

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOUTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 208, S. 1639, Immigration.

Ted Kennedy, Russell D. Feingold, Daniel K. Inouye, Tom Carper, Sheldon Whitehouse, Pat Leahy, Richard J. Durbin, Benjamin L. Cardin, Ken Salazar, Frank R. Lautenberg, Joe Lieberman, Dianne Feinstein, John Kerry, Charles Schumer, Ben Nelson, B.A. Mikulski.

Mr. REID. I now ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum required under rule XXII be waived, and I therefore withdraw the motion.

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

CAFE STANDARDS

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, today we have been discussing in the halls and corridors and rooms not far from where I many speaking what changes we should make with respect to fuel efficiency standards for cars, trucks, and vans. There are a lot of aspects of this bill that are important. Few are as important as what we are going to do with respect to fuel efficiency standards for cars, trucks, and vans, not just for the next couple of years but probably for the next 15 years or so.

I want to begin my remarks by saying how important I believe manufacturing is. We are neighbors. Both Delaware and Pennsylvania have a rich tradition of manufacturing. It is an important part of our economy and continues to be. If we are going to be successful as a nation in the 21st century, it will be because we have retained a vibrant manufacturing base, and we are in danger of seeing that slip away. Part of the manufacturing base in my State has been, for 60 years or so, a vibrant automobile manufacturing base. We have two auto assembly plants in northern Delaware. Outside of Wilmington is a GM plant where we manufacture the Pontiac Solstices and Saturn Sky. We actually export some of those Saturn Skys to Europe, and we are about to start exporting Saturn Skys to South Korea, something we are excited about.

In Newcastle County south of Newark along the Maryland line is a Chrysler assembly plant where they used to make tanks during World War II. Today they make all the Dodge Durangos and all the Chrysler Aspens in the world.

On a per capita basis, we build probably as many cars, trucks, and vans per capita in Delaware as any other State. We are not a big State, but auto manufacturing remains an important part of our economic base.

With that as a background, I want to mention the approaching debate on CAFE, fuel efficiency standards for our vehicular fleet. There are three goals I

see. The first goal for me—and I hope for us—is to reduce the growth of our dependence on foreign oil, then stop the growth of our dependence on foreign oil, and then reduce our dependence on foreign oil. Over 60 percent of the oil we use comes from sources beyond our borders. We have a trade deficit of about \$650 billion. Fully one-third of that is attributable to our dependence on foreign oil. We need to reduce that dependence.

I was in Iraq the last weekend. We have over 150,000 troops there exposed and in danger as I speak. Every time I fill up the tank of my car with gas, I am convinced some of the money I spend in buying that gas goes to other parts around the world where people take our money, and I fear they use it to hurt us. We ought to be smarter than that. One of the things we clearly need to do is to reduce our growing reliance on foreign oil and eventually, sooner than later, reduce that reliance.

The second goal for me is to reduce harmful emissions, the stuff we put up in the air. Whether it is nitrogen oxide, carbon monoxide, carbon dioxide, which is the greenhouse gas that leads to global warming, those emissions come out of cars, trucks, and vans. For me, goal No. 2 is to reduce the incidence of those emissions. It will improve our health and reduce the threat we face from climate change from greenhouse gases.

The third goal for me and in the context of this legislation is to accomplish goal No. 1, reduce our reliance on foreign oil; accomplish goal No. 2, reduce the emission of bad stuff into the air; and to do that by not further disadvantaging the domestic auto industry in our State. So those are the three goals I have for us.

I want to take a moment and look back to 1975. In 1975, the average mileage for cars, trucks, and vans was about 14 miles per gallon. For several years leading up to 1975, there was a prolonged debate on whether we should require more fuel-efficient vehicles. I have asked my staff to see if we can find a little bit of what was being said back in the mid-1970s as we debated whether to raise over a 10-year period fuel efficiency standards from 14 miles per gallon to 27.5 miles per gallon for cars and roughly 20 miles per gallon for light trucks and SUVs.

This is a comment from one of the senior officials at General Motors:

If this proposal becomes law—

The increase over 10 years of CAFE standards to 27.5 miles per gallon—

the largest car the industry will be selling in any volume at all will probably be smaller, lighter, and less powerful than today's compact Chevy Nova.

The Presiding Officer and I are old enough to remember what a Chevy Nova looked like. I want to tell you, when we were driving around the streets of Washington, DC, or Delaware or Colorado, most of the vehicles out there were a lot bigger than a compact Chevy Nova, and they were in 1975 as well.

Here is another comment from the debate of the mid-1970s on raising CAFE standards. This is from a senior official at Chrysler in 1974.

In effect this bill would outlaw a number of engine lines and car models, including most full size sedans and station wagons. It would restrict the industry to producing subcompact-size cars, or even smaller ones, within 5 years.

Five years from this was 1979. In 1979, we were still making full size sedans and station wagons. We were still making them in 1985. We are still making them today. The idea that we would be producing subcompact-size cars within 5 years or even 25 years, it never happened. Those are a couple of comments that were made in 1974 and 1975, as we took up the debate.

The Congress decided in 1975 to go ahead and pass more stringent fuel efficiency standards for cars, trucks, and vans. Over a 10-year period we ramped up so that by 1985, the car fleet was expected to achieve on balance 27.5 miles per gallon, and for light trucks and SUVs about 20 miles per gallon.

I put up these quotes because a good deal of what we have heard from the auto industry in recent years, as we have debated whether to return to raising fuel efficiency standards, actually sounds a lot like what we heard in 1974 and 1975. You could almost take away the years that are at the bottom of each of these quotes, and it would be *deja vu* all over again.

For the past 22 years since we raised CAFE standards, what we have heard mostly from the domestic auto industry is, if you raise fuel efficiency standards further, four things will happen: One, the big three—GM, Chrysler, Ford—will lose market share, will lose money. They will close plants. They will cut or eliminate jobs. We have heard that for pretty much the last 22 years, and for the last 22 years we have not raised fuel efficiency standards.

This is a chart where we can see the market share for each company. The orange share is Chrysler. The green is Ford. The blue is GM. This is 1985. Here we have 20 years later, 2005. Let me just read it. From Chrysler to Daimler-Chrysler, when you put that together, you get about 13.5 percent market share. In effect, Chrysler's market share has actually dropped without any change in fuel efficiency standards since 1985. Their market share has dropped from 1985, if we actually backed out Daimler.

From 1985 to 2005, Ford's market share dropped from 22 percent of sales to almost 17 percent. That is without any change in CAFE. Over at GM, we see market share dropped most precipitously from about 41.5 percent of the market in 1985 to 26 percent in 2005.

I would say these numbers are actually lower now. Ford is no longer at 17 percent of market share. Regrettably, GM is not at 26 percent market share. The market share didn't drop because of increases in CAFE.

The plants were not closed because of increases in CAFE. Hundreds of thousands of people did not lose their jobs

because of increases in CAFE. These companies, last year, collectively, lost in the North American automotive operations—Chrysler, GM, Ford—lost probably, collectively, about \$15 billion. That was not because of increases in CAFE, because we have not increased fuel-efficient standards for 22 years.

We have had a lot of visits in my office in the last several weeks. I am sure the Presiding Officer has had folks come to see him from the auto manufacturers, probably domestic and foreign. One CEO said to me, in a visit last week, his company would have to—if we adopted the measure that has been reported out of the Commerce Committee, which is the underlying language on CAFE in the bill before us this week—but if we adopted that, his company would have to produce cars that got 50, 52 miles per gallon.

I said: Well, let's think about that. Let's talk about that. You will recall the measure before us today says that by 2020, overall, NHTSA—an arm of the Department of Transportation—would have to have overseen an increase in the fuel efficiency standards of cars, trucks, and vans; that, overall, cars, trucks, and vans put together would, beginning by the year 2020, have 35 miles per gallon.

What most people do not understand is that trucks, light trucks, and SUVs do not have to get 35 miles per gallon under the language in the bill by 2020. But overall, when you combine cars, trucks, vans, and SUVs from the different companies that sell cars in this country, they have to get 35 miles per gallon.

Now, let's take a look at a chart that lists a bunch of auto companies. It is a little hard to follow, but I ask you all to bear with me. The effect of the legislation that is before us, the underlying bill, would mean—DaimlerChrysler builds more light trucks, SUVs. They are a truck-heavy company, as opposed to, we will say, Volkswagen. Volkswagen builds mostly cars. They do not build much in the way of light trucks or SUVs and sell that in this country.

But the car companies, the truck companies that tend to build the trucks, light trucks, and SUVs, they would end up with a requirement—between now and 2020—a requirement by NHTSA to have a fuel economy of something less than 35 miles per gallon. For the vehicle makers that are more heavily on the car side, as opposed to the light trucks and SUVs, they are going to expect to have a fuel efficiency standard north of, higher than 35 miles per gallon.

In this case, Volkswagen, if they continue to have the mix they have of vehicles in 2005, they would have to have in their mix of product about 38, 39 miles per gallon. So this is not a monolithic number. It is not 35 miles per gallon for trucks, 35 miles per gallon for cars. It is not 35 miles per gallon for each of these auto manufacturers.

But the idea is, when you put them all together, at the end of the day, we want, in 2020, for NHTSA to have pre-

sided over a process that gets our fleet of vehicles sold in this country, in 2020, to 35 miles per gallon.

Now, for years we have heard our friends from Detroit say: Protect us in this way. Protect us so we don't have foreign competitors—who build a lot of energy-efficient cars—don't let them use the high miles per gallon they get from their fuel-efficient cars to allow them to come in and sell a whole bunch of trucks, light trucks, SUVs, and minivans that are not energy efficient.

Meanwhile, companies such as DaimlerChrysler and GM and Ford, which are selling a lot of trucks, if we are not careful, will end up with a situation where other companies that are listed on this chart would be able to sell a whole lot of trucks, a whole lot of minivans, a whole lot of SUVs that are energy inefficient. Our automakers could not sell anymore. They would be constrained because of the requirements in legislation.

So here is what we have tried to come up with in response to the concerns by our automakers. We have come up with a plan that says to NHTSA: We do not care who is making real small cars, but we want you to set the same fuel efficiency standards for real small cars, regardless of who is making them. For midsized cars, we want you to set the same fuel efficiency standard targets for midsized cars, regardless of what companies make them. For larger cars, heavier cars, bigger cars, the same fuel efficiency standard would apply for that category of vehicles.

For pickup trucks, regardless of who is making them, light trucks, the same standard would have to apply, whether it is Nissan that is making them, Honda, or DaimlerChrysler. For a small truck, they all have to be producing vehicles that get the same fuel economy standards. For larger SUVs, the largest SUVs, whoever is making them—I don't care if it is Toyota, Nissan, Chrysler, GM—NHTSA would be promulgating a fuel efficiency standard that would be the same for all manufacturers.

Now, not everybody likes that. I suspect some of the folks who have been making energy-efficient cars for some time believe they are not getting the kind of credit they should get for their early work. But this is a proposal that is in the underlying bill, and it is in response to the domestic auto manufacturers who have said: Do not put us in a situation where the only folks who can sell light trucks and SUVs of any size are folks who happen to be building vehicles in other countries. So we tried to be responsive to their proposal.

Let's go back to this chart I have in the Chamber, if we could. I wish to return to the conversation I had with the CEO of one of the companies who came to see us. We will call it company X. Company X plans, in about 5 years, to be selling in this country a mix of products that would be 60 percent truck, that would be 40 percent cars. By trucks, I mean light trucks, SUVs, minivans. But that is their goal in 5

years: 40 percent cars, 60 percent trucks.

If we assume for a moment that the fuel average requirement, the minimum average requirement for light trucks and SUVs is going to be 30 miles per gallon—that is probably pretty close to what it is going to be; it may be about what is doable—at the 60-percent market concentration for the trucks: 60 percent times 30 miles per gallon adds up to 18 miles per gallon.

If another 40 percent of what they build and sell is cars, the question is: What miles per gallon would they have to achieve for their car fleet, collectively—small, mid, large—what would they have to achieve to roughly get to 35 miles per gallon overall for their fleet average? The answer is: 42—not 52, not 62 miles per gallon. But this is what they would have to be able to deliver in mileage per gallon in 2020 from their car fleet in order to come up with an overall fleet average for this company of about 35 miles per gallon.

Now the question is, is it realistic in 13 years for a company to be making cars that get 42 miles per gallon?

Well, I was at the Detroit Auto Show back in January. One of the coolest cars I saw was a Chevrolet. It was a Chevrolet Volt, a flex-fuel, plug-in hybrid vehicle that, hopefully, Chevrolet is going to be making by the early part of the next decade. You plug it in, charge the battery, and you are off.

Let me say, the leader is on the floor. I say to the leader, I do not wish to get in your way, but if you want to jump in here, jump in.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SALAZAR). The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have been listening to the Senator speak. I wish to say one thing. I participated in an event today where we had a car there that was a hybrid. Gee, it was fun. There were two vehicles there, a Prius and a Ford. One of those—they would both get basically the same mileage—but the man there who was promoting these batteries, this past week, drove 177 miles on 1 gallon of gasoline. That is the future. That is the future of our country, that we will be able to have these hybrids driving across the country, pulling into a motel and plugging it in. There will just be a cord, like an extension cord.

I wanted to say one thing. I want to comment on the Senator's advocacy. The people of Delaware—I say this without any hype at all—are so fortunate to have someone who is so into legislation. I don't know of another Senator, in looking at an issue, who understands it so thoroughly. I say that sometimes I wish you didn't know it so thoroughly, because it doesn't allow me to have any wiggle room at all. But I say that without any reservation. I am so admiring of the Senator's talents to legislate. I am very partial to you because you and I came here together in 1982 as freshmen Members of the House of Representatives. But the

people of Delaware got a well-trained legislator when you came to the Senate. Your experience in the State, as a Statewide officeholder, a Member of the House of Representatives, a Governor, a Senator—you have not only had the experience, but you still have the tenacity and the will to be a good legislator, and the people of Delaware are very fortunate, but so are we as a country.

I would ask my distinguished friend, there are a few closing matters. Could you do those when you complete your statement?

Mr. CARPER. I will.

Mr. President, I was talking about the visit of last week with the CEO of one of our major three automakers. The point I was trying to make is the automakers don't have to come up with cars that get 52 miles per gallon or 50 miles per gallon, but if they have a fleet of 60 percent trucks and 40 percent cars in 2020, they are going to have to do better, and better is 42 miles per gallon.

Our leader, Senator REID, was talking about an event here today where some vehicles were on display. I think they were jerry rigged—maybe it was Ford Escape and some other vehicles, maybe Priuses—in order to get very high mileage, I think he said 170 miles per gallon. We don't need cars that get 170 miles per gallon by 2020 to make this standard of roughly 35 miles per gallon for the fleet. We don't need cars that get 50 miles per gallon.

But in this case, Company X—which is a real company, it turns out—is working toward 42 miles per gallon and they would meet the expected requirements that would be set for them.

I said to my visitor last week, the CEO who was visiting me, You have an obligation to your shareholders and you have an obligation to your employees to try to get the best deal out of this that you guys can be proud of and maximize your profits.

I said: As a Senator who cares about the economic development and job creation in my State, I want you to be profitable. I want you to be successful.

So I feel some obligation too. But I went on to add that we have an obligation here, as does the Presiding Officer, my friend from Pennsylvania, who is going to speak in a minute, we have an obligation that goes beyond that which our CEO feels, or other CEOs feel. We have an obligation to make sure we do reduce our reliance on foreign oil. The car companies, in all honesty, don't have that obligation. We have an obligation to make sure the air we breathe is cleaner. We have an obligation to make sure the threat of global warming is diminished, not increased. They don't have that requirement, as we do. That is our job.

It is not enough for us, though, to say to the car companies: You have to eat your spinach. You have to go out there and make the tough decisions all by yourself to raise fuel efficiency standards. I think we have an obliga-

tion in the Federal Government and in other levels of Government as well to help them. It shouldn't be them doing this all by themselves; we have an obligation to help them. I mention maybe four ways where we are trying to help them in the legislation that is before us today and that we will be voting on tomorrow and during the next couple of days.

With respect to making more energy efficient cars, here are some ways we can help the industry. One is through basic research and development investments. If we go back a few years, we have invested a lot of money in fuel cell technologies, as my colleagues know. In the legislation before us, the underlying bill on CAFE standards, we authorized the expenditure of \$50 million a year over the next 5 years for new battery technology, for a new generation of lithium batteries, so the kind of cars the majority leader was talking about a few minutes ago, so we can actually build them, actually build the Chevrolet Volt. The Chevrolet Volt, the car I was talking about earlier, the coolest car at the auto show, a flex-fuel, plug-in hybrid, you plug it in, charge the battery at night from your house, go out the next day, drive maybe 30, 40 miles before you have to recharge again. If you get to work before that time, plug it in at work. In the meantime, when you put on your brakes, it is a traditional hybrid. You put on your brakes and recharge the battery.

But in the Chevrolet Volt, it actually carries with it an auxiliary power unit. The auxiliary power unit doesn't run the car, it charges the battery. It can be fuel cell powered, it could be biofuels diesel, it could be an ethanol internal combustion engine recharging the battery, and the battery running the wheels.

I saw a headline in the local paper in my State a month ago. It was a picture of one of the top folks at GM standing alongside the Chevrolet Volt and talking about this vehicle, which they hope to have on the road by the early part of the next decade, to get over 100 miles per gallon. That is not the entire fleet, it is one vehicle, but that is 100 miles per gallon. If we can do that, 100 miles per gallon or even 80 or 90 or 70 for the Chevrolet Volt and the kind of things our majority leader saw today, the fuel efficiencies there, if it is even a half or a third of what he saw, the idea of getting 35 miles per gallon for a total fleet in 2020 is not a pipedream, it is realistic. I am convinced that to the extent our auto manufacturers are positioned to build more energy efficient cars, to at least have some of them, they make themselves more competitive in the world environment.

But I was talking about the ways we can help, the Federal Government can help our industry to meet these higher standards. One, Federal investments in basic R&D. Whether it is for fuel cells several years ago or whether it is new battery technology, we are putting in

about \$40 million this year. I hope next year it will be 50 and the next 5 years after that at \$50 million a year.

Second, another way we can help is to use the Federal Government's purchasing power to help commercialize these new technologies. We are going to be building and putting out on the road a new generation, next-generation hybrid Durango and a next-generation hybrid Chrysler Aspen. Currently they are internal combustion engines. They don't get 20 miles per gallon. They are high teens for fuel economy. But starting sometime by the middle of next year we will have on the road hybrid Durangos and hybrid Chrysler Aspens, the fuel economy of which will be increased by 40 percent over current levels—a 40-percent increase. I want to see—and I know others of my colleagues want to see—when the Federal Government goes out and buys—and we buy a lot of vehicles every year on the civilian side and on the defense side—I want to have included in the legislation we pass something that says some small percentage, some modest percentage of the vehicles we are going to be buying, anyway, should be invested in highly energy efficient new technology cars or trucks or vans, and their reaction to have the opportunity to do that in the context of the underlying legislation.

We are going to take up the Defense authorization bill in a couple of weeks and we will have an opportunity to do the same thing in terms of using the Government's purchasing power on the military side to commercialize these more energy efficient technologies in the cars, trucks, and vans that the military buys.

A third way the Federal Government can help the auto companies meet these more stringent standards, in addition to investments in R&D, in addition to the vehicular purchases of the Government to commercialize technologies, is with respect to tax credits. In the Energy bill adopted in 2005, we have energy tax credits that say if you buy a highly energy-efficient hybrid vehicle, you get a tax credit of \$300 to almost \$3,500 for your purchase. There is a similar provision in the same bill that says to folks who buy highly energy-efficient, diesel-powered vehicles with very low emissions that they can get the same kind of tax breaks, \$300 to roughly \$3,500.

As it turns out, almost all of the hybrids, incentivized by those tax credits, are made in other countries. So we have tax incentives to encourage people to buy hybrids from other countries. Shame on us. Hopefully, in the next couple years we will put American hybrids on the road and incentivize people to buy American-made hybrids, such as the Durango and the Chrysler Aspen that will be produced less than a year from now. No American manufacturer is making today, nor will they next year, diesel-powered vehicles with emission levels low enough to qualify under the 2005 legislation.

One of the changes that has been agreed to and is in the Finance Committee's package, Mr. President—and you are a member of the Finance Committee—one of the provisions the committee adopted in the finance language that accompanies the Energy bill allows the low-emission, highly energy-efficient Chrysler products that are being manufactured and sold in this country this year, for 1 year—that will be next year—their products will qualify not for the full tax credit but for about three-quarters of the tax credit just for 1 year. After that, they have to be very low emissions starting in 2009, which is as it should be.

That is something we can do to incentivize folks to buy vehicles made in this country that have low emissions and are highly efficient. The more energy efficient, the bigger the tax credit.

The fourth and last point we can do in the way of helping the industry is, there is a flex-fuel mandate that says some of the vehicles we build in this country have to be capable of running on ethanol or some kind of fuel other than traditional petroleum. However, as my colleagues know, today, if you drive around this country and have one of these vehicles that can run on ethanol, it is hard to find a pump. It is hard to find a pump in Colorado, Pennsylvania, Delaware, or any other State, except Minnesota where I think they have 400 gas stations that actually have ethanol. But it is hard to find a fueling station where we can actually fill up with something other than gasoline.

There needs to be included in this legislation something that mandates the oil companies, just as we did 20, 25, 30 years ago on unleaded gas, so the people who have vehicles that are capable of running on renewable fuel can actually find a place to fill up.

Similarly with hydrogen, as we move to the point of building more hydrogen-powered vehicles. It doesn't do us any good if we don't have hydrogen fueling stations in this country. The Federal Government has an obligation to make sure that fuel is available too.

Those are four actions the Government can do, and I hope will do, in the context of this legislation before us: One, investments in R&D, in this case new battery technology; two, use Federal Government purchasing power to help companies to commercialize this new technology; three, use tax credits to incentivize people to buy the vehicles once they are produced, more energy-efficient vehicles produced; and, finally, hydrogen infrastructure so people who buy flex-fuel vehicles can find the product, the stations where they can fill up.

The last point I want to make, and it goes back to my conversation with my friend who is a CEO of one of these domestic auto companies. I mentioned he has an obligation to his shareholders and employees. I am sure he cares about the quality of air. I am sure he

cares about our dependence on foreign oil. That is not his day job. That is our day job, so we should focus on it as we debate these issues.

My colleague from Colorado who is presiding, and my colleague from Pennsylvania who is waiting patiently for me to wrap up—and I have been to funerals for people from our State who have died in Iraq or Afghanistan. We have tried to console family members. I was in Iraq over the weekend. We have 160,000 men and women there today. They are in harm's way as I speak. We are so dependent on troubled parts of the world for oil, unstable parts of the world for oil, where we have men and women at risk, where we lost lives yesterday and probably lost lives today and probably will tomorrow.

I think of a member of my staff, Sean Barney, who worked with me since 2000 when I ran for the Senate. Sean decided he wanted to go into the Marines. He joined the Marines and went through basic training. This is a guy with an undergraduate degree from Swarthmore and a graduate degree from Columbia who decided he wanted to be a marine.

A couple years ago, he went to basic training and became a PFC and ended up in Anbar Province, in the streets of Falluja, shot by a sniper in the neck which severed his carotid artery. He, by all rights, should be dead. He lived, miraculously. He has some degree of disability in his right arm, right shoulder, right hand, but he is alive.

When I have visited in Iraq, I had a chance to visit with a bunch of National Guard troops. We have them over there from Colorado and Pennsylvania too—folks from the 198th Signal Battalion. I was their commander in chief when I was Governor for 8 years. I have a special affection and devotion to them. I wanted to make sure they come home safely.

When I got home early Monday morning, I went to a sendoff for 150 members of one of our military police units. They were heading on to Fort Dix. They are at Fort Dix today and then on to Iraq.

I guess the point I am making is, while we want to make sure our domestic auto industry is successful and is profitable, and we have a good, strong auto manufacturing base, I want to make sure we stop sending men and women around the world to these troubled spots that have large amounts of oil deposits. And we are concerned about that situation. That is something of which we need to be mindful. For me, it figures into this equation and this debate.

I close by saying, we will have a chance to debate these issues tomorrow morning, and we will have a chance to vote on the language in the underlying bill, maybe with a change from an amendment Senator STEVENS and I have offered and maybe will be adopted, or maybe with the more far-reaching change negotiated and developed by

our colleagues, Senators PRYOR, LEVIN, STABENOW, and BOND. At the end of the day, though, when we pass this legislation and send it on to the House, it is so important that it moves in a meaningful way toward reducing our dependence on foreign oil; that in a meaningful way it reduces the emissions of harmful matter into our air; and in a real way it also enhances and doesn't undermine the competitiveness of our domestic auto industry.

It is not easy to do all three of those goals, but those are the three things we need to do. If we can send from the Senate to the House at the end of this week or early next week legislation that is actually faithful to those three goals, we will have done our work and done good work.

Tomorrow and the next day will be the test to see if we can measure up to those standards. I hope we can.

I apologize to my colleague from Pennsylvania for going on as long as I have. I thank him for his patience.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ENERGY EFFICIENT APPLIANCES

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, first of all, I thank Senator CARPER for his presentation and his wisdom. I appreciate that.

I rise tonight very briefly to express hope that is contained in an amendment I have. I know we have an agreement in place, and this is for the purpose of talking about this amendment as opposed to formally speaking on it.

This is a very simple amendment I have. It is an idea I had based on some of my work in State government. It is simply to do this, to offer a proposal that allows low-income families to purchase home appliances which are energy efficient and that will allow them to not only heat their homes or wash their clothes or use other appliances but to do it in an energy-efficient way.

It is based upon my experience in State government, as a State treasurer, where we started a program in Pennsylvania called Keystone Help, back in the last couple of years. Right now, that program has helped people in 60 out of our 67 counties. It is simple.

What the Federal version of this would do is to dedicate \$4 million over 5 years. It is not a lot of money, and it is paid for by the current \$750-million-per-year authorization for weatherization programs in the Federal Government. So it is just \$4 million out of the \$750 million that is already in the bill and already paid for.

These funds would be used to help low-income families purchase Energy Star certified appliances. This means they have been certified by the Department of Energy for their energy-efficient qualities.

Here is what the appliances are that would be allowed to be paid for out of the money applied in this program: refrigerators, water heaters, washers and dryers, home heating systems and air-conditioning—basic necessities of life in America today.