

big number. To somebody like me, from Rhode Island, it is almost unimaginable. So I asked my staff to give me some means of comparing, some way of thinking about how big that number is.

This is a penny. And I asked my staff: If a penny was \$1 billion and you put a stack of pennies on my desk here, how high would that stack of \$1 billion pennies go to make \$7.7 trillion? Well, they found out that the stack of \$1 billion pennies would have to go 39 feet high to amount to \$7.7 trillion. I don't think the television camera can take this in, but from here to the very top of this room is about 39 feet of \$1 billion pennies. That is the enormous burden on our country from the improvident, wasteful, feckless policies of the Bush administration.

I have a credit card. The distinguished Senator from Michigan has a credit card. If we borrow money on our credit cards, we have to pay interest. American families across the country work to pay interest on mortgages, on credit cards, and on loans of various kinds. Well, guess what. We have to pay a lot of interest on a debt such as we have. And in the recent budget, as the Presiding Officer will recall, that we just passed in the Budget Committee and that we are discussing on the floor, there is \$260 billion in interest, much of it paid to foreign countries, on our national debt—\$7.7 trillion of it run up by one administration, the administration of George W. Bush.

Now, that \$260 billion is another pretty big number. So I asked: What could we do with \$260 billion if we didn't have to give it to the Saudis and the Chinese and the Mexicans and everybody else we have borrowed money from to fund George Bush's \$7.7 trillion debt? Well, here is what we could do: For starters, we could pay for health insurance for everyone. We would have universal health care in this country. And you know what, there would be money left over. With the money that was left over, you could also add a million children—a million children—to Head Start Programs. Universal health care for everyone, a million extra children getting Head Start, and still there would be money left over. You could double every Pell grant, which helps kids in America pay for college and reach out and seize their futures. Universal health care, a million extra kids in Head Start, and doubling every Pell Grant. And there would still be money left over. With that last bit of money left over, you could repair or replace 95 percent of the bridges that currently need repair and reconstruction in America—not 100 percent, only 95 percent. You would have to wait until next year to do that last 5 percent.

That is what the cost to us is of an administration and a Republican Congress that ran up \$7.7 trillion in debt.

So I appreciate very much the ranking member who spoke eloquently last week about the problem of that last \$9.6 billion in discretionary spending

we authorized in the Senate-passed budget above the \$1 trillion mark. We wouldn't need to worry about that \$9.6 billion if his colleagues and President Bush hadn't run up \$7.7 trillion in debt for Americans to have to pay in the future because this administration, frankly, was too cowardly to pay its own way and has borrowed from future generations to pay for the war in Iraq and to pay for tax cuts for the richest Americans. In a country where the difference between the wealthy and the poor, between the CEOs and the workers is growing dramatically, is straining the very fabric of our society, instead of bringing us together, what was the President's solution? Lots more tax cuts for the very richest people, who are doing the absolute best already, the ones who have nothing to worry about except whether they take the Lincoln or they take the Benz. They are the ones who need the tax cuts in this country? I don't think so. But the President did, and he didn't even have the guts to pay for it or find the cuts. He borrowed the money. That is why we are at \$7.7 trillion.

So I think it is fascinating that we are having this budget discussion. I want to salute our chairman, Senator CONRAD, who is absolutely brilliant with the budget. He works so well with people in this body and has such enormous credibility that he is able to work through issues in a very special way—in large part because of his personal character and his credibility. We all benefit from his being able to do that.

But he has had to work very hard to try to bring this budget into balance, 3 or 4 years out from now. It is not easy work, putting this budget together.

When people come to the floor and criticize his efforts and try to knock \$9.6 billion off and worry that this might not be fiscally prudent, it is astonishing when those remarks come from the people who aided and abetted George Bush in running up \$7.7 trillion in money that we owe now to the rest of the world, that we will have to pay off indefinitely, that will be a weight and a burden on the shoulders of this country for decades if not generations.

I actually think we need to do something about the \$7.7 trillion Bush Debt. I recommended that we have a formal commission of some kind, an authority whose job it is to take the best and the brightest people who understand our economy and figure out how we pay down \$7.7 trillion. It is really a disaster.

Some of us have served in State government before we came here. Some of us have served in municipal government. If there is a crisis at the State government level—an economic crisis—if a municipality has a terrible fire in a facility and has to rebuild, you take that problem and you set it aside and you create a revenue stream and you deal with it. You don't try to force it through the regular operating budget of the State or of the municipality.

We may be at the stage where the Bush Debt of \$7.7 trillion is so serious for us fiscally that we should start thinking about getting together a group of the most learned economists, the people who care the most about America's future, who see the hazard to our welfare, to our national security that this kind of debt creates, and can think creatively about how we can set up special revenue streams to pay it down and begin to bring our country back in balance.

I appreciate the courtesy of the Chair in listening to these remarks. I did think as we closed out the budget debate it was important to remind everybody that, for all the big talk the Bush administration may make about fiscal prudence and about being responsible, it is the most fiscally imprudent and the most irresponsible administration in our history. Indeed, President Bush alone has borrowed more money from foreign countries than all 42 Presidents who preceded him—not any one of them, all of them. If we add up everything they borrowed through the entire history of the Republic, in just one Presidency he has them beat.

It takes a little brass to be able to come and argue for fiscal prudence and responsibility and not mention that President Bush and the Republican Congress ran up \$7.7 trillion in debt. I thought we should think about it and reflect on that as this debate concludes.

I appreciate working with the very distinguished Senator from Michigan. Her work on the Budget Committee is very valuable. She is a wonderful colleague to me, and I appreciate the indulgence this evening.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASEY). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. BROWN. I ask unanimous consent to speak up to 10 minutes as in morning business.

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

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, both the international community and experts from across our country have come to a definite consensus. Climate change is not a theory. It is a reality. We may not like it, but we have to confront it. Rising temperatures, melting icecaps, and extreme weather show the increasing effects of global warming in the United States and especially around the globe. Without action, we will be unable to avoid dangerous consequences for our children, grandchildren, and subsequent generations. We risk the health of our citizens, the

well-being of our coastal areas, the productivity of our farms, forests, and fisheries.

There is solid support in this institution and around the country for a mandatory cap-and-trade approach to reducing carbon emissions. All three Presidential candidates—Senators OBAMA, CLINTON, and MCCAIN—and both political parties have agreed on this philosophy. The Senate passed the Lieberman-Warner bill out of committee in December. It is likely to reach the floor of the Senate in the next few weeks. I am not saying a climate change bill will pass this year. I am saying a climate change bill will pass. No more burying our heads in the sand, no more ignoring the issue and putting it off for another day. It is not a question of whether; it is a question of when and a question of what it will look like.

As a manufacturing State reliant on coal—not too different from the State of the Presiding Officer—Ohio is going to be significantly affected by the climate change bill regardless of its specifics. I am working with Senators from other industrial States—Senators CASEY, BAYH, LUGAR, DURBIN, STABENOW, LEVIN, and others—to ensure that the effects on manufacturing jobs are considered as this legislation is drafted. We can't shut our eyes or turn our backs or hope that global warming goes away and becomes someone else's problem. That is not going to happen. But we can maximize Ohio's gains, Pennsylvania's gains, the gains of other States, and minimize those losses, looking first at the opportunities presented to us by global change legislation.

The mandatory cap-and-trade approach to climate change will create a market for clean energy and green jobs. By creating markets for clean energy, we can stabilize our Nation's energy supply, reduce greenhouse gases, and bolster manufacturing in Lima, Zanesville, Toledo, and Ashtabula. It has been estimated that in terms of a global market, the advanced and alternative energy sector will double several times over in the next decade, from a \$55 billion industry to a \$226 billion business. Wind power alone, it is estimated, will grow from \$18 billion to a \$61 billion market. In the last 15 months, I have conducted roundtables in Ohio, bringing together 15 or 20 people to talk about problems, about their communities. You can see what is happening in a State such as mine.

The Cleveland Foundation, in conjunction with Case Western Reserve University, is going to build a field of wind turbines in Lake Erie, the first time wind turbines have ever been placed in a freshwater lake.

I have seen the Composite Center in Dayton which makes new, lighter, stronger materials, initially for airplanes, now for fuel-efficient automobiles and wind turbines. The University of Toledo is doing some of the best wind turbine research in the United

States. In Columbus and Ohio State, there is the Center for Automotive Research, the work they are doing for more fuel-efficient automobiles. Today I talked with someone who was visiting Washington from Battelle Institute. They are doing astonishing things on a whole range of issues; Stark State and Rolls-Royce on fuel cells. Oberlin College has built the largest building of any college campus in the country fully powered by solar energy. The problem is those solar cells and panels are not made in this country because we don't make them. They were bought from Germany and Japan.

At the same time, we are seeing the largest solar company in the country producing near Toledo in Perrysburg. In Ashtabula, right across the border from Erie, we are seeing components for wind turbines. In place after place, Ohio is helping to lead the way to make my State the Silicon Valley of renewable energy.

Ohio has the potential to create 20,000 new jobs through renewable energy projects. That puts Ohio second only to California in terms of potential job creation. But we have a lot of work to do. Any climate change legislation must invest in the deployment of renewable energy technology and promote green job growth. That is why I introduced legislation called the Green Energy Production Act last month. It is an energy bill, an environment bill, and a jobs bill. The bill creates a government corporation that will set up loan programs and grant programs for green energy manufacturers, mostly small businesses, to get them to develop products and get them to market.

Over 5 years, the bill would invest \$36 billion with no political strings attached, no Government picking winners and losers but companies that need capital that are just taking off, small businesses, businesses that need to grow, businesses that need to expand. Some \$36 billion will be invested in green energy manufacturing. We have great R&D in my State, but the big problem is commercialization, the key to creating jobs in my State.

Speaking of jobs, we can't overlook the tremendous challenges the industrial Midwest will face under climate change legislation. My State is the seventh largest in the country by population. We are the fourth largest carbon-emitting State, behind California, Texas, and New York. In the past year and a half, I have held roundtables all over my State in some 60 of the 88 counties. They have given me an opportunity to be with workers and business people and civic leaders and local government officials.

One thing is crystal clear: Ohioans are anxious about their communities' futures, and the statistics match their anxiety. More than 40,000 manufacturing plants have shut down in the United States since 2001. More than 3.3 million manufacturing jobs have been lost, about one-sixth of all U.S. manu-

facturing jobs. My State has lost more than 200,000 jobs. Pennsylvania is comparable. The simple fact is, our economy cannot prosper unless we manufacture and sell goods as a State and a nation. Manufacturing is too important to the prosperity of this country and to our economic and national security. Manufacturing is too important to ignore, as this Government has done in the last few years.

I know, given a level playing field, our companies can outcompete any around the globe. Any climate change legislation must be developed in conjunction with manufacturers to ensure U.S. competitiveness with other growing industrial giants in the world, particularly China and India. We must work together to ensure that domestic manufacturers are protected from imports that come from countries without comparable climate change legislation. That means working together to provide appropriate transition assistance to our energy intensive industries. My State, in some sense, specializes in energy-intensive industries—steel, chemicals, glass, cement, aluminum. We must work together to minimize any economic harm while ensuring the environmental integrity of the climate change legislation.

The bill that came out of committee needs to do a better job. It has made progress from the original bill to the substitute bill brought forward by Senator BOXER. It has made major progress, but it has to do a better job of addressing the need, particularly in people's own personal electric bills and the cost of energy to manufacturers. The bill needs to help low- and middle-income consumers who will face higher energy costs and must help communities and workers who are displaced due to a shift from coal power. It means providing support necessary to create green jobs in Ohio and across the Midwest, and it means helping those energy-intensive manufacturers I was talking about with their energy costs and with unregulated international competition. Some environmental groups quote economic models saying that business under a cap-and-trade program will be all wine and roses. They are on one side. Some business groups are touting economic models that predict climate change legislation will send us all back to living in caves. Both sides are wrong. It is not going to be that easy, but it is also not going to put American business out of business.

One last point. When you talk to people about climate change, one of the first questions that always comes up is what do we do about China and India. If they are not going to, why should we, in some sense, unilaterally disarm as a country, putting more and more costs on Ohio businesses in Cleveland, Columbus, Dayton, Cincinnati? Why should we put more cost on these businesses, when China and India are not doing that? We have three possibilities. One is do nothing. That is unacceptable. We have two other possibilities:

To work with countries around the world on bringing them to a level of climate change comparable to the level we want to get to; one is multilateral environment and climate change agreements, negotiations, Kyoto-type agreements among all the major industrial powers in the world. That will take years. That will perhaps only be as successful as Kyoto, which wasn't very successful, ultimately.

The other path to walk down is what we do about trade legislation, about accepting those products coming into the United States from other countries. When we have pretty strong environmental laws, you know in your State what has happened with the steel industry, where they have put huge numbers of dollars into scrubbers and other kinds of environmental cleanup. China and India, frankly, don't do that. When we buy products from China and India, we buy steel from them, discounting the issue of toxic toys and contaminants in vitamins and all the unsafe products they send us that are ultimately consumer products, but when we buy steel from China and India, that steel is made by cheaper labor, and it is also made with very weak environmental rules.

The only way to change that, to get China and India to the table, if you will, if we will not do the negotiations that will be so difficult and tedious and take so long, is to say, every time we import steel from China and India, steel where there is an environmental cost in its production, we charge a tariff at the border, a tariff reflecting the cost that they have not borne but that our manufacturers bear on the production of that steel. So why should a steel company in Lorain or a foundry in Mahoning Valley have to pay these huge additional costs under climate change to deal with their carbon emissions, when people in China and India don't? The only way to equalize that and to make this competitive and keep American business competitive is to figure out what it actually costs China and what moneys China and India save by not coming up to the same level of environmental protection that we do.

That should always have been part of the trade debate. The Bush administration has never believed that. That is one of the reasons we have lost so many manufacturing jobs in my State, since President Bush took office—bad trade policy, bad environmental policy, bad labor policy.

Ultimately, this climate change issue is going to be about equalizing the cost of making air cleaner, limiting carbon emissions, dealing with all the issues around CO₂. The way to do that is through a trade policy that works for us, for China, for India, and especially works for our grandchildren, great-grandchildren, and those subsequent generations. We must work together in this institution to shape legislation that truly addresses global climate change while protecting our manufacturing jobs. That means working as-

siduously with countries around the world in reaching those goals.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, I ask to speak in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

LESSONS FROM 1787

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, I rise today to address some of the critical issues this body faces at this point in history, and to reflect on why these challenges are surmountable if we focus on working together to forge ahead.

These are clearly not easy times. We are engaged in a global battle for the future of freedom. We are up against radical Islamic extremists who will do anything they can to annihilate those who do not live and believe their way.

At home, we face some daunting questions when it comes to expanding opportunity for all Americans. So do we follow a proven path of tax relief? Can we change the way we educate our children to prepare them for global competition in the 21st century? How do we provide quality health care that is accessible and affordable for all of our families? How do we secure our borders and strengthen legal immigration? Can we come together to make difficult decisions about the future of entitlements before they bankrupt this country?

Today, we face the task of funding the global war against Islamic extremists, providing our troops with the resources they need and prioritizing funding so we do not incur unnecessary debt.

Yes, these are tough questions, with serious consequences. But more than two centuries ago, a group of patriots convened to write our Constitution, and they provided the framework for the Government in which we have the honor to serve today.

They faced questions we take for granted centuries later but which could only have been resolved by incredible vision and the grace of God.

As Delegate James Wilson stated:

... we are providing a Constitution for future generations and not merely for the circumstances of the moment.

How votes would be apportioned in the Congress was one of the first and most difficult questions this convention tackled. The smaller States wanted an equal vote, and the larger States, obviously, preferred a proportional vote. Some argued that the vote in the lower House should be based on taxes paid. There were threats of breaking up

States to make them smaller and more manageable to govern. Decisions had to be made regarding the terms of Members of Congress. How would they be paid? What powers would be granted to the Government?

Remember, this was a country that had fought its way out from under the control of a powerful monarchy. The Framers of the Constitution were incredibly aware of that fact.

The Great Compromise was the measure that gave every State two Senators. But would foreigners be permitted to serve in the Congress? Where would the seat of Government be? Would officers of the Government be required to swear an oath to support the Constitution? Who would ratify the Constitution—the States or the people?

To think today about the number of decisions and compromises that were made over the course of a summer is humbling. The North Carolina delegates wrote to their Governor:

A very large Field presents to our view without a single Straight or eligible Road that has been trodden by the feet of Nations.

Yet great thought, debate, and deliberation went into every single decision. Issues were often revisited time and again before a consensus was painstakingly reached.

The Constitution was by no means thrown together quickly or haphazardly. Once decisions were ultimately made about the branches of Government and their powers, a document needed to be artfully drafted to steer the United States in 1787 as well as for generations to come. The product was nothing short of miraculous. Yet the Constitution was still not a done deal.

The Constitution and its revolutionary ideas had many supporters, but it also faced fierce opposition. It was described as “a most ridiculous piece of business” by some. Those who stood against the Constitution honed in on people's fears. After all, this was a completely experimental government with no proven model to follow. As delegate Davie of North Carolina declared: “It is much easier to alarm people than to inform them.”

Fortunately for this Nation the constitutionalists prevailed. To study the transformation of a blank slate of hopes and aspirations to a functioning Constitution that would guide a democracy for more than 200 years is awesome. There are several valuable lessons that I wish to share with my colleagues.

It is difficult to pass legislation today with a closely divided Senate. It was painfully difficult to make decisions about forming a new government and then determine and agree on what should be included in our Constitution. To make progress even more frustrating, a subject already voted on could be reconsidered again the next day and voted on again.

But these men did not let the process interfere with their progress. Their experience and their reasonableness