

thing this summer is when Dave Frederickson took Hilary Bolea to a tractor pull at the Minnesota Farmfest. So we have a great team, and I am proud of their work.

I am happy the farm bill passed today with its forward-looking provisions on cellulosic ethanol, the disaster relief, permanent disaster relief that we worked so hard to get, the strong safety net for our farmers. The reasons we had that safety net 75 years ago in the Depression with volatile prices, volatile weather, continue today.

As you know, I would have liked to have seen a little more reform in this bill. I would like to see some income eligibility limits as well as the subsidy limits set down in the Dorgan-Grassley bill. We are going to continue to push for that reform. We will work with Representative PETERSON, who is from Minnesota, the head of the Ag Committee in the House, and our great leader, Senator HARKIN, with our ranking member, Senator CHAMBLISS, as the bill goes to conference committee.

I am hopeful there will be some discussion with the White House about the reform in the bill. We have a very good start here and we need to continue that discussion in the months to come.

The other thing, I wish to commend the Senate for passing the Energy bill yesterday. I came out of the Commerce Committee. We worked on that gas mileage standard. We are now seeing a 10-mile-per-gallon increase, not only good for the environment but also, most importantly, good for the American consumer. They can save money by having less cost for gas. This energy bill is just the beginning of us starting to focus not on spending all our money on the oil cartels in the Middle East but instead focusing on the farmers and workers of the Midwest and our own energy independence.

Finally, on the FHA reauthorization and the work being done on the subprime issue, I had a roundtable with a number of people involved in this back in Minnesota. Minnesota is fourth in the country for subprime mortgage foreclosures. The chickens are coming home to roost in terms of predatory lending. We finally have started to work on the issue in Washington, and we see the problems it is causing not only for individual homebuyers but for entire neighborhoods and communities.

All in all, I believe we got some things done at the end of the week.

The one last thing I commend the Senate for is the work on the pool safety bill. I have spoken on the floor a few times about something of maybe little note when you look at the larger scheme, but a very important note to one family, and that is the Taylor family of Edina, MN. Their girl Abby was severely injured in a wading pool this summer. She may never eat again. She is sick but she is so strong in spirit. Her family called me literally every 2 weeks to check on the progress of this bill. Because of Abby, we were able to

strengthen the bill. It was named after former Secretary of State Jim Baker's granddaughter when she was so tragically killed in a similar accident. This puts in a standard, a retroactive standard for public pools which includes apartments, any pools used by the public. It includes stronger drain covers, a vacuum suction system. It is a very good bill. The House bill is similar. I have every intention to get this thing done. I thank Senator PRYOR, Senator STEVENS, and others for their work to get this done on a bipartisan basis in the Senate. One of the proudest moments my year here was when I was able to call Scott Taylor last night at about 9 p.m. from the Senate floor and tell him that that bill had passed and to know we were going to go home to Minnesota and have a little Christmas present for that family, something we worked so hard on to make sure this wouldn't happen to another child.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Madam President, as I have announced several times in the last few days, I am going to shortly move to proceed to S. 2248, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. This is such an important piece of legislation. I spoke briefly on this subject earlier, but I want to provide a more complete explanation of the process by which the Senate will consider this vital piece of legislation.

Earlier this year, the Director of National Intelligence came to Congress and alerted us to what he described as a significant gap that had emerged in our Nation's foreign intelligence-gathering capacity. Members on both sides of the aisle and from all sides of this important debate became convinced that this problem was real and that we had an obligation to address it. Although many of us differ on the solution, all Senators without exception, both Democrats and Republicans, want to ensure that intelligence professionals have the tools they need to keep our country as safe as possible. We all worked in good faith with the administration through July and August to provide those tools in a way that protects the privacy and liberties of law-abiding Americans.

Unfortunately, the bill signed by President Bush fell well short of that goal. I and many other Democrats opposed the so-called Protect America Act. That is why we made sure it had

a 6-month sunset, so we could come back and do a better job of ensuring judicial and congressional oversight of these sensitive activities. As we all know, had the President been operating as we have always operated in the past, he would simply have come to the Intelligence Committee, the Judiciary Committee, and told them the changes that were necessary. But they didn't do that.

As my colleagues know, the Senate Judiciary Committee and the Intelligence Committee share jurisdiction over the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. As a result of the President not asking us to act in a timely fashion, we find ourselves in a difficult position. But in spite of that, both committees have worked diligently over the past few months. This hard work has resulted in two different versions of legislation to improve FISA, S. 2248, reported out of the committees.

I consulted extensively with Chairmen ROCKEFELLER and LEAHY about the best way for the Senate to consider this delicate subject. I have determined that in this situation it would be wrong of me to simply choose one committee's bill over the other. I personally favor many of the additional protections included in the Judiciary Committee bill. I oppose the concept of retroactive immunity in the Intelligence bill. But I cannot ignore the fact that the Intelligence bill was reported favorably by a vote of 13 to 2, with most Democrats on the committee supporting that approach. I explored the possibility of laying before the Senate a bill that included elements of both committee bills. Earlier this week I used Senate rule XIV to place two bills on the calendar, first S. 2440, consisting of titles I and III of the Intelligence bill, but did not include title II on retroactive immunity. The second bill, S. 2441, consists of title I of the Judiciary bill and titles II and III of the Judiciary bill. Senator LEAHY and I favor the second bill, S. 2441. But for me to override Senate precedent and rules in this case would be wrong and unfair. After consulting with Chairman ROCKEFELLER and Chairman LEAHY, we recognized—these two veteran legislators—that the best thing to do would be to follow regular order. It is the right thing to do. It is not right for me to pick and choose. After the committee structure has been established—and I believe in it—to simply say it doesn't matter in this case, it matters in every case. If it doesn't matter in one case, then it doesn't matter in any case. We have to follow the rules we have here; otherwise, it becomes very unfair, and it becomes a situation where I am the one picking and choosing. That isn't the way it should be. Both chairmen, with their experience, agreed that this was the right approach, even though, as I repeat, Senator LEAHY and I would rather have the Judiciary Committee bill that we believe strengthens the position we had initially and not have to try to put them in at a subsequent time.

Under regular order, under the rules of the Senate governing sequential referral, I will move to proceed to S. 2248, the bill reported by each committee. When that motion to proceed is adopted, the work of both committees will be before the Senate, all elements of both pieces of legislation. All Senators will then be involved in the process. That is how it should be—all members of the Intelligence Committee, all members of the Judiciary Committee, and all Members of the Senate, Democrats and Republicans.

Because of the order in which they considered the bill, the Intelligence Committee version will be the base text. The Judiciary Committee version will be automatically pending as a substitute amendment.

I admire and respect the work done by these two committees on a bipartisan basis. Senators LEAHY and SPECTER work extremely well together. Senators ROCKEFELLER and BOND work extremely well together. These are the two committees that will have matters before this Senate. In the weeks since the two committees acted, Senators ROCKEFELLER and LEAHY have been working very hard to narrow the differences between their two versions of the bill. The ranking Republicans, Senators BOND and SPECTER, have been included in these conversations and deliberations. I expect that when we begin debate on the bill there will be amendments to incorporate many of the Judiciary Committee provisions into the Intelligence Committee text. In my view, that will make the final product stronger.

There is one issue that cannot be resolved through formal negotiation. As some are aware, the Intelligence Committee bill provides the telephone companies with retroactive immunity for lawsuits filed by customers for privacy violations and other aspects of the law. For me and many Members, there is a belief that such a grant of immunity is not wise. Others disagree. We saw what happened in the Intelligence Committee. That is a committee that the Republican leader and I worked very hard to get people on that committee who are going to work long hours. No committee in the Congress works longer hours than the Intelligence Committee. They work in anonymity. They don't have public hearings very often. Most of the time they are secluded in the Hart Building in that confidential space they have alone. The press doesn't know what is going on there. Staff, except for a few exclusive staff members, have no idea what is going on in there. These people on the Intelligence Committee work very hard and out of the purview of the public. That is the way it has to be. I expect there will be full debate on this subject of immunity next week as there should be.

Senators SPECTER, FEINSTEIN, WHITEHOUSE, WYDEN, and others are working to craft a compromise that might give the phone companies some

relief but would allow the lawsuits to go forward in a manner that would preserve accountability. In one way or another, we must ensure that President Bush is held accountable for his actions. Some people believe his actions were unwise and misdirected. It is important for the Senate to complete work on this bill next week to allow time for the Senate and House to produce a final product in conference. Our ultimate goal is a bill that commands broad bipartisan support in the Congress and in the country. The process I have outlined offers us the best opportunity to do so. It is going to be difficult, it is going to be time consuming, and it is going to be important. It is for the safety and security of our Nation.

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

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

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, for nearly 30 years, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, FISA, as it has come to be known, has represented the ultimate balance between our country's need to fight terrorism ferociously and to protect the constitutional rights of the American people.

I intend to outline several of the key issues in this debate this afternoon. First, though, I want to say a word about the process which the distinguished Senate majority leader has just touched on.

I was one of two in the Senate Intelligence Committee to oppose the Intelligence Committee's version of the legislation. I am strongly opposed to granting telecommunications companies total retroactive immunity when they have been accused of wrongdoing in the President's warrantless wiretapping program. The Intelligence Committee legislation includes such a grant of immunity, and it was the major reason I opposed the legislation.

I do, however, respect Senator REID's decision to hold the debate on this legislation under the regular Senate rules. Certainly, the distinguished majority leader has been under a lot of pressure from all sides to change the rules that in one way might favor one side or the other, but I think the majority leader has made the right decision by insisting that this debate go by the book.

I have had the chance now to work with the distinguished majority leader for more than a quarter century. I know how much respect he has for the Senate and for this institution. He firmly believes in the committee process. He firmly believes in the Senate's rules and traditions, and he worked to carry those beliefs out as both the minority whip and the minority leader. So we will have a chance, as Senator

REID noted, to try to work a compromise on several of these key issues.

I have said on a number of occasions, it may well be appropriate that the phone companies deserve some measure of protection with respect to their role in this surveillance program. But at a time when there are scores of lawsuits, the idea of complete and retroactive immunity seems to me to be over the line.

It would be my intention, if we cannot reach a compromise on this issue—and it is my hope we will—it would be my intention, once again, to oppose legislation that grants total and complete immunity for the companies.

Now, when the Senate Intelligence Committee picked up on its work this fall, coming back after the recess period, once again, we had a chance to meet with the director of the intelligence community, Mr. MCCONNELL. As usual, he laid out a thoughtful case on a key issue, and that is that in some respects the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act has not kept up with the times.

Clearly, there are threats overseas, when one foreigner communicates with another foreigner, where it is important that our intelligence officials are in a position to protect the interests of the American people and run surveillance with respect to those conversations.

I and others said to the administration repeatedly that we would be supportive of that effort, and we would be supportive of that effort even when on an incidental basis it might pick up the conversations of innocent Americans. It was an effort to try to reach common ground with the administration and, in particular, to acknowledge that Admiral McConnell had a very valid point.

But, unfortunately, the administration would not take yes for an answer. I and others said—Chairman ROCKEFELLER, Senator BOND. I have had the chance to work closely with both of them. Both of them have been supportive of a number of initiatives I have felt strongly about with respect to accountability, holding the intelligence community to its word with respect to disclosure, declassification.

I have the view that when Chairman ROCKEFELLER and Senator BOND have a chance to work with a number of us on the committee, we can find common ground on a lot of these key issues. We can find common ground on the issue that the administration said for months and months was their principal concern; and that was to be able to pick up on the conversations of individuals overseas who represented a real threat to the security and well-being of the American people.

But, as I indicated, that was not enough for the administration. They would not accept yes for an answer. At that point, they then began to push very hard for this idea of complete and retroactive immunity for the telecommunications companies. This

the Department of Justice legal opinions related to the President's warrantless wiretapping program, and I have read these opinions myself. In my judgment, the legal reasoning in these opinions is shaky at best, and in some areas it is exceptionally weak.

I think most Americans would be surprised and dismayed to learn that their President had ordered the NSA to conduct this program based on such flimsy legal justification. Nothing in any of these opinions has convinced me that the President's warrantless wiretapping program was legal. Now that the existence of the warrantless wiretapping program has been confirmed, I see no national security reason to classify most of these opinions. As far as I can tell, these opinions are being kept classified in order to protect the President's political security, not our national security.

Our committee has also reviewed written correspondence sent to certain telecommunications companies by the Government, and I have read this correspondence as well. I cannot reveal the details of this correspondence, but I can say that I remain unconvinced that the Congress should grant total immunity to the companies.

For years, there have been a number of laws on the books, such as the Wiretap Act, the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, and, of course, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, that together make it very clear that participating in a warrantless wiretapping program is against the law.

Now, a number of our colleagues have argued that any companies that were asked to provide assistance after September 11 should be granted leniency since they acted during a time of national panic and understandable confusion. I think this argument has some merit, but the bill that was reported by our committee would not just grant immunity for 6 months or a year after September 11, it would grant immunity for actions taken up to 5 years after our country was attacked. I think that is far too long, and I will explain why.

If a phone company executive was asked to participate in warrantless wiretapping in the weeks after September 11, it is understandable that he or she might not take the time to question assertions from the Government that the wiretapping was legal, but this should not give a free pass to participate in warrantless wiretapping forever. At some point over the following months and years, this phone company executive has an obligation to think about whether they are complying with the law, and as soon as you realize that you are breaking the law, you have an obligation to stop. In the months and years following September 11, it should have been increasingly obvious to any phone company that was participating in this program that it might not be following the law.

For starters, in the weeks after September 11, Congress and the President got together to review the Foreign In-

telligence Surveillance Act, including the wiretapping provisions. But Congress did not change the sections of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act that state warrantless wiretapping is illegal. This should have been a giant red flag to any phone company that participated in the program.

Next, in the summer of 2002, the Director of the NSA, General Hayden, appeared before our committee in open session and testified about the need to get warrants when someone was inside the United States. I am sure General Hayden would argue he was parsing his words carefully, but at a minimum it was clear, at this point, most of the Congress, and certainly the American people, believes warrantless wiretapping was illegal. The President has argued he authorized this program under his authority as Commander in Chief, but in the spring of 2004, the Supreme Court issued multiple rulings clearly rejecting the idea that the President can do whatever he wishes because the country is at war. These rulings should have also been a giant red flag for any phone company engaged in warrantless wiretapping.

Finally, as the Intelligence Committee's recent report noted, most of the letters requesting assistance stated the Attorney General believed the program was legal, but as our report points out, one of the letters did not even say the Attorney General had approved. I have read this letter, and I believe it should have set off loud alarm bells in the ears of anyone who received it. In my view, as the years rolled by, it became increasingly unreasonable for any phone company to accept the Government's claim that warrantless wiretapping was legal. By 2004, at the very latest, any companies involved in the program should have recognized the President was asking them to do things that appeared to be against the law. The former CEO of Qwest has said publicly he refused requests to participate in warrantless surveillance because he believed it violated privacy laws. I cannot comment on the accuracy of this claim, but I encourage my colleagues to stop and think about its implications.

I also encourage my colleagues to go read the letters that were sent to telecommunications companies. I think these letters seriously undermine the case for blanket retroactive immunity. The bill that passed the Intelligence Committee would grant immunity long past the point at which it was reasonable for phone companies to believe the President's assertions. It would even grant immunity stretching past the point at which the program became public. By the beginning of 2006, the program was public and all the legal arguments for and against warrantless wiretapping were subject to open debate. Clearly, any companies that participated in this program in 2006 did so with the full knowledge of the possible consequences. I see no reason at all why retroactive immunity should

cover this time period. When the Senate Intelligence Committee voted to grant total retroactive immunity, I voted no because I thought it was necessary to take more time to study the relevant legal opinions as well as the letters that were sent to the communications companies.

Now that I have had a chance to study these documents, I am convinced that granting 6 years of total retroactive immunity is not warranted. I would very much like to support this important legislation because certainly there are many good provisions and they have been put together under the work of Chairman ROCKEFELLER and Senator BOND. It is my hope, as Senator REID noted earlier, we will be able to find a compromise with respect to this issue. As I have said, it may well be clear at some point down the road that the phone companies deserve some measure of protection. We certainly want law-abiding citizens and companies to be supportive of our country in times of danger, and that is why I have made the point that if we were talking about a relatively short period after 9/11, it would be one thing, but it is quite another when you are talking about year after year after year, when there were red warning flags going up.

So I look forward to working with Chairman ROCKEFELLER and Senator BOND, both of whom have great expertise in this field and have always been very fair, and I hope we can find a way to address the question of the communications companies in a fair way.

I would also like to say, before I wrap up—I know it is late in the day—a quick word about an amendment I offered in the committee that has been included in both versions of the legislation that the Senate Intelligence Committee wrote and that was written in the Judiciary Committee. Many Americans may not realize the original FISA law only provided protections for our people inside the United States and it does not cover Americans who travel overseas. If the Government wants to deliberately tap the phone calls of a businesswoman in Minneapolis, MN, or an armed services member in Roseburg, OR, the Government has to go to a judge and get a warrant. But if that Minnesota businesswoman or Oregon serviceman is sent overseas, the Attorney General can personally approve a surveillance by making his own unilateral determination of probable cause.

It is my view that in the digital age, it makes no sense for Americans' rights and freedoms to be limited by physical geography. So when the Intelligence Committee was writing its legislation, I offered an amendment that would require the Government to get a warrant before deliberately surveilling Americans who happen to be outside the country. That amendment establishing these "rights that travel," so to speak, was cosponsored by Senators FEINGOLD and WHITEHOUSE, and it was approved in the Senate Intelligence

Minnesota businesswoman or Oregon serviceman is sent overseas, the Attorney General can personally approve a surveillance by making his own unilateral determination of probable cause.

It is my view that in the digital age, it makes no sense for Americans' rights and freedoms to be limited by physical geography. So when the Intelligence Committee was writing its legislation, I offered an amendment that would require the Government to get a warrant before deliberately surveilling Americans who happen to be outside the country. That amendment establishing these "rights that travel," so to speak, was cosponsored by Senators FEINGOLD and WHITEHOUSE, and it was approved in the Senate Intelligence Committee on a bipartisan vote. The White House, regrettably, called this amendment troublesome, and I will only say I am prepared to work with colleagues on this issue. Just as I indicated I will be working with our Vice Chairman, Senator BOND, on the issue of telecommunications immunity, I am prepared to work with him and the chairman of the committee, Senator ROCKEFELLER, on my amendment to make sure there are no unintended consequences with respect to the amendment I authored that is in the Intelligence Committee legislation and that is also in the Judiciary Committee print.

I am not prepared to agree that Americans who step outside the country should have fewer rights than they do here at home. I am going to fight for that amendment that ensures Americans in the digital age have their individual liberties, have their constitutional rights wherever they travel, and I am going to fight for it even if the administration continues to oppose it.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Madam President, I now move to proceed to Calendar No. 512, S. 2248, and I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to S. 2248, FISA.

Harry Reid, Patrick Leahy, Ken Salazar, Daniel K. Inouye, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Frank R. Lautenberg, Debbie Stabenow, Richard J. Durbin, Tom Carper, John Kerry, E. Benjamin Nelson, Evan Bayh, Kent Conrad, Carl Levin, Mark Pryor, Charles Schumer, Jay Rockefeller, S. Whitehouse, Bill Nelson.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the manda-

tory quorum be waived that is required under rule XXII and that the cloture vote occur at 12 noon, Monday, December 17.

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

Mr. REID. Madam President, I now withdraw the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is withdrawn.

#### CHANGES TO S. CON. RES. 21

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, section 302 of S. Con. Res. 21, the 2008 budget resolution, permits the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee to revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels for legislation that improves certain services for and benefits to wounded or disabled military personnel and retirees, veterans, and their survivors and dependents. Section 302 authorizes the revisions provided that the legislation does not worsen the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2007 through 2012 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2007 through 2017.

I find that the conference report accompanying H.R. 1585, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008, satisfies the conditions of the deficit-neutral reserve fund for veterans and wounded service members. Therefore, pursuant to section 302, I am adjusting the aggregates in the 2008 budget resolution, as well as the allocation provided to the Senate Armed Services Committee.

I ask unanimous consent to have the following revisions to S. Con. Res. 21 printed in the RECORD.

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

*Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2008—S. Con. Res. 21; Revisions to the Conference Agreement Pursuant to Section 302 Deficit-Neutral Reserve Fund for Veterans and Wounded Servicemembers*

[In billions of dollars]

#### Section 101

##### (1)(A) Federal Revenues:

FY 2007 .....	1,900.340
FY 2008 .....	2,025.853
FY 2009 .....	2,121.872
FY 2010 .....	2,175.881
FY 2011 .....	2,357.045
FY 2012 .....	2,499.046

##### (1)(B) Change in Federal Revenues:

FY 2007 .....	-4.366
FY 2008 .....	-24.943
FY 2009 .....	14.946
FY 2010 .....	12.160
FY 2011 .....	-37.505
FY 2012 .....	-98.050

##### (2) New Budget Authority:

FY 2007 .....	2,371.470
FY 2008 .....	2,508.884
FY 2009 .....	2,527.042
FY 2010 .....	2,581.368
FY 2011 .....	2,696.714
FY 2012 .....	2,737.580

##### (3) Budget Outlays:

FY 2007 .....	2,294.862
FY 2008 .....	2,471.500
FY 2009 .....	2,573.867
FY 2010 .....	2,609.801
FY 2011 .....	2,702.693
FY 2012 .....	2,716.354

*Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2008—S. Con. Res. 21; Revisions to the Conference Agreement Pursuant to Section 302 Deficit-Neutral Reserve Fund for Veterans and Wounded Servicemembers*

[In millions of dollars]

#### Current Allocation to Senate

Armed Services Committee:	
FY 2007 Budget Authority .....	98,717
FY 2007 Outlays .....	98,252
FY 2008 Budget Authority .....	102,125
FY 2008 Outlays .....	102,153
FY 2008-2012 Budget Authority .....	546,992
FY 2008-2012 Outlays .....	546,679

#### Adjustments:

FY 2007 Budget Authority .....	0
FY 2007 Outlays .....	0
FY 2008 Budget Authority .....	-15
FY 2008 Outlays .....	-112
FY 2008-2012 Budget Authority .....	258
FY 2008-2012 Outlays .....	-22

#### Revised Allocation to Senate

Armed Services Committee:	
FY 2007 Budget Authority .....	98,717
FY 2007 Outlays .....	98,252
FY 2008 Budget Authority .....	102,110
FY 2008 Outlays .....	102,041
FY 2008-2012 Budget Authority .....	547,250
FY 2008-2012 Outlays .....	546,657

#### ENERGY INDEPENDENCE AND SECURITY ACT

Mr. FEINGOLD. Madam President, I support the passage of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007, H.R. 6, which sets the U.S. energy policy on the right path.

I am particularly supportive of the critical improvements that were made in this bill to raise vehicle fuel economy standards while protecting American jobs. It is vitally important to my hometown of Janesville, WI, and to other hard-working communities across the country that Congress strike the right balance on this issue. Since the Senate considered the Energy bill earlier this year, I have worked with my colleagues to ensure that the final version includes strong but reasonable CAFE standards. I am glad that together we have accomplished that feat, and the bill has the support of interests as varied as the UAW, General Motors, and environmental groups.

I also support the bill's renewable fuel standard, which will require 36 billion gallons of renewable fuels by 2022, of which 21 billion will come from advanced biofuels, such as cellulosic ethanol and biodiesel. The bill also includes language I cosponsored urging that 25 percent of energy come from renewable sources by 2025 and setting requirements for improved energy efficiency for buildings, appliances, and lighting. The bill also includes an important provision, based on a bill I cosponsored, that makes it unlawful for an individual to knowingly manipulate the price of oil or gas.

I am, however, disappointed that after hard work and negotiations that produced a good, balanced energy bill, a minority of Senators repeatedly blocked the bill. It is unfortunate that to overcome this Republican roadblock, we had to remove the renewable electricity standard and the energy tax provisions—these new or extended renewable energy tax incentives were fully offset, so they would not have added to our deficit.

However, on balance, the version of the bill that the Senate passed is a positive step. It moves us away from our dependence on oil, increases our