

come next year, we are providing incentives for the American people to make better choices about the kind of energy we will use. And because of the Energy bill, those choices will be clean energy choices.

Today, 50 percent of our Nation's electricity comes from coal, and the EIA estimates that by 2025, 54 percent of electricity consumed will be generated from coal. In China, they are building a coal-fired powerplant every 10 days. Let it be our mission to invest both the human and capital resources to the goal of zero-emission, coal-based power generation.

Having made the statement about China, let me hope that we will find a way to negotiate with China so that they, too, will begin to be concerned about what they are generating and begin some mutual programs of restraint. Wouldn't that be good news for the world? Let us dedicate ourselves to choosing a free-market, incentive approach rather than a punitive, regulatory approach to solving this global problem.

On nuclear energy, what did we do? In advancing nuclear power, Congress affirmed sound science and technology and rejected irrational fear. By doing this, we strengthened the nuclear renaissance in America. We provided Federal risk insurance for the first six nuclear reactors, production tax credits, and loan guarantees, and we renewed the Price-Anderson Act. All these initiatives and more provided evidence of our renewed support for clean nuclear power.

Until the passage of the Energy bill 18 months ago, the world was passing us by on nuclear power. The renaissance was fading. Then Congress acted. Since that time, as many as 32 new nuclear reactors are in the planning stages. These nuclear plants would provide enough electricity to power 29 million homes. If these plants come into fruition, they will displace 270 million metric tons of carbon dioxide each year.

Consider this: When all of those plants are operating for 5 years, it is estimated that they will have displaced the same amount of carbon emissions that the 230 million cars on the road in America today produce each year.

This is what is at stake as we implement the various provisions of the Energy Policy Act of 2005. We must do more to solve our growing nuclear waste problem, and we must do more to show Americans what the rest of the world already knows: nuclear power is the largest source of clean, carbon-free energy in the world. Advancing nuclear power is essential for our economic strength and environmental well-being. While we do it, we will not be able to stop using other kinds of energy. So the coal people need not worry. They will be used, too, because this great land needs both and more.

With the passage of the Energy Policy Act, we helped to stabilize long-term prices of natural gas by providing

the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission with the tools necessary to ensure the safe operation and reliability of our Nation's liquid natural gas assets. Since the passage of the Energy bill in August of 2005, FERC has approved seven new LNG terminals or terminal expansions. Working with private sector operators, FERC has brought on line the capacity equivalent of 1.34 billion cubic feet per day of natural gas, with the potential to increase that to 13.3 billion cubic feet per day. We must continue to look for ways domestically to find additional supplies of natural gas, as we did last year with the passage of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006.

In passing the Energy Policy Act, we substantially advanced renewable sources of energy in America. By the end of 2007, 2 million American homes will be powered by wind as we bring on line 6,000 megawatts of new wind power this year, part of the \$4.5 billion in wind power investments spurred by the Energy bill. As a result of the wind power brought on line, we will displace 11 billion pounds of carbon dioxide annually.

And there is so much more that we did. We promoted a modernized electricity grid, invested in solar energy, tax provisions that helped add almost 340,000 hybrid vehicles, and the list goes on. I continue to look for more to be done. In this Congress, we all will focus our efforts on convincing colleagues and the American people that the solutions to our energy and environmental challenges lie in the genius of the American people. I will not support energy policies that burden the people with higher energy costs and undue regulations. I oppose the creation of additional unmanageable bureaucracy with its potential for punitive and burdensome regulations that harm the American worker. We will meet the challenge of providing clean, affordable, and abundant energy supplies in this Nation by facilitating and unlocking the ingenuity of the American people with more capital investment, more loans guaranteed for people with new ideas to build new things. That is what we did in the Energy Policy Act of 2005, and that is what we will continue to do, hopefully.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

#### THE BUDGET

Mrs. MCCASKILL. Madam President, over the past week, I have taken a good look at the President's budget submission. I am new around here, and I will admit that the Federal budget is very complex. But as somebody who has spent the last years of my life as an auditor, I have come to one inescapable conclusion about the budget that has been presented to this Congress for consideration. First, it is not honest; second, it has the wrong priorities.

This budget reflects part of the problem we have; that is, our country is

facing incredible problems that are very difficult, and we want the American people to support us and believe in us. We cannot expect them to join us in a fight against these complex problems if we aren't going to begin the process by being honest with them. We cannot expect them to support what we do if we are not willing to tell them the complete and unvarnished truth about the situation we face in America today in terms of our budget.

The President claims with a straight face that this budget will eliminate the deficit by 2012. In fact, the President claims it will create a surplus in 2012. That sounds great. The problem is, it is not true. The numbers do not add up. First, he fails to include the full cost of the war in Iraq. In this budget, it says the war will only cost \$50 billion in 2009. Keep in mind that in this budget cycle, we will spend over \$240 billion on the war in Iraq. The confusing part to me about the \$50 billion is that it is a mystery. Why is this \$50 billion a mystery? It is a mystery because no one seems to know where the figure came from.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I had the opportunity to listen, as the Secretary of Defense and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and even the Comptroller for the Department of Defense were asked the question: Where did the \$50 billion figure come from? They did not know. If the leadership of our military and the highest ranking financial official in the Department of Defense do not know where a figure in the budget came from for our war effort, what does that tell you about the integrity of the document? If that figure came from somewhere other than the leaders of the military, we have a problem.

The President also conveniently left out the long-term cost of alternative minimum tax relief for the middle class, which the administration knows we all support. The AMT was never designed to reach down into the middle class, as it does and will continue to do in an ever-increasing way, to cause even more stress and pressure on a middle class that believes it is under attack from all sides. Furthermore, this budget assumes deep cuts in education and health care, cuts that the administration knows are not realistic.

Finally, it hides the long-term cost of the President's ill-advised program to privatize Social Security. This budget is a gimmick. It is the kind of gimmick that the American people have grown very tired of. If proper budgeting procedures were followed, the Federal Government would still be hundreds of billions of dollars in the red by 2012.

If it is not bad enough that this budget is not honest with the American people as to what its implications are, it is even worse when you look at the priorities. First, let's talk about the tax cuts in the President's budget. It preserves billions of dollars in oil subsidies, despite the fact that, once again, we just heard that one of the big

oil companies had a record profit-making quarter. Second, there is \$73 billion in this budget to extend tax cuts for millionaires through 2012. I am not talking about tax cuts for people who make \$200,000 a year or \$300,000 a year. I am talking about for millionaires, \$73 billion. Maybe you think that is not so bad, \$73 billion for millionaires, until you realize the rest of the story that is contained in this budget.

In this budget, the President wants our veterans to spend as much as \$15 billion more for the health care they have been promised. According to McClatchy newspapers, this figure could be as high as \$15 billion. It is at least \$5 billion for additional enrollment fees in health care and additional pharmaceutical costs. Our veterans are being given a tax increase. They say it is not a tax increase; it is a revenue enhancement. This budget is filled with revenue enhancements, also known as user fees, also known as tax increases. So we have a tax cut in this budget for the millionaires, and we have taxes being raised on our veterans. We also have \$37.8 billion over 10 years for seniors to increase their Medicare premiums. Tax cuts for the millionaires; tax increases for our veterans and seniors.

Besides the seniors and veterans, who else will pay? Our children will pay through cuts in the health insurance program for children. There may be a little more money in this budget, but there is not enough money to cover the children who currently are covered under this program in the United States. Missouri is one of those States that has a shortfall in funding. If we do not fix the President's budget, we will be taking care of the millionaires, and tens of thousands of children will be removed from health care rolls in the State of Missouri.

The COPS Program is cut, law enforcement. College loan programs are cut.

I have heard in the last couple of years in my life the phrase "support our troops" as often as I have heard almost the words "good morning." I have heard it in this room dozens of times in the last few days, as people have argued about the war in Iraq and said, "You are not supporting our troops. You have to show that you support our troops."

This budget is the way we show whether we support our troops. Supporting our troops is not a phrase for a political campaign. It is not something to be bandied about to get political advantage, over which resolution we are voting on, or who looks better, the Republicans or the Democrats. It should be embodied in what we do as we decide the priorities for the money we spend on behalf of the American people.

In this budget, we have said to veterans coming home—and that we are talking about veterans under the age of 65—that they will have to pay more. That is being proposed at the same time we are walking around here right-

eously indignant that we are not doing enough to support our troops. In reality, the veterans of this Nation have been losing benefits throughout the Iraq war conflict. They have been fighting for their health care, fighting to see a doctor, and waiting in long lines. This budget is an opportunity to quit talking the talk and begin to walk the walk when it comes to the men and women who have put their lives on the line for our flag and for the country we love.

There are not very many veterans coming home from Iraq who are having sleepless nights, worrying about the estate tax on their \$10 million estates. There are not very many veterans coming home from Iraq who are worried about their capital gains tax on a multimillion dollar piece of property or their stock portfolio. But there are veterans coming home from Iraq who are having sleepless nights about their health care, about their children's health care, about their children's education, and about their retirement security.

This budget does not reflect that we care about those veterans and their sleepless nights. Let's make the phrase "support the troops" mean something other than trying to jockey for position in a political game of hardball. Let's get our priorities straight. Let's fix this deeply flawed budget for the American people, and let's begin by being honest about the budget.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. SMITH. Madam President, two of my colleagues came to the floor and asked that they be recognized. Out of courtesy to them, I ask unanimous consent that Senator ISAKSON be given 5 minutes and Senator CHAMBLISS be given 5 minutes, and that the time I have reserved be retained.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

#### SCHIP

Mr. ISAKSON. Madam President, I rise to wholeheartedly endorse an amendment filed today prior to the 2:30 deadline, authored by Senator CHAMBLISS and coauthored by myself. The amendment relates to SCHIP, State Children's Health Insurance Program, and a crisis that exists right now, this minute, in 17 States in the United States of America.

As the occupant of the chair knows, SCHIP is a program where our most needy children are able to get health insurance. It is a 71-percent Federal Medicaid match. But unlike Medicaid, it is not an entitlement; it is an appropriated amount annually that is derived by a formula as the States get their benefit. What has happened this

year is that a number of States, with a number of children eligible for the program, have run out of their Federal match and it is capitated.

Also, a number of States have a significant surplus. What Senator CHAMBLISS has proposed, and what I am advocating, is an amendment we want to propose to the CR which would take that amount of surplus SCHIP money in States with more than 200 percent of their estimated need—take that amount above 200 percent and put it into a pool and reallocate it to those States that are falling short, so that through this fiscal year every child in America who has been promised children's health insurance can in fact get it.

It doesn't penalize any State that has a surplus because that is money they have not and will not use. It doesn't benefit any State who has abused the system. It is just that we have a number of States that have grown rapidly in their numbers. In Georgia alone, in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina, we added 43,000 children immediately into our State's population, most all of whom remain today.

I know the CR amendment tree has been filled as of now. The distinguished majority leader has filled the tree, so there will be no room for amendments to the continuing resolution. I intend to vote tomorrow for cloture to allow us to complete this resolution and continue appropriations for this year. I hope the distinguished majority leader will think about the value of saving the SCHIP program this year.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter that was distributed by the majority leader and the Speaker, written to the President of the United States, on February 2.

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

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
Washington, DC, February 2, 2007.

The PRESIDENT  
The White House,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We understand you plan to submit a request for emergency supplemental appropriations soon, which news reports indicate could exceed \$100 billion. As you consider the emergency needs of our nation, we respectfully request that you not forget the millions of low-income Americans who are insured under the State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP). We ask that you submit a separate spending proposal to cover shortfalls in SCHIP for Fiscal Year 2007 which have been estimated to be \$745 million. Unless we act quickly to provide additional funds to this important program, we are putting the health coverage of thousands of Americans in jeopardy.

As you know, over 46 million Americans are without health insurance. We can ill afford to increase the rolls of the uninsured for failure to adequately fund a successful and efficient insurance program such as SCHIP. Yet we know that at least fourteen states will face a shortfall of SCHIP funds within months. The Governor of Georgia has written to us stating that "It is vitally important to our most needy citizens that Congress act expeditiously."

At the end of the last Congress, we were successful in including a provision to avert a