on each home retrofitted.

"(i) REVIEW AND EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall review and evaluate the performance of any covered organization that receives a grant under this section (which may include an audit), as determined by the Secretary.

"(j) COMPLIANCE WITH STATE AND LOCAL LAW.—Nothing in this section or any program carried out using a grant provided under this section supersedes or otherwise affects any State or local law, to the extent

that the State or local law contains a requirement that is more stringent than the applicable requirement of this section.

“(k) ANNUAL REPORTS.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress annual reports that provide—

“(1) findings;

“(2) a description of energy and cost savings achieved and actions taken under this section; and

“(3) any recommendations for further action.

“(l) FUNDING.—Of the amount of funds that are made available to carry out the Weatherization Assistance Program for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019 under section 422, the Secretary shall use to carry out this section for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019—

“(1) 2 percent of the amount if the amount is less than \$225,000,000;

“(2) 5 percent of the amount if the amount is \$225,000,000 or more but less than \$260,000,000;

“(3) 10 percent of the amount if the amount is \$260,000,000 or more but less than \$400,000,000; and

“(4) 20 percent of the amount if the amount is \$400,000,000 or more.”.

SEC. 2103. STANDARDS PROGRAM.

Section 415 of the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6865) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) STANDARDS PROGRAM.—

“(1) CONTRACTOR QUALIFICATION.—Effective beginning January 1, 2015, to be eligible to carry out weatherization using funds made available under this part, a contractor shall be selected through a competitive bidding process and be—

“(A) accredited by the Building Performance Institute;

“(B) an Energy Smart Home Performance Team accredited under the Residential Energy Services Network; or

“(C) accredited by an equivalent accreditation or program accreditation-based State certification program approved by the Secretary.

“(2) GRANTS FOR ENERGY RETROFIT MODEL PROGRAMS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible to receive a grant under section 414C, a covered organization (as defined in section 414C(b)) shall use a crew chief who—

“(i) is certified or accredited in accordance with paragraph (1); and

“(ii) supervises the work performed with grant funds.

“(B) VOLUNTEER LABOR.—A volunteer who performs work for a covered organization that receives a grant under section 414C shall not be required to be certified under this subsection if the volunteer is not directly installing or repairing mechanical equipment or other items that require skilled labor.

“(C) TRAINING.—The Secretary shall use training and technical assistance funds available to the Secretary to assist covered organizations under section 414C in providing training to obtain certification required under this subsection, including provisional or temporary certification.

“(3) MINIMUM EFFICIENCY STANDARDS.—Effective beginning October 1, 2015, the Secretary shall ensure that—

“(A) each retrofit for which weatherization assistance is provided under this part meets minimum efficiency and quality of work standards established by the Secretary after weatherization of a dwelling unit;

“(B) at least 10 percent of the dwelling units are randomly inspected by a third party accredited under this subsection to ensure compliance with the minimum efficiency and quality of work standards established under subparagraph (A); and

“(C) the standards established under this subsection meet or exceed the industry

standards for home performance work that are in effect on the date of enactment of this subsection, as determined by the Secretary.”.

TITLE XXII—STATE ENERGY PROGRAM

SEC. 2201. REAUTHORIZATION OF STATE ENERGY PROGRAM.

Section 365(f) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6325(f)) is amended by striking “\$125,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2012” and inserting “\$75,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019”.

SA 2996. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2262, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At beginning of title V, insert the following:

SEC. 5 ____ . STUDY OF REGULATIONS THAT LIMIT GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS FROM EXISTING POWER PLANTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on the effect that regulations limiting greenhouse gas emissions from existing power plants would have on jobs and energy prices.

(b) DETERMINATION.—If, based on the study conducted under subsection (a), the Secretary of Energy determines that the regulations described in that subsection would directly or indirectly destroy jobs or raise energy prices, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall not finalize the regulations.

SA 2997. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2262, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At beginning of title V, insert the following:

SEC. 5 ____ . CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL OF EPA REGULATIONS WITH HIGH COMPLIANCE COSTS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if the cost of compliance with a regulation of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency exceeds \$1,000,000,000, the regulation shall not take effect unless Congress enacts a law that approves the regulation.

SA 2998. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2262, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At beginning of title V, insert the following:

SEC. 5 ____ . DOMESTIC OIL AND NATURAL GAS PRODUCTION GOAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In developing an onshore and offshore oil and gas leasing program for the Department of the Interior, subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary of the Interior (referred to in this section as the “Secretary”) shall determine a domestic strategic production goal for the development of oil and natural gas from Federal onshore and offshore areas, which goal shall be—

(1) the best estimate of the practicable increase in domestic production of oil and nat-

ural gas from the outer Continental Shelf and Federal onshore areas; and

(2) focused on—

(A) meeting domestic demand for oil and natural gas;

(B) reducing the dependence of the United States on foreign energy; and

(C) the production increases achieved by the leasing program at the end of each of the 15- and 30-year periods beginning on the effective date of the program.

(b) PROGRAM GOAL.—For purposes of the onshore and offshore oil and gas leasing program of the Department of the Interior, the production goal determined under subsection (a) shall be an increase by January 1, 2032, of the greater of—

(1)(A) not less than 3,000,000 barrels in the quantity of oil produced per day; and

(B) not less than 10,000,000,000 cubic feet in the quantity of natural gas produced per day; or

(2) not less than the projected 30-year percentage increase in the production of oil and natural gas from non-Federal areas, as determined by the Energy Information Administration.

(c) REPORT.—Beginning on the date that is 1 year after the effective date of the onshore and offshore oil and gas leasing program and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report on the progress of the program in meeting the production goal under subsection (a) that includes an identification of projections for production and any problems with leasing, permitting, or production that will prevent meeting the goal.

SA 2999. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2262, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At beginning of title V, insert the following:

SEC. 4 ____ . STUDY OF EFFECT OF TIER 3 MOTOR VEHICLE EMISSION AND FUEL STANDARD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on the effect that the Tier 3 motor vehicle emission and fuel standard would have on the price of gasoline.

(b) DETERMINATION.—If, based on the study conducted under subsection (a), the Secretary of Energy determines that the Tier 3 motor vehicle emission and fuel standard would result in an increase in the price of gasoline, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall not finalize the standard.

SA 3000. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2262, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At beginning of title V, insert the following:

SEC. 5 ____ . PROHIBITION ON COLLECTION AND DISBURSEMENT OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCER PERSONAL INFORMATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall not establish any searchable online database

of the personal information of any owner, operator, or employee of a livestock or farming operation.

(b) INCLUSIONS.—For purposes of subsection (a), personal information includes—

- (1) names of the owners, operators, or employees or of family members of the owners, operators, or employees;
- (2) telephone numbers;
- (3) email addresses;
- (4) physical or mailing addresses;
- (5) number of livestock;
- (6) Global Positioning System coordinates;

or

(7) other personal information regarding the owners, operators, or employees.

(c) FOIA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Personal information described in subsection (b) shall be exempt from disclosure under section 552 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—For purposes of paragraph (1), this section shall be considered a statute described in section 552(b)(3)(B) of title 5, United States Code.

SA 3001. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2262, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the beginning of title V, insert the following:

SEC. 5 ____ . ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY VEHICLES MANUFACTURING INCENTIVE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 136 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17013) is repealed.

(b) EFFECT OF REPEAL.—The repeal under subsection (a) shall not affect any incentive, loan, or other assistance provided under section 136 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17013) on or before January 1, 2014.

SA 3002. Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. SESSIONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2262, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the beginning of title V, insert the following:

SEC. 5 ____ . GROUND-LEVEL OZONE STANDARDS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including regulations), in promulgating a national primary or secondary ambient air quality standard for ozone, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency—

(1) shall not propose a national primary or secondary ambient air quality standard for ozone that is lower than the standard established under section 50.15 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on January 1, 2014), until at least 85 percent of the counties that were nonattainment areas under that standard as of January 1, 2014, achieve full compliance with that standard;

(2) shall only consider all or part of a county to be a nonattainment area under the standard on the basis of direct air quality monitoring;

(3) shall take into consideration feasibility and cost; and

(4) shall include in the regulatory impact analysis for the proposed and final rule at least 1 analysis that does not include any calculation of benefits resulting from reducing emissions of any pollutant other than ozone.

SA 3003. Mr. COBURN (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2262, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . GUIDELINES TO ENCOURAGE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES TO HELP REDUCE ENERGY USE AND COSTS.

Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue to the head of each Federal agency guidelines to reduce energy costs at that Federal agency by requiring employees of the Federal agency—

(1) to turn off the lights in the work areas of the employees at the end of the work day; and

(2) to turn off or unplug other devices that consume energy during periods in which the employees are not in the office.

SA 3004. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2262, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . INSTALLATION RENEWABLE ENERGY PROJECT DATABASE.

(a) LIMITATION.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall establish a searchable database to uniformly report information regarding installation renewable energy projects undertaken since 2010.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The database established under subsection (a) shall include, for each installation energy project—

- (1) the estimated project costs;
- (2) estimated power generation;
- (3) estimated total cost savings;
- (4) estimated payback period;
- (5) total project costs;
- (6) actual power generation;
- (7) actual cost savings to date;
- (8) current operational status; and
- (9) access to relevant business case documents, including the economic viability assessment.

(c) UPDATES.—The database established under subsection (a) shall be updated not less than quarterly.

SA 3005. Mr. COBURN (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2262, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . CERTIFICATION REQUIRED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall certify that the amount of energy cost savings over a 10-year period as a result of each project or activity funded under this Act or an amendment made by this Act would equal or exceed the cost of the project or activity.

(b) ACTUAL ENERGY USE.—On completion of a project or activity provided funds under this Act or an amendment made by this Act, the Secretary shall certify that, over a 10-year period, as a result of the project or activity—

(1) there was a reduction in actual energy use; and

(2) the energy cost savings exceeded the costs of the project or activity.

SA 3006. Mr. COBURN (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2262, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 82, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following:

SEC. 4 ____ . EVALUATION AND CONSOLIDATION OF DUPLICATIVE GREEN BUILDING PROGRAMS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—The term “administrative expenses” has the meaning given the term by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget under section 504(b)(2) of the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010 (31 U.S.C. 1105 note; Public Law 111–85), except that the term shall include, for purposes of that section and this section, with respect to an agency—

(A) costs incurred by the agency and costs incurred by grantees, subgrantees, and other recipients of funds from a grant program or other program administered by the agency; and

(B) expenses related to personnel salaries and benefits, property management, travel, program management, promotion, reviews and audits, case management, and communication about, promotion of, and outreach for programs and program activities administered by the agency.

(2) APPLICABLE PROGRAMS.—The term “applicable programs” means the programs listed in Table 9 (pages 348–350) of the report of the Government Accountability Office entitled “2012 Annual Report: Opportunities to Reduce Duplication, Overlap and Fragmentation, Achieve Savings, and Enhance Revenue”.

(3) APPROPRIATE SECRETARIES.—The term “appropriate Secretaries” means—

- (A) the Secretary;
- (B) the Secretary of Agriculture;
- (C) the Secretary of Defense;
- (D) the Secretary of Education;
- (E) the Secretary of Health and Human Services;

(F) the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development;

(G) the Secretary of Transportation;

(H) the Secretary of the Treasury;

(I) the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency;

(J) the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology; and

(K) the Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

(4) SERVICES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the term “services” has the meaning given the term by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(B) REQUIREMENTS.—The term “services” shall be limited to activities, assistance, and aid that provide a direct benefit to a recipient, such as—

- (i) the provision of medical care;
- (ii) assistance for housing or tuition; or
- (iii) financial support (including grants and loans).

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than October 1, 2014, the appropriate Secretaries shall submit to Congress and post on the public Internet websites of the agencies of the appropriate Secretaries a report on the outcomes of the applicable programs.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—In reporting on the outcomes of each applicable program, the appropriate Secretaries shall—

(A) determine the total administrative expenses of the applicable program;

(B) determine the expenditures for services for the applicable program;

(C) estimate the number of clients served by the applicable program and beneficiaries who received assistance under the applicable program (if applicable);

(D) estimate—

(i) the number of full-time employees who administer the applicable program; and

(ii) the number of full-time equivalents (whose salary is paid in part or full by the Federal Government through a grant or contract, a subaward of a grant or contract, a cooperative agreement, or another form of financial award or assistance) who assist in administering the applicable program;

(E) describe the type of assistance the applicable program provides, such as grants, technical assistance, loans, tax credits, or tax deductions;

(F) describe the type of recipient who benefits from the assistance provided, such as individual property owners or renters, local governments, businesses, nonprofit organizations, or State governments; and

(G) identify and report on whether written program goals are available for the applicable program.

(c) PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS.—Not later than January 1, 2015, the appropriate Secretaries shall jointly submit to Congress a report that includes—

(1) an analysis of whether any of the applicable programs should be eliminated or consolidated, including any legislative changes that would be necessary to eliminate or consolidate the applicable programs; and

(2) ways to improve the applicable programs by establishing program goals or increasing collaboration so as to reduce the overlap and duplication identified in—

(A) the 2011 report of the Government Accountability Office entitled “Federal Initiatives for the NonFederal Sector Could Benefit from More Interagency Collaboration”; and

(B) the report of the Government Accountability Office entitled “2012 Annual Report: Opportunities to Reduce Duplication, Overlap and Fragmentation, Achieve Savings, and Enhance Revenue”.

(d) PROGRAM ELIMINATIONS.—Not later than January 1, 2015, the appropriate Secretaries shall—

(1) identify—

(A) which applicable programs are specifically required by law; and

(B) which applicable programs are carried out under the discretionary authority of the appropriate Secretaries;

(2) eliminate those applicable programs that are not required by law; and

(3) transfer any remaining applicable projects and nonduplicative functions into another green building program within the same agency.

SA 3007. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2262, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . REPEAL OF ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY VEHICLES MANUFACTURING INCENTIVE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) REPEAL.—Section 136 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17013) is repealed.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) takes effect on the date that is 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) DEFICIT REDUCTION.—Any amounts made available to carry out section 136 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17013) (as in effect before the amendment made by subsection (a)) that are not obligated as of the date of enactment of this Act are rescinded.

SA 3008. Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. VITTER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. INHOFE, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. WICKER, Mr. JOHANNIS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. ENZI, Mr. RISCH, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MORAN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. COCHRAN, and Mr. CORNYN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2262, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 5 ____ . IDENTIFICATION OF WATERS PROTECTED BY THE CLEAN WATER ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Neither the Secretary of the Army nor the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall—

(1) finalize the proposed rule entitled “Definition of ‘Waters of the United States’ Under the Clean Water Act” (79 Fed. Reg. 22188 (April 21, 2014)); or

(2) use the proposed rule described in paragraph (1), or any substantially similar proposed rule or guidance, as the basis for any rulemaking or any decision regarding the scope or enforcement of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.).

(b) RULES.—The use of the proposed rule described in subsection (a)(1), or any substantially similar proposed rule or guidance, as the basis for any rulemaking or any decision regarding the scope or enforcement of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) shall be grounds for vacation of the final rule, decision, or enforcement action.

SA 3009. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself and Mr. UDALL of Colorado) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2262, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the beginning of title V, insert the following:

SEC. 5 ____ . RENEWABLE ELECTRICITY STANDARD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title VI of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2601 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 610. RENEWABLE ELECTRICITY STANDARD.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) BASE QUANTITY OF ELECTRICITY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘base quantity of electricity’ means the total quantity of electric energy sold by a retail electric supplier, expressed in terms of kilowatt hours, to electric customers for purposes other than resale during the most recent calendar year for which information is available.

“(B) EXCLUSIONS.—The term ‘base quantity of electricity’ does not include—

“(i) electric energy that is not incremental hydropower generated by a hydroelectric facility; and

“(ii) electricity generated through the incineration of municipal solid waste.

“(2) BIOMASS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘biomass’ means—

“(i) cellulosic (plant fiber) organic materials from a plant that is planted for the purpose of being used to produce energy;

“(ii) nonhazardous plant or algal matter that is derived from—

“(I) an agricultural crop, crop byproduct, or residue resource; or

“(II) waste, such as landscape or right-of-way trimmings (but not including municipal solid waste, recyclable postconsumer waste paper, painted, treated, or pressurized wood, wood contaminated with plastic, or metals);

“(iii) animal waste or animal byproducts; and

“(iv) landfill methane.

“(B) NATIONAL FOREST LAND AND CERTAIN OTHER PUBLIC LAND.—In the case of organic material removed from National Forest System land or from public land administered by the Secretary of the Interior, the term ‘biomass’ means only organic material from—

“(i) ecological forest restoration;

“(ii) precommercial thinnings;

“(iii) brush;

“(iv) mill residues; or

“(v) slash.

“(C) EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LAND.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (B), the term ‘biomass’ does not include material or matter that would otherwise qualify as biomass if the material or matter is located on the following Federal land:

“(i) Federal land containing old growth forest or late successional forest unless the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture determines that the removal of organic material from the land—

“(I) is appropriate for the applicable forest type; and

“(II) maximizes the retention of—

“(aa) late-successional and large and old growth trees;

“(bb) late-successional and old growth forest structure; and

“(cc) late-successional and old growth forest composition.

“(ii) Federal land on which the removal of vegetation is prohibited, including components of the National Wilderness Preservation System.

“(iii) Wilderness study areas.

“(iv) Inventoried roadless areas.

“(v) Components of the National Landscape Conservation System.

“(vi) National Monuments.

“(3) EXISTING FACILITY.—The term ‘existing facility’ means a facility for the generation of electric energy from a renewable energy resource that is not an eligible facility.

“(4) INCREMENTAL HYDROPOWER.—The term ‘incremental hydropower’ means additional generation that is achieved from increased efficiency or additions of capacity made on or after—

“(A) the date of enactment of this section; or

“(B) the effective date of an existing applicable State renewable portfolio standard program at a hydroelectric facility that was placed in service before that date.

“(5) INDIAN LAND.—The term ‘Indian land’ means—

“(A) any land within the limits of any Indian reservation, pueblo, or rancheria;

“(B) any land not within the limits of any Indian reservation, pueblo, or rancheria title to which was on the date of enactment of this section held by—

“(i) the United States for the benefit of any Indian tribe or individual; or

“(ii) any Indian tribe or individual subject to restriction by the United States against alienation;

“(C) any dependent Indian community; or

“(D) any land conveyed to any Alaska Native corporation under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.).

“(6) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term ‘Indian tribe’ means any Indian tribe, band, nation, or other organized group or community, including any Alaskan Native village or regional or village corporation as defined in or established pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.), that is recognized as eligible for the special programs and services provided by the United States to Indians because of their status as Indians.

“(7) RENEWABLE ENERGY.—The term ‘renewable energy’ means electric energy generated by a renewable energy resource.

“(8) RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCE.—The term ‘renewable energy resource’ means solar, wind, ocean, tidal, geothermal energy, biomass, landfill gas, incremental hydropower, or hydrokinetic energy.

“(9) REPOWERING OR COFIRING INCREMENT.—The term ‘repowering or cofiring increment’ means—

“(A) the additional generation from a modification that is placed in service on or after the date of enactment of this section, to expand electricity production at a facility used to generate electric energy from a renewable energy resource;

“(B) the additional generation above the average generation during the 3-year period ending on the date of enactment of this section at a facility used to generate electric energy from a renewable energy resource or to cofire biomass that was placed in service before the date of enactment of this section; or

“(C) the portion of the electric generation from a facility placed in service on or after the date of enactment of this section, or a modification to a facility placed in service before the date of enactment of this section made on or after January 1, 2001, associated with cofiring biomass.

“(10) RETAIL ELECTRIC SUPPLIER.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘retail electric supplier’ means a person that sells electric energy to electric consumers (other than consumers in Hawaii) that sold not less than 1,000,000 megawatt hours of electric energy to electric consumers for purposes other than resale during the preceding calendar year.

“(B) INCLUSION.—The term ‘retail electric supplier’ includes a person that sells electric energy to electric consumers that, in combination with the sales of any affiliate organized after the date of enactment of this section, sells not less than 1,000,000 megawatt hours of electric energy to consumers for purposes other than resale.

“(C) SALES TO PARENT COMPANIES OR AFFILIATES.—For purposes of this paragraph, sales by any person to a parent company or to other affiliates of the person shall not be treated as sales to electric consumers.

“(D) GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), the term ‘retail electric supplier’ does not include—

“(I) the United States, a State, any political subdivision of a State, or any agency, authority, or instrumentality of the United States, State, or political subdivision; or

“(II) a rural electric cooperative.

“(ii) INCLUSION.—The term ‘retail electric supplier’ includes an entity that is a political subdivision of a State, or an agency, authority, or instrumentality of the United States, a State, a political subdivision of a State, a rural electric cooperative that sells electric energy to electric consumers, or any other entity that sells electric energy to electric consumers that would not otherwise qualify as a retail electric supplier if the en-

tity notifies the Secretary that the entity voluntarily agrees to participate in the Federal renewable electricity standard program.

“(b) COMPLIANCE.—For calendar year 2014 and each calendar year thereafter, each retail electric supplier shall meet the requirements of subsection (c) by submitting to the Secretary, not later than April 1 of the following calendar year, 1 or more of the following:

“(1) Federal renewable energy credits issued under subsection (e).

“(2) Certification of the renewable energy generated and electricity savings pursuant to the funds associated with State compliance payments as specified in subsection (e)(4)(G).

“(3) Alternative compliance payments pursuant to subsection (h).

“(c) REQUIRED ANNUAL PERCENTAGE.—For each of calendar years 2014 through 2039, the required annual percentage of the base quantity of electricity of a retail electric supplier that shall be generated from renewable energy resources, or otherwise credited towards the percentage requirement pursuant to subsection (d), shall be the applicable percentage specified in the following table:

Calendar Years	Required Amount percentage
2014	6.0
2015	8.5
2016	8.5
2017	11.0
2018	11.0
2019	14.0
2020	14.0
2021	17.5
2022	17.5
2023	21.0
2024	21.0
2025	23.0
2026 and thereafter through 2039	25.0.

“(d) RENEWABLE ENERGY CREDITS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A retail electric supplier may satisfy the requirements of subsection (b)(1) through the submission of Federal renewable energy credits—

“(A) issued to the retail electric supplier under subsection (e);

“(B) obtained by purchase or exchange under subsection (f); or

“(C) borrowed under subsection (g).

“(2) FEDERAL RENEWABLE ENERGY CREDITS.—A Federal renewable energy credit may be counted toward compliance with subsection (b)(1) only once.

“(e) ISSUANCE OF FEDERAL RENEWABLE ENERGY CREDITS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall establish by rule a program—

“(A) to verify and issue Federal renewable energy credits to generators of renewable energy;

“(B) to track the sale, exchange, and retirement of the credits; and

“(C) to enforce the requirements of this section.

“(2) EXISTING NON-FEDERAL TRACKING SYSTEMS.—To the maximum extent practicable, in establishing the program, the Secretary shall rely on existing and emerging State or regional tracking systems that issue and track non-Federal renewable energy credits.

“(3) APPLICATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An entity that generates electric energy through the use of a renewable energy resource may apply to the Secretary for the issuance of renewable energy credits.

“(B) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible for the issuance of the credits, the applicant shall demonstrate to the Secretary that—

“(i) the electric energy will be transmitted onto the grid; or

“(ii) in the case of a generation offset, the electric energy offset would have otherwise been consumed onsite.

“(C) CONTENTS.—The application shall indicate—

“(i) the type of renewable energy resource that is used to produce the electricity;

“(ii) the location at which the electric energy will be produced; and

“(iii) any other information the Secretary determines appropriate.

“(4) QUANTITY OF FEDERAL RENEWABLE ENERGY CREDITS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, the Secretary shall issue to a generator of electric energy 1 Federal renewable energy credit for each kilowatt hour of electric energy generated by the use of a renewable energy resource at an eligible facility.

“(B) INCREMENTAL HYDROPOWER.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—For purpose of compliance with this section, Federal renewable energy credits for incremental hydropower shall be based on the increase in average annual generation resulting from the efficiency improvements or capacity additions.

“(ii) WATER FLOW INFORMATION.—The incremental generation shall be calculated using the same water flow information that is—

“(I) used to determine a historic average annual generation baseline for the hydroelectric facility; and

“(II) certified by the Secretary or the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

“(iii) OPERATIONAL CHANGES.—The calculation of the Federal renewable energy credits for incremental hydropower shall not be based on any operational changes at the hydroelectric facility that is not directly associated with the efficiency improvements or capacity additions.

“(C) INDIAN LAND.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall issue 2 renewable energy credits for each kilowatt hour of electric energy generated and supplied to the grid in a calendar year through the use of a renewable energy resource at an eligible facility located on Indian land.

“(ii) BIOMASS.—For purposes of this paragraph, renewable energy generated by biomass cofired with other fuels is eligible for 2 credits only if the biomass was grown on the land.

“(D) ON-SITE ELIGIBLE FACILITIES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of electric energy generated by a renewable energy resource at an on-site eligible facility that is not larger than 1 megawatt in capacity and is used to offset all or part of the requirements of a customer for electric energy, the Secretary shall issue 3 renewable energy credits to the customer for each kilowatt hour generated.

“(ii) INDIAN LAND.—In the case of an on-site eligible facility on Indian land, the Secretary shall issue not more than 3 credits per kilowatt hour.

“(E) COMBINATION OF RENEWABLE AND NON-RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES.—If both a renewable energy resource and a nonrenewable energy resource are used to generate the electric energy, the Secretary shall issue the Federal renewable energy credits based on the proportion of the renewable energy resources used.

“(F) RETAIL ELECTRIC SUPPLIERS.—If a generator has sold electric energy generated through the use of a renewable energy resource to a retail electric supplier under a contract for power from an existing facility and the contract has not determined ownership of the Federal renewable energy credits associated with the generation, the Secretary shall issue the Federal renewable energy credits to the retail electric supplier for the duration of the contract.

“(G) COMPLIANCE WITH STATE RENEWABLE PORTFOLIO STANDARD PROGRAMS.—Payments made by a retail electricity supplier, directly or indirectly, to a State for compliance with a State renewable portfolio standard program, or for an alternative compliance mechanism, shall be valued at 1 credit per kilowatt hour for the purpose of subsection (b)(2) based on the quantity of electric energy generation from renewable resources that results from the payments.

“(f) RENEWABLE ENERGY CREDIT TRADING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A Federal renewable energy credit may be sold, transferred, or exchanged by the entity to whom the credit is issued or by any other entity that acquires the Federal renewable energy credit, other than renewable energy credits from existing facilities.

“(2) CARRYOVER.—A Federal renewable energy credit for any year that is not submitted to satisfy the minimum renewable generation requirement of subsection (c) for that year may be carried forward for use pursuant to subsection (b)(1) within the next 3 years.

“(3) DELEGATION.—The Secretary may delegate to an appropriate market-making entity the administration of a national tradeable renewable energy credit market for purposes of creating a transparent national market for the sale or trade of renewable energy credits.

“(g) RENEWABLE ENERGY CREDIT BORROWING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than December 31, 2014, a retail electric supplier that has reason to believe the retail electric supplier will not be able to fully comply with subsection (b) may—

“(A) submit a plan to the Secretary demonstrating that the retail electric supplier will earn sufficient Federal renewable energy credits within the next 3 calendar years that, when taken into account, will enable the retail electric supplier to meet the requirements of subsection (b) for calendar year 2014 and the subsequent calendar years involved; and

“(B) on the approval of the plan by the Secretary, apply Federal renewable energy credits that the plan demonstrates will be earned within the next 3 calendar years to meet the requirements of subsection (b) for each calendar year involved.

“(2) REPAYMENT.—The retail electric supplier shall repay all of the borrowed Federal renewable energy credits by submitting an equivalent number of Federal renewable energy credits, in addition to the credits otherwise required under subsection (b), by calendar year 2022 or any earlier deadlines specified in the approved plan.

“(h) ALTERNATIVE COMPLIANCE PAYMENTS.—As a means of compliance under subsection (b)(4), the Secretary shall accept payment equal to the lesser of—

“(1) 200 percent of the average market value of Federal renewable energy credits and Federal energy efficiency credits for the applicable compliance period; or

“(2) 3 cents per kilowatt hour (as adjusted on January 1 of each year following calendar year 2006 based on the implicit price deflator for the gross national product).

“(i) INFORMATION COLLECTION.—The Secretary may collect the information necessary to verify and audit—

“(1)(A) the annual renewable energy generation of any retail electric supplier; and

“(B) Federal renewable energy credits submitted by a retail electric supplier pursuant to subsection (b)(1);

“(2) the validity of Federal renewable energy credits submitted for compliance by a retail electric supplier to the Secretary; and

“(3) the quantity of electricity sales of all retail electric suppliers.

“(j) ENVIRONMENTAL SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Incremental hydropower shall be subject to all applicable environmental laws and licensing and regulatory requirements.

“(k) STATE PROGRAMS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this section diminishes any authority of a State or political subdivision of a State—

“(A) to adopt or enforce any law (including regulations) respecting renewable energy, including programs that exceed the required quantity of renewable energy under this section; or

“(B) to regulate the acquisition and disposition of Federal renewable energy credits by retail electric suppliers.

“(2) COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION.—No law or regulation referred to in paragraph (1)(A) shall relieve any person of any requirement otherwise applicable under this section.

“(3) COORDINATION WITH STATE PROGRAM.—The Secretary, in consultation with States that have in effect renewable energy programs, shall—

“(A) preserve the integrity of the State programs, including programs that exceed the required quantity of renewable energy under this section; and

“(B) facilitate coordination between the Federal program and State programs.

“(4) EXISTING RENEWABLE ENERGY PROGRAMS.—In the regulations establishing the program under this section, the Secretary shall incorporate common elements of existing renewable energy programs, including State programs, to ensure administrative ease, market transparency and effective enforcement.

“(5) MINIMIZATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE BURDENS AND COSTS.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall work with the States to minimize administrative burdens and costs to retail electric suppliers.

“(1) RECOVERY OF COSTS.—An electric utility that has sales of electric energy that are subject to rate regulation (including any utility with rates that are regulated by the Commission and any State regulated electric utility) shall not be denied the opportunity to recover the full amount of the prudently incurred incremental cost of renewable energy obtained to comply with the requirements of subsection (b).

“(m) PROGRAM REVIEW.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall enter into an arrangement with the National Academy of Sciences under which the Academy shall conduct a comprehensive evaluation of all aspects of the program established under this section.

“(2) EVALUATION.—The study shall include an evaluation of—

“(A) the effectiveness of the program in increasing the market penetration and lowering the cost of the eligible renewable energy technologies;

“(B) the opportunities for any additional technologies and sources of renewable energy emerging since the date of enactment of this section;

“(C) the impact on the regional diversity and reliability of supply sources, including the power quality benefits of distributed generation;

“(D) the regional resource development relative to renewable potential and reasons for any investment in renewable resources; and

“(E) the net cost/benefit of the renewable electricity standard to the national and State economies, including—

“(i) retail power costs;

“(ii) the economic development benefits of investment;

“(iii) avoided costs related to environmental and congestion mitigation investments that would otherwise have been required;

“(iv) the impact on natural gas demand and price; and

“(v) the effectiveness of green marketing programs at reducing the cost of renewable resources.

“(3) REPORT.—Not later than January 1, 2018, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report describing the results of the evaluation and any recommendations for modifications and improvements to the program.

“(n) STATE RENEWABLE ENERGY ACCOUNT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the Treasury a State renewable energy account.

“(2) DEPOSITS.—All money collected by the Secretary from the alternative compliance payments under subsection (h) shall be deposited into the State renewable energy account established under paragraph (1).

“(3) GRANTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Proceeds deposited in the State renewable energy account shall be used by the Secretary, subject to annual appropriations, for a program to provide grants—

“(i) to the State agency responsible for administering a fund to promote renewable energy generation for customers of the State or an alternative agency designated by the State; or

“(ii) if no agency described in clause (i), to the State agency developing State energy conservation plans under section 362 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6322).

“(B) USE.—The grants shall be used for the purpose of—

“(i) promoting renewable energy production; and

“(ii) providing energy assistance and weatherization services to low-income consumers.

“(C) CRITERIA.—The Secretary may issue guidelines and criteria for grants awarded under this paragraph.

“(D) STATE-APPROVED FUNDING MECHANISMS.—At least 75 percent of the funds provided to each State for each fiscal year shall be used to promote renewable energy production through grants, production incentives, or other State-approved funding mechanisms.

“(E) ALLOCATION.—The funds shall be allocated to the States on the basis of retail electric sales subject to the renewable electricity standard under this section or through voluntary participation.

“(F) RECORDS.—State agencies receiving grants under this paragraph shall maintain such records and evidence of compliance as the Secretary may require.”

“(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. prec. 2601) is amended by adding at the end of the items relating to title VI the following:

“Sec. 609. Rural and remote communities electrification grants.

“Sec. 610. Renewable electricity standard.”

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR,
AND PENSIONS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will to meet on May 8, 2014, at 10 a.m. in room SD-106 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Hearing on the nomination of the Secretary of Health and Human Services—Designate, Sylvia Mathews Burwell.”

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact Emily Schlichting of the committee staff on (202) 224-6840.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR,
AND PENSIONS

Mr. HARKINS. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will to meet on May 13, 2014, at 10 a.m. in room SD-430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Strengthening Minority Serving Institutions: Best Practices and Innovations for Student Success."

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact Aissa Canchola of the committee staff on (202) 224-2009.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO
MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 6, 2014, at 9:30 a.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 6, 2014, at 10 a.m., in room SD-215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "New Routes for Funding and Financing Highways and Transit."

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 6, 2014, at 3 p.m., to hold a hearing entitled "Ukraine—Countering Russian Intervention and Supporting a Democratic State."

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 6, 2014, at 2:30 p.m.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS AND THE
FEDERAL WORKFORCE

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on the Efficiency and Effectiveness of Federal Programs and the Federal Workforce of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 6, 2014, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "A More Efficient and Effective Government: Cultivating the Federal Workforce."

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

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator LANDRIEU, I ask unanimous consent that Megan Brewster, a fellow in Senator LANDRIEU's office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the 113th Congress.

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

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUILDING
HEIGHT RULES CLARIFICATION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 4192, which was received from the House and is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4192) to amend the Act entitled "An Act to regulate the height of buildings in the District of Columbia" to clarify the rules of the District of Columbia regarding human occupancy of penthouses above the top story of the building upon which the penthouse is placed.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent the bill be read three times and passed and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The bill (H.R. 4192) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

NATIONAL CHARTER SCHOOLS
WEEK

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 438 submitted earlier today by Senators LANDRIEU and ALEXANDER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 438) congratulating the students, parents, teachers, and administrators of charter schools across the United States for their ongoing contributions to education, and supporting the ideals and goals of the 15th annual National Charter Schools Week, to be held May 4 through May 10, 2014.

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

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

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

The resolution (S. Res. 438) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

NATIONAL SAFE DIGGING MONTH

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 439, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 439) supporting the goals and ideals of National Safe Digging Month.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 439) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MAY 7,
2014

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, May 7, 2014; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 2262, the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act, postclosure, and that the time during the adjournment count postclosure.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. DURBIN. The 30 hours of postclosure debate on the motion to proceed to S. 2262 would expire at 5:45 p.m. tomorrow. Senators will be notified when the next vote is scheduled.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. DURBIN. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:16 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, May 7, 2014, at 9:30 a.m.