

I don't know the corporate structure of that particular job creator, but I know the larger point is that many of the job creators do pay taxes at the individual level. We know from research that four out of five of the taxpayers who would pay the higher taxes being proposed by the President are business owners—the very people we are hoping will create jobs, and create them soon for Americans.

Mr. ISAKSON. I thank the Senator from Mississippi for his stories, which are true and to the point. My story was about two small businesses. And I thank the Senator physician from the great State of Wyoming, and I would ask if he has any additional remarks.

Mr. BARRASSO. Well, I know you see this in Georgia and in Mississippi. We know what doesn't work. We know what doesn't work is more borrowing and more spending and overregulation and the threat of raising taxes on people and the job creators of this country. So there is much to be done, and that is why we actually came out with this Jobs Frontier—the western caucus did—because we want to increase affordable American energy.

The President, when he was running for office, said under his proposals electricity costs would necessarily skyrocket. If you want a productive, vibrant economy, you need low-cost energy, and if you want a secure nation, you need American energy to do that. So when my colleague from the Gulf State of Mississippi talks about energy in the gulf, there is a lot there. I can talk about Wyoming from the standpoint of energy being available on Federal land, which is being blocked by regulations. We ought to be exploring for that energy as well as in Alaska. So there is much we can do to make our country stronger, safer, more secure, better, and more vibrant, but the proposal put forth by the President—and here I agree with my colleague from Mississippi—is another spending bill—just spending—as the first stimulus was. It is a bill that is not going to do what we need to do to get this economy going in a vibrant sense. From my perspective, the No. 1 thing we should do is stop doing what we know doesn't work.

Mr. ISAKSON. Well, I want to conclude, unless the Senator from Mississippi has anything to add.

Mr. WICKER. Well, just to say this, and I will take a minute to say it and then I will thank my friend from Georgia for taking the lead on this colloquy.

We also need to show job creators that we are actually serious about fixing our fiscal house. You know, we have had the Gang of 6, we have had the Simpson-Bowles Commission, we have had Dr. COBURN and Senator LIEBERMAN with a proposal, and we have had Alice Rivlin's proposal—an expert on budgetary matters. We know the solutions that are out there, and they are hard to do politically. They would subject us all to intense political criticism

and a firestorm. But if we do it on a bipartisan basis for the good of this country now, for the good of not only job creators today and people out there who are dying to come back to work but also for future generations, then we can do the right thing.

I will simply say this: I call on the President of the United States to give us some leadership on working together on a bipartisan basis to make these tough decisions. If we do it together, as Ronald Reagan and Tip O'Neill did in the 1980s, we can make the case to the American people that sometimes you have to do hard things, but we do things on a bipartisan basis to create jobs and to make a better future for future generations. It will not be done unless the Chief Executive of the United States of America comes forward and signals a willingness to hold hands with us and do the right thing for the future.

I desperately hope in these final months of 2011 we can get that signal sent to the committee of 12, and that we can work together to make major, significant structural changes that will save our fiscal future.

I thank my colleague.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Mississippi, and I will close by simply saying you have heard three Republicans this morning talking about differences we might have on regulation and on tax policy, but you have also heard the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, the physician Senator from Wyoming, and myself, from the State of Georgia, say we are ready, we are willing, and we are hopeful that we can sit down together as a Congress—not as a partisan Congress but as a bipartisan Congress—and find solutions to the regulatory problems, find incentives for businesses to invest, and find ways we can create jobs in the private sector, because in the end that is where job creation takes place.

I will end with where Senator REID started in his remarks. Yesterday was a landmark day. Republicans and Democrats came together and passed three free-trade agreements which will create jobs in the United States of America. Our problem is we waited almost a thousand days to do it. Let's start accelerating those decisions that must be made to bring us together. Let's find ways to cut our spending, empower our businesses, and find ways to regulate in a positive way, not in a suppressive and oppressive way on American small businesses.

Senator WICKER, Senator ISAKSON, and Senator BARRASSO are three who stand ready to join in doing that, anytime, anyplace, anywhere.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The 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 ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business for 15 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am here to speak about what is currently an unpopular topic in this town. It has become no longer politically correct in certain circles in Washington to speak about climate change or carbon pollution or how carbon pollution is causing our climate to change.

This is a peculiar condition of Washington. If you go out into, say, our military and intelligence communities, they understand and are planning for the effects of carbon pollution on climate change. They see it as a national security risk. If you go out into our nonpolluting business and financial communities, they see this as a real and important problem. And, of course, it goes without saying our scientific community is all over this concern. But as I said, Washington is a peculiar place, and here it is getting very little traction.

Here in Washington we feel the dark hand of the polluters tapping so many shoulders. And where there is power and money behind that dark hand, therefore, a lot of attention is paid to that little tap on the shoulder. What we overlook is that nature—God's Earth—is also tapping us all on the shoulder, with messages we ignore at our peril. We ignore the messages of nature—of God's Earth—and we ignore the laws of nature—of God's Earth—at our very grave peril.

There is a wave of very justifiable economic frustration that has swept through our Capitol. The problem is that some of the special interests—the polluters—have insinuated themselves into that wave, sort of like parasites that creep into the body of a host animal, and from there they are working terrible mischief. They are propagating two big lies. One is that environmental regulations are a burden to the economy and we need to lift those burdens to spur our economic recovery. The second is the jury is still out on climate changes caused by carbon pollution, so we don't need to worry about it or even take precautions. Both are, frankly, outright false.

Environmental regulation is well established to be good for the economy. It may add costs to you if you are a polluter, but polluters usually exaggerate about that.

For instance, before the 1990 acid rain rules went into effect, Peabody Coal estimated that compliance would cost \$3.9 billion. The Edison Electric Institute chimed in and estimated that compliance would cost \$4 to \$5 billion. Well, in fact, the Energy Information

Administration calculated the program actually cost \$836 million, about one-sixth of the Edison Electric Institute estimate.

When polluters were required to phase out the chemicals they were emitting that were literally burning a hole through our Earth's atmosphere, they warned that it would create "severe economic and social disruption" due to "shutdowns of refrigeration equipment in supermarkets, office buildings, hotels, and hospitals." Well, in fact, the phaseout happened 4 years to 6 years faster than predicted; it cost 30 percent less than predicted; and the American refrigeration industry innovated and created new export markets for its environmentally friendly products.

Anyway, the real point is we are not just in this Chamber to represent the polluters. We are supposed to be here to represent all Americans, and Americans benefit from environmental regulation big time.

Over the lifetime of the Clean Air Act, for instance, for every \$1 it costs to add pollution controls, Americans have received about \$30 in health and other benefits. By the way, installing those pollution controls created jobs because they went to manufacturers to build the controls and to Americans to install them. But setting that aside, a 30-to-1 benefit ratio to keep our air clean sounds like a mighty wise investment to me. That 30-to-1 ratio doesn't even count the intangible benefits—intangible but very real benefits—of clear air and clean water, the benefits of the heart and the soul, the benefits to a grandfather of taking his granddaughter to the fishing hole and still finding fish there or of the city kid being able to go to a beach and have it clean enough to swim there or the benefit to a mom who is spared the burden of worry, of sitting next to her asthmatic baby on the emergency room albuterol inhaler waiting for his infant lungs to clear.

Well, unfortunately, polluters rule in certain circles in Washington, and they emit propaganda as well as pollution, and they have been emitting too much of both lately.

Their other big lie the jury is still out on is whether human-made carbon pollution causes dangerous climate change and oceanic change. Virtually all of our most prestigious scientific and academic institutions have stated that climate change is happening and that human activities are the driving cause of this change. Many of us in Congress received a letter from those institutions in October 2009. Let me quote from that letter.

Observations throughout the world make it clear that climate change is occurring, and rigorous scientific research demonstrates that the greenhouse gases emitted by human activities are the primary driver. These conclusions are based on multiple independent lines of evidence, and contrary assertions are inconsistent with an objective assessment of the vast body of peer-reviewed science.

Let me repeat that last quote.

Contrary assertions are inconsistent with an objective assessment of the vast body of peer-reviewed science.

This letter was signed by the heads of the following organizations: the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the American Chemical Society, the American Geophysical Union, the American Institute of Biological Sciences, the American Meteorological Society, the American Society of Agronomy, the American Society of Plant Biologists, the American Statistical Association, the Association of Ecosystem Research Centers, the Botanical Society of America, the Crop Science Society of America, the Ecological Society of America, the Natural Science Collections Alliance, the Organization of Biological Field Stations, the Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, the Society of Systematic Biologists, the Soil Science Society of America, and the University Corporation for Atmospheric Research.

These are highly esteemed scientific organizations. They are the real deal. They don't think the jury is still out. They recognize that, in fact, the verdict is in, and it is time to act.

More than 97 percent of the climate scientists most actively publishing accept that the verdict is actually in on carbon pollution causing climate and oceanic changes—97 percent. Think of that.

Imagine if your child were sick and the doctor said she needed treatment, and out of prudence you went and got a second opinion. Then you went around and you actually got 99 second opinions. When you were done, you found that 97 out of 100 expert doctors agreed your child was sick and needed treatment. Imagine further that of the three who disagreed, some took money from the insurance company that would have to pay for your child's treatment. Imagine further that none of those three could say they were sure your child was OK, just that they weren't sure what her illness was or that she needed treatment, that there was some doubt.

On those facts, name one decent father or mother who wouldn't start treatment for their child. No decent parent would turn away from the considered judgment of 97 percent of 100 doctors just because they weren't all absolutely certain.

How solid is the science behind this? Rock solid. The fact that carbon dioxide in the atmosphere absorbs heat from the Sun was discovered at the time of the Civil War. This is not new stuff. In 1863 the Irish scientist John Tyndall determined that carbon dioxide and water vapor trapped more heat in the atmosphere as their concentrations increased. A 1955 textbook, "Our Astonishing Atmosphere," notes that nearly a century ago the scientist, John Tyndall, suggested that a fall in the atmospheric carbon dioxide could allow the Earth to cool, whereas a rise in carbon dioxide would make it warmer.

In the early 1900s, a century ago, it became clear that changes in the amount of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere might account for significant increases and decreases in the Earth's average annual temperatures and that carbon dioxide released from manmade sources, anthropogenic sources—primarily by the burning of coal—would contribute to those atmospheric changes. This is not new stuff. These are well-established scientific principles.

Let me look for a moment at the book I talked about, "Our Astonishing Atmosphere," published in 1955—the year I was born, more than half a century ago—for the "Science for Every Man Series." Let me read:

Although the carbon dioxide in the atmosphere remains at a concentration of 0.03 percent all over the world, the amount in the air has not always been the same. There have been periods in the world's history when the air became charged with more carbon dioxide than it now carries. There have also been periods when the concentration has fallen unusually low. The effects of these changes have been profound. They are believed to have influenced the climate of the earth by controlling the amount of energy that is lost by the earth into space. Nearly a century ago, the British scientist John Tyndall suggested that a fall in the atmospheric carbon dioxide could allow the earth to cool whereas a rise in the carbon dioxide would make it warmer. With the help of its carbon dioxide, the atmosphere acts like a greenhouse that traps the heat of the sun. Radiations reaching the atmosphere as sunshine can penetrate to the surface of the earth. Here, they are absorbed, providing the world with warmth. But the earth itself radiating energy outwards in the form of long-wave heat rays. If these could penetrate the air as the sunshine does, they could carry off much of the heat provided by the sun. Carbon dioxide in the air helps to stop the escape of heat radiations. It acts like a blanket to keep the world warm. And the more carbon dioxide the air contains, the more efficiently does it smother the escape of the earth's heat. Fluctuation in the carbon dioxide of the air has helped to bring about major climate changes experienced by the world in the past.

This is 1955. This is "Our Astonishing Atmosphere," out of the "Science for Every Man Series." This is not something that was just invented.

Let's look at the facts that we actually observe in our changing planet. Over the last 800,000 years—8,000 centuries—until very recently the atmosphere has stayed within a bandwidth of between 170 parts per million and 300 parts per million of carbon dioxide. That is not theory, that is measurement. Scientists measure historic carbon dioxide concentrations by, for example, locating trapped bubbles in the ice of ancient glaciers. So we know, over time—and over long periods of time—what the range has been.

What else do we know? We know since the industrial revolution, we—humankind—have been burning carbon-rich fuels in measurable and ever-increasing amounts. We know we release up to 7 to 8 gigatons of carbon dioxide each year. A gigaton, by the way, is 1 billion metric tons. So if you are going to release 7 to 8 billion metric tons a

year into the atmosphere, predictably that increases carbon concentration in our atmosphere. "Put more in and find more there" is not a complex scientific theory. It is not a difficult proposition. And 7 to 8 billion metric tons a year into the atmosphere is a very big thing in the historical sweep.

So we now measure carbon concentrations climbing in the Earth's atmosphere. Again, this is a measurement, not a theory. The present concentration exceeds 390 parts per million.

So 800,000 years and a bandwidth of 170 to 300 parts per million, and now we are over 390.

This increase has a trajectory. Plotting trajectories is nothing new either. It is something scientists, businesspeople, and our military service people do every day. The trajectory for our carbon pollution predicts that 688 parts per million will be in the atmosphere in the year 2095 and 1,097 parts per million in the year 2195. These are carbon concentrations not outside of the bounds of 800,000 years but outside of the bounds of millions of years. As Tyndall determined at the time of the Civil War, increasing carbon concentrations will absorb more of the Sun's heat and raise global temperatures.

Let me end by reviewing the scale of the peril that we are facing if we fail to act. Over the last 800,000 years, as I said, it has been 170 to 300 parts per million of carbon dioxide. Since the start of the industrial revolution, that concentration is now up to 390 parts per million. If we continue on the trajectory that we find ourselves, our grandchildren will see carbon concentrations in the atmosphere top 700 parts per million by the end of the century, twice the bandwidth top that we have lived in for 8,000 centuries.

To put that in perspective, mankind has engaged in agriculture for about 10,000 years. It is not clear we had yet mastered fire 800,000 years ago. The entire development of human civilization has taken place in that 800,000 years, and within that 170 to 300 parts per million bandwidth. If we go back, we are back into geologic time.

In April of this year, a group of scientific experts came together at the University of Oxford to discuss the current state of our oceans. The workshop report stated:

Human actions have resulted in warming and acidification of the oceans and are now causing increasing hypoxia.

Acidification is obvious—the ocean is becoming more acid; hypoxia means low oxygen levels.

Studies of the Earth's past indicate that these are the three symptoms . . . associated with each of the previous five mass extinctions on Earth.

We experienced two mass ocean extinctions 55 and 251 million years ago. The rates of carbon entering the atmosphere in the lead-up to these extinctions are estimated to have been 2.2 and 1 to 2 gigatons of carbon per

year respectively, over several thousand years. As the group of Oxford scientists noted:

Both these estimates are dwarfed in comparison to today's emissions.

As I said earlier, those are 7 to 8 gigatons per year. The workshop participants concluded with this quote:

Unless action is taken now, the consequences of our activities are at a high risk of causing, through the combined effects of climate change, overexploitation, pollution and habitat loss, the next globally significant extinction event in the ocean.

The laws of physics and the laws of chemistry and the laws of science these are laws of nature. These are laws of God's Earth. We can repeal some laws around here but we can't repeal those. Senators are used to our opinions mattering a lot around here, but these laws are not affected by our opinions. These laws do not care who peddles influence, how many lobbyists you have or how big your corporate bankroll is. Those considerations, so important in this town, do not matter at all to the laws of nature.

As regards these laws of nature, because we can neither repeal nor influence them, we bear a duty, a duty of stewardship to see and respond to the facts that are before our faces according to nature's laws. We bear a duty to shun the siren song of well-paying polluters. We bear a duty to make the right decisions for our children and grandchildren and for our God-given Earth.

Right now I must come before the Chamber and remind this body that we are failing in that duty. The men and women in this Chamber are indeed catastrophically failing in that duty. We are earning the scorn and condemnation of history—not this week, perhaps, and not next week. The spin doctors can see to that. But ultimately and assuredly, the harsh judgment that it is history's power to inflict on wrong will fall upon us. The Supreme Being who gave us this Earth and its abundance created a world not just of abundance but of consequence and that Supreme Being gave us reason to allow us to plan for and foresee the various consequences that those laws of nature impose.

It is magical thinking to imagine that somehow we will be spared the plain and foreseeable consequences of our failure of duty. There is no wizard's hat and wand with which to wish this away. These laws of nature are known; the Earth's message to us is clear; our failure is blameworthy; its consequences are profound; and the costs will be very high.

I thank the Senator from Arkansas for his indulgence for the extra time, and I yield the floor.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN of Ohio). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMERICAN JOBS ACT

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I take this time to comment on a vote that took place earlier this week that the people of this Nation are having a hard time understanding—why the Republicans are filibustering legislation that will allow us to consider job growth in America. It is a filibuster, and that happens so frequently in this body that it seems to be standard operating procedure for the Republicans. But in this case I think the American public realizes they have gone too far.

We have to create more jobs. We have to create more jobs so our economy can grow. There are millions of Americans who are seeking work and cannot find jobs and they need work in order to support their families. We need more jobs for our economy to grow.

We got into a debate in August about what we were going to do about raising the debt ceiling and we were all concerned about the deficits this country has. Yes, we are concerned that our current deficits are not sustainable, but we will not have a budget that is sustainable unless we have more jobs. You can look at all of the programs to reduce government spending or to try to bring in more revenues, but if we do not create more jobs we are not going to be able to get our budget into a semblance of order.

The reason for that is simple. The more people out of work, the more reliant they are on government services and the less taxes paid in to pay our bills. So for the sake of those who are seeking employment, for the sake of our economy, for the sake of our budget, we have to create more jobs.

We had a vote this week on moving forward on S. 1660, the President's jobs initiative. It was a motion to proceed. It was a motion to bring the bill to the floor so we could get into a debate about the best way to create jobs. Many of us thought we would have amendments that would enhance and improve the President's package. The President's package was a starting point for our debate. But the Republicans said no, we are going to filibuster even the opportunity for us to consider jobs legislation. They wouldn't even allow us to move forward.

We had a majority of the Senate. We had enough votes to pass it or at least proceed if it were a simple majority, which is what most democracies believe is the right standard. But, no, we had a filibuster that did not even allow us to consider the jobs bill on the floor of the Senate.

I find that most surprising. When you look at the President's proposal, the individual provisions have bipartisan support. This is not a Democratic proposal. Every one of the provisions that