

Today, terror is our enemy, and it uses the civil liberties that we cherish to attempt to do us harm; in fact, to destroy us. In fact, the freedom of access to communication, to employment, to travel, even to our borders, are the tools and the weapons of those who would do our civil liberties harm and in fact take them away. Because of this, do we give up our civil liberties? Absolutely not. But because of this, we must watch, listen, and pursue our enemies with the technologies of the 21st century. The PATRIOT Act does not threaten our civil liberties. It is our insurance policy to preserve them.

We obviously must be diligent with anything we give Government, in terms of a tool or a power to communicate or to watch or to surveil. But do we turn our back on everything we cherish and that has made us great out of fear we might lose it when, in fact, it is our obligation to protect it? We are in the ultimate war between good and evil. Our enemy today, terror, is unlike any enemy we have ever had. All our previous enemies wanted what we had—our resources, our wealth, our ingenuity, our entrepreneurship, our natural resources, our money, our wealth. Terror doesn't want that. Terror doesn't want what we have. Terror doesn't want us to have what we have. They don't want me to be able to speak freely in this body and speak my mind, or my constituents in Georgia to do the same, even if what they say is diametrically opposed to me. They don't want me to freely carry a weapon and defend myself. They don't want a free press that can publish and write its opinion. They don't want any of the inalienable rights and the guarantees and the civil liberties that we have because they know it stands against the tyranny and the control and the suppression that their radical views have brought to a part of the world.

This place you and I call home and the rest of the world calls America is a very special place. You don't find anybody trying to break out of the United States of America. They are all trying to break in. And they are for a very special reason. The civil liberties and the guarantees of our Constitution and the institutions that protect our country—the reasons that you and I stand here today.

While I respect the dissent of any man or woman in this Chamber about the PATRIOT Act, I regret that we have delayed our ratification of the single tool that turned us around post-9/11, in terms of our ability to protect our shores and our people.

I remind this Chamber and everyone who can listen and hear what I am saying that when the 9/11 Commission reviewed all that went wrong prior to 9/11, it recognized that what went right post-9/11 was the passage of the PATRIOT Act. It acknowledged, without our ability to connect the dots, we could not protect the country.

Once again, I cherish our civil liberties. I see the PATRIOT Act not as a

threat to them but an insurance policy to protect them. As we go to a vote in less than an hour, I encourage every Member of the Senate to vote to proceed and then debate, as we will, the issues and the concerns. But in the end, we should leave this Chamber, today or tomorrow, sending a message to those who would do us harm and sending a message to those whom we stand here today to preserve and protect, that we will not let any encumbrance stop our pursuit of those who would destroy or injure us, our children or our grandchildren.

At the end, at the age of 61 and with the opportunity to serve in the Senate, the rest of my life will be about those grandchildren. Riley Dianne Isakson and Sarah Katherine Isakson are less than a month old. They have a bright future. The PATRIOT Act is going to ensure that the very civil liberties that will allow them to pursue happiness to its maximum extent will still exist because America did not turn its back or fear our ability to compete in a 21st century of terror with the type of 21st century laws we need to surveil, to protect, and to defend those who would hurt or those who would harm this great country, the United States of America.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ENERGY

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I rise to address some troubling information about natural gas, energy, and the prices of energy as well as its availability. This information came from a hearing held in the Air subcommittee of the EPW Committee last week, and I think it is of sufficient importance to all Members and all States in the Nation that I rise to speak to my colleagues about it.

We all know that American families and workers are suffering from high energy costs. They will suffer even more if we do not balance our environmental concerns with their energy needs. That is why the hearing held last week in the Air subcommittee is all the more important. If we fail to heed the warning our families and workers are sending us about high energy costs and their lost jobs, their lost incomes, their lost standards of living, then we risk doing even more harm.

The people I am talking about include manufacturing workers who used to make chemicals, plastic products, automobile parts or fertilizer. Many of them are now out of work because their employer moved to a foreign

country with cheaper natural gas prices.

The pain, obviously, doesn't stop with workers. Families suffer from lost wages. Most of those who are lucky enough to get a new job will be working for lower wages. Does that mean that those wages have to move even lower? Do they have to live with a broken-down car even longer?

In addition, seniors on fixed incomes are particularly vulnerable to high natural gas prices. Across the Midwest, indeed across the country, many depend on natural gas to heat their homes in the winter and cool their homes in the summer. What do we tell them: Wear a coat inside during the winter and turn on a fan during the summer? We all know of the tragedies that hit our seniors in summer heat waves. What do we tell their families?

Some have said we should tell our workers and their families that we are going to hurt them even more in order to fight climate change. We will pass proposals to cap carbon emissions which, by the way, will raise energy prices even more. For some, I guess today's energy prices are not high enough. Some are willing to drive power and heating bills even higher in their fight against global warming. Some do not care that there are no technologies currently available to capture and store carbon dioxide. But they are working on finding those. We are not there yet.

Some are willing to stop using cheap and abundant fuels, such as coal, and force ourselves to use only the expensive and very limited supply of natural gas. Every year, recently, we have had an opportunity to vote on the McCain-Lieberman proposal. Every year we hear about how it will deliver a \$100 billion hit or more to the economy. Thankfully, every year the Senate kills this job killer.

Last year, as part of the Energy bill debate, we passed a sense of the Senate stating support for climate change strategies that did not hurt the economy. I think we can all agree with that. It sounds simple, but as we consider the "McCain-Lieberman lite" proposals, we have to look at whether a second generation of proposals will actually spare our families and workers from more pain.

Since we still do not have the technologies to capture and store carbon, they will present other dubious arguments. Some will pin their hopes on projections that future natural gas prices will fall from triple historic levels, where they are now, to only double historic levels, where they were a few years ago. This will somehow make carbon caps affordable.

Not only do I doubt that natural gas prices will return to historic lows, States represented by Members advocating these proposals are actively trying to block actions necessary to increase natural gas supply and get prices down. Government natural gas projections, which we found very dubious, include a prediction that natural

gas prices will fall in the coming decades. However, that prediction depends upon liquefied natural gas imports rising by 600 percent by 2030, a sixfold increase in LNG imports. I find such hopes mind-boggling. How could we increase LNG imports by 600 percent at the same time we have coastal States from Maine, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and Delaware opposing or blocking LNG terminals?

By the way, these Northeastern States blocking natural gas imports through their States are the very ones proposing we punish Midwestern States using coal by forcing them to switch to natural gas to make electricity—the natural gas that they will not allow us to get through LNG.

Others who claim carbon caps will be affordable, pin their hopes on rosy economic analyses that say we can buy our way out of the problem. They propose, instead of cutting carbon emissions, powerplants will be able to purchase, hopefully, cheap credits from others who, hopefully, cut their own carbon emissions elsewhere.

They are running models from MIT, Stanford, and Harvard that say the price of buying carbon cuts in other countries will be cheaper than forcing U.S. powerplants to reduce their own carbon emissions. I can't dispute these are smart people, but I wonder if they are reading the newspaper. Their models show a ton of carbon cuts costing just over \$1 a ton. At that price, they say it would be affordable. Unfortunately, last week the price to purchase a ton of carbon reductions was \$31. You do not have to be from Harvard to do that math. That is 31 times more expensive. Do we believe that the cost of carbon credits will drop by 97 percent after we impose our own cap, when you see the increasing demand for energy from India and China? That I do not believe is likely.

Europe's system to cap carbon is certainly in a shambles. European countries are failing miserably to meet their Kyoto carbon-cut requirements. Thirteen of the fifteen original EU signatories are on track to miss their 2010 emissions targets—by as much as 33 percent in Spain and 25 percent in Denmark. Talks to discuss further cuts beyond that, when Kyoto expires, have only produced agreement to talk further. It sounds similar to the Senate these days. We can talk well, but doing things is difficult.

If Europe is, for all practical purposes, ignoring their Kyoto carbon commitments and there is no agreement to continue with carbon caps after Kyoto, how can we expect the creation of enough credits? In the alternative, if Europeans suddenly decide to rush and meet their commitments by buying up massive amounts of credits to meet their shortfalls, how will there be enough credits for a U.S. demand bigger than all of Europe combined?

While these questions are complicated, their consequences are simple. A mistake on our part could add

significantly to the misery of our manufacturing workers. A mistake on our part will add to the hardships families face paying their heating and power bills. And one more thought: Iran and Saudi Arabia are furiously busy expanding their petrochemical industry, based upon their vast supplies of natural gas.

I ask unanimous consent an article on that subject be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BOND. This means that not only more cheap foreign chemicals, but it means potentially more closed U.S. plants. We must also ask whether we want to add to our oil addiction a new chemical dependency on Iraq, Iran, and the Middle East.

Before we make any hasty decisions, I believe we must have answers to these questions, and we must answer these questions as we begin to debate further carbon cap proposals.

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

EXHIBIT 1

[From MEHRNEWS.com, Jan. 2, 2006]
IRAN STRIVING TO RANK FIRST IN ETHYLENE PRODUCTION

Iran plans to be number one in producing ethylene in the world—reaching 12 million tons output within the next 10 years—by allocating 17.5 billion dollars in investment for development of petrochemical projects in the Fourth Five-Year Development Plan (2005–2010).

The figure stood around 12.5 billion dollars for the first to third development plans (1990–2005) in total.

Out of the 25 projects under implementation, the National Petrochemical Company (NPC) have completed 17 and would finish the rest soon, said Hassan Sadat, manager of plans in the NPC.

NPC plans to have an output of 25.6 million tons capacity by March 2010 jumping up from 7.3 million tons in 1999, he added.

The investment in the sector is forecast to increase by 40 percent in the fourth plan.

Sadat said that the output of polymers would reach 10 million tons within the next 10 years. The production of chemical fertilizers, methanol, and aromatic materials would increase to 8 million tons each. NPC has estimated that the country earns some 20 billion dollars from export of petrochemicals only by the date.

At present, nearly 52,000 employees work in petrochemical sector that enjoys modern technologies such as ABS, PET—PAT, engineering polymers, isocyanides, DME, and acetic acid.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MURKOWSKI). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Madam President, I yield the remaining time in morning business on our side.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

USA PATRIOT ACT ADDITIONAL REAUTHORIZING AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2006—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 2271, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to the consideration of S. 2271, a bill to clarify that individuals who receive FISA orders can challenge nondisclosure requirements, that individuals who receive national security letters are not required to disclose the name of their attorney, that libraries are not wire or electronic communication service providers unless they provide specific services, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 10:30 is equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Madam President, the upcoming cloture vote on the motion to proceed to S. 2271, introduced by my friend Senator SUNUNU, is the first opportunity for my colleagues to go on record on whether they will accept the White House deal on PATRIOT Act reauthorization. Back in December, 46 Senators voted against cloture on the conference report. I think it's clear by now that the deal makes only minor changes to that conference report. The Senator from Pennsylvania, chairman of the Judiciary Committee and primary proponent of the conference report in this body, was quoted yesterday as saying that the changes that the White House agreed to were "cosmetic." And then he said, according to the AP, "But sometimes cosmetics will make a beauty out of a beast and provide enough cover for senators to change their vote."

The Senator from Alabama said on the floor yesterday: "They're not large changes, but it made the Senators happy and they feel comfortable voting for the bill today." I agree with both of my adversaries on this bill that the changes were minor and cosmetic. I explained that at length yesterday, and no one else other than Senator SUNUNU came down to the floor to defend the deal.

Some of my colleagues have been arguing, however, that we should go along with this deal because the conference report, as amended by the Sununu bill, improves the PATRIOT Act that we passed 4½ years ago.

It's hard for me to understand how Senators who blocked the conference report in December can now say that it's such a great deal. It's not a great deal—the conference report is just as flawed as it was 2 months ago. No