

would also include BOP buses to move the detainees from the airfields to our facilities (a cost of approximately \$1,300 per bus trip). Thus, the total cost could reach approximately \$500,000.

Currently, there is not sufficient bedspace at any high-security Federal prison to confine these individuals. Our high-security institutions are operating at 55 percent above capacity. There are approximately 199,700 Federal inmates at present, and we are expecting the inmate population to increase to over 221,000 by the end of fiscal year 2011. The average yearly cost of confining a high-security inmate in the BOP is approximately \$25,400.

We would most likely confine these detainees in one or two penitentiaries. This would require us to transfer a sufficient number of inmates to other penitentiaries in order to create the necessary bedspace. Such transfers would add to the cost of confining the enemy combatants and would impose significant additional challenges on our agency (based on the level of crowding in all high-security BOP institutions).

Due to the unique status of enemy combatants and the probable lack of information about these individuals' histories of violent behavior or disruptive activities, it is unlikely that we would house these detainees with inmates in the general population of high-security institutions (with inmates serving sentences for Federal crimes and District of Columbia code offenses). Therefore, if transferred to BOP custody, these enemy combatants would most likely be confined in special units, segregated from the general inmate population. It is also likely that many of these individuals require separation from other enemy combatants. This kind of confinement is comparable to special housing units in BOP institutions (which are used for administrative detention and disciplinary segregation). These units are more costly to operate than general population units due to the increased staffing and enhanced security procedures needed for inmates who have separation requirements and/or who are potentially violent or dangerous.

The management of inmates in special housing units presents additional challenges due to the increased security required for these individuals. It would be even more challenging to confine enemy combatants who would likely have additional restrictions or requirements dictated by the Department of Defense. We are unsure how our inmate management principles, which focus on constructive staff-inmate interaction, maximum program involvement, and due process discipline would fit into the Department of Defense's requirements for the enemy combatants.

While it is not entirely clear where the BOP's obligations would begin and end with regard to the provision of basic inmate programs and services, we foresee the need for some special or enhanced services in order to provide the basic necessities to these enemy combatants. We would need to acquire translation services or transfer appropriate bilingual staff for us to communicate our expectations to these individuals and to allow these detainees to communicate their needs and concerns to us. We would need these translation services in order to provide appropriate visiting, telephone, and correspondence privileges to the detainees and, if required, to monitor these communications. We also would likely need to make accommodations with regard to our food service and religious programs to meet the cultural and religious requirements of these detainees.

I hope this helps you understand our concerns regarding the confinement of enemy

combatants. Please contact me if I can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

HARLEY G. LAPPIN,  
*Director.*

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I point out also that in a recent report, U.S. officials said the Taliban's new top operations officer in southern Afghanistan is a former prisoner at the Guantanamo detention center.

Pentagon and CIA officials said Abdullah Ghulam Rasoul was among 13 prisoners released to the Afghan Government in December 2007. He is now known as Mullah Abdullah Zakir, a name officials say is used by the Taliban leader in charge of operations against United States and Afghan forces in southern Afghanistan.

One intelligence official told the Associated Press that Rasoul's stated mission is to counter the growing U.S. troop surge. I wished to put that in the RECORD.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I inquire of the Chair, I was scheduled to speak after the Senator from Ohio. I understand he is not ready to speak yet and that it is permissible if I take some time now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. INHOFE. First of all, before I get into what I want to talk about, I have been listening to the Senator from Utah. I find it to be very interesting because his subject matter is also a mission of mine. I think a lot of people have not realized the problem we have with the bum raps given to Guantanamo Bay, and almost all of them are by people who have not been there. To my knowledge, almost without exception, those people who have gone down there—newspapers and publications making accusations of torture and human rights violations—once they go there and see it, you never hear from them again, and that includes Al-Jazeera and some of the Middle Eastern publications. I believe we have a problem with people who have somehow brought forth this idea that there have been abuses that haven't taken place. I think probably the most important part of the argument is that there is not another Guantanamo Bay; there is no place you can put these detainees.

As I said in my question to the Senator from Utah, what are we going to do with these some 245 detainees if they are not there? Also, with the escalation of activity in Afghanistan, what will we do with those detainees whom we will capture? The problem is, some people say they will be put in prisons in Afghanistan. There are two prisons there; however, they have said they will only take Afghans. If the terrorist who is caught is from Djibouti or Yemen or Saudi Arabia, there is no place else to put them other than Guantanamo Bay. It is a resource we need to have. We don't have a choice.

I believe our President was responding to a lot of activists who were upset

because during his inaugural address he didn't say anything about this, so they are making demands that he stop any kind of legal activity that is going on in the way of trials or tribunals and then close it in 12 months. You cannot do that until you determine how you are going to take care of the detainees who are currently there and those who will be there.

I feel strongly we are going to have to look out after the interests of the United States. Nothing could be worse than to take 15 to 17 installations within the continental United States and put terrorists there, only to serve as magnets for terrorist activity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for as much time as I may consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### GLOBAL WARMING

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, some things have happened recently regarding one of my favorite subjects, and that is global warming. Way back in the beginning of this issue—to give you a background, since the occupant of the chair wasn't here at that time—the Republicans were the majority, and I was chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee. We were within inches of ratifying the Kyoto Treaty.

Similar to everybody else, I assumed that manmade gases were causing global warming. Everybody said they did. The Wharton School of Economics came out with the Wharton Econometric Survey. They said it would cost—if we were to sign the Kyoto Treaty and live by the emissions requirements—between \$300 billion and \$330 billion a year. That was the range. That would be the result. It is something I looked at.

We started looking at the science, only to find out there is a lot of intimidation in the scientific community and most of this was originally brought by the United Nations. I have been one of the critics of the U.N. and a lot of things they do and don't do. If you will recall, when this first started, it was the U.N. IPCC, Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, that came up with the idea that manmade gases—CO<sub>2</sub>, methane—were the cause of the global warming.

Now, since that has been proven not to be true, and we are now in a cooling spell, they are trying to change the term to "climate change." We are not going to let them do that. It has always been "global warming." We looked at the science. We had bills coming up on the floor that would have addressed this. One was in 2005. At that time, I was kind of alone on the floor for 5 days, 10 hours a day, to try to explain why we could not impose the largest tax increase in history on the American people. So in looking at the cost of this thing, we started hearing

from a lot of scientists who had been intimidated but were now wanting to come out of the closet and tell the truth about their real feelings.

The reason I wished to come here today is because there is a Gallup Poll that came out yesterday. I wish to share that with you and with this body. A record high of 41 percent of Americans now say global warming is exaggerated. This is the highest level of public skepticism about mainstream reporting in more than a decade, according to the March 11, 2009 Gallup Poll survey. I use that poll because Gallup and the Pew organization have never been sympathetic to my view. Yet their poll was announced.

We should never underestimate the intelligence of the American people. Sadly, that is exactly what the promoters of manmade climate fears have consistently been doing. Keep in mind, the issue we are talking about is not whether there is global warming. We went through a period of global warming that ended 7 years ago. Now we clearly are in a cooling period. Prior to that, we have had several times—people forget, God is still up there. Throughout these written histories, we have had these cycles.

The interesting thing about this poll that came out yesterday is looking at the percentage of people who worry a great deal about the environment, this is a total change from what we have seen before. It is now—what is it, No. 9? The last thing is global warming. These are environmental concerns: pollution of drinking water, water pollution, toxic contamination of soil and water, and very last is global warming. There was another poll just about a month ago by Pew Research, I believe it was, and that one shows the same thing. I say this because of some of my colleagues who think the American people are believing this stuff—manmade gases making global warming.

This is January last month, and this is by the Pew Polling Group. This isn't just environmental issues; it says, "Name your major concern." No. 1, economy; No. 2, jobs. Where is global warming? No. 20, at the bottom, the very last one. That is something that has changed.

Getting back to the poll, the previous Gallup Poll released on Earth Day 2008 showed the American public's concern about manmade global warming is unchanged from 1989. This is after all the media hype, all the media talking about how bad man is.

By the way, I am going to pause here for a minute because in 2005 we debated a bill on this floor that would have—since we did not ratify the Kyoto treaty—said unilaterally what should we do in the United States because some people would like to believe this is a great problem. They said: Let's pass our own global warming bill in the United States. Think about that. If you are one who believes CO<sub>2</sub> and anthropogenic gases are causing global warming, if you really believe that in your

heart, what good would it do to do it only in the United States? If you do that, all these jobs are going to go to countries such as China, Mexico, India—places where they don't have emission controls—and you would have a net increase in CO<sub>2</sub> after we paid the tax and the punishment for it.

After one of the most expensive climate change fear campaigns in our Nation's history, there is no change in global warming concerns by Americans in the past two decades. This skepticism persists despite the Nobel Peace Prize jointly shared by former Vice President Al Gore and the United Nations.

By the way, I have to say I cannot think of one assertion that was made in the science fiction movie Al Gore put together that has not been refuted scientifically. I am talking about sea-level rises and all the rest of the things. Sure, it scared a lot of kids. A lot of kids had nightmares. Nobody now believes there is any science behind that particular movie.

The skepticism persists despite a \$300 million campaign to spread climate fears. Skepticism persists despite a daily drumbeat of scary scenarios promoted by the United Nations and the media of what could, might, or may happen 20, 30, 50, 100 years from now. In fact, global warming skepticism appears to have grown stronger as the shrillness of the climate fear campaign intensified.

The latest Gallup Poll released on March 11 further reveals the American public has a growing skepticism. A record-high 41 percent now say it is exaggerated. This represents the highest public opinion since the whole issue began. These dramatic polling results are not unexpected as prominent scientists around the world continue to speak out publicly for the first time to dissent from the Al Gore-United Nations and media-driven manmade intimidation on climate fears.

In addition, a steady stream of peer-reviewed studies, analyses, real-world data, and developments have further refuted the claims of manmade global warming fear activists.

Americans are finally catching on in large numbers that the U.N. IPCC is a political, not a scientific, organization. Interesting that when the U.N. IPCC comes out with their periodic reports, they never talk about the scientists. It is the politicians who are making the accusations or coming to the conclusions. So they have these briefs on the political analyses of these reports.

If new peer-reviewed studies are to be believed, today's high school kids watching Gore's movie will be nearing the senior citizen group AARP's membership age by the time warming allegedly resumes in 30 years. That is interesting because now they are talking about maybe it did not happen, maybe we were not in the middle of it in the middle nineties when they tried to get us to ratify the Kyoto treaty, but it is coming, maybe 30 years from now.

Dr. John Brignell, a skeptical UK emeritus engineering professor at the University of South Hampton, wrote in 2008:

The warmers—

He calls them—

are getting more and more like those traditional predictors of the end of the world who, when the event fails to happen on a due date, announce an error in their calculations and [they come up with] a new date.

That is what they are doing now.

Furthermore, I always believed the more global warming information people have, the less concerned they will become. That is obvious. That poll 5 years ago would have had this way up there somewhere around No. 3. Now it is No. 20. It just barely made the list.

Confirming this unintended consequence is a study by the scientific journal Risk Analysis released in February of 2008 which found that Gore and the media's attempts to scare the public "ironically may be having just the opposite effect." The study found that the more informed respondents "show less concern for global warming." The study found that "perhaps ironically, and certainly contrary to . . . the marketing of movies like the Ice Age and An Inconvenient Truth, the effects of information on both concern for global warming and responsibility for it are exactly the opposite of what were expected. Directly, the more information a person has about global warming, the less responsible he or she feels for it; and indirectly, the more information a person has about global warming, the less concerned he or she is for it."

Again, this is not me, JIM INHOFE, U.S. Senator, talking. This is Professor John Brignell. Certainly you cannot question his credentials.

Climate realism continues to be on the march.

I now report to you on the skeptical Heartland Institute's International Conference on Climate Change in New York, which just finished 3 days ago. It is brand new. As the most outspoken critic of manmade global warming alarmism in the United States, I am pleased to see the world's largest ever gathering of global warming skeptics assembled in New York City just this week to confront the issue, "Global warming: Was it ever really a crisis?" That was the title of the convention. All of these scientists from all over the world were taking part in it.

A lot has changed over the last 6 years since I started speaking out against the likes of Al Gore, the United Nations, and the Hollywood elitists. Perhaps the most notable change is the number of scientists no longer willing to be silenced. How do you silence a scientist? You take away their grants, whether they be Government grants or they come from the Heinz Foundation or the Pew Foundation or others. If you don't agree with us, certainly you should be punished.

I remember not too long ago on the Weather Channel—Heidi Cullen has

this weekly show. It is to promote the idea that man is responsible for global warming. She says: Any meteorologist who does not agree with me should be decertified. All of a sudden, everyone started yelling and screaming. The vast majority of meteorologists will agree with the comments I am making today.

Certainly since Al Gore made his movie, hundreds of scientists have come out of the woodwork to refute the claims made by the alarmists.

The gathering of roughly 800 scientists, economists, legislators, policy activists, and media representatives at the Second International Conference on Climate Change sponsored by the Heartland Institute provides clear evidence to the growing movements against alarmism—the world is coming to an end.

I am happy that important voices are being heard in New York, including Vaclav Klaus, the President of the Czech Republic. I was in the Czech Republic not too long ago. He couldn't have been nicer and more complimentary of me. He said: What they are trying to do is to punish us economically in our country and your country on science that is strictly not there.

In his remarks to the conference 3 days ago, Vaclav Klaus, President of the Czech Republic, said:

Today's debate about global warming is essentially a debate about freedom. The environmentalists would like to mastermind each and every possible aspect of our lives.

Climate scientist Dr. Richard Lindzen of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, MIT, one of the world's leading experts in dynamic meteorology, especially planetary waves, told the gathering in New York that momentum is with the skeptics, saying:

We will win this debate, for we are right and they are wrong.

I have a chart. This was Richard Lindzen, who is the Alfred P. Sloan professor of atmospheric science at MIT. This was an op-ed piece in the Wall Street Journal. He says:

A general characteristic of Mr. Gore's approach is to assiduously ignore the fact that the Earth and its climate are dynamics; they are always changing even without any external forcing. To treat all change as something to fear is bad enough; to do so in order to exploit that fear is much worse.

I think he was talking about the amount of money former Vice President Al Gore made on this issue, but I am not going to get into that now.

The point is, I am talking about credentials of scientists and them coming out with statements such as these, and they were not doing this just a few years ago.

So this event that took place in New York City in the last few days is very significant. Others in attendance were William Gray, Colorado State University. He is one of the experts there who testified before the Environment and Public Works Committee one time before making this same type of statement.

Stephen McIntyre, primary author of Climate Audit, a blog devoted to the analysis and discussion of data, he is a devastating critic of the temperature record of the past 1,000 years, particularly the work of Michael Mann, the creator of the infamous "hockey stick" graph. That graph is thoroughly discredited. There is no scientist who will stand behind that graph. What he attempted to show after this, there was a marked increase in temperatures. That was the blade on the hockey stick. What he forgot to put down—and nobody will disagree with this fact—is that in the timeframe from about 1200 to 1400, we had what they call the medieval warm period. Then we went into the little ice age.

This medieval warm period is interesting. If anyone wants to take a trip up to Greenland and talk to them, go through their history books and look at what the prosperity was during this timeframe, that is when all the Vikings were up there. They were growing all this stuff. Then, of course, when the cycle reversed, it went into the little ice age. They all died or left. Actually, the economic activity was much better. That was also when they were growing grapes in the Scandinavian countries because it was warm enough to do that.

This chart is significant because what they have done is looked at this and said the world is coming to an end. And in a minute I am going to talk about what all the pundits were saying in the middle seventies when they said another ice age is coming. But this has been going on throughout recorded history.

Chemist Dr. Arthur Robinson, curator of a global warming petition signed by more than 32,000 American scientists, including more than 10,000 with doctorate degrees—and they all are rejecting the alarmist assertion that global warming has put the Earth in a crisis and caused primarily by mankind.

Dr. Willie Soon, Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics, has also testified along the same line.

Retired award-winning atmospheric scientist Dr. Roy Spencer, now with the University of Alabama in Huntsville.

Here is a very small sampling of recent developments in the news.

The New York Times: "Prominent geologist Dr. Don Easterbrook warns we are in 'decades-long cooling spell.'" And I think everyone would agree with that.

"NASA warming scientist 'suffering from a bad case of megalomania'—former supervisors says." This was only yesterday in the Business and Media Institute. This is an excerpt of the report:

John Theon, a retired senior NASA atmospheric scientist, said . . . at The Heartland Institute's 2009—

What I have been talking about here—

. . . that the head of NASA's Goddard Institute for Space Studies, James Hansen,

should be fired. Hansen is widely known for his outspokenness on the issue of manmade global warming. I have publicly said I thought Jim Hansen should be fired, "Theon said." But my opinion doesn't count much, particularly when he is empowered by people such as the current President of the United States. I am not sure what we can do to have him get off of the public payroll and continue with the campaign or crusade. I think the man is sincere, but he is suffering from a bad case of megalomania.

Another article. "NASA Warming Scientist Under Fire—From Former Supervisor—Jim Hansen should be fired." This is another one, although this time they make the observation that James Hansen, who is the most outspoken proponent that it is man-made gases, anthropogenic gases, and CO<sub>2</sub> that is causing global warming, is the recipient of \$250,000 from the Heinz Foundation. Obviously, that does have an impact on his position.

This one is: "U.S. Government Meteorologist Claims 'Gross Blatant Censorship' for Speaking Out Against Climate Alarmism." This was March 9, a few days ago, by Stanley Goldenberg, a meteorologist with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's—that is NOAA—Atlantic Oceanographic and Meteorological Laboratory Hurricane Research Division. This is an excerpt of what this scientist said:

The debate, as you also know, is masked by media censorship, bias and distortion. I am interviewed quite a bit on many, many levels and thankfully most of our interviews are benign. They're trying to get out to the public.

In his criticism, Goldenberg said:

I've seen gross, gross blatant censorship. If you're here from the media I'd be glad to argue with you from firsthand experience. I challenge anybody from a mainstream media source to take or print a positive report on this conference. They won't get it past the editor.

He is talking about, of course, the media bias, which we all know took place during this conference.

This is an excerpt from the Boston Globe's paper yesterday:

New figures being released today show the recession helped drive down global warming emissions from the northeast power plants last year to their lowest levels in at least 9 years. The drop in emissions may be good for the environment, but was not seen as reason for celebration. "What does this say about the state of the economy?" said Robert Rio, senior vice president of Associated Industries of Massachusetts. We could get 100 percent below the cap if we shut every business and moved them out of state.

The NASA moonwalker and geologist Harrison Schmitt said climate change alarmists intentionally mislead. This again is yesterday's Business & Media Institute quoting him:

Last month, Apollo 17 astronaut and moonwalker Harrison Schmitt added his voice to the growing chorus of scientists speaking out against the anthropogenic—man-made—global warming theory. In strongly worded comments he said the theory was a "political tool." Now, in a speech at the International Conference on Climate Change he outlined his argument in great detail saying,

“the science of climate change and its causes is not settled.” . . . Several indisputable facts appear evident in geological and climate science that makes me a true, quote, denier, unquote, of human caused global warming. The conclusion seems inescapable that nature produces the primary influences on climate.

I think this chart shows that it has been going on throughout recorded history.

Another article: “A Freezing Legacy For Our Children.” This one is by James Marusek, nuclear physicist and engineer retired from the U.S. Department of the Navy. He said:

There is a lot of talk these days about the legacy we will leave our children and our grandchildren. When I stare into the immediate future, I see a frightening legacy caked in darkness and famine. Instead of intelligently preparing, we find ourselves whittling away this precious time chasing fraudulent theories. Climate change is primarily driven by nature. It has been true in the days of my father and his father and all those that came before us.

Again, this guy is a nuclear physicist and engineer.

This is from a new study titled “The Evidence Is That The Ocean Is Cooling, Not Warming.” This was 2 days ago. And it contains an excerpt titled “Cooling of the Global Ocean Since 2003,” by Craig Loehle, Ph.D., National Council for Air and Stream Improvement. He said:

Ocean heat content data from 2003 to 2008—4½ years—were evaluated for trend. The result is consistent with other data showing a lack of warming over the past few years.

I think I am making a point here that no one is going to argue, and that is that now we are in a cooling period. It drives people nuts, those who try to make people think the world is coming to an end; that it is going to get too hot, and now they realize that is not the case.

This is another statement made by another scientist, and this was 3 days ago.

Alaska River Ice now 60 percent thicker than it was 5 years ago. Flashback: The Nenana Ice Classic is a pretty good proxy for climate change in the 20th Century.

In other words, it is increasing, not decreasing. Here is another scientist. This was reported 4 days ago in Investors Business Daily by atmospheric physicist S. Fred Singer, Professor Emeritus of Environmental Sciences at the University of Virginia, who served as the founding director of the U.S. Weather Satellite Service.

We conclude therefore that the drive to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions is not concern about climate. Ultimately, ideology may be what's fueling the CO<sub>2</sub> wars.

So it goes on and on. Here is another: “Left-wing Columnist Alexander Cockburn A Climate Skeptic—John Fund—March 11.” And Alexander Cockburn, by the way, is normally on the other side. Here is that quote:

My most memorable exchange was with Alexander Cockburn, the left-wing columnist for the Los Angeles Times and the Nation magazine. Mr. Cockburn has undergone blistering attacks since he first dissented from

the global warming “consensus” in 2007. “I’ve felt like the object of a witch hunt,” he says. “One former Sierra Club board member suggested I should be criminally prosecuted.” Mr. Cockburn was at the conference collecting material for his forthcoming book “A Short History of Fear,” in which he will explore the link between fear mongering and climate catastrophe proponents. “No one on the left is comfortable talking about science,” he told me. “They don’t feel they can easily get their arms around it, so they don’t think about it much. As a result, they are prone to any peddler of ideas that reinforce their preexisting prejudices. One would be that there is a population explosion that must be dealt with by slowing down economies.” I asked him how he felt hanging around with so many people who have a more conservative viewpoint than he does. “It’s been good fun and I’ve learned a lot,” he told me. “I think what they are saying on this topic is looking better and better.”

And here is one of the guys who was a chief proponent of the fear mongers. We have to keep in mind there is a lot of money involved in making people afraid. I am old enough to remember back in the middle 1970s, when we were going through at that time what was thought to be this devastating ice age; that we were all going to freeze to death. Here is Time magazine, and here they talk about another ice age is coming and they document their case. This is 1974, from Time magazine.

Now, let’s look at Time magazine a few years later. Here is Time magazine a couple of years ago and they have totally reversed themselves. No longer is it an ice age that is coming and we are all going to die; the headline now is “Be Worried, Be Very Worried,” and they have this polar bear standing on the last scoop of ice in the Arctic.

By the way, there are 13 different populations of polar bears in Canada, and with the exception of the one on the western Hudson Bay area, they are all flourishing. They are doing very well. The population has quadrupled since the 1960s. So don’t feel badly about the polar bear. They are doing fine.

My point here is that these publications, I can assure you—and I have not checked this out, but that last one, in 1974, from Time magazine, I am sure that sold a lot of editions because everyone wanted to read the story as to how another ice age was coming and we were all going to die. We have checked on this. This was their biggest seller in that particular year. I don’t see the date, but a couple of years ago, because they capitalize on this type of disaster.

I suppose I will go ahead and conclude now. We had some new information, and apparently I didn’t bring it down with me, but I would only say this. I am one of the chief critics of what has been happening economically in this country since last October. Last October, we voted on a \$700 billion bailout for the banking industry. I was against that. I recognize that was both Republican and Democrat. It came out of a Republican White House and it was in concert with the Democrats. They all said: Let’s scare everybody so we

can have this \$700 billion bailout. I voted against it, and some of my conservative friends voted for it.

This was the largest authorization of money in the history of the world, and it was all taking place at that time in October—October 10 is when we voted in the Senate, with 75 Senators voting for that. My problem with it was that it was put together by our then-Secretary of the Treasury, and we were giving him total authority over how to spend \$700 billion—the largest amount of money ever talked about in one block in this country, or in the history of the world. So I opposed it.

Now we find out that as soon as he got the money, he didn’t spend it. He said he was going to buy distressed assets. He didn’t spend it on that. He put money into the banks, and we haven’t noticed a change in the credit since then. Now, of course, we have a new President and we have the budget and the omnibus bill that was voted on a few days ago—\$410 billion—and all these people are talking about earmarks and all that. But let’s keep in mind that only 1 percent of that \$410 billion was in anything like earmarks. I wish people were as concerned about the 99 percent as they are the 1 percent, but that is a huge amount of money.

Now we have the President, with his budget coming forward, and this is going to produce huge deficits—in the trillions—and I have been critical of those. But as bad as all of that is, and talking about the huge amounts of money, what is worse is if we should be forced or pushed by the promoters of these global warming scares into passing a tax, what they call a cap-and-trade tax. In other words, this is a tax that would tax the American people. For all practical purposes, it would be a CO<sub>2</sub> tax. They don’t call it that. They disguise it by calling it a cap and trade. But nonetheless, the analysis of that is that it would be somewhere in the neighborhood of \$300 billion to \$330 billion a year.

The reason I bring that up is that if we are pushed into passing some kind of a global warming or a cap-and-trade tax of \$300 billion to \$330 billion, they will masquerade it and act as if it isn’t that much, but we know it is. We have sources—MIT and several other sources—and economic analysis that has taken place that says if that should happen, it will be something that occurs every year. At least these large amounts of money in the stimulus bills and in the bailout bills are one-shot deals, theoretically. But the other would be a tax increase on the American people.

I do have a dog in this fight. I do have a selfish concern. My wife and I have 20 kids and grandkids. My life is not going to change by anything that is passed in terms of a tax increase, but it does affect the next generations, and I think we are going to have to get to the point we are looking at not what is it today but down the road how are we going to pay for it.

To go back to the original \$700 billion bailout, if you do the math, there are 140 million taxpaying families in the country. Divide that by \$700 billion and that is \$5,000 a family. We are talking huge amounts. And should we pass this global warming tax increase that would be comparable to over \$300 billion, it would mean \$3,000 a family. And that is every year.

I think we need to overcome the problem that we have in following the media off this plank and look at the science and let the science tell us what to do. If we do that, we will find with everything I have talked about over the last 35 minutes is in fact true.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. STABENOW). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

#### U.S. TRADE REPRESENTATIVE

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, this Chamber will confirm in the coming days a new U.S. Trade Representative. Mayor Kirk's confirmation represents an opportunity for American trade policy to break from the false choice between free trade and fair trade.

As our economy struggles with massive job losses, a shrinking middle class that we have seen during the entire Bush years, and a housing crisis brought on by wrong-headed policy, the housing crisis that undermines the pursuit of the American dream, our trade policy must be part of our response to the new realities of the global economy.

Mayor Kirk inherits a position traditionally focused on status quo trade policy, and expanding that policy with more of the same status quo trade policy that gives protection to large business, protection to big oil, protection to big drug companies—and even with new rights and new privileges—a status quo trade policy that suppresses the standard of living for American workers, and at the same time hurts workers in China and India and Mexico; a status quo trade policy that does nothing to curb the cost of climate change or the degradation of the environment; and a status quo trade policy that has yielded an \$800 billion—more than \$2 billion a day—trade deficit.

For 8 years the Bush trade policies were wrong. They are wrong now. They

should not continue this way in the future. Our trade deficit has reached annually, thanks to Bush trade policies and thanks to lax trade enforcement, a wrong-headed, unregulated, free-trade policy, which has allowed toys with lead paint, contaminated toothpaste and other products, and weakened the health and safety rules for our trading partners and our own communities.

We want more trade but not like this. Bush trade policies have devastated communities in my State, in towns such as Tiffin, Chillicothe, and Lorain, and done damage to your State in places such as Flint and Detroit and Hamtramck. Job loss does not just affect the worker or the worker's family, as tragic as that is for them, job loss, especially job loss in the thousands, devastates communities. It depletes the tax base. It means the layoff of police and fire personnel and schoolteachers. It hurts local business owners—the drug store, the grocery store, the neighborhood restaurant.

Massive job losses prevent middle-class growth. The Senator from New York, who is in the Chamber, talked about how the middle class in the last 10 years has shrunk. The middle class has shrunk in pure numbers. It has shrunk in income, in buying power. The middle-class people in this country have seen their incomes go down in part because of the Bush trade policy and partly because of tax policy and in part because of the economic policy generally.

Massive job losses prevent middle-class growth, as manufacturing jobs that once anchored a community are gone, but they demoralize a community. Ohio has seen the loss, during the Bush years, of more than 200,000 manufacturing jobs; nationwide, 4.4 million manufacturing jobs, 26 percent, more than one out of four manufacturing jobs in our country that simply disappeared.

We know in Michigan and Ohio and across the industrial heartland of this country and in every State, American manufacturing can compete and compete with anyone in the world if it is a fair fight. But the deck is stacked against us when our Government does not enforce our own trade laws that level that playing field.

Foreign competitors take an unfair advantage, and it is stopping American manufacturers from reaching their potential. We can no longer afford to sit on the sidelines. We must establish a manufacturing policy in this Nation that helps businesses stay here, that helps communities thrive, that rebuilds middle-class families in communities in my State.

It starts with reforming our trade policy. I am pleased to hear Mayor Kirk's emphasis on trade enforcement. Too many of our major trading partners are breaking the rules through massive currency imbalances, tax and capital subsidies, and through unfair labor and environmental practices.

In recent years, the Trade Representative has shown, to put it bluntly, a

terrible record in response to public demand for strong trade enforcement. The Trade Representative that has occupied that office for close to a decade simply does not enforce our trade laws. All five of the public petitions for trade enforcement actions filed during the Bush administration, each concerning currency manipulation or labor exploitations by China, every one of those five public petitions was denied by the U.S. Trade Representative.

In some cases those petitions were denied on the day they were submitted, as if the administration even bothered to read them. Wrong-headed economic policy, job-killing trade agreements have also fueled increasing income disparity at home and abroad. I traveled some years ago, after NAFTA passed—a trade agreement that has hurt our Nation—I traveled at my own expense to McAllen, TX, across the border, with a couple of friends to Reynosa, Mexico. I met a husband and wife who worked for General Electric. They lived in a shack about 15 by 20 feet, dirt floor, no running water, no electricity. If it rained hard, the dirt floor turned to mud.

If you walked through the neighborhood, you could see where people worked in that neighborhood because these shacks were made out of building materials from the companies they worked for or the companies that supply the companies for which they worked.

These two workers worked for General Electric Mexico, 3 miles from the United States of America. If you go to one of those plants where those workers worked, those plants looked a lot like an American plant. These workers made about 90 cents an hour and lived, as I said, in squalid conditions, as hard as they were working, 6 days a week, 10 hours a day.

I visited an auto plant nearby, and this auto plant looked exactly like an auto plant in Michigan or Ohio, except perhaps it was more modern. If you walked into the auto plant, things were clean, the technology was up to date, the workers were productive, working hard.

There was one difference between the auto plant in Reynosa, Mexico, and the auto plant in the United States; that is, the auto plant in Reynosa, Mexico, had no parking lot because the workers could not afford to buy the cars they made. That is what our trade policy has wrought.

You can go to Malaysia and go to a Motorola plant. The workers cannot afford to buy the cell phones they make. You can come back to this hemisphere and go to Costa Rica to a Disney plant and the workers cannot afford to buy the toys for their children, the toys they make, or you can go back across the sea to China and the workers in plant after plant after plant cannot afford to buy the material, buy the products they make.

Simply put, in this country, because of a strong union movement over the