

programs that fund training and education targeted specifically at the energy sector. I am sure the Federal bureaucrats in each of these three agencies are trying to do as best they can. But it can't possibly be necessary or, for that matter, wise for all three agencies to be doing the same thing.

The obvious solution is for the Department of Energy to ensure there are no federally funded programs with the same stated objectives as the programs they are already administering.

My amendment requires the Secretary of Energy to coordinate with the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Education prior to issuing any career skills and workforce training funding opportunity announcements to ensure that these three departments are not issuing redundant and overlapping grants.

We cannot keep spending more taxpayer dollars in the same inefficient ways. Energy efficiency is important, but far more important is our Nation's overall energy policy. We should be discussing energy efficiency only as part of that critical debate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I wish to speak about the debate which has gone on the last 2 days on this floor about two very important issues related to a stronger energy policy for America.

As I said earlier in the week, and I was proven to be correct, it is unlikely we would develop an energy policy in the next 4 days in open debate on the floor of the Senate. Lots of people came down and talked about things they thought should be in it. Many of those things I agree with, but there is a process we go through, and we are working through—not as quickly as some people would like, but we are making a lot of progress.

Right now on the floor of the Senate are two very important pillars or two very important cornerstones or two very important first steps which could be taken in the building of a stronger, more vibrant, more commonsense, more middle-class-friendly, more job-creating energy policy than the one we have right now.

The saddest thing about watching this debate or speeches which sort of parade as if it is a debate, but it is not really—pretend that it is a debate but it is not—the speeches we have heard are not outlining the truth to the American public about what is going on.

We have the opportunity the next time the Senate gathers early next week to have a cloture vote on an energy efficiency bill. That means bring debate to an end and vote on an energy efficiency bill which will create hundreds of thousands of jobs, supported by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the

American Chemistry Council, and the Environmental Defense Fund. Hundreds of organizations have come together across the political spectrum looking here for common sense and cooperation, and they are not finding much of either.

These coalitions have spent an enormous amount of time lobbying Members of the House and the Senate to pass an efficiency bill led by Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN, two very respected Members of this body—one Republican with strong conservative credentials, one Democrat with strong progressive credentials but both demonstrating in their career the ability to work together and find common ground, exactly what the American public is asking for. We can ask any Republican, any Democrat, any Independent, and they say: Can't you all work together and find a way forward?

So Senator PORTMAN and Senator SHAHEEN did. They brought a bill to committee. I wasn't the chair. I can't take credit for this. RON WYDEN is the chair and LISA MURKOWSKI is the ranking member. They can take credit for this. They came up with a fantastic bill which creates jobs, saves a lot of energy, and is our best source of energy through efficiency. It creates jobs right here in America. It is the cleanest energy we can produce.

So these two terrific Senators come and bring us a bill. It is debated in public, in committee, and amazingly comes out of committee I think on a vote of 19 to 3, a very important piece of building an energy policy.

Even as chair of this committee now—and I hope to remain chair for many years to come. There is an election between that and that aspirational goal, so we shall see. I would like to remain chair. But I can promise it is not going to be one bill which comes out of the energy committee that builds an energy policy.

First of all, part of the bills have to come out of the Finance Committee. They are about tax policy related to the generation of all sorts of different kinds of electricity not even in my jurisdiction. There are some issues that have to come out of the commerce committee, which has jurisdiction and authorization over pipelines. There are other committees that are going to have to contribute to strengthening and building an energy policy where America can be independent and secure, where we can have partnerships with Canada and Mexico, producing the cleanest fuels possible and generating electricity in the cleanest way possible, abundantly and affordably and reliably for our people, that will make manufacturing soar in this Nation, that will give opportunities for more domestic drilling both onshore and offshore.

The people I represent want this so badly, and they know it can happen. I am not sure why more Senators don't understand this can happen, but it is going to take cooperation. It is going

to take a little give-and-take. I guess that is too much to ask and that is so sad. I guess it is too much to ask for a little cooperation and a little give-and-take.

So this energy efficiency bill comes to the floor, and it is held up because many Members want other pieces of the energy plan. They most certainly have good ideas. Most certainly there are good ideas out there on both sides of the aisle, but there is one idea that is very powerful. To say how powerful it is, I am not going to read my words about it. I have already spoken about it is time to build the Keystone Pipeline now. It is time to stop studying now.

I respect the President's review of the situation. I disagree with the length of time he has taken and with the decision he made last week to continue to study. I have said respectfully to him: Mr. President, the time for studying is over. The time for building is now. The process has run its course over 5 years, five studies. Every one of them has come down on the side of building it for jobs, for security, and it is better for the environment to transport this product, these oil sands, from one of our best friends, Canada, by pipeline than by either rail or truck.

Everyone in this country knows how dangerous and crowded the highways and railways are. One does not need to serve on the transportation committee of the Senate or House to understand that issue. Every mother, every father, every 17-year-old with a driver's license—in our State it is 16, and maybe in some States it is 20—understands how scary it is to drive on highways with big trucks filled with, unfortunately, sometimes dangerous things.

Why would we want this for our children? Why can't we add to the 2.9 million miles of pipeline we have and build a pipeline with Canada? We are not talking about building a pipeline with Cuba or Venezuela. We are talking about Canada—our best ally, our greatest trading partner, and our partner on the frontlines of wars, in the research labs we partner with them—to build a pipeline to safely move oil they are going to produce one way or another because they need it for their economy and the world needs it. They have the highest environmental standards in the world.

Our highways are crowded. Our trains are crowded. Trains are colliding all over the country. Every morning in some section of the country there is another train that has run off the track with horrible materials being spilled into waters and rivers. I think Democrats are upset about that, Republicans are upset about it.

There is one very big idea, very big amendment to the efficiency bill I think the Republicans would truly like; that is, to have a vote on the Keystone Pipeline. As the chair of the committee, I know that is their strong feeling. I am a supporter of the Keystone Pipeline. So I think to myself: Let's see if we could maybe make this work.

The Republican leadership has been saying for months they want a vote—not a resolution, not a sense of the Senate, which we have already had, but a straight up-or-down vote on a directive to build the pipeline.

So I think to myself: This seems to be fair, a little give-and-take. Democrats aren't happy—not everybody—with the Keystone Pipeline, not all Republicans are happy with the efficiency, but the business community is broadly supportive of both and so are labor unions. So we have labor unions, the business community, and the environmental community which is strongly in favor of efficiency.

Of course many of the strongest voices are not for Keystone and I understand that. We have a different view. I respectfully disagree with their position, but this is a big country. It is a democracy, and we represent that democracy right here at these desks.

So I think to myself in my Louisiana way: Maybe if every side gives a little bit, we could get two very important things done, when nothing much is getting done in the energy sector, which is what we need to move our economy forward, to get labor unions working, to get people who aren't in labor unions working, to create jobs—hundreds of thousands, millions of jobs. Everybody is talking about that in their campaigns.

It is upsetting to me to know how many people are running for reelection in this Chamber who go home and talk about jobs and then turn around and come here and vote no. They talk about jobs at home and vote no in the U.S. Senate—no for efficiency jobs, no for the Keystone Pipeline.

It is very interesting. I am going to read what some of the Republican leaders have said about Keystone. Maybe they have changed their minds since they have said these, and over the weekend maybe the press could ask them if they have had a change of heart.

Senator WICKER said on January 25, 2013:

Many Americans understand the economic importance of moving forward with the Keystone pipeline and what that means for job creation and energy security in the United States. It is imperative that we continue to press the Administration to approve this critical project.

So next week on Monday or Tuesday, my friend, the Senator from Mississippi, is going to have an opportunity to vote to press the President on Keystone and to vote for a bill that he is a cosponsor of—the energy efficiency bill. Again, he is going to have a chance to press the President of the United States to build the Keystone Pipeline, using all the power he has as a Senator from the State of Mississippi to do that, and to vote on the energy efficiency bill. I hope he will follow his words and his promise.

Senator CHAMBLISS and Senator ISAKSON, in a letter to President Obama on February 11, 2014, said:

By any reasonable standard, the Keystone Pipeline is clearly in our national interest. Keystone will greatly advance our energy security interests by establishing a reliable supply of oil from one of the most stable trading partners and closest friends, and will lead to economic growth and help create good jobs, sustainable jobs for U.S. workers.

I would like to add my name to this. They might not want me to, but I would like to add my name so it would say that Senator ISAKSON, Senator CHAMBLISS, and Senator LANDRIEU believe in this. I couldn't have said it better myself.

So I wonder what they will do next week when we have a chance to vote on the efficiency bill and on the pipeline.

Senator CORNYN, the minority whip, on May 7, said:

It might be better to build this pipeline so we could safely transport oil from Canada down to refineries in my State where it can be converted to gasoline, aviation fuel and the like, and the process will create an awful lot of jobs.

May 7 floor statement from Senator CORNYN.

This pipeline connects to refineries in Texas. So I wonder, the Senators from Texas—Senator CRUZ, Senator CORNYN—are you going to vote for an up-or-down vote on Keystone and vote on the efficiency bill? You can vote no, you can vote yes on the efficiency bill. Energy efficiency may not be important to people in Texas. The chambers of commerce in Texas may not have a position. I think they are very supportive, from what I have looked at, and the national chamber of commerce is on board. Maybe that is not important to them, but I think it is.

I spend a lot of time in Texas. It is a neighboring State. They have a big economy. I do a lot of work for their coastal restoration. People tell me that even though jobs are plentiful in Texas, thank goodness—not in every community but in many communities and in Louisiana—we can always use more. Building and construction jobs are local in nature, putting our architects and engineers to work. The engineers were in my office last week saying: Senator LANDRIEU, some of our engineers are busy, but some of them aren't, and we could put a lot of engineers to work on this energy efficiency bill.

So if Senator CORNYN wants to actually build the pipeline and press the President to build it, he is going to have a chance to vote up or down on whether he wants to do that, and the opportunity is to do it in conjunction with an up-or-down vote on an energy efficiency bill. Democrats get a little bit of what they want, Republicans get a little bit of what they want, and what the country gets is cooperation and a chance for jobs, which is all they want, really—good jobs.

Senator INHOFE:

President Obama and the administration no longer have a valid reason to stall the final stages of the pipeline. Approving the Keystone Pipeline is one thing the President can do today with his pen that will create thousands of jobs.

The President said he is not going to do it. The question is, Will Senator INHOFE join with enough of us to pass a bill that presses him to do it? I think if we could get the vote on the floor, we might be able to get our 60 votes. I have never said we were guaranteed—there is no guarantee, but we are very close. We have 11 Democratic cosponsors, including myself, on a bill with 45 Republicans. We are just three or four short. I think that would be defined as “pressing.”

Senator BURR said this in January 2012:

Today I join 43 other Senators in introducing a bill to continue construction on the Keystone XL Pipeline, a project that will take great steps towards improving our energy security as well as create jobs for thousands of American workers. Despite claims that promoting energy security and creating jobs are top priorities, President Obama has rejected the permit earlier this month.

Senator MCCONNELL said:

The Keystone Pipeline—a good example of something that would create jobs for the American people.

As Senator MCCONNELL knows, there might be quite a few people from Kentucky who are out of work who could travel not too far. It is better to work at home and be with your family and kids—I understand that—but lots of times people have to travel distances to work. Sometimes people want to travel those distances because the jobs available to them at home are minimum wage, and if they travel and get out, they can make handsome sums—working tough hours and long hours, but people have been doing it for decades. I know there are people in Kentucky who would like jobs. So I am hoping that next week when Senator MCCONNELL has some time to think through this as the minority leader, he can come to the floor and say: You know what, this isn't such a bad deal after all.

Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN have presented a bill that is supported by the Chamber of Commerce and the Environmental Defense Fund and so many business organizations that depend on me and Senator REID to help them create private sector jobs in America.

This isn't a government program. This is creating private sector high-paying jobs, saving energy. We have been working on it for 5 years. This is not a new idea. This is not something Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN are doing in an election year.

I thank Senator SHAHEEN for her great leadership. She started working on this when she was Governor, before she even got to the Senate of the United States. She is an expert on energy efficiency. I can remember when former-President Clinton came to our caucus several years ago. Senator SHAHEEN was one of the first to stand up and ask him several important and very timely questions and say: Mr. President, you have given us a way forward here on a piece of energy legislation that I think both Republicans and

Democrats can support. I am looking forward to leading it.

This was years ago. This isn't an election-year ploy; this is a half a decade of work.

So my question to my Republican friends is, Do you want to build the Keystone Pipeline or do you want an issue to talk about? Because it seems to me that we can get a vote on the efficiency bill and on the Keystone Pipeline, so we actually are doing what you all say you want to do, which is to press the President.

That is all our power is. I know it is hard for people to realize this, but our powers are limited by the Constitution. We are Senators; we are not Presidents. We have equal power to the Presidency, not more and not less. So while some people might want to run around and convince people in their hometowns that they have more power than the President, they do not. They have equal power. So let's exercise it. Let's press, which is what our job is—pressing the administration. Sometimes administrations don't want to do what Congress does, so Congress presses forward. But we don't want to press, I don't think. I think they want to talk or have an issue to talk about.

I would like to have a vote. I would like to separate the wheat from the chaff, clear the fog. This is not complicated at all.

You have heard a lot about amendments, amendments, amendments. There is one thing that is more important than all the amendments—more important than Senator VITTER's amendment, Senator BARRASSO's amendment, more important than any amendments on our side—that is, are we going to vote to build the Keystone Pipeline? Right now, 70 percent of the people of the United States support building the pipeline. Right now, the studies have been completed. Right now, the evidence is in.

I know there are people on this floor who disagree, and I want to be as respectful as I can. There is no one on the floor here debating this now, but if you did come, I would most certainly appreciate you talking about it if you are opposed. I know there are people who still feel as if Keystone is not the right thing to do, but the evidence is in on that, and we should build it. It is important to secure America's domestic production. It is important for America to not rely on outsiders—particularly those who aren't our friends—for the energy we need to keep our economy growing and strong.

It is very disheartening for me to read the headlines every day—and I know from my constituents that it is for them, too—and see what is going on in Ukraine and watch Europe not being able to be as strong as I know Europe wants to be. I know they want to be stronger, but because they depend so much on Russia for their gas and they are not energy independent, they have to be careful about what they do to come to the Ukraine's aid. Anybody

can understand that. It doesn't take a diplomat to explain what is going on.

Does America ever want to be too weak to stand up to Russia? I don't think so. Does America ever want to be too weak to stand up to China? No. Do we ever want to be too weak to stand up to India if we have to, or Venezuela? No. So build the pipeline. We have already built 2.9 million miles of pipe. I have 9,000 miles of pipeline in Louisiana. We have been building them a long time. Yes, sometimes they have not been laid correctly. Yes, Federal agencies and State agencies have failed the people in many instances in making sure the environment was as protected as it should be. But we know how to build energy infrastructure. And I will tell you that the people of Louisiana would much rather build infrastructure than put uniforms on our sons and daughters and send them halfway around the world so we can get gasoline in our cars.

Let me put it plainly. I lost 44 men in Iraq and Afghanistan. Gone. I have hundreds of wounded soldiers. When you ask me what the price is—build the Keystone Pipeline or continue to have wars over oil—I don't know, it is pretty easy for me.

I am not going to let people come down to the floor here and get away with talking about these amendments because it is not about amendments. It is not about process. It is about whether this Senate wants to press this legislation. Press. That is all we can do. We can't make the President do anything unless we can override the veto if he vetoes it, and that has happened before—not often, but it has happened—but that is what the Constitution says.

So let's take it one step at a time. Let's press on to build the pipeline, get an up-or-down vote. Let's move forward on an energy efficiency bill that the House has actually, amazingly, passed a good version of. Think about it. Not only has a Democratic-controlled Senate passed an efficiency bill with seven Republican cosponsors and at least a dozen more who I know would vote for the bill if allowed to by their leader, Mr. MCCONNELL, but the Republican-controlled House has already passed an energy efficiency bill. So we would just go to conference with these two bills and work out the details, and all of these organizations that have lobbied and spent money and time to try to explain this to us—“Please, can you all help us create jobs we need right here at home? We would be so happy and encouraged that the Democratic process is working”—showing them that we are hearing them and listening to them would be a really terrific step forward.

Finally, you will hear some Republican leaders say: Well, Senator, that sounds great, but you have to deliver us 60 votes for Keystone.

No, I never said I could deliver 60 votes for Keystone. I said I would try to deliver 60 votes. That is all I can do.

I said I would try, and I have tried my best. We had three Democrats last

year. We now have 11 Democrats. I am not doing this by myself. Senator HEITKAMP has been extraordinarily helpful, Senator McCASKILL has been wonderful, and Senator TESTER has been helping, as has Senator DONNELLY. So many of our colleagues have been working very hard over here. We are so close. It is not about amendments, it is about Keystone. That is the amendment, Keystone.

If we can have a separate vote on Keystone and a separate vote on energy efficiency, we can press the House to act and get those two matters, hopefully, to the President's desk. That is the best we can do. What the President decides to do after that, I don't know. He has a responsibility, and we have a responsibility. He will exercise it as he sees fit, but we need to do our job. We can't worry about doing his job. He needs to do his job.

It is time to build the Keystone Pipeline.

I will submit for the RECORD the dozens of comments made by my Republican friends about how important it is to build the pipeline. They didn't say: Let's build the pipeline and also pass three other important pieces of legislation. They didn't say: Let's build the pipeline, but we don't really want to build the pipeline until we can get votes on X, Y, and Z. They said the most important thing we can do—and 70 percent of the American public supports it, and it is growing every day—is to build this pipeline. Labor and business support it. A broad range of people supports it, with the exception of Nebraska, which has not made its final decision. Our law allows for Nebraska courts to make the final decision about where that pipeline will be laid because the people of Nebraska did not want it laid in one of the largest water aquifers in North America, so they moved the line, which is appropriate, and so that is being worked out. Other than that, we are ready to go.

I particularly hope the people of Kentucky will ask Senator MITCH MCCONNELL if he is ready to build the Keystone Pipeline and if he is ready to vote to press the President to build the Keystone Pipeline, which is within the limits of our power. Our powers are limited, but we could exercise them to the fullest. I hope we will do that, and I hope next week we will get a straight-up vote on the efficiency bill Senator PORTMAN and Senator SHAHEEN have worked so hard on that is supported by a broad range of coalition members, and I hope that coalition will generate and get its members activated between now and Tuesday.

I hope those in America who want to build this Keystone Pipeline will also activate their phones, their emails, and contact their legislators, particularly our two leaders HARRY REID and MITCH MCCONNELL, who will ultimately be responsible for whether these votes occur.

All we can do is do our best. I think I have demonstrated a real effort to get

this done, and I thank my colleagues over here who have been extraordinarily helpful. We hope we can find common sense, common ground, and do what the Senate of the United States can do, press forward to create jobs for the American people.

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

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am here now for the 66th consecutive week the Senate has been in session to ask my colleagues to wake up to the threat of climate change. The topic has become taboo for Republicans in Congress, and so the discussion on climate change is somewhat one-sided around here, but the recent comprehensive National Climate Assessment released this week shows Americans are witnessing the effects of climate change in every State of our Nation.

Colleagues, read the assessment. Find out how climate change is affecting every region of the country.

In March I visited Iowa, where I heard over and over that Iowans are awake to the threat of climate change and are actually ready to hold Presidential candidates accountable on climate when they go there for the first-in-the-Nation Presidential caucus.

Over the April recess I spent 5 days traveling down the southeastern coast of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida. I went there to talk to people on that coast firsthand. I met with scientists, students, outdoorsmen, faith leaders, and State and local officials—people of diverse backgrounds, but all of them have one thing in common: their concern for the coastal communities they love. These folks know climate change is real because they see it where they live. They are not waiting around for this Chamber to get organized. They are acting.

Last week I spoke here about the business owners, community leaders, and researchers I met in North Carolina. From there I headed into South Carolina. My first stop was the University of South Carolina's Baruch Institute for Marine and Coastal Sciences.

At the Baruch Institute, I learned how salt marshes—the ocean's nurseries and our first line of defense against storms and hurricanes—have to adapt to rising sea levels. These marshes retain sediment as the tide goes in and out, and they slowly increase their elevation as the sea level rises, if given enough time.

Dr. Jim Morris, director of the Baruch Institute, has been studying these

marshes for decades. He is a renowned expert. He explained that sea level rise is starting to happen so fast that the marshes may not keep up. If they can't keep up, then the marsh deteriorates to mudflat, and the mudflat deteriorates to open water, which is already happening in places I visited. That deterioration from marsh to mudflat can devastate coastal property, infrastructure, and wildlife.

Business as usual means sea level rise increases of 3 feet or more by 2100. This chart illustrates what the Baruch Marine Institute and surrounding marshes would look like after this sea level change—before and after. It would be pretty much a goner.

Next I visited the Cape Romain National Wildlife Refuge, which extends for 22 miles and encompasses more than 6,000 acres of barrier islands, salt marshes, intricate coastal waterways, sandy beaches, fresh and brackish water impoundments, and maritime forest. Sea level rise threatens this area as well.

One signal: Last year over 70 percent of endangered loggerhead turtle nests had to be relocated by people in order to prevent them from being flooded. This is a place where these turtles have been nesting for centuries, but now look at how coastal erosion is affecting their nests. These are the turtle eggs, and the coast has eroded. National Park Service officials there told me:

This is not just about wildlife. This is about the community. It's about your livelihood and well-being.

They are right.

According to a foreword in the report titled "Climate Change Impacts to Natural Resources in South Carolina" by Alvin Taylor, director of the South Carolina Department of Natural Resources—I mean, tell me how people from South Carolina are denying climate change is real when the State published a report called "Climate Change Impacts to Natural Resources in South Carolina."

Here is what the report says:

Climate-related changes may adversely affect the environment in many ways, potentially disrupting or damaging ecological services, water supply, agriculture, forestry, fish and wildlife species, endangered species, and commercial and recreational fishing . . . Fishing, hunting, and wildlife viewing contributes almost \$2.2 billion annually to South Carolina's economy and supports nearly 59,000 jobs.

How can they pretend it is not real? Business owners and executives in South Carolina are starting to take action on climate change. There is a South Carolina Small Business Chamber of Commerce, headed by Frank Knapp, who has organized something called the South Carolina Businesses Acting on Rising Seas to raise awareness among businesses and their customers of the threat posed to the Palmetto State. In cities including Charleston and Myrtle Beach, coastal businesses threatened by rising sea levels are displaying strips of blue tape in their window fronts where the water

level would be to show their support for taking action.

I continued down the coast and visited Charleston's Fort Johnson, where marine research facilities are located for NOAA, the College of Charleston, the South Carolina Department of Natural Resources, and the Medical University of South Carolina. The tide gauges in Charleston are up over 10 inches since the early 1920s. Deny that all you want. It is a measurement, it is not a theory.

This chart shows what Fort Johnson would look like with 3 feet of sea level rise, which is projected for 2100. Nearly all the research facilities at Fort Johnson would be lost ironically to the very seas their research helps us understand. Three feet could actually be on the low end of sea level rise by 2100. This chart of Fort Johnson demonstrates what 3 feet of sea level rise looks like.

During my visit at Fort Johnson, I heard from students, faculty, elected officials, and Federal and State employees all working at the leading edge of climate change and adaptation research. One scientist, Dr. Peter Moeller, described how climate change is allowing algae species to grow in waters where they were previously not found. As these algae species migrate to new areas, they encounter bacteria, fungi, and other unfamiliar algae. As Dr. Moeller explained to me, under these conditions, previously nontoxic algae can make dangerous toxins that are novel to science and nature. It almost sounds as if science fiction, but these are the consequences of human-caused climate change.

My last stop in South Carolina was at a roundtable discussion at the Coastal Conservation League. There I heard from a diverse group of South Carolinians—researchers, environmental advocates, business owners, and faith leaders—about their efforts to raise awareness to the threats of climate change and to promote clean energy. I learned this: South Carolinians are not afraid to talk about climate change and how it is affecting their State—at least not until they get to Washington.

When WCBD-TV in Charleston asked Representative MARK SANFORD about my visit to his State, he actually said something quite nice. He said:

At our family farm in Beaufort, I've watched over the last 50 years as sea levels have risen and affected salt edges of the farm. I applaud Senator WHITEHOUSE for getting people together in the Lowcountry today to discuss this problem, and while we would likely approach solutions differently, building the conversation is a necessary first step.

That is a helpful opening, and I appreciate that.

Jim Gandy, chief meteorologist for WLTX Columbia, has been forecasting South Carolina weather for 28 years. He is affectionately known as South Carolina's weatherman. Jim was at the White House this week to interview President Obama about the National