

where he played center on the football team and threw shot put and discuss for the track and field team. Those close to him describe him as a wonderful young man with a nice smile and a hearty laugh, a loyal friend, and a patriot with a strong desire to serve his country. Family and friends say he had a zest for life and loved to hunt and drive fast cars.

Sensing a call to duty, and in response to the September 11 terrorist attack on our Nation, he joined the U.S. Army in 2004. Justin reported to Fort Benning, GA, where he completed basic training, infantry training, and Army Airborne School. Upon completion of his training in August 2004, he was assigned and reported to the 2nd Battalion, 505th Parachute Infantry Regiment at Fort Bragg. In August 2006, he deployed with his unit to Iraq. He said he went to Iraq so that the Iraqi children could have the same opportunities as U.S. children and he was extremely proud of what he was doing. The awards and decorations that Specialist Rollins received over his years of service are a testament to his strong character. They include the Bronze Star with Valor, two Purple Heart medals, Army Good Conduct Medal, National Defense Service Medal, Iraq Campaign Medal, Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, Army Service Ribbon, Army Overseas Service Ribbon, Combat Infantry Badge, and Airborne Wings.

Patriots from the State of New Hampshire have served our Nation with honor and distinction from the first conflict at Fort William and Mary, New Castle, NH, to the current conflict in Samarra, Iraq, and U.S. Army SPC Justin Allan Rollins served and fought in that same fine tradition. During our country's difficult Revolutionary War, Thomas Paine wrote, "These are the times that try men's souls. The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will, in this crisis, shrink from the service of their country; but he that stands it now, deserves the love and thanks of man and woman." In these turbulent times Justin stood with the country he loved, served it with distinction and honor, and earned and deserves our love and thanks.

My sympathy, condolences, and prayers go out to Justin's parents Skip and Rhonda, older brother Jonathan, grandparents, longtime girlfriend Brittney Murray, and to his other family members and many friends who have suffered this most grievous loss. Family, friends, and fellow soldiers will no longer be able to enjoy his company. Strangers will never have the opportunity to know his friendship. Yet memories of this young patriot will last forever with those who were fortunate enough to have had the opportunity to know him. Justin had said that there is no higher honor than to be buried in Arlington National Cemetery, and now he joins many of our country's heroes in that sacred place. Because of his devotion and sense of

duty, the safety and liberty of each and every American is more secure. In the words of Daniel Webster, may his remembrance be as long lasting as the land he honored. God bless Justin Allan Rollins.

PRIVATE FIRST CLASS JASON D. JOHNS

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, today I have a heavy heart and deep sense of gratitude to honor the life of a brave young man from Frankton. Jason Johns, 19 years old, died on February 21 while deployed in Afghanistan. With his entire life before him, Jason risked everything to fight for the values Americans hold close to our hearts, in a land halfway around the world.

Although Jason moved to Florida when he was young, his valor over the course of his service in Afghanistan makes us proud to count him as a Hoosier, too. According to his father, Jason had known that he had wanted to be a soldier for as long as his friends and family could remember. He fulfilled that dream when he joined the Army in 2005, shortly after receiving his GED. Jason enjoyed the military, and he intended to make it his career, hoping to someday reach the rank of general. His father, along with friends of the family, described him as serious about his career and a selfless man who wanted to serve his country.

Jason died while serving his country in Operation Enduring Freedom. He was a member of the 3rd Battalion, 82nd General Support Aviation Battalion, 82nd Airborne Division out of Fort Bragg, NC. This brave young soldier leaves behind his mother and father, Kim and Jeffrey Johns, and two older brothers, Jack and Jeremiah.

Today, I join Jason's family and friends in mourning his death. While we struggle to bear our sorrow over this loss, we can also take pride in the example he set, bravely fighting to make the world a safer place. It is his courage and strength of character that people will remember when they think of Jason, a memory that will burn brightly during these continuing days of conflict and grief.

Jason was known for his dedication to his family and his love of country. Today and always, Jason will be remembered by family members, friends, and fellow Hoosiers as a true American hero, and we honor the sacrifice he made while dutifully serving his country.

As I search for words to do justice in honoring Jason's sacrifice, I am reminded of President Lincoln's remarks as he addressed the families of the fallen soldiers in Gettysburg: "We cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate, we cannot hallow this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here." This statement is just as true today as it was nearly 150 years ago, as I am certain that the impact of Jason's actions will

live on far longer than any record of these words.

It is my sad duty to enter the name of Jason D. Johns in the official RECORD of the United States Senate for his service to this country and for his profound commitment to freedom, democracy, and peace. When I think about this just cause in which we are engaged, and the unfortunate pain that comes with the loss of our heroes, I hope that families like Jason's can find comfort in the words of the prophet Isaiah who said, "He will swallow up death in victory; and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces."

May God grant strength and peace to those who mourn, and may God be with all of you, as I know He is with Jason.

IMPROVING AMERICA'S SECURITY ACT

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, over 5 years ago, on September 11, terrorists murdered nearly 3,000 people in the single deadliest attack on American soil in our history.

What all Americans witnessed and what too many families experienced personally and tragically was the dawn of a new era. We knew it then. National Guard patrolled Federal buildings and airports. The military patrolled the skies over New York and Washington, DC. The United States had been attacked by a new kind of enemy in a new and more dangerous world. We faced tough questions as a nation: How do we defeat this enemy? How do we fight terror abroad and protect America at home?

What was clear that day and remains so today is that the threat posed to us by terrorism requires a great mobilization of American might, muscle, resources, and ingenuity.

Armed with this mandate, many of us fought alongside those who lost loved ones on September 11 to compel an unwilling Bush administration to create the 9/11 Commission. The determination and steadfastness demonstrated by the families hardest hit by the September 11 tragedy made the 9/11 Commission a reality. We applauded when the bipartisan Commission concluded its investigation and released its thorough report detailing recommendations to protect this Nation from another attack, confident that the Congress and the administration would in short order implement their recommendations.

Shamefully, for some in our Federal Government, the sense of urgency and resolve faded in the months and years that followed. Some of the Commission's most commonsense recommendations went ignored. Even in the face of dangerous incompetence in our emergency preparedness and response to Hurricane Katrina, we received tough rhetoric instead of much needed reform. Five years after the 9/11

attacks and 2½ years after the 9/11 Commission released its initial report, much of the work of properly securing our homeland has gone undone. That is why this legislation to implement many of the remaining recommendations of the 9/11 Commission is long overdue.

I have long supported the Commission's recommendation that "homeland security assistance should be based strictly on an assessment of risks and vulnerabilities." With our homeland security resources limited, we need to be smart about how we distribute funding to guard against terrorism. Sadly, all too often, funding decisions have been made based on politics in Washington instead of the reality in our cities and neighborhoods. It is why I introduced the Homeland Security Block Grant Act as well as the Domestic Defense Fund Act, both of which would provide direct and threat-based homeland security funding to our communities and first responders to help them improve our homeland defense. But even funds supposedly distributed based on risk have been administered incompetently.

Last spring, the Department of Homeland Security, DHS, announced its 2006 homeland security grants. Cities and States across the country facing high terrorist threats suffered considerable funding cuts, a decision which can be largely attributed to a series of highly questionable risk assessments. New York City and Washington, DC, both already the targets of attacks, were slated for drastic reductions. Funding under the Urban Area Security Initiative, UASI, alone was slashed in New York City by more than 40 percent and in Washington, DC by 43 percent.

We clearly need to get smarter about how we assess risk. It would surprise most people to learn that until now, the process of assessing risk has been done on an ad hoc basis within DHS, with several different offices tasked with contributing to the analysis. This seemingly haphazard process has led to constantly changing grant guidance and formulas, wide fluctuations in yearly grant awards, and a failure to develop a long-term strategy for risk assessment. What we need is a full-time staff of methodologists whose sole responsibility it is to assess risk. That is why I offered an amendment to bill that would create a Risk Assessment Center within DHS.

While the funding proposal contained within Improving America's Security Act moves us closer toward a threat-based funding model, it still falls short of what the 9/11 Commission recommended. Specifically, the State minimum funding requirements contained within the bill are still too high and there is still too much reliance on population-based formulas that bear little relation to risk. My hope is that during conference committee negotiations to reconcile the House and Senate bills, efforts will be made to ensure

that our limited homeland security funds are directed toward mitigating our most significant vulnerabilities and that political formulas are abandoned.

As we discuss the importance of homeland security and how critical it is to provide adequate funding for our first responders, we cannot leave the 43,000 transportation security officers, TSOs, in this country out of the conversation. Every day, TSOs are on the national security frontlines, keeping our airports safe and protecting countless citizens as they travel. Despite the significant training, experience, and patience required to execute these duties, TSOs have lacked the basic workers rights and protections for over 5 years, including whistleblower protections and the right to collectively bargain. As a result, the officers we task with protecting our airplanes from another terrorist attack now have the highest injury rate of any Federal agency, a high attrition rate of almost 30 percent, and, according to a recent report, the lowest morale of any agency in the Federal Government.

It is why I supported Senator McCASKILL's amendment that would guarantee to TSOs collective bargaining and other basic labor rights that other Federal law enforcement officers already enjoy. This amendment would promote our Nation's security by providing a stable workplace structure for the resolution of disputes and the reduction of turnover, as well as allow TSOs to expose threats to aviation security without fear of retaliation. The amendment also includes provisions that make explicit that TSOs would not enjoy the right to strike, the right to bargain for higher pay, or the right to reveal classified information, and that the TSOs must follow all orders during an emergency. This was a smart and carefully tailored amendment that correctly recognizes that we will not be able to effectively safeguard our Nation's security if we do not stand with and support its security workers.

It is also past time to secure our ports and transportation systems. Unscanned cargo containers that pass through our ports pose a substantial risk to our homeland security, threatening not only the gateways to our national economy but also the larger American public. We learned the painful lesson on September 11 that those intent on destroying our American way of life are keenly focused on exposing our vulnerabilities. Because our ports serve as the gateway to our country and its economy, they remain attractive targets susceptible to terrorist attack.

In 2005, more than 84 million tons of cargo with a value greater than \$132 billion passed through the Port of New York and New Jersey alone. The sheer scope of commerce at our ports means the threat carries grave consequences—and will take a great deal of hard work and our smartest strategies to meet. And while we took important steps to-

ward addressing these concerns last year with the passage of the SAFE Ports Act, we still need to act with more urgency. It is why I supported efforts to expedite the implementation of new scanning requirements during consideration of the Improving America's Security Act.

I am encouraged that the bill does take steps to secure our rail and mass transit systems. Given the lessons of London, Madrid, and Mumbai, it is unbelievable that not more has been done to secure our mass transit. Passenger rail systems—primarily subway systems—here in the United States carry about 5 times as many passengers each day as do airlines. Instead of forcing an impossible decision, between protecting one form of transportation over another, we should invest in the resources and tools necessary to secure our entire transportation infrastructure—before terrorists strike our rail systems here at home.

Importantly, the bill provides grants through TSA to Amtrak, freight railroads, and others to upgrade security across the entire freight and intercity passenger railroad system. Additionally, the bill provides funding through the Department of Transportation, DOT, to upgrade and to fortify Amtrak railroad tunnels in New York, Washington, and Baltimore.

Furthermore, the legislation requires the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, FMCSA, to provide recommendations to both motor carriers and States on how to coordinate hazardous materials routing. The bill also requires DHS to develop a program to encourage equipping trucks that carry hazardous materials with communications and tracking technology. These steps are in addition to those in the bill that bolster aviation security standards. Importantly, the bill requires the Transportation Security Administration, TSA, to develop and implement a system, within 3 years of the date of enactment, to provide for the screening of all cargo being carried on passenger aircraft, a security measure that is long overdue.

The bill also takes several important steps to address our emergency communications systems before we face another crisis. Chaotic, real-world disasters, whether manmade or natural, do not obey borders. They require close coordination of Federal, State and local agencies, firefighters, police officers and EMTs, and others. Yet often these different entities use different communications devices, frequencies, even languages. On September 11, police officers could not effectively talk to firefighters at Ground Zero; at the Pentagon, first responders from Virginia and Washington, DC faced the same problem. After Katrina, we had responders exchanging business cards at the site of the disaster along the gulf.

That is why the 9/11 Commission recognized our crucial need to have interoperable communications, so that all

of our first responders can communicate with each other at the scene of an emergency. It is why I introduced legislation last year that would give our first responders an interoperable emergency communications system coordinated under Federal leadership. I am pleased that the bill provides funds to improve interoperable emergency communications and gives the National Telecommunications and Information Administration, NTIA, greater direction regarding how to distribute these funds.

This bill also contains a provision offered by Senator STEVENS and me which will provide immediate and critical funding to help upgrade and improve our Nation's 9-1-1 call centers. This funding will help ensure that 9-1-1 call centers can be an effective part of an emergency response plan and will make certain they have the technological upgrades to handle and process all the emergency calls that come into them so that our first responders know where to go and what situation they are walking into.

Nearly 5 years ago, America suffered a brutal terrorist attack that stole nearly 3,000 lives and changed America forever. What was required here in Washington was leadership. Leadership to inspire Americans to meet the threat head on. Leadership to mobilize our resources and respond effectively. Leadership to keep our country safe in a new and more dangerous world.

Sadly, the Bush administration failed to match the urgency and resolve of the American people in this great struggle to secure our homeland. Today, with passage of this important legislation, we will demonstrate the leadership that we have been sorely missing for too long in the fight to safeguard our Nation and its citizens.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I regret that on March 9, I was unable to vote on certain provisions of S. 4, the Improving America's Security Act of 2007. I wish to address these votes so that the people of the great State of Kansas who elected me to serve them as United States Senator may know my position.

Regarding vote No. 68, on the motion to invoke cloture on the Cornyn amendment No. 312, as modified, I would have voted to invoke cloture on this amendment. My vote would not have altered the result of this motion.

Regarding vote No. 69, on the motion to invoke cloture on the Reid amendment No. 275, as amended, I would not have voted to invoke cloture on this amendment. My vote would not have altered the result of this motion.

TESTIMONY OF DR. ROBERT SOCOLOW

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, on Tuesday, February 27, 2007, the Finance Committee held a hearing on energy-

tax issues titled: America's Energy Future: Bold Ideas, Practical Solutions. I ask unanimous consent that the following testimony from that hearing be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE CHALLENGE OF MANAGING U.S. COAL IN A CLIMATE-CONSTRAINED WORLD

TESTIMONY BEFORE THE SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE

(Professor Robert Socolow, Princeton University, Feb. 27, 2007)

Mr. Chairman, Senator Grassley, and members of the Committee: Thank you for inviting me to testify today. I am pleased to be here in my capacity as co-director of Princeton University's Carbon Mitigation Initiative; as a Professor of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering at Princeton; and as an individual concerned about the future of U.S. and global energy policy. I commend you for these hearings.

In 2004 Stephen Pacala and I published a paper in *Science* magazine called "Stabilization Wedges: Solving the Climate Problem for the Next 50 Years with Current Technologies." We argued for a portfolio of climate-change mitigation strategies. Among these strategies are the deepening of energy efficiency in buildings, transport, and industry; the deployment of renewable energy, nuclear power and biofuels; and the capture and sequestration of carbon dioxide produced at coal power plants and coal-to-liquids plants.

Today, I will focus my testimony on the strategy that has moved to near the top of the list from the perspective of urgency: carbon capture and sequestration, or CCS for short.

COLLISION AVOIDANCE

Mr. Chairman, this really is a time of Bad News and Good News. The Bad News is that two trains are on a collision course. The Good News is that there is still time to switch one of the trains onto a different track.

Train Number One is the rush to coal power in the U.S., a consequence of changed expectations about the future natural gas price. Train Number Two is the urgency of dealing with climate change. In my view, none too soon, climate change is high on the agenda for U.S. policy.

A collision is imminent because burning coal as we have burned it in the past sends more carbon dioxide into the atmosphere for each unit of useful energy produced than any other energy source. So, the rush to coal makes the already difficult challenge of climate change even more challenging.

The switch is carbon dioxide capture and sequestration, or CCS. Using CCS, when coal is burned its carbon does not end up in the atmosphere.

READINESS

CCS is commercially mature; it uses proven technologies in new combinations. Carbon dioxide has long been captured at natural gas power plants and coal power plants for use by the food industry. A 500-mile carbon dioxide pipeline built 20 years ago has brought carbon dioxide from across New Mexico from southwest Colorado to oil fields in west Texas. There are no technological reasons to delay full-scale deployment of CCS.

The best evidence I know for the readiness of CCS for full-scale deployment is the 500-megawatt CCS project at BP's Carson refinery, near Long Beach, California. This project of BP and Edison Mission Group received investment tax credits under Section 48B of the tax code, per the 2005 Energy Pol-

icy Act. The project will gasify 4500 tons per day of petcoke, the bottom of the barrel at a refinery, a negative-cost fuel. Four million tons of carbon dioxide will be sent off-site each year for enhanced oil recovery (EOR).

Carbon dioxide capture and sequestration is likely to become a favorable economic strategy for a coal utility at a price of about \$30 per U.S. ton of carbon dioxide. Prices on emissions in the same range should also enable other "upstream" carbon-saving strategies, ending flaring at the oil field and bringing new investments at oil refineries. Carbon dioxide policy should reach far upstream, because the low-hanging fruit is upstream.

Efficiency in energy use is where the other low-hanging fruit are to be found. A low-tech air-conditioner cooling a poorly designed and poorly instrumented office building is as out of place in a climate-constrained world as a coal plant without carbon dioxide capture and sequestration.

EOR AND NATIONAL ENERGY SECURITY

Carbon dioxide is the mischief molecule in the atmosphere, but the miracle molecule below ground. Used for enhanced oil recovery (EOR), carbon dioxide injects new life into old oil fields. Quantitatively, a new one-thousand-megawatt coal plant will produce about six million tons per year of carbon dioxide. If captured and used for enhanced oil recovery, this carbon dioxide should increase oil production at mature fields by between 30,000 and 80,000 barrels a day. Any carbon dioxide heading for the sky is domestic oil not produced—and more imported oil.

NO CTL WITHOUT CCS

Your committee is considering subsidizing synthetic fuel from domestic coal. From a climate change perspective, unless synfuels production is accompanied by carbon dioxide capture and sequestration, this is a big step backward. Burning coal-based synthetic fuel in a car engine, instead of burning gasoline made from crude oil, sends approximately twice as much carbon dioxide to the atmosphere when driving the same distance—unless CCS is incorporated into the synfuels production process, in which case CTL fuel is no worse for climate than petroleum fuel.

"No CTL without CCS" isn't the world's most exciting bumper sticker, but it carries a vitally important message.

CARBON PRICE, PLUS

Mr. Chairman, The sulfur trading you helped launch in the early 1990s has been a spectacular success and the template for every cap-and-trade proposal since then. But the launching of CCS will require "a carbon dioxide trading system, plus." I strongly recommend that your committee restrict the next investment tax credits only to coal power plants and coal synfuels plants that capture and sequester carbon dioxide.

Moreover, I recommend that policies specify only that carbon dioxide must be sequestered, with penalties for failure, but then leave it to the market to choose the specific capture and sequestration strategy for each circumstance.

POLICY MUST DISTINGUISH INDUSTRIAL FROM NATURAL CARBON DIOXIDE

Several federal and state energy policies in the 1980s that subsidized enhanced oil recovery resulted in the extraction of carbon dioxide from large geological formations—carbon dioxide that otherwise would have stayed below ground for millions of years. This adverse impact on climate was inadvertent; but now we know better. All legislation henceforth must distinguish industrial carbon dioxide from natural carbon dioxide.

POLICIES THAT PENALIZE EARLY BAD ACTION

Urgently needed for the current period are policies that give clear and persuasive signals that any new coal plants without CCS