

would fail to guarantee any of the benefits for consumers, large energy users, and farmers and ranchers contained in the Bingham amendment.

For example, the Domenici amendment would:

Waive requirements for state to participate in the program if the governor found state programs to be "substantially contributing to the overall goal." This vague language could stifle investment in renewables and cripple the federal trading program that assures the lowest possible cost for renewable energy.

Weaken renewable requirements by including non-renewables such as nuclear power. These provisions would subtract all existing nuclear generation from the utilities renewables requirement, give utilities credits for already-planned and economic capacity upgrades, provide a windfall for the poorest performing nuclear plants of the last 3 years, and give credits for building new nuclear power plants that are already heavily subsidized in the 2005 Energy bill. These nuclear bailouts and subsidies would reduce the potential contribution of new renewable energy from the Bingham proposal.

Allow utilities to receive credits for "an inherently low-emission technology that captures and stores carbon" without defining what that technology might be or assuring how much, if any, of the carbon actually gets stored, or how permanent such storage is.

Allow DOE to designate "other clean energy sources" to qualify for clean energy credits without any restrictions on the Secretary.

Undercuts the development of new renewables by including all "new" hydropower. This would encourage new dam construction irrespective of the potential for significant environmental impacts these facilities can have. The Domenici amendment would reverse the compromise language in the Bingham amendment that would permit "incremental" hydro power that encourages new hydropower generation while protecting natural resources.

Includes electricity savings from energy efficiency and demand-response programs, which will further erode the national energy security, diversity, economic, and environmental benefits of developing new renewable energy sources. While we support a separate standard for energy efficiency and demand-response, the Domenici amendment would create a zero sum game between efficiency and renewable energy by forcing them to compete under the same standard.

Overall, the combined effects of allowing nuclear, efficiency, demand-response, as well as new hydro, and other non renewable clean energy sources to qualify for the standard—without any restrictions—would greatly reduce, and potentially eliminate, the development of new renewable energy sources and the corresponding economic and environmental benefits.

We urge you to support the strong Bingham RES amendment and oppose weakening amendment such as the Domenici amendment, as it would take us backwards, not forwards on energy policy.

Sincerely,

EarthJustice, Environmental Law and Policy Center, Greenpeace, National Audubon Society, National Environmental Trust, Natural Resource Defense Council, Sierra Club, Southern Alliance for Clean Energy, Union of Concerned Scientists, U.S. Public Interest Research Group, Western Organization of Resource Councils.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent

that the Senate now be in a period for the transaction of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes.

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

The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

ENERGY

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, let me thank Senator BINGAMAN for his leadership efforts in addressing one of the major crises facing our country. I thank Senator DOMENICI as well.

As Senator BINGAMAN just indicated, I would go further than he is going in his proposal. I think he has made an important step forward, but I think given the gravity of the situation we face, it is imperative for the future not only of our country but for the future of our planet that we seize this moment and we be bold and we be aggressive because if we are not, what the scientific community is telling us is that the results could be catastrophic.

When thousands of scientists from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change tell us with 100 percent certainty that global warming is real, and with 90 percent certainty that it is manmade, we should listen. When these scientists tell us that today, in terms of the melting of glaciers and permafrost, in terms of the increase in drought around the world, the increase of forest fires we are seeing in the United States, in terms of the loss of drinking water and farmland all over the world today, it would be absolutely irresponsible not only for us but for future generations if we did not stand up and say we are going to do everything we can to lower greenhouse gas emissions and reverse global warming.

I have introduced legislation—which the Presiding Officer is one of the co-sponsors of and was introduced with Senator BOXER—which, in fact, would lower greenhouse gas emissions by 80 percent less than where they were in 1990. I think that is the type of aggressive effort that we need. If Senator KERRY offers his amendment to make sure 20 percent of the electricity we produce in this country comes from renewables, I will strongly support that legislation. Fifteen percent, as Senator BINGAMAN has proposed, is a good step forward, but it does not go far enough.

The bad news is that as a nation, we are lagging far behind the rest of the world, or many countries in the world, in going forward in terms of energy efficiency and sustainable energy. The bad news is that today in America, in terms of transportation, we are driving vehicles which, if you can believe it, get worse mileage per gallon than was the case 20 years ago. Meanwhile, several weeks ago, I was in a car which was a retrofitted Toyota Prius which gets 150 miles per gallon. Yet, as a nation, on average we are driving vehicles which get worse mileage per gallon than we had 20 years ago.

All over our country, we are lacking in public transportation. In Europe, in Japan, in China, their rail systems are far more sophisticated and advanced than we are. Our roadways, from Vermont to California, are clogged with cars, many of them getting poor mileage per gallon. Yet we are not investing and creating jobs in mass transportation. But it is not only transportation that we are lacking in, studies have indicated that if we make our own homes more energy efficient, we can save substantial amounts of energy.

Some estimates are, if we do the right things, we could cut our energy expenditures by 40 percent—40 percent. Yet there are millions of homes in this country inhabited by lower income people who don't have the money to adequately insulate their homes, put in the kind of roofs they need, the kind of windows they need, and we are literally seeing energy go right out of the doors and the windows because we are not adequately funding weatherization. But it is not just lower income people. Many middle-class families are also in homes that are inadequately weatherized, inadequately insulated.

One of the things I have long believed as I have studied this issue of global warming is that not only do we have the moral imperative to reduce greenhouse gas emissions significantly so that we can reverse global warming, but in that process we can seize this crisis, respond to this crisis, and create some very golden opportunities in terms of creating good-paying jobs. If you look at those areas in the world where they have moved most effectively in terms of reducing greenhouse gas emissions, such as Germany, many countries in Europe, and our own State of California, the result has been, yes, there has been economic dislocation, but at the end of the day, they have created a lot more jobs than they have lost.

I have worked with groups such as the Apollo Project, which is a group that brings together labor organizations as well as environmentalists, that say: How do we move toward lowering greenhouse gas emissions and creating good-paying jobs? The opportunities are sitting right in front of us.

Detroit has lost billions and billions of dollars year after year by building cars that many Americans no longer want. Maybe if we move toward energy-efficient cars, people might start buying those cars, and instead of laying off workers, maybe we can create more jobs. Think of the jobs we can create as we build a rail system that we are proud of. As cities like Chicago and New York and other cities rebuild their antiquated subway systems, we can create jobs doing that.

We can create jobs all over this country in terms of energy efficiency. As we move toward biofuels, I can tell my colleagues that in my State of Vermont, our small family farmers are struggling very hard to stay on the

land. There is a lot of evidence out there that we can create significant income for family-based agriculture as we move to biofuels, not only in Vermont but all over this country.

The good news is there is a lot of good, new technology out there. That means we have the opportunity right now to build the cars of the future. I was in an electric car last month which now has a range of 200 miles—200 miles in an electric car. That is far more than most people use in a day. There is potential there as well.

If we look at what is going on in the world right now, the fastest growing source of new energy is wind. There is huge potential in terms of the growth of wind technology. One of the reasons I am supporting the strongest possible energy portfolio is that I want to see the wind technology exploding and growing all over this world. The more that is produced, the cheaper it will become. When I talk about wind, we are not just talking about large wind farms, as important as that is, as part of the energy mix. We are talking about small wind turbines which we believe in 5 or 6 years will be available for \$10,000, \$12,000, \$14,000 that on average can provide half of the electric needs a rural house might need.

Look at what is going on in California right now. I think we owe a lot to our largest State for leading us in a direction that the rest of our country might want to emulate. In California now what they are saying is that in 10 years they want, and have funded, the need for 1 million photovoltaic units on rooftops throughout California—1 million. In California, what they are saying is they can provide significant incentives to those people who want to install photovoltaics. There is huge potential in this country moving toward solar energy. One of the issues that concerns me and saddens me is that the technology for solar energy, which was originally developed in the United States, has now moved abroad.

Think of all of the jobs we can create if we as a nation had the goal of saying, in 10 years we will have 10 million rooftops in America using solar energy. Think how many jobs we can create by people installing those units. Think of the jobs we can create as American factories start producing those photovoltaic units—not in China, not in Japan, not in Germany, but producing them right here in the United States of America. But to do that, we are going to need the policies such as net metering, which says if I own a photovoltaic unit and I produce more than I am consuming, it goes back into the grid and I get paid for that, as they are doing right now in Germany.

It means if I am a middle-income person who cannot afford the \$30,000 I need to install that photovoltaic unit, I am going to need some help, and it may be a lot more than the type of tax credits we are now providing. I think we could learn from California, which is encouraging people in a much more generous way than we are doing.

It is quite similar for wind production as well; that is, the production tax credit should be significantly increased and the investor tax credit should be significantly increased as well.

Some people might say: Well, Senator SANDERS, this will cost a lot of money. They are right. It will cost a lot of money. But I would remind my colleagues that not too long ago on the floor of this Senate a significant number of Senators voted to repeal the estate tax completely—repeal the estate tax completely—which would cost our Government \$1 trillion over a 20-year period. All of those tax breaks are going to the wealthiest three-tenths of 1 percent of the population, the very wealthiest people in America.

Well, if some of my friends think we have the resources to provide \$1 trillion in tax breaks to the wealthiest three-tenths of 1 percent, I would argue that we have the resources to incentivize the American people to purchase automobiles and other vehicles that get good mileage per gallon, incentivize and help people to put photovoltaic units on their rooftops, and incentivize and help people in rural America to purchase small wind turbines which could provide a substantial amount of electricity for their homes.

So the good news is that today, unlike 20 or 30 years ago, what we can say in honesty is that the technologies now are available in terms of transportation and energy efficiency.

Last month I talked to a major manufacturer of electric lights. What he told me is that in 4 or 5 years, there will be lights on the market, LED lights, which will last for 20 years when plugged in and consume about one-tenth of the electricity that is currently being consumed. Those are the kinds of breakthroughs we are making right now.

What we have to do as a Senate right now is provide the incentives to the American people to go out and purchase the lightbulbs which today might cost, if it is even a compact fluorescent lightbulb, more than an incandescent lightbulb, but in the long run, you save money. But we have to help those who do not have the money to do that.

An argument could be made that if the Federal Government helped every American purchase compact fluorescent lightbulbs and pay for those lightbulbs, we probably will save money in the long run without needing to build new powerplants, and certainly we would be making a major investment in lowering greenhouse gas emissions.

I conclude by saying that we would be absolutely irresponsible if we did not stand up to the big oil companies, the big coal companies, and all of those people who want us to continue to go along the same old path. We would be irresponsible because we would not be bringing about the changes we need to protect our kids and our grandchildren and, in fact, the very well-being of our planet.

I hope that as this debate continues for the rest of this week and into next week, that what we understand is that there is an absolute moral imperative that we act as boldly as we can to lower greenhouse gas emissions, that we act as boldly as we can to break our dependency on fossil fuels, that we be prepared to be a leader in the world in terms of moving toward energy efficiency, and that we embrace the new technologies that are out there in terms of solar energy, wind energy, geothermal, and other energies.

The more we invest, the more we produce, the more breakthroughs we will see. There are extraordinary opportunities out there, and if we do the right things, if we get our act together, 30 years from today the kind of energy system that exists in this country will look very different than the one that exists now. Not only will we be able to lower greenhouse gas emissions and reverse global warming, we are going to clean up the planet, which I think will go a long way to prevent many types of diseases that currently exist.

Now is the time for boldness, now is the time for the United States not to continue being a laggard behind other countries on this issue but becoming a leader around the world. It is not good enough to criticize China and India. What we need to do is become a leader and reach out and help those countries move forward in combating global warming.

This is the opportunity, and I think history will not look kindly upon us if we do not take advantage of this moment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CANTWELL). The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I echo the words of the Senator from Vermont about the Energy bill being an opportunity for our country—an opportunity in terms of a better environment, global warming, to preserve our planet, an opportunity to stabilize energy costs, and an opportunity especially for good-paying jobs.

I come from a State that has taken a real hit from the Bush economic policy. I come from a State that has taken a real hit from trade policy through the last two administrations, Democratic and Republican administrations.

I look at what we are able to do with this Energy bill and better manufacturing policy.

I start with a story. Oberlin College is a school halfway between Cleveland and Toledo, not far from where I live. It is the site of the largest freestanding building on any college campus in the country fully powered by solar energy. The problem is that all of the solar panels were imported from Germany and Japan because we simply do not make enough solar panels in this country to do what we ought to be doing. It is the same with wind turbines. Toledo is especially well known for research in wind turbines and wind power. Yet with the exception of a plant in Ash-tabula that makes a small component

for wind turbines, very little manufacturing is done in this country on that particular alternative energy.

With the right kinds of incentives and with changing tax law, changing trade law in the Energy bill, Ohio, as the industrial Midwest, can play a major role in alternative energy.

We have seen energy policy, tax policy, trade policy, and the failure to have a manufacturing policy cause significant job loss. My State has lost literally hundreds of thousands of manufacturing jobs since President Bush took office, in part because of the lack of a manufacturing policy and no leadership from the White House, in part because of trade policy, in part because of tax policy.

For us, as we look to the future on trade agreements and trade policy, it is not good enough just to oppose bad trade agreements, it is not good enough to oppose the next round of NAFTA or CAFTA, it is not good enough to try to fix PNTR with China. We need a much more forward-looking manufacturing policy. That means expanding efforts on exports. It means expanding the Manufacturing Extension Program that Senator KOHL has worked on and I have worked on, and others. And it means a different regimented trade policy.

The Bush administration has just announced with some Members of the House of Representatives, some Members of my party, that they want to move forward on the Panama and Peru trade agreements. Those are two trade agreements where the administration finally has decided they support environmental and labor standards, but this is also an administration that has never pushed very hard for environmental and labor standards in our own country.

I would look askance at the administration's promises without more proof of what, in fact, they are going to do on enforcement of labor and environmental standards. All one need do is look at the news stories that came out after the announcement from our U.S. Trade Ambassador Schwab and some House Democrats that there would be labor and environmental standards in the Panama and Peru trade agreements when soon after those news stories they said they may not be in the core trade agreements, that they may be in side deals, side agreements. We learned that lesson once with NAFTA where the labor standards and environmental standards were outside the agreement in a separate agreement, and that simply didn't matter. It didn't help that trade agreement work for American families in Steubenville or for workers in Toledo. It didn't work for communities in Finley and Lima and Mansfield.

We also know, listening to the discussions after the Peru and Panama trade agreements were announced with the labor and environmental standards, some people do not seem so certain that they are going to work as hard on

enforcing these labor standards and environmental standards as they might have initially promised. All we need to do is look at the Jordan trade agreement passed in 2000, a trade agreement in the House of Representatives I supported but a trade agreement that had labor and environmental standards. Soon after President Bush took office, U.S. Trade Representative Robert Zoellick sent a letter to the Jordanians with a wink and a nod saying that because of dispute resolution issues, he wasn't going to enforce those labor and environmental standards.

If we are going to move forward on trade policy, it means stronger labor standards, stronger environmental standards, and stronger food safety standards. It means standards in the agreements, as part of the agreements. It means enforcing those agreements, and it means a manufacturing policy, the Manufacturing Extension Program, better assistance for small companies to export, better currency rules, particularly with China. It means benchmarks so that once these trade agreements pass, we can gauge whether the trade agreements helped our trade surplus deficit, our trade relations, and that there be benchmarks showing if there were job increases or job losses, did it mean a lower trade deficit or higher trade deficit, did it mean wages went up or wages went down for American workers. We need those benchmarks if we are going to pass trade agreements so we can look a year later and see if these trade agreements are working.

I contend they certainly are not working. The year I ran for Congress, the same year the Presiding Officer was elected to Congress, in 1992, we had a trade deficit of \$38 billion. In 2006, our trade deficit exceeded \$800 billion. Our trade deficit with China bilaterally in 1992 was barely in the double digits. Today, our trade deficit with China is upward of \$230 billion.

President Bush 1 said \$1 billion in trade deficit is equivalent to the result of about 13,000 fewer jobs, and if you just do the math and look at the trade deficit, multiplying times 20, from a factor of 20, the trade deficit is that much larger today than it was a decade and a half ago, you know it is costing us jobs. That is why a trade agreement with a tax policy, with a manufacturing policy that really does help American communities, that helps people in Toledo, Finley, Zanesville, Springfield, Miami Valley, and the Mahoney Valley in my State, will matter to help build a middle class.

I am hopeful that as we do this Energy bill and the House and Senate move ahead on trade policy in the next year, that we can link these so that it really does help to create a middle class, strengthen the middle class in our country with better trade, tax, and manufacturing policies.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I rise in support of Senator BINGAMAN's renewable portfolio amendment which would require that 15 percent of the Nation's electricity be generated from renewable sources by 2020.

I have heard from my office some of the debate which has taken place today. I was surprised that some of my colleagues have characterized this amendment as some sort of Federal giveaway for the wind industry. The renewable portfolio standard will not just benefit the wind industry, of course, but it will also benefit the production of energy from solar, biomass, electricity from biogas, small hydro, geothermal, and ocean and tidal energy projects as well.

This diverse set of energy sources will help protect us from the fuel price increases, such as those we have seen in natural gas recently. In turn, this reduction in demand for natural gas might even cause natural gas prices to fall, causing electricity prices to also fall.

Another economic benefit of the renewable portfolio standard is that it would help these emerging technologies flourish in the United States. Right now there are renewable energy firms in Europe that are outpacing their U.S.-based competitors. But by driving up demand for renewable energy domestically, we will help develop these industries at home, creating jobs and allowing us to develop energy as a domestic economic engine. At the same time we are meeting our energy challenges, at the same time that we are meeting the economic imperative of our energy challenges, at the same time that we undermine foreign countries—for which we are giving our dollars abroad in terms of our addiction to those energy sources—we can also fuel a domestic economic engine by pursuing these sources.

Of course, the most dramatic effect of the amendment will be its positive impact environmentally. According to the Energy Information Administration, it will reduce carbon emissions by 222 million tons per year by the year 2030, and other reports project reductions of as much as 10 percent per year from the electricity sector. This would be the equivalent of removing 71 million cars from the road. Think about it—removing 71 million cars from the road.

I also want to point out what this amendment will do for the solar energy industry. This amendment will provide triple renewable energy credits to solar energy. As a result, it has been estimated that this will result in a 500-percent increase in solar energy production.

Solar needs to be a significant part of America's energy future. When you have a way to generate energy that produces no carbon emissions, has no moving parts, makes no noise, and results in no adverse wildlife impacts, that is something we as a nation need to be pursuing.

My home State of New Jersey realized this a few years ago and set about enacting policies designed to spur the growth of its solar market. The results have been extremely successful. New Jersey has the second largest solar market in the entire Nation, from 6 installations to nearly 2,000 in just 5 years, over 7 megawatts of installed capacity, and tens of millions of kilowatt-hours produced each year. New Jersey, of course, is blessed with many things, but it is not blessed with more Sun than most of the rest of the Nation. The State simply recognized that by being visionary we could not only start generating large amounts of pollution-free energy in our own State, but we could also provide a kick-start to a whole new industry. That industry, of course, generates not only great energy, truly clean energy, truly renewable energy, but at the same time creates a very significant economic positive consequence as well.

What New Jersey has done we must do as a nation. The renewable portfolio standard amendment, along with the extension of solar tax credits, will help expand the use of solar energy, and, most importantly, lower the cost.

I also want to urge my colleagues to oppose the Domenici amendment—the amendment that Senator DOMENICI has offered to Senator BINGAMAN's renewable portfolio standard amendment. That amendment would stall the development of renewable energy and thereby undercut the entire point of this bill. There are some who don't want to challenge the industry. There are those who don't want to bring us to a higher standard. For them, the Domenici amendment to Senator BINGAMAN's renewable portfolio standard is their out. That is their out.

For those Members of the Senate who don't want to bring us to a higher challenge, who don't want to challenge the industry, who, in essence, are happy to support the status quo, the Domenici amendment is their solution.

The Domenici amendment, however, has numerous problems. To begin with, the substitute would allow States to opt out of the standard for just about any reason—just about any reason. If a State can opt out, the renewable industries will be hesitant to adequately invest in these projects and, therefore, we won't move forward.

The substitute will also weaken renewable requirements by including nonrenewables, such as nuclear power. This would divert money from renewables to an already well-subsidized energy source.

The Domenici substitute would also allow the Department of Energy to designate "other clean energy sources" to qualify for clean energy credits without any restrictions on the Secretary—without any restrictions on the Secretary. Who knows what would be included under such a definition. This would leave discretion for the Secretary to include "clean coal" or any other source of energy one could put the word "clean" in front of.

In addition, the Republican substitute would include energy inefficiency projects and demand-response programs. The more things we add to the standard, the less meaningful the standard becomes. We cannot pit efficiency against renewables. We need both efficiency and renewables to flourish in partnership and not compete for investment dollars.

Once again, I praise Senator BINGAMAN, the chair of the Energy Committee, on which I have the privilege of sitting, for his amendment, for his vision, for bringing us and challenging us to a higher standard, one that the Nation clearly needs. It will be beneficial for our environment, it will boost our domestic economy, and it will reinforce the actions taken by 23 States that have already shown leadership by instituting renewable portfolio standards. If the States have already shown leadership in this regard, the Nation and the Senate need to show the same leadership.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of that important amendment and against efforts to weaken this important provision. Those are, I hope, words that Members of the Senate will take to heart.

TRIBUTE TO PETER CHASE NEUMANN

Mr. REID. Madam President, today I rise to honor the achievements of Peter Chase Neumann. Not only is Peter recognized locally and nationally for his skill as a trial lawyer, he is also deeply involved with philanthropies whose work has been enormously beneficial to Nevada. These significant contributions have resulted in Peter being named the recipient of the Nevada Trial Lawyers Association Lifetime Achievement Award, and deservedly so.

Peter has tried more than 150 civil and criminal cases to verdict and almost 50 appeals to the Nevada and Arizona Supreme Courts. His ability in the legal profession is renowned, and his talents are wide-ranging, from trial advocacy in personal injury cases to writing academic articles. He has dedicated himself to the cause of justice for the wrongfully injured, and has been recognized for his work in *Town and Country Magazine's* Top Trial Lawyers in America, in *Las Vegas Magazine*, by *Top Gun Lawyers* in Nevada and by *The Best Lawyers* in America.

His leadership in the legal community is unparalleled: He has served as president of the Arizona, Nevada, and Western Trial Lawyers Association, and on the Board of Governors for the American Trial Lawyers Association. He was both legislative advocate for and president of the Plaintiff's Bar, and was accepted as a diplomat in the International Society of Barristers and the American Board of Trial Advocates.

His devotion to the law has not in any way impeded his philanthropic contributions. He and his wife Renate

have served with the Angel Kiss Foundation, a nonprofit dedicated to helping families cope with the financial burdens associated with childhood cancer. President Clinton recognized Peter's influence and appointed him to the Tahoe Regional Planning Committee. He has involved himself with Scenic America and Scenic Nevada, committing himself to the cause of protecting Nevada's natural treasures in the Lake Tahoe region and beyond.

Peter is also an accomplished airplane pilot. In recent years, he has spent untold hours soaring in his gliders all over America.

Most people know Peter for his reputation as a renowned trial lawyer or for his work in the philanthropic community in my State. But I have had the privilege to call Peter my friend. It is my great pleasure to offer congratulations to Peter Chase Neumann for his lifetime of excellence in his profession, in his public service, and in his philanthropy.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, with the cost of health care continually increasing for employers, individuals, and the Government combined with the growing number of uninsured Americans it is clear that our health care system is in dire need of change. My goal is to help every American have access to affordable health insurance and to continue the State Children's Health Insurance Program, SCHIP.

In an op-ed in *The Hill* on June 6, 2007, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, Mike Leavitt, suggested a very good proposal for increasing access to health insurance. His proposal calls for reauthorization of SCHIP and keeping the program's focus on kids, providing the same tax advantage to all Americans through a standard deduction for health insurance, and encouraging State innovation through grants to help low income individuals afford private health insurance.

I support Secretary Leavitt's ideas. However, health care reform is too big of an issue for one party to tackle on its own. Our only chance of achieving true, meaningful reform is if both parties work together. This involves reaching across the aisle and getting Democrats to say two words "private markets" and Republicans to say two words "universal access."

Two of my colleagues have put forward two different but thoughtful pieces of legislation addressing the uninsured Senator WYDEN's Healthy Americans Act, S. 334, and Senator COBURN's Universal Health Care Choice and Access Act, S. 1019. But I am doing something that I rarely do cosponsoring both of them to encourage my goal of affordable health insurance for every American while continuing the SCHIP program helping children.

I have cosponsored these bills in the spirit of reform, but that does not mean I support every provision in both