

right, the politics of this issue would change again if there were long gas lines at the pump and they were paying \$3-plus a gallon. So the supply is there in the current form, but 60 percent of it comes from a foreign nation somewhere in the world. Most of those supplies and those foreign nations are in very precarious political situations. It is a very unstable world out there from whence these supplies come. As a result, the futures market anticipates that and builds a margin in to offset the risk to deal with the demand.

What am I saying here? I am saying to the Senate today that S. 1419 is a piece of the total, but it isn't where we ought to be tomorrow. Tomorrow ought to be about energy security and energy production. You don't talk green, although you have to talk green and should talk green. You don't talk cellulosic ethanol being in production in 10 years at a rate of 15 billion gallons a year because it won't be, because the technology isn't there, although we are driving there. Energy efficiency, a CAFE standard, is a place we ought to go. I for the first time join with the Senator from North Dakota in a 4-percent mandatory efficiency. That takes us down the road. But that is out in the future. What about tomorrow? What about knowing where our current oil reserves are, the 15 or 20 billion barrels or more of oil that is in the Outer Continental Shelf that may be very accessible in a clean and environmentally sound way? What about expanding our refinery capacity? Because in this transitional period of the next two-and-a-half to three decades, where more cars will be electric, more cars will be hybrid, we will be producing 20 percent of our liquid transportation fuels from corn-based ethanol, cellulosic-based ethanol, to get to the 30 to 32 billion gallons a year. What about all of that? That is our future.

My consumers in Idaho want to know about tomorrow. The Reid-Bingaman bill has nothing to do with tomorrow. We simply cannot ignore the next 10 or 15 years and jump into the future. We have to continue to produce and we need to produce. We have to continue to refine the hydrocarbons to supply the gas, and we need to expand that capability. It better be on shore. It better not be in Venezuela or in Kuwait or Saudi Arabia or someplace else that is at this moment, at best, politically unstable, let alone Iran and Iraq. That is where our dependence lies today. To fail to address that in the Senate is to fail to address the No. 1 question of a great nation: How do we stay great? How do we stay at 26 percent of the world GDP? How do we stay generous to the rest of the world? We produce and push a lot of new technology, and that is in part what the Reid bill is about. That is all going to be transparent and giveable to the rest of the world. When we lead on energy in all aspects, the rest of the world benefits because we share it.

Therefore, as this bill comes to the floor, there is a great deal that has to

be done. We need a new RPS, renewable portfolio standard, wind, solar—a great idea, an old concept. Today's energy world is about cleanliness. Why not a new standard? Why not a clean portfolio standard instead of a renewable portfolio standard? Include wind, include solar, include sequestration of carbon, include efficiencies, include nuclear, include hydro. Let's get on with the business of being clean. If Senator REID wants to come to the floor and talk about climate change, then he ought to be talking about all of those other things that drive the economy toward a cleaner energy future, not command and control but incentives, creativity, bringing off the laboratory shelf and into production the kind of things we know are already out there.

Coal to liquids, what is wrong with that? Some environmental groups are wringing their hands and saying: There might be a problem there. We know it will burn 90 percent cleaner. That is not a problem. It is only in the mind of some idealist that it isn't perfect. How do you get to perfection? You start by adjusting and changing and improving. Today we are tremendously proud of our ethanol production in corn. But it has been 20 years in refinement and development to the distillery that is set up tomorrow somewhere in the Midwest. It is going to be so much better than the distillery that went into production a decade and a half ago. That is what this bill ought to be about, and it isn't there today.

What about the tax incentives, and what is the Finance Committee going to do? None of that is there.

This chart illustrates the problem. Here is the line for demand; here is supply. This is the hydrocarbons. That is pretty simple. Where does this margin come from? Offshore, foreign countries. High risk, less national security. Why do a lot of military leaders and those who look in broader terms support what BYRON DORGAN and LARRY CRAIG did today in the SAFE bill and those three factors about production, efficiency, and biofuels? They support it because of national security, taking this out of the equation, getting us back into production.

You have heard me talk a lot over the past about the Outer Continental Shelf and the billions and billions of gallons of oil that is out there. We have allowed States to say no even though it is a national, Federal resource. Last year we picked up a little bit right here in lease sale 181, but here in the eastern gulf are phenomenal resources, billions and billions of barrels of oil that are very accessible, achievable in a sound environmental way, and we are still saying no. We are still saying, let a tinhorn dictator in Venezuela jerk us around.

Here is another problem. The Cubans have said: Come drill us. The world is coming. The world is drilling in Cuba today. Vietnam came in last week. Spain, Norway, Malaysia, and Canada are 45 miles off our shore drilling for

oil, but we can't drill. It is the ultimate "no" zone of politics. The "no" zone went up decades ago when the technology wasn't there to achieve the environmental standards upon which we demand and insist. The technology is here today. But the politics of Florida won't allow us to touch this. So the American consumer simply says: OK. I am going to pay more. I am going to pay another 50 cents a gallon so Florida can have its political way or anywhere else, for that matter, along the eastern seaboard or as it relates to this equation over here, the western coast, Alaska. Or have we come to a turn in the road where technology allows us to go there in a clean way and bring down that dependency, allows us to thumb our nose, if you will, at the foreign sources?

Here is the other side of the equation. Nearly \$300 billion a year leaves our shore to go to another country to buy their oil, and some of those countries are buying guns and shooting at us. How smart we aren't to allow that policy to continue to prevail.

That is part of the debate in the coming weeks as it relates to 1419. It is not a complete package. It is way out into the future. It is not about tomorrow. It is not about national security. It is not about production. If we don't have those factors in a bill, this Senate will not serve its public and the American consumer in a responsible way in sustaining and building a great nation.

I yield the floor.

---

#### RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, at 12:30 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. CARPER).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

---

#### MOMENT OF SILENCE TO HONOR AIRMEN, SOLDIERS, SAILORS, AND MARINES LOST IN IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we have reached another tragic milestone in the Iraq war: 3,500 American troops have now been lost. Every one of those 3,500 is a hero. But every brave man and woman who continues to serve and protect us is a hero as well.

This is a somber time. At a somber time such as this, words betray our grief and our gratitude. So I ask my colleagues to join me in a moment of silence to honor the memory and sacrifice of every airman, soldier, sailor, and marine we have lost in Iraq and Afghanistan.

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

The Senate will observe a moment of silence.

(Moment of silence.)

Mr. REID. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

Mr. President, would the clerk report what is now before the Senate or what should be before the Senate.

**CREATING LONG-TERM ENERGY ALTERNATIVES FOR THE NATION ACT OF 2007**

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Under the previous order, the hour of 2:15 having arrived, the motion to proceed to the consideration of H.R. 6 is agreed to and the motion to reconsider is considered as having been made and laid on the table.

Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of H.R. 6, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 6) to reduce our Nation's dependency on foreign oil by investing in clean, renewable, and alternative energy resources, promoting new emerging energy technologies, developing greater efficiency, and creating a Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve to invest in alternative energy, and for other purposes.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The majority leader is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 1502

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute.)

**MR. REID.** Mr. President, I have amendment No. 1502 at the desk.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 1502.

**MR. REID.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of Monday, June 11, 2007, under "Text of Amendments.")

**MR. REID.** Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

**MRS. FEINSTEIN.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

**MRS. FEINSTEIN.** Mr. President, I have come to the floor to discuss one of the provisions of this Energy bill that is now before the Senate. This is the provision that would increase the fuel efficiency of our Nation's fleet of vehicles. These provisions were approved by the Commerce Committee with substantial bipartisan support. They are known as the Ten-in-Ten Fuel Economy Act.

I come to the floor in place of Chairman INOUYE, who is ill today and has asked me if I would mind describing the provisions of this legislation, and, of course, I am delighted to do that. The legislation is supported by a bipartisan group of Senators, including Senators STEVENS, SNOWE, DORGAN, COL-

LINS, DURBIN, BOXER, CANTWELL, CARPER, KLOBUCHAR, and KERRY.

The basic premise of the legislation is to increase the fuel economy of cars, SUVs, and light trucks by 10 miles per gallon over 10 years—that is the "10 over 10"—and to do this by 2020. But the bill does do more than that. It continues beyond 2020 and increases fuel efficiency by 4 percent a year through 2030. This is with the addition of the Dorgan legislation which the Commerce Committee added to Senator SNOWE's, Senator INOUYE's and my 10-over-10 bill in the Commerce Committee.

Some would have liked this legislation to go further, perhaps to 40 miles per gallon or more. Others do not want any significant increases. But I think this legislation strikes the right balance, and it sets forward a significant, achievable standard for the future.

It would be the first major fuel efficiency increase in the past 25 years. Can you believe it? With all the talk and all the discussion in the past 25 years, nothing has been done to increase fuel efficiency. I have been working on this legislation in one form or another—first, it was with Senator SNOWE as an SUV loophole closer. We have been doing this for more than a decade now.

But the simple truth is that today the technology exists to accomplish the goals of this legislation. It can be done without reducing safety and with significant benefit to our economy and our environment. It does so in a way that gives auto manufacturers the flexibility and the time they need. I hope they listen to this because I think they have a misimpression of the bill. This is not according to just us, but it is according to the experts—the National Academy of Sciences, the International Council on Clean Transportation, and experts at Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory. So it is time to break the logjam.

We all know our Nation faces stark energy challenges. Gas prices have risen to above \$3 a gallon—more than doubling in the past 5 years. Global warming is real, it is happening, and it is having an impact on the world around us. The United States needs to address the transportation sector's emissions of carbon dioxide. Transportation, in 2004, accounted for 28 percent of U.S. greenhouse gas emissions. With a war in Iraq and tense relations with Iran, we need to move away from our dependence on foreign oil. Through this legislation, we believe we can have a significant impact in each of those areas.

By 2025, increases for cars and light-duty trucks would save 2.1 million barrels of oil per day. That is nearly the amount of oil imported daily from the Persian Gulf, so it would be a savings, by 2025, of about what we import each day now. That is consequential. It would reduce carbon dioxide emissions—which is the primary global warming gas—18 percent from antici-

pated levels in 2025. That is the equivalent of taking 60 million cars off the road in a year. And—and this is a big "and"—it would save the consumer, the driver, the family, a net \$69 billion at the gas pump. That is based on a \$3.08 a gallon gas price. That is the recent average price nationwide. So with gas costing \$3.08 a gallon, the net consumer savings—if this bill were in place—would be \$69 billion. This would mean, if you go to the individual or the individual family, it is a savings of \$700 to \$1,000 a year for families with children, depending on the price of gas. So the time has come to act.

Now, here is what the measure would do. I hope people will listen. It would set achievable fuel economy standards for all vehicles, increasing fleetwide average fuel economy for all cars, SUVs, and trucks by 10 miles per gallon over 10 years—or from 25 to 35 miles per gallon by model year 2020. So 25 to 35 miles per gallon by 2020, and it is 2007 today. It would provide for an additional 4-percent annual increase after that until 2030. It would require the Department of Transportation to improve the fuel economy of medium and heavy-duty trucks over a 20-year period—not tomorrow, not today but over a 20-year period—for the first time in history addressing this particular area of concern.

America, do something about your heavy trucks, and over the next 20 years try to see if you can't make them more fuel efficient.

The key to this bill is it changes the way automakers are allowed to meet these standards in fairly substantial ways. I wish to describe them.

The provision provides the time and the flexibility needed for automakers, we believe, to meet these standards. This is where Detroit does not listen. We believe—we sincerely believe—it creates a level playing field for all automakers. Let me describe how.

Under the existing CAFE system, each automaker must meet a 27.5 miles-per-gallon standard for their particular fleet of cars. This current system disadvantages American companies that build larger cars with lower gas mileage. So we admit the present system disadvantages American automobile makers.

But under the newly proposed system contained in this bill, the National Highway Transportation Safety Administration would have broad discretion to divide vehicles into classes based on their attributes, such as size. So a small car in a small-car class is evaluated against other small cars—not a small car evaluated against a Navigator or a Cadillac but class-by-class evaluations. This requirement would no longer apply to each automaker. This is additional flexibility. Different automakers will meet different standards, depending upon the mix of cars they choose to make.

From 2011 to 2019, the National Highway Transportation Safety Administration must set fuel economy standards that are the maximum feasible