

WEBB would know that neighborhood—used to say, “Great balls of fire, time’s a wastin’.” I say time’s a wastin’. Let’s get busy now, but let’s do the things that work. Let’s not create a bureaucracy that will be counterproductive.

I yield the floor.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the junior Senator from California is going to want to yield back the morning business time, I suppose, and get on with the bill; is that correct?

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining morning business time be yielded back, and under the previous order, the Chair will report the motion to proceed to S. 3036.

Mr. INHOFE. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mrs. BOXER. Sure.

Mr. INHOFE. I assume the Senator has an opening statement to make, and I do, too, on this legislation we are going to be going to. If you have an opening statement, Senator SPECTER would like to follow you and I would follow him. Is that an order that would be acceptable to the Senator?

Mrs. BOXER. I have to check because I have a number of Democratic Senators who wish to partake if we go to this. How much time will we have on this?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time until 5:30 will be equally divided.

Mrs. BOXER. If the Senators could put a time certain on it, and I will be happy to put a time certain on my time?

Mr. SPECTER. Five minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. Five minutes? Great.

Mr. INHOFE. Twenty-five minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. I would have 25 minutes, to be followed by Senator SPECTER for 5, then followed by Senator INHOFE for 25, to be followed by Senator LIEBERMAN for 20.

I make that as a unanimous consent request.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

CLIMATE SECURITY ACT OF 2008—MOTION TO PROCEED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 3036, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to S. 3036, a bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental

Protection Agency to establish a program to decrease emissions of greenhouse gases, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, if you will let me know when I have gone 20 minutes, I will greatly appreciate it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will so notify the Senator.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, this is a historic day, not only for our country, but I think the world is watching us. It is because we have a pressing issue called global warming, climate change; you could call it either one. Scientists have told us that in fact we have a very small window right now within which to respond. But it is a historic day because for the first time we have what I call tripartisan legislation out of the Environment and Public Works Committee. It is the Boxer-Lieberman-Warner bill. It is a Democrat, it is an Independent, and it is a Republican. We have come together to say to our colleagues and to the American people: Finally, we are going to deal with this critical challenge.

I wish to take a moment to thank Senator REID for scheduling this matter. There were a lot of voices saying: Why do this now? Why do we have to do this now? I know, because I came to the Congress with HARRY REID, why he wants to do this now. Because it is, in fact, one of the greatest challenges of our generation and we have to respond with a landmark bill, it will take us a while. We must get started. We certainly hope our colleagues will vote to get started. If they do not vote to get started, they are going to have to explain why they have turned their backs on the world’s leading scientists and on the Bush administration’s own political appointees—such as the head of the CDC, who told us that we face real problems if we do not act, such as the vectors that will now live in warming waters. They will be turning their backs on the intelligence community and the military community, who have looked out in the future and have written papers—and this is the main reason JOHN WARNER is into this—telling us that if we do not act, we are going to see desperate refugees throughout the world. We are going to see droughts and floods worse than the ones we have seen. When refugees are moving because of rising waters, droughts, or floods, you are going to see wars develop in all parts of the world. That is why Senator REID said yes. He said yes to American leadership. That is what we want to say by moving to this bill and supporting it. We say yes to green jobs.

Because the President already said he is going to veto this bill if it passes, I have to say it is very interesting that one of the reasons he gave is that in one of the models, it shows that gas prices will go up 50 cents a gallon in 20 years. That would be 2 cents a year. In

fact, if you look at the record of this administration—and they have done nothing to stop it—gas prices have gone up, under their watch, 250 percent. Just take a look at this chart—250 percent, from \$1.47 to \$3.94; 250 percent. This administration did nothing. Now when they come forward and they say we can’t pass this bill because gas prices will go up, here is the truth.

The truth is, because we are going to get better fuel economy—because of a bill the President did sign, and we are glad he supported this part—you are going to be putting less fuel in your tank. So even if it is more per gallon, you are going to be getting better mileage, so you are not going to feel that 2 cents a year. And second, and this is key, it is fitting for this administration which has supported big oil and supported foreign oil and goes to the Middle East and holds hands with the leaders there and kisses them on the cheek and begs for oil—it is very fitting: They are still the voice of the status quo. They are still the voice for continuing our dependence on oil.

This is what has happened without a climate change bill. This is what has happened without a bill to fight global warming. We see this ridiculously impossible increase in costs, and then the administration does nothing about this but is scaring the people and saying they are going to get hit with higher prices.

Let me also address this. In this Boxer-Lieberman-Warner substitute that is before us, we have in there two things we didn’t have in the Lieberman-Warner bill. One is a deficit reduction fund.

You can take down the chart now. It is too ugly to look at.

In the Boxer-Lieberman bill, we did not have a deficit reduction trust fund, and therefore people could have argued that this is going to be a terrible thing for us as we look out in the future. We put that in there, and CBO says our bill is deficit neutral.

We also have in this bill a very large piece—almost \$1 trillion—of tax relief. So when we do see some increases in energy costs in the early years—electricity, for example—we can offset that because there will be tax relief and then there will be this consumer relief that will go through the utilities. They will give rebates immediately.

For those people who said: Oh, my goodness, we are moving forward with this and we need to make sure we can get off the track, I want to say thank you to Senators BINGAMAN and SPECTER who, in their bill, had created what I thought was a very important off-ramp. The one thing I didn’t agree with them on was the price they pegged for the price of carbon because the business people I spoke to, including those in Silicon Valley, said: That is a mess. If the price is too low, then business will simply not invest. The Silicon Valley people and the investors from across this country—we had one at a press conference today who said he represented, I think, a \$4 trillion fund,

said they are waiting to invest in new green technologies, in new jobs. They are waiting to do it. They are waiting for this legislation. But they will not do it unless we don't have an easy off-ramp, we have an off-ramp that can be used in circumstances that warrant it.

We have put the number between \$22 and \$30, which reflects the consensus of the labor groups as well as the environmental groups. We have tried to come together. We have tried to put this together in such a way that it essentially moves us forward, takes us where we have to go, and takes us there in a way that will mean the creation of millions of jobs.

Some of our colleagues will say this: Why do this now? We are in a recession. Precisely because we are in a recession is why we should be doing this. This bill is the first thing that brings us hope.

We sent a rebate check to people. I am really glad we did it. I voted for it. Guess what. We had no money to do that. We had to go into the red to do that. We had to go into deficit spending to send a rebate check. This bill gives us the funds to give relief to our consumers. This bill does that.

I compliment JUDD GREGG because I have had meetings with him, and this was his point. Mind you, he wants to give it all back to taxpayers. We use some of it for investments in these new technologies so we can swiftly move away from foreign oil and big oil, but it was JUDD GREGG—who I know was not a fan of our bill, again because of what I said—who gave us this idea and this notion that we could have these funds to return to our consumers.

I know Senator WARNER, who is on the floor now, has many contributions he is going to talk about in this bill. I will not go into details. But he also said it was important that the President has an ability to say: Wait a minute, this bill goes a little too far. We have to take a pause, a timeout. He has written it in such a way that I am very supportive of it because it balances the powers of the President and Congress. He will talk more about it.

Now that I see my two colleagues are on the floor—I have not had a chance to thank him on the Senate floor—I want to say to Senators LIEBERMAN and WARNER how much they mean to me—on this issue and also personally. I will not get overly emotional about it at all, but I will say this about Senator WARNER: Senator WARNER has a legacy that if he didn't do one more thing in the Senate, if he just decided to come by and say "Hi" to us for his last 6 or 8 months, it would have been enough. It would have been 10 times what most of us will achieve.

His legacy on national security is unparalleled; you know that and I know that. You have spoken to me about it. But when Senator WARNER came to me, since I am now chair of the EPW Committee—which is the deepest and greatest honor I have ever had—and he said: I have been doing a lot of thinking

about this, BARBARA, and I think we have to move; we have to get America back into a leadership position; I have told JOE LIEBERMAN; he said he is going to work with us.

I knew at that moment we would, in fact, reach this day. Now, even reaching this day was not easy. When you read "How a Bill Becomes a Law," and it says, you take it to the subcommittee, and the subcommittee approves it; you take it to the full committee, the full committee approves it; then you take it to the floor and the floor approves it, this was difficult for us to get through subcommittee and then to get through the full committee and now to take it to the floor. We know this is not easy. We know this is difficult. All great matters of the day are not easy. They take time. They take effort.

Landmark laws take effort. They do not happen overnight. But at moments such as these, when we are dealing with such a big issue, we should think back to our predecessors, when our predecessors in Congress saw rivers on fire from pollution or contaminated water that made us sick or filthy air that filled our lungs, and magnificent creatures such as the bald eagle close to extinction, Congress acted. We were not afraid. We were not afraid. We stepped to the plate and said: This is America, and our ingenuity can resolve these questions. We could have walked away. They could have walked away. But they did not walk away.

Now we are going to find out who is going to walk away from this and who is going to step to the plate. I think it is that important. The American people deserve to know who is willing to step to the plate.

Now, look, every bill means we have to compromise. Lord knows. I am looking at my friend, Senator WARNER, and smiling because I am thinking of the many times he said to me: Senator, I do not think I can go there with you.

Then he wanted something, and I said: Senator, I do not think I can go there with you. But we met halfway here. We met halfway. That is what we need to do in the Senate.

I wish to say that my colleagues in the Senate, including Senator WEBB, who is sitting in the chair, have allowed me into their lives, into their offices. We have talked for hours. I have heard their concerns. They have raised questions. In many cases, they have led us in a good direction to be stronger.

For example, in the case of Senator WEBB, he had many concerns. One of them happened to be what about the countries we trade with, are not they going to have an advantage? I cited the Bingaman-Specter bill again and said: We took something good from that bill. We took that part of Senator SPECTER that deals with saying, if countries come and want to bring in a lot of products into our Nation, and their countries are not doing anything about this, they are going to have buy allowances; they are going to have to do their part.

These are the kinds of things we hope to strengthen in this bill. Look, we have clear evidence, evidence that greenhouse gas pollution will cause our planet to heat up well beyond what is safe. We have to act. I do not want to do more than is necessary; I do not want to do less than is necessary. I am trying to find that "just right" spot.

I do agree with Senator WARNER that because we are looking out into the future, we have to give the Presidents now and in the future the ability to say: Let's take another look. We also have to continue to look to the scientists. Therefore, in our bill we say, the scientists should submit a report every few years. We need to see if we are doing too little or is it just right and adjust to it.

I think I mentioned this before. Senator REID deserves a lot of credit for bringing this bill forward. We have wasted time. Look, I blame myself. I blame myself. I did not grab the reins of this thing early enough in my career.

I have to say, Senator LIEBERMAN did. Senator MCCAIN raised the issue early on. I had some problems with their approach, and I did not engage. I admit this. This is the hardest thing for anyone to admit, for a Senator to say: I was wrong. I was wrong. I did not get it.

I have to give Al Gore and all the people who came before the committee when I got the gavel a year ago, a year and a half by now—and we said: You know, we are going to look at this thing. I did not have all the answers then. I had a lot of questions. We had the world's leading scientists, we had religious leaders, we had State leaders, we had Republicans, we had Democrats, we had businesses, we had mayors.

We had 25 full-blown hearings on this. Plus we had lunches and we had dinners where we invited in the scientists, the experts, people from Europe who have taken the lead, to ask them questions.

They made a lot of mistakes in the beginning. We were nervous about that. I remember one of the first times Senators LIEBERMAN and WARNER and I spoke was, we have to make sure that whatever bill we work on does not give rise to speculation and get-rich-quick schemes.

So we have been very careful to learn from the mistakes Europe has made. But when you cut it all up and you look at Great Britain, for example, a very small country compared to us, they have cut back carbon by 15 percent. In the same time, they have raised their gross domestic product by 45 percent. They have created 500,000 new jobs.

You do not have to go that far. Go to my State of California. We are in a terrible mess right now because of the housing crisis. We have so much of the foreclosure problem. We have a recession in housing and in construction. I was told unequivocally that because of

our global warming legislation we have there, 450 new solar businesses—and I am not even looking at nuclear and I am not looking at wind, I am looking at solar—450 companies have formed.

They are hiring many of the workers who are losing their jobs in the construction industry. So there are ways to do it that are wrong. There are ways to do it that are right. Now, today, you will hear from those who wish to kill this bill, kill it as dead as they can. They say it is too complicated, that we should do nothing and we should continue the status quo.

Well, the status quo is devastating, my friends. The scientists have told us that. The price of gas is off the charts. My friend, Senator LIEBERMAN, made this point beautifully at a press conference we had. The whole point of the bill is to get us off oil, is to unleash the genius of America so there are investments in alternatives, alternative fuel cars that get better fuel efficiency.

I will tell you this, knowing what I know from California, it is going to have a positive and beneficial effect; whereas, if we turn away out of fear, out of fear mongering, out of scare tactics, out of saying global warming is a hoax, it does not exist, look at scientist X, look at scientist Y.

You will hear it all on this floor. You will hear it all on this floor. But I remind you, there were people who said the world was flat, even when everyone knew it was not. There were people who said cigarettes did not cause cancer, when the rest of us knew they did. There are still people who say HIV does not cause AIDS. They are wrong. I can go on.

Oh, airbags, they will not save lives. Wrong. When you stand on the Senate floor, whether you are a Democrat or Republican, an Independent, whether you are short or tall or medium, whenever you challenge the status quo, watch out, folks, because the slings and arrows are going to be at your back, at your front, at your side.

I am ready. Why am I ready? I am ready because we have unbelievable bipartisanship on this bill. The quality of this partnership runs deep. LIEBERMAN and WARNER, LIEBERMAN and WARNER.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has 5 minutes 15 seconds remaining.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you very much. The bipartisanship on this runs deep. I have mentioned Senators LIEBERMAN and WARNER. Every member of my committee on the Democratic side and even some on the Republican side who did not like the bill contributed to the debate. Colleagues all over the Senate helped us.

The Energy Committee helped us. I will tell you, I went into member's offices, and I got great ideas from many offices. I mentioned Senator GREGG gave me a great idea. He does not like this bill because he wants to give all the money back. He does not want to

invest any of the money, but he gave me a great idea on the tax cut. We had Senators CANTWELL and MURRAY point out the importance of hydropower and how we could address that.

I could name colleague after colleague. Senator JOHN WARNER, who will be here for a lot of this debate, is a magnificent voice on this subject. I put him in the category of Al Gore on this subject. He knows what he is talking about. He helped so much without any credit. He put together business meetings, he put together dinners. He had people come over. We studied together. We studied with scientists. It was like going to school.

Senator KERRY, Senator CASEY. And I could go on with other colleagues. The fact is, I am not fearful of what is going to come at us starting soon because we have the facts on our side. We have a deep well of support from colleagues who know their stuff. There are 11 National Academies of Science that concluded climate change is real. The Nobel Prize-winning Intergovernmental Committee on Climate Change: Global warming is unequivocal. Human health impacts, children and the elderly vulnerable. I have lots of other information which I do not have the time to do.

I mentioned national security. National security. A report by the Center for Naval Analysis found that the United States could more frequently be drawn into situations of conflict to help provide stability before conditions worsen and are exploited by extremists. This is what Senator WARNER said so wisely.

So in summing up at this point, I urge my colleagues to vote yes to proceed. I do not know whether there is going to be a deliberate effort to try to stop us on this motion to proceed because I have not been informed. I can only say to colleagues: Do not be fearful because you have nothing to be fearful about.

I will tell you what there is to be fearful about: doing nothing, saying no, turning your back on the scientists, on the religious leaders who are with us, on the mayors, the Governors, on so many supporters who understand this. That would be dangerous because gas prices are shooting up to the sky. If we do not get off oil, that is our future.

With that bill, that is not our future. So if you want to be afraid, and that is your motive, to be afraid, you want to be afraid, vote no. If you want to start to address energy independence, clean energy, if you want to address the threats science says we face, vote yes on the motion to proceed. Let's get down to this and have a great debate in the Senate tradition. Because this issue definitely deserves to have that kind of debate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, could we have the Chair advise the body with regard to the existing time agreement. It would be my hope that I could follow

Senator JOSEPH LIEBERMAN, since the two of us are the principal sponsors of this bill.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, what I would like to do, we do have it locked in right now in terms of a UC. It would be Senator SPECTER next for 5 minutes, me for 25 minutes, and Senator LIEBERMAN for 20 minutes.

I will be managing the time in opposition. The time that has been requested from me is for Senator BOND to follow Senator LIEBERMAN. Then I am sure you would be on there.

Mr. WARNER. I will have to accept that.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I think I can resolve this. If my colleagues will wait a minute, can you tell me how much time remains on our side after Senator LIEBERMAN finishes?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is Senator SPECTER speaking on the proponent or opponent side?

Mrs. BOXER. I think he got some time from Senator INHOFE.

Mr. SPECTER. Undecided.

Mr. INHOFE. He is our time.

Mrs. BOXER. Senator INHOFE said he is speaking on his time, which is fine either way. But I am trying to find out how much time remains.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. After Senator LIEBERMAN speaks, there will be 29 minutes left.

Mrs. BOXER. May I give 2 minutes to Senator CARDIN following Senator LIEBERMAN and the remainder of the time to Senator WARNER?

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I propose that Senator WARNER and I divide the 20 minutes I have. I will take 10 and Senator WARNER can take 10. Then we will fill in after that. We have been in this together from the beginning and we are going to be on the boat at the end as well.

Mrs. BOXER. Is that all right with the Senator?

Mr. WARNER. I think that is most generous, but you take 15, I will take 5.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I refuse the offer.

Mrs. BOXER. So it is 10 and 10.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. After we hear from Senators SPECTER and INHOFE.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues for squeezing me in for 5 minutes. I sought this time to talk very briefly about the Bingaman-Specter bill which is aimed at solving the problem of global warming but is somewhat more moderate than the Warner-Lieberman bill.

I will take a few seconds on a personal note. I have had quite a few people take a look at me today and ask me how I am. On C-SPAN 2, some people may notice I am a little pale, a little thin, and a little bald. I feel better than I look. I have gone through this chemotherapy for Hodgkin's once, and I am optimistic about doing it again. But I agree with Senator BOXER that this is an historic day, and I wanted to be here at the outset of this debate.

I have long been concerned about the problem of global warming, and I congratulate Senator MCCAIN and Senator LIEBERMAN for what they did several years ago and what Senator WARNER and Senator LIEBERMAN are doing now. I think it is vital that we move ahead on this issue, and I intend to vote yes on the motion to proceed. It is my hope that in this debate we can reconcile many of the interests. Warner-Lieberman and Bingaman-Specter have a lot of similarities, but there are significant differences. I believe it is going to be difficult to get 60 votes to impose cloture so that this bill can move ahead. Senator BINGAMAN and I started a long time ago, 18 months ago, in January of 2007, with a draft bill. We were ready for introduction July 11, 2007, and assembled a large group of labor, business, industry, and environmentalists to support the bill which we have. I would like to see us attain the goals of Lieberman-Warner. I would like it very much. But for reasons which are detailed in my extensive written statement, I do not believe that is possible.

On February 14 of this year, at the request of management and labor, I testified before the Finance Committee on the issue of what importers were going to have to do. Illustratively, China wants 30 years. Well, in 30 years there won't be a steel industry. We have to reconcile a great many conflicting interests. My State is a major coal State. One of the top experts on Capitol Hill on this subject, Tom Dower, worked months working through complex issues with labor and management and conservationists. The details of a very extensive analysis are set forth in my floor statement, but that is the essence of my approach today.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of my statement be printed in the RECORD.

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

AMERICA'S CLIMATE SECURITY ACT

MR. SPECTER. Mr. President, I seek recognition to discuss the Lieberman-Warner climate change bill, S. 2191/S. 3036, "America's Climate Security Act of 2007." It is my intention to support cloture to end debate on the motion to proceed to this legislation, however I have concerns about the legislation some of which I will outline here.

Global climate change is potentially the greatest threat to mankind and our planet that our civilization has ever faced. The amount and quality of scientific data continue to improve our understanding of global climate change. This information points toward potentially severe ramifications for Earth's climate, ecosystems, and life as we know it. The most recent assessment in February 2007 by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) concluded that "most of the observed increase in globally averaged temperatures since the mid-20th century is very likely due to the observed increase in anthropogenic greenhouse gas concentrations." This 90% likelihood of human impact on the global climate adds to the compelling case that action to fight climate change is warranted.

Some skeptics of the human contribution to this global problem remain, however their voices grow more distant as more information comes to light and the realities that we face in terms of regulatory uncertainty around this issue have given rise to calls for action from the business community. Given past uncertainties, I have previously been unable to support legislative proposals which have threatened U.S. economic interests without meaningful environmental benefit. The Senate voted 95-0 in 1997 to overwhelmingly support the Byrd-Hagel resolution (S. Res. 98) rejecting the Kyoto protocol for its unequal treatment of developed and developing nations, as well as the potential serious harm to the U.S. economy. Subsequently, the Senate has twice voted on climate change legislation offered by Senators McCain and Lieberman—failing by votes of 43-55 in 2003 and 38-60 in 2005. As I stated on the Senate floor at the time, the McCain-Lieberman bill did not contain adequate protections for the U.S. economy, nor did it adequately address the global nature of the problem.

Given my commitment to finding a way for the U.S. to combat global warming, Senator Bingaman and I offered a Sense of the Senate amendment to the 2005 Energy Policy Act. An effort to set aside our amendment failed 54-43 and it was subsequently passed by voice vote. The resolution called for adoption of an economy-wide program that will slow, stop and reverse greenhouse gas emissions without harming the economy and that will encourage action by developing nations. Meeting these dual tests is a great challenge that I believe must be met not just to pass a bill into law, but to ensure the effort's long-term viability and support from the American people.

Following the 2005 debate, Senators Domenici and Bingaman as Chairman and Ranking Member, respectively, of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources issued white papers and held Committee sessions to debate the merits of various approaches to this issue.

In January 2007, Chairman Bingaman and I proposed a "discussion draft" of comprehensive legislation to address climate change. Between January and July, our staff held a series of public workshops for stakeholders and Senate, House, and Administration staff. Hundreds of people attended these sessions and hundreds more were involved in other meetings to provide comments, suggestions, and concerns. We heard from electricity generators, mining companies, transportation fuel refiners, natural gas producers, energy-intensive manufacturers, consumer groups, environmental organizations, conservationists, sportsmen, labor unions, faith-based organizations, and many others.

The culmination of this process was the introduction of the Bingaman-Specter "Low Carbon Economy Act of 2007," S. 1766, on July 11, 2007. We held a memorable press conference in the Energy Committee hearing room in the Dirksen building flanked by key supporters of our bill from labor groups, energy companies, and conservation organizations. I was very pleased to stand with Richard Trumka (AFL-CIO), Cecil Roberts (Mineworkers), Bill Klinefelter (Steelworkers), John Rowe (Exelon), Jim Miller (PPL), Jim Rogers (Duke Energy), Jeff Sterba (PNM), Mike Morris (AEP), and David Crane (NRG Energy). We also greatly appreciated the support of 21 groups representing millions of hunters, anglers and other conservationists including Ducks Unlimited; Trout Unlimited; National Wild Turkey Federation; and Pheasants Forever. In addition to Senator Bingaman and I, our bipartisan cosponsors included Senators Akaka, Casey, Harkin, Murkowski, and Stevens.

The "Low Carbon Economy Act" creates a strong and credible approach to reduce U.S. greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions while protecting the U.S. economy and engaging developing countries. The Act creates a cap-and-trade program for U.S. GHG emissions that is modeled on the successful Acid Rain Program. By setting an annual target and allowing firms to buy, sell, and trade credits to achieve the target, the program is designed to elicit the most cost-effective reductions across the economy. The target is set to avoid harm to the economy and promote a gradual but decisive transition to new, low-carbon technologies.

The strategic targets of the Act are: Starting in 2012 reducing U.S. GHG emissions to 2006 levels by 2020 and 1990 levels by 2030. To limit economic uncertainty and price volatility, the government would allow firms to make a payment at a fixed price in lieu of submitting allowances. This fee, referred to in the bill as the "Technology Accelerator Payment" (TAP), starts at \$12 per metric ton of CO₂-equivalent in the first year of the program and rises steadily each year thereafter at 5 percent above the rate of inflation. If technology improves rapidly and if additional GHG reduction policies are adopted, the TAP option will never be engaged. Conversely, if technology improves less rapidly than expected and program costs exceed predictions, companies could make a payment into the "Energy Technology Deployment Fund" at the TAP price, to cover a portion or all of their allowance submission requirement.

Under the Act, carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions from petroleum and natural gas are regulated "upstream"—that is, at or close to the point of fuel production. For these fuels, regulated entities are required to submit tradable allowances equal to the carbon content of fuels produced or processed at their facilities. Regulated entities that must submit allowances include: Petroleum refineries, natural gas processing facilities, fossil fuel importers, large coal-consuming facilities, and producers/importers of non-CO₂ GHGs. GHG emissions from coal are regulated "downstream" at the point of fuel consumption.

The proposal sets out a detailed methodology for distributing tradable emission allowances. At the beginning of the program in 2012, a majority (53 percent) of allowances are given out for free to the private sector. This amount is gradually reduced each year after the first five years of the program. In addition, 8 percent of allowances will be set aside annually to create incentives for carbon capture and storage to jump-start these critical technologies; 24 percent of total allowances will be auctioned by the government to generate much-needed revenue for the research, development, and deployment of low- and no-carbon technologies, to provide for climate change adaptation measures, and to provide assistance to low-income households; 5 percent of allowances are reserved to promote agricultural sequestration; and 1 percent of the allowances will reward companies that have undertaken "early actions" to reduce emissions before program implementation. Another 9 percent of the allowances are to be distributed directly to States which can use associated revenues at their discretion to address regional impacts, promote technology or energy efficiency, and enhance energy security.

To effectively engage developing countries, the Act would fund joint research and development partnerships and technology transfer programs similar to the Asia Pacific Partnership. The bill also calls for a Five-Year Review Process that provides an opportunity to reassess domestic action in light of efforts by our major trade partners (and relevant

scientific and technological developments). If by 2020 other countries are deemed to be making inadequate efforts, the President could recommend to Congress that products imported from such countries must be accompanied by allowances (from a separate reserve of allowances) sufficient to cover their embedded greenhouse-gas content. If there is sufficient international progress in reducing global greenhouse gas emissions, the President could recommend changes in the U.S. program designed to achieve further reductions (e.g., to at least 60 percent below 2006 levels by 2050).

There are many other provisions of this comprehensive legislation that help set the U.S. on the right track in taking meaningful steps to combat global climate change and put our trading partners on notice that we take this issue very seriously. Strong U.S. leadership will go a long way in moving the Nation and the world toward a cleaner and more sustainable future.

Much of the Lieberman-Warner bill tracks closely to the Bingaman-Specter bill. The two bills regulate the same entities (oil and natural gas producers; coal consumers; and non-CO₂ greenhouse gas producers) using the same approach—cap-and-trade. They both initially provide a free allocation of roughly three-quarters of available allowances for affected industries and special purposes, while selling the remaining quarter through a government auction, the proceeds of which are used for technology research, development, and deployment, as well as climate change adaptation and other purposes. Both bills transition many of the free allocations to auctions over time—thus providing an increasing price signal to affected industries that they must invest in new technologies.

While these provisions are similar, there are fundamental differences that cause me great concern. First, the emissions reductions “targets” or “caps” in Lieberman-Warner are very stringent and potentially unattainable without high cost. The bill begins in 2012 and would limit emissions to 2005 levels; it would require 19 percent below 2005 by 2020 (1990 levels); and 30 percent below 2005 levels by 2030.

The second crucial problem of the Lieberman-Warner bill is the lack of adequate cost control mechanisms like a Bingaman-Specter-style “safety valve” or price cap, particularly in the context that we are considering taking unilateral action on a global problem for which many of our trading partners are not. Theoretically, the costs of a cap-and-trade program will be manageable if optimistic assumptions about the availability of affordable low-carbon technologies prove correct, very meaningful improvements in energy efficiency and conservation are attained, and ample “offsets” or allowances from non-regulated entities like farmers are readily available. However, there is a great deal of uncertainty about all of these crucial elements.

Therefore, there must be some protection for the U.S. economy as a whole and various sectors that would have to shoulder the burden of higher than expected costs. It is for this reason that I believe any cap-and-trade program should include a “safety valve” or cap on the price of each ton emissions. Without such a protection, a series of risks remain including cost-sensitive industries moving production overseas as a result of higher energy prices in the U.S. that could not be passed through to consumers in a competitive market. It is worth noting that such production would likely move to countries that are not taking actions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, so essentially making the problem worse. Other risks include raising energy costs in the transportation and electricity sectors to levels that

could not be met by consumers, thus exacerbating the overwhelming situation in which many Americans already find themselves.

I understand Chairman Boxer has included a new cost control mechanism in her substitute bill that is modeled on suggestions from the Nicholas Institute at Duke University and the National Commission on Energy Policy, as well as the U.S. Climate Action Partnership. My staff participated in a number of meetings with the offices of Senators Boxer, Lieberman, Warner, Baucus, and Bingaman over the timeframe of January through April 2008 in an attempt to explore options to control costs. I am disappointed that Chairman Boxer decided to include these new cost containment auction provisions without first vetting their details with me and my staff. Upon review of the details provided in the substitute, it appears that a number of emission allowances (6 billion tons) would be borrowed from 2030–2050 and placed into a reserve fund that could be used to release into the market in the form of another auction. In 2012, the President would choose a price between \$22 and \$30 from which this additional auction of allowances would occur, and in subsequent years the auction starting price would rise 5 percent over inflation annually. While this is an interesting concept, it is entirely unclear to me what effect, if any, this would have on the cost of the program. It is clearly complicated and does not likely provide affected industries with the same level of certainty that is inherent in a safety valve with an established price. I believe the new cost containment provisions require extensive review and in the meantime, a safety valve should be added—the details of which should be open to discussion, debate, and analysis as well.

Some other concerns I have with the current bill involve the international competitiveness provisions that were first included in the Bingaman-Specter bill and were conceived by American Electric Power (AEP) and the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (IBEW). On February 14, 2008, I testified before the Senate Committee on Finance at a hearing on the international implications of climate legislation. I outlined my thoughts that the provisions in the Bingaman-Specter and Lieberman-Warner bill to require imports by the year 2020 to have credits to account for the carbon emitted in their production is consistent with trade law. The Boxer substitute has made some changes to these provisions, including moving forward the start date of import allowance purchases to 2014. While this and other provisions are welcome, I remain concerned that we still have not gotten this part of the legislation quite right. I intend to work with my colleagues and affected industries like steel, glass, iron, aluminum, cement, pulp, paper, chemicals, and industrial ceramics, to shore up these imperative provisions.

I also understand that certain emissions from industrial production were intended to be exempted because there is no alternative method of production. These “process gas emissions” provisions should be made very clear so as to remove any uncertainty by these industries. Without these protections, the competitiveness issues again might lead companies to shift production of energy-intensive products like steel to countries without emission standards.

Finally, as I review the Lieberman-Warner bill, I am concerned that it does not provide the essential pathway to the future of coal use and thereby protect consumers from the price impacts of a rapid shift from coal to natural gas for electricity consumption. The U.S. currently produces half of its electricity through the combustion of coal. While there

is also a great deal of capacity to burn natural gas, the high price of natural gas leads most regions of the country to only use it at times of peak demand. However, if a price to carbon places natural gas in a competitive advantage relative to coal use, we could see immediate shifting to this resource which is also used as a feedstock or raw material in chemical and fertilizer production. Natural gas prices in recent years have experienced a great deal of volatility. Coal, by comparison, has been relatively stable and less expensive.

If our Nation hopes to meet its rising energy demand into the future and keep prices for consumers affordable, any climate change response will have to factor how to bridge to that point in the future when capture and storage or sequestration of carbon dioxide is commercially deployable and regulated to ensure the environmental integrity of pumping millions of tons of carbon dioxide underground. This technology will not only be a key to meeting domestic energy needs while protecting the environment, but is likely the most effective way we can influence the greenhouse gas emissions of developing countries like China and India that are heavily dependent on coal. Under all modeling scenarios of climate change legislation, carbon capture and storage is shown to be critical. Otherwise, we will have to greatly exceed all expectations for deployment of nuclear energy, renewable energy, efficiency, and conservation, as well as other low carbon technologies, all of which will already be called upon to shoulder a tremendous burden in shifting our economy from one that is carbon-based on low-carbon-based. I intend to work with my colleagues to ensure this clean future for coal use.

In conclusion, the Senate has a unique opportunity to pass our Nation’s first comprehensive climate change response. While this is an extremely complicated issue, much work has been done to date and it now comes down to finding the right balance between limiting U.S. greenhouse gas emissions and protecting the U.S. economy. This is often the challenge of environmental policy and we have found the right approaches in the past—including the acid rain cap-and-trade program after which this legislation is modeled. I look forward to working with all of my Senate colleagues as this debate proceeds. I thank the presiding officer and yield the floor.

Mr. SPECTER. It is my hope that we will reconcile all these interests and move ahead, but I think it is very important that we not search for a goal we cannot attain and end up doing nothing. We know the maxim that the perfect is the destroyer of the good.

I thank my colleagues and yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oklahoma will yield for a moment, I say to my colleague, we have served together now for 28 years in this body. I wish you well in this latest chapter, but I also commend you for the forthright manner with which you have always come forward in this body at any time. If there is an ounce of reduction in the tremendous energy you apply to your work here in the Senate, you acknowledge it, but always saying you will be back stronger than ever. I wish you well.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for those remarks. I feel better than I look, which isn’t necessarily saying a whole lot.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I am going to have an opening statement. Let me say that my good friend Senator BOXER and I, the last time we had a major bill on the floor, were in agreement with each other having to do with the Water Resources Development Act and, prior to that, transportation reauthorization. On this, we very much disagree. She has every right to be wrong. I wish to also mention, since she commented about the possibility that the cloture vote might be tough, I don't think it will be because there are a lot of people who very much oppose this legislation who are going to vote for cloture, including some of the leadership on our side that is opposed to this bill. Although the vast majority of the scientists do not believe that man-made anthropogenic gases, CO₂, methane, are a major contributor to climate change, that is not a part of the debate of the Lieberman-Warner bill. If it were, it would take a lot more time than we will be able to devote. So we are not going to discuss that. That is for another day. As we begin the debate today, the climate legislation, I want to make a few points.

First, I wish to discuss what we as Republicans stand for, then talk briefly about the process of how we got to the debate and how we got the debate on the floor today, then, finally, discuss how we wish to see the floor debate progress over the coming days or perhaps the coming weeks, as some believe it might be.

First and foremost, we, as Republicans, believe any legislation that attempts to address climate change must protect American families and must protect U.S. workers. It has to maintain global fairness and, finally, offer clean energy solutions. Unfortunately, this bill, the Climate Security Act of 2008, which, it is my understanding, is what it is called now since this has been an amendment or a substitute that we are considering, fails on all of these counts.

We believe any climate legislation must offer clean energy solutions. Substantial investment must be made in new clean energy technologies which would generate more energy efficiently by producing less carbon without the Government picking winners and losers. It makes good business sense to produce energy more efficiently, and American companies are at the forefront of developing these new technologies. We support investments in solar, wind, hydro, geothermal, and other innovative technologies, but we must be careful not to interfere in the free market system or we might stifle new innovations. Any approach that addresses climate change must incorporate more emission-free nuclear power. We are on the verge of a nuclear renaissance in this country, and it is key to our long-term domestic energy independence. We have to address the remaining issues that hinder the construction of new nuclear plants such as loan guarantees, waste, and regulatory

certainty. Senator DOMENICI, the greatest champion the nuclear industry has ever had, is retiring at the end of this year. I can think of no greater honor to him than to make his renaissance a reality, the renaissance of nuclear energy.

Coal is our most abundant energy source. It must be a part of any solution. We must invest in clean coal technologies in order to increase our energy security. While we are continuing to explore carbon capture and storage, we cannot hold the future use of coal hostage to this one technological feat. Senator BYRD has been a tireless advocate for greater use of coal, and I know Senator VOINOVICH and Senator BARRASSO on the committee have been championing its use.

We need to promote natural gas. Increasing supplies of natural gas are needed in order to compensate for fuel switching which could harm America's industrial base and export jobs. We know that fuel switching is taking place right now. We have an almost limitless supply of natural gas available, and we have proven we can develop this important resource in an environmentally friendly way. I wish to see us build upon Senator WARNER's past work and open up more of the offshore resources which would be absolutely necessary for us to capture this natural gas.

We must seriously consider how climate legislation will impact economic competitiveness. Emissions are a global issue which should be addressed globally, not unilaterally. All major emitting countries, including developing nations, must participate in order for any U.S. program to produce meaningful reductions in atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases. Today China emits more carbon dioxide than we do. That divide is only going to grow because 2 years ago we produced more than they did. China is increasing their number of coal-fired generating plants by two each week. The Kyoto treaty expires next year, and any future treaties should include developing nations. Any action has to provide real protections for the American economy and jobs. American jobs should not go overseas where environmental laws are less strict and emissions increase. If the United States were to act unilaterally, manufacturing facilities will go overseas, because they have to go where the energy is. We know that. That is where the energy regulations or emission regulations are more lax. This will result in more emissions at the industrial source and more emissions in transporting products back to the United States.

Let me repeat that. In the event we acted unilaterally and we had a cap-and-trade system that ended up reducing emissions of CO₂, then companies that would be the losers in this program would merely move to China or India or down to Mexico. There they don't have any emission requirements. So it would actually have the effect of

increasing the amount of CO₂ in the atmosphere. Any action has to provide real protections for the American economy and jobs. We must protect American families. Any action should not raise the cost of gasoline or energy to American families, particularly for the low income and elderly who are most susceptible to energy costs. Those who make \$20,000 a year spend one-third or more of their income on energy. We can't turn our back on less fortunate people. We have to carefully consider the policy tools used to enact any climate legislation. Any solution must not include slush funds controlled by Federal bureaucracies used to reward political friends. The climate solution should not require an overhaul of our economy, and those decisions should not be made by nameless bureaucrats rewarding friends or pet projects.

Senator CORKER has examined this legislation carefully and has outlined over 45 new programs created by this bill. As the Wall Street Journal said last week:

This bill would impose the most extensive government reorganization of the American economy since the 1930s.

We can't afford any tax increases either directly or indirectly. We must recognize that true innovation comes from the private sector. This bill will raise over \$6.7 trillion from carbon sales and auctions primarily coming from consumers. In other words, consumers are going to be paying the \$6.7 trillion. But it does direct \$2.45 trillion back to consumers. So if all the transition assistance funding goes directly to consumers without the businesses or States keeping any of the funds to run their transition programs, which they are allowed to do, this means that over \$4.2 trillion will be used to fund new government programs. The Senator from California referred twice in her opening remarks to Senator GREGG, complimenting him, saying he believes the only difference between the two of them is he wishes to send this back to the taxpayers rather than to have \$4.2 trillion of new bureaucracies in this country. I agree with that. Any solution has to be national in scope without States or regions imposing duplicative or additional requirements on top of a Federal system. It will be impossible for American industry to remain competitive if different regions or States have additional climate programs on top of a Federal program.

Finally, any national program must contain a transparent, effective cost-control mechanism to avoid harm to the economy and job losses. There are many ideas out there which might work, including ideas from Senators BINGAMAN and SPECTER. Senator SPECTER just spoke. Simply borrowing credits from future years will only create a larger problem later on.

How we got here: Unfortunately, the bill we are discussing today violates all of these principles. It ignores the needs of American families. It jeopardizes the jobs of American workers. It does not

offer a global solution and, in fact, will increase global emissions. It does not promote good, clean energy solutions and, in fact, will make us even more dependent upon foreign sources of energy.

One of the chief problems with this legislation is that it was hastily considered by the Environment and Public Works Committee without the benefit of the appropriate legislative process, and a new version is now being considered on the Senate floor that we have had no hearings on whatsoever.

The chairman of the Environment Committee has stated—and you are going to hear again and again today and in the next few days and maybe the next few weeks—that the committee held over 20 hearings last year before proceeding to a substitute and a full committee markup. However, you must take a look at the type of hearings we held. Most of the hearings examined the potential impact of climate change 50 years in the future. My favorite example is a hearing held on May 24 last year: “The Issue of the Potential Impacts of Global Warming on Recreation and the Recreation Industry.” That was the name of the hearing. The apparent point of this hearing was to show that if there is no snow in 50 years, the skiing industry might suffer. Well, I think that is probably a reasonable statement, and I think it would. But the thing is, that did not really address a cap-and-trade system that we needed to study before coming to the floor.

Unfortunately, the list of issues unaddressed by this committee is longer than the actual list of hearings the chairman did hold. These topics, which were never explored by the committee prior to crafting the legislation, include how to draft a cap-and-trade system—how do you do it—how to allocate credits; how to design an auction system; how many credits to assign each industrial sector; how to structure the Carbon Market Efficiency Board; how to create a domestic offset program; what to do with international offsets; what the impacts would be on fuel switching; whether carbon capture and storage technologies will be available by 2030; whether the number of nuclear powerplants can be built in time to provide the necessary electricity; how the impact on the natural gas supply will affect other industries; how many jobs will be sent overseas; how much worldwide emissions will increase when U.S. jobs will be sent overseas; what the international provisions’ impacts will be on trade and particularly exports; how to effectively contain costs through a transparent mechanism. The list goes on and on and on.

Contrast this committee process with the process currently underway in the House Committee on Energy and Commerce. Chairman DINGELL’s committee, which has jurisdiction over climate change and environmental issues in the House, is pursuing the issue under a

much more methodical and deliberative process, as any legislation of this magnitude demands. Acknowledging the complexity of the issues surrounding any mandatory greenhouse gas reduction policy, the committee has held a series of hearings and has released several white papers. The topics have included the fundamental aspects of greenhouse gas cap-and-trade policy, including the point of regulation and the benefits of auction versus allocation schemes; the interaction of climate change policy with other environmental laws such as the Clean Air Act, the Endangered Species Act, and the National Environmental Policy Act; State and Federal preemption issues; international competitiveness and how to engage the developing world; and technology barriers. These are only threshold issues, as each one lends itself to further examination. Now, that is what has been done over in the House of Representatives in Chairman DINGELL’s committee, and he has made a lot of progress over there, and there are some things we should pay attention to. In fact, we plan to be using some of that on the floor here.

While the subcommittee did hold one legislative hearing prior to the markup and the full committee held three such hearings over a 2-week period before the full committee markup, all these hearings were held without the benefit of any economic or environmental analysis. The committee members had no idea what the impacts of this legislation would be when we considered the bill in December. We offered a number of amendments to protect workers, families, and to try to keep a check on energy prices. Almost all of them were defeated. But we were promised that our issues would be addressed before the bill reached the Senate floor. Well, that was last December.

On May 20, less than 2 weeks ago, the committee bill and report were finally filed after a more than 5-month delay. For a bill of this magnitude—and I remind my colleagues how the Wall Street Journal characterized it—I will repeat again—“this bill would impose the most extensive government reorganization of the American economy since the 1930s”—only allowing Senators to review the report for less than 2 weeks is highly troubling.

Even more troubling is that the same week, we all saw for the first time two more versions of the same bill. Later on May 20 a new version of the bill with a never before seen amendment was filed and held at the desk as a new bill, S. 3036, which is actually the version we will be voting on this evening.

Then finally, on Friday, May 23, a managers’ substitute which completely rewrote the legislation was circulated to Members. I can only assume that once cloture is invoked—and it will be invoked—and we begin debating this bill, the substitute will be offered, which, of course, is something that has never been the subject of hearings, eco-

nomics analysis, or an environmental benefits test.

Since the markup last December, we have had numerous economic modeling and analysis conducted by the EPA, the Energy Information Agency, and multiple private sector analyses. Unfortunately, the committee of jurisdiction, the Environment and Public Works Committee, never bothered to hold a single hearing on any of these economic reports.

I would like to point out that the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee held an economic hearing on our bill 2 weeks ago, and I applaud Chairman BINGAMAN for holding that important hearing. I will be quoting from that hearing from the Energy and Natural Resources Committee several times during the course of this debate.

So where are we today? We spent months holding impact hearings and then rushed through a few quickly scheduled legislative hearings and held a markup without any analysis of the bill. We then waited over 5 months before receiving yet two more drafts of the bill—the last version a mere 10 days ago. The Senate is now being asked to vote for cloture on a motion to proceed to a bill that was released 2 weeks ago.

Although I believe we really need to debate these issues on the Senate floor—and many of the Members who oppose the Lieberman-Warner bill are voting to proceed to it—I find it most difficult to vote to proceed to the largest tax increase in the history of America. The mechanics of this bill, the impacts, and the costs have never been fully debated, and they deserve to be. Proponents of this legislation have talked about how important this bill is and why we need to act. I believe this warrants a full debate.

In 1990, the Senate spent over 5 weeks debating the Clean Air Act amendments. I was serving in the House at that time. It went on and on and on. This bill goes much further than the Clean Air Act amendments in its impact on the American economy and jobs and our international competitiveness. It will do more to direct our energy policy for the next 50 years than either the Energy bill of 2007 or the Energy bill of 2005 combined. I hope the majority intends to provide enough time to fully debate this legislation and does not plan to rush it on and off the floor in an attempt to check a box.

Over the next few days, you will see a number of Republican amendments, which I believe will get bipartisan support, which will attempt to protect our workers, our families, our international competitiveness, and will promote clean energy solutions.

There have been many comments in the press, particularly from the chairman of the committee, that this bill will be pulled if any so-called weakening amendments are adopted. I hope we will have a constructive and open debate on this bill. There will be many amendments offered and, I hope, debated and voted upon.

This bill is the largest bill we will consider this Congress. In fact, it is probably the largest bill ever considered by the Senate in its impact on the economy and our entire way of life, and I hope the majority will give it the time it deserves.

But 2 weeks from now or whenever that vote does take place—keep in mind, tonight's vote at 5:30 is only a cloture vote on a motion to proceed. It is a procedural vote. It allows us to limit debate on the motion to proceed to the bill. But whenever the real vote comes or however long it takes to reach the final vote, it will be both interesting and informative to see how many Members of the Senate vote for the largest tax increase in the history of America.

Now, we will be talking about a number of things during the course of this debate. Some of this will be tonight, some of it will be over the next few days. We are anxious to do that. For our purposes today, we will be allocating time, and I would like to announce that after the time that is already under a unanimous consent agreement to go to Senators LIEBERMAN and WARNER, we will start going back and forth. I will be controlling the time for those who oppose the bill, and Senator BOXER or Senator LIEBERMAN will be handling the time for those who support it.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point Senator CARDIN be recognized for up to 5 minutes. The reason for this request is Senator CARDIN has to preside at 4 o'clock. Then we would go back to the 20 minutes divided between Senator WARNER and myself. Then presumably there would be somebody the Senator from Oklahoma would designate to speak. We are happy to add 5 minutes to the Senator's time to make it equal.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, that is all right so long as the allocation of time does not punish us.

I also ask unanimous consent to lock in, after your presentation, Senator BOND for 15 minutes.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank the Senator.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today America takes a major step forward in reasserting our leadership on the world stage. Upon enactment, the Lieberman-Warner Climate Security Act will be the most aggressive climate change bill in the world, slashing American greenhouse gas emissions by two-thirds by mid-century, putting America in the lead in reducing harmful emissions.

Let me begin by acknowledging the tremendous leadership of Senators LIEBERMAN, WARNER, and BOXER. They

have worked tirelessly to take on this, the greatest challenge of our time. And they have done so with great intelligence, great skill, and a remarkable willingness to forge a consensus that meets our needs. I salute them. They are extraordinary public servants, and the Nation owes them an incalculable debt of thanks.

The Climate Security Act is truly historic.

The legislation will transform the American economy, positioning us to continue our global leadership for decades to come. Energy efficient, high-performance businesses will flourish here and serve as international leaders in ushering in sustainable economic growth around the world.

Retooling the American economy for the 21st century will put us in charge of our own energy supplies. Our current reliance on other countries, many of whom are not friendly to Americans or the values we cherish, puts us at unacceptable risks to disruptions in the fuel supply chain. This bill will put us on a path to energy independence and that is a path to improved national security.

Dramatically reducing greenhouse gas emissions is essential to the environmental health of our planet. This legislation goes further, providing billions of dollars in resources to plant forests, grow sustainable sources of biofuels, and protect and restore our most precious natural resources, such as the Chesapeake Bay.

The Lieberman-Warner Climate Security Act is good for our economy, critical for our national security, and essential for the health of our environment.

The bill will reassert American leadership among the nations of the world. And we will do it the way America has always done it—with ingenuity and hard work and leadership by example.

Global warming presents a real and present threat to our economy.

Four global warming impacts—hurricane damage, real estate losses, energy costs, and water costs—will drain billions of dollars annually from our economy. By the end of the century, the annual costs from these impacts alone will reach an estimated \$1.9 trillion annually.

Clearly, these impacts would be devastating. Unfortunately, they are not the only adverse economic costs of doing nothing.

Rising food prices and global food shortages underscore the need for stable, ample, and environmentally sound agricultural practices. But climate change brings with it widespread droughts in some parts of the world, an increase in plant pests and diseases, and reduced crop yields. The drought that has persisted in Australia in recent years has had a devastating impact on the world price of wheat. Today's rising cost for a loaf of bread is a harbinger of the dramatic impacts on our food supply if we fail to act.

And it is not just crops that will suffer. In the Chesapeake Bay rising water

temperatures are blamed for a dramatic loss of the most common underwater grass in the lower bay. Eelgrass, as it is called, simply cannot tolerate the warmer waters. That means crabs and other species have no habitat. Virginia and my home State of Maryland have just instituted dramatic reductions in the blue crab harvest next fall because of the falling numbers of crabs in the bay. Our multimillion dollar blue crab fishery is at risk—and at risk today—from global warming.

The good news is that the actions we take to reduce global warming will be good for our economy.

Through its innovative cap-and-trade system, the bill is designed to be self-financing, and there will be sufficient funds to also make a major contribution to debt reduction.

American businesses will see an unprecedented Federal investment in retooling for tomorrow.

In the first 10 years, the bill provides \$61 billion for renewable energy. Wind, solar, geothermal and other zero- and low-carbon sources of power will get the boost they need to become an integral part of our energy distribution system. And to prepare for that capital investment, the bill also provides \$18 billion over that same period for an Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Worker Training program. We will have both the infrastructure and trained workforce for a new energy sector.

In Frederick, MD, today we already have one of the world's leading solar energy operations. Companies such as BP Solar will have the resources they need to grow their businesses and the trained workforce to build, install, and operate a new generation of electricity-generating equipment.

Our core heavy industries will benefit from \$138 billion by 2022. Those funds will help iron, steel, pulp, paper, cement, and other carbon-intensive industries with the assistance they need to remain competitive while they shift to cleaner energy sources.

Lehigh Cement's largest plant in America is located in Union Bridge, MD. The plant produces up to 2 million tons annually. The company will now have the resources it needs to become even more efficient—and more profitable—because of this transition assistance.

The bill contains provisions that will help American consumers make the transition to tomorrow's economy, too. More than \$800 billion is reserved for tax credits and tax cuts that will make sure that during the transition average Americans don't have to bear the costs.

I am especially proud of a section of the bill I authored that will direct about \$171 billion, over the life of the bill, to States and localities for public transit nationwide. About two-thirds of this money will go to support existing systems such as Washington Metro, MARC and MTA, while about 30 percent will help develop new systems that will take more and more cars off

our roads, cut dangerous emissions, ease congestion, and reduce our dependence on foreign energy sources, such as OPEC.

Today, too much of our national energy needs are supplied by other nations. Our reliance on foreign oil weakens our position in the world. Today, we are sending massive infusions of American dollars to oil-rich countries that don't share our values and are often active opponents of American foreign policy. We know that some of those petrodollars have been used to finance terrorists.

No entity relies on petroleum more than the American Department of Defense. We have a great strategic weakness with such a strong reliance on foreign oil.

My senior Senator, Senator MIKULSKI, and I have been working with Volvo-Mack Truck in Hagerstown, MD, to build prototype heavy-duty hybrid trucks for military use. These trucks will dramatically reduce their need for oil because of their increased fuel efficiency. They are also being tooled to handle a wide variety of biofuels. In the future, we envision fuel-efficient vehicles powered by home-grown biofuels.

The bill contains funding to support these prototypes, putting them into widespread use. Our military will benefit, along with the entire commercial sector of our economy.

Global warming threatens our national defense in another way. Naval Station Norfolk in Virginia is a keystone location for American Naval operations. But Norfolk is under grave threat because of rising sea level.

At a hearing before the Environment and Public Works Committee last summer, scientists told us that sea level rise has been higher in the Chesapeake Bay than worldwide because of a number of factors including land subsidence. Their best prediction is that we could see a 3-foot rise in water levels by the end of the century. Our critical national security infrastructure lies directly in the path of these rising waters.

Just 30 miles east from here in Annapolis, MD, the U.S. Naval Academy sits literally on the edge of the Severn River. The Academy has already seen damage from major storms. This is a story that is repeated up and down the coasts of America. Our military installations and assets are at risk. We need to act to protect them so that our Armed Forces can protect us.

While the Climate Security Act will have profound impacts on our economy and our national security, at its heart, this is an environmental bill. The bill was reported by the Environment and Public Works Committee. It amends the Clean Air Act. The Environmental Protection Agency is the central player.

The current administration has been painfully slow in recognizing the threats to the worldwide environment that runaway greenhouse gas emissions

are causing. Begrudgingly, they are now accepting the fact that the impacts are huge and growing.

The legislation will reduce dangerous greenhouse gas emissions by over 70 percent from the 2,100 entities covered in the bill. Even with the uncovered segments of the economy included, the emissions are two-thirds below 2005 base levels. These are impressive cuts. I think we can do even better. The consensus scientific opinion in the world is that we must do better. Cuts of at least 80 percent are required, and I will support efforts on the floor to set that as our 2050 target.

Periodic reviews that are built into the bill will build the case, I believe, that we will need to do more to curb the most adverse environmental outcomes.

Cutting greenhouse gas emissions is essential to putting our global ecosystem back into balance. Doing so will have other direct health and environmental benefits. Bringing down CO₂ emissions will almost assuredly bring down nitrogen oxide, sulfur dioxide, and mercury emissions as well. The ozone code red days that are all too commonplace every summer will be reduced as we cut greenhouse gases. Similarly, the fish consumption advisories that every State faces because of widespread mercury contamination will gradually be lifted as mercury levels go down.

Although the bill modifies the Clean Air Act, we will see major benefits for our coastal areas, including the Chesapeake Bay. Rising water temperatures will abate. The bill also provides extensive funding to manage the adaptation that will be needed for our natural systems.

A National Wildlife Adaptation Strategy will direct funding to those areas most likely to be adversely affected by climate change and ocean acidification.

The Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Program and the Land and Water Conservation Fund are existing programs with strong State partnerships that have proven track records of effectiveness. Both will see major infusions of financial support: \$185 billion for the Wildlife Restoration Program and another \$52 billion for the Conservation Fund.

Annually, Maryland would be expected to receive an additional \$52 million for these well-established programs.

The EPA, the Army Corps of Engineers, and NOAA will all have dedicated programs to protect and restore our fresh and estuarine water systems. The Chesapeake Bay is one of several water bodies specifically mentioned in the bill because of the value of the resources at risk and the need for priority funding.

The Forest Service and the Department of the Interior will have crucial roles to play as well. In all, the Federal investment in programs to protect natural resources will approach \$300 billion over the life of the bill.

The time to act is now. There is no country in the world better positioned than the United States to undertake this historic challenge. We have the world's strongest economy. We are the international leaders in climate science. We have an extraordinary history of facing the gravest challenges facing mankind. I believe that America is ready to meet this change.

The time to act has long since passed. The time to catch up is now. I urge my colleagues to support the strongest possible Lieberman-Warner Climate Security Act. It is a challenge we can and must meet.

Mr. President, again, I acknowledge the tremendous leadership of Senators BOXER, LIEBERMAN, and WARNER in bringing forward this historic legislation. The Climate Security Act is truly historic. The legislation will transform the American economy, positioning us to continue our global leadership for decades to come. Energy-efficient, high-performance businesses will flourish here and serve as international leaders in ushering in sustainable economic growth around the world.

Retooling the American economy for the 21st century will put us in charge of our own energy supplies. Our current reliance on many other countries, many of which are not friendly to Americans or the values we cherish, puts us at unacceptable risks to disruptions in the fuel supply chain. This bill will put us on a path to energy independence, and that is a path to improved national security. This bill is important for national security. It is important for our economy, and it is certainly important for our environmental health.

The legislation goes further, providing billions of dollars in resources to plant forests, grow sustainable sources of biofuels, and protect and restore our most precious national resources, such as the Chesapeake Bay.

The Lieberman-Warner Climate Security Act is good for our economy, good for our national security, and good for our environmental health. The bill will reassert American leadership among the nations of the world, and we will do it the way America has always done it—with ingenuity, hard work, and leadership by example.

Clearly, we know the scientific information as to the dangers we face. The dangers we face are real, with extreme weather conditions, disruptions to our food supplies. We have seen this already. In my own State of Maryland, we have a problem today with the blue crab. The reason, quite frankly, is the waters of the Chesapeake Bay are just too warm for the seagrasses and juvenile crabs cannot survive. That is bad for our watermen. That is bad for our State. That is bad for our economy. I can give you another 100 examples in Maryland where science is telling us that global climate change is real, hurting our economy.

The good news is that action we take to reduce global warming will be good

for our economy. Through its innovative cap-and-trade system, the bill is designed to be self-financing, and there will be sufficient funds to also make major contributions to debt reduction. Because of the financing and investments in the legislation, it will help reduce our Government borrowing. It is good for our economy.

American businesses will see an unprecedented Federal investment in retooling for tomorrow. In the first 10 years, the bill provides \$61 billion for renewable energy. Wind, solar, geothermal, and other zero- and low-carbon sources of power will get the boost they need to become an integral part of our energy distribution system. To prepare for that capital investment, the bill also provides \$18 billion over that same period for an energy efficiency and renewable energy worker training program. We will have both the infrastructure and trained workforce for a new energy sector.

For our core heavy industries, they will benefit also. There will be \$138 billion to help heavy industries. Those funds will help iron, steel, pulp, paper, cement, and other carbon-intensive industries with the assistance they need to remain competitive while they shift to cleaner energy sources.

LeHigh, the largest cement plant we have in America, is located in Union Bridge, MD. The plant produces up to 2 million tons annually. The company will now have the resources it needs to become even more efficient and more profitable because of this transition assistance.

I am especially proud of the section of the bill I helped author that will direct \$171 billion over the life of the bill to States and localities for public transit nationwide. I wish to thank Senator BOXER for helping make this amendment a reality in this bill. About two-thirds of this money will go to supporting systems such as the Washington Metro, MARC, and MTA, while 30 percent will help develop new systems that will take more cars off the road. This legislation will make public transit convenient and economic.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, this bill is important for our country and for our future. I am proud to be a cosponsor. I urge my colleagues not only to vote to bring up this bill, but let's work out the amendments and let's pass it so that America can regain its leadership in the world on fighting the rising problems of greenhouse gases.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I ask the Chair if I may be informed when 10 minutes has expired.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will be so notified.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank the Chair.

For the first time in the history of the Senate or of the House, a comprehensive bill to curb global warming has reached the floor after having been reported favorably by the committee of

jurisdiction. This has happened, in my opinion, because of two people. One is Senator WARNER, who joined the fight early on with me, to my great pleasure, and made this a bipartisan piece of legislation and was responsible for helping us get it out of the subcommittee and the full committee. The second person is Chairman BOXER, whose drive and persistence and legislative skill fashioned a majority within the committee and brings this bill to the floor with some momentum behind it.

The fact is, twice in the past—in 2003 and 2005—Senator MCCAIN and I brought a comprehensive climate measure to a vote in the full Senate, but we had to do it by amendment because in neither case did the Environment Committee report it out favorably. I will say that the amendment, as it is known, lost twice with a high vote total of 44. I am confident we are going to do a lot better than that in this consideration. So the bottom line is, this Climate Security Act has reached this point through the regular order, as we say in the Senate, having earned increasing and diverse political support along the way. I think that represents a tremendous step forward.

The Climate Security Act has a bipartisan list of cosponsors in addition to Senator WARNER and myself, including Senators COLEMAN, COLLINS, and DOLE, Senators CARDIN, CASEY, HARKIN, KLOBUCHAR, NELSON of Florida, SCHUMER, and WYDEN. Each of those Members contributed substantially to the bill while also helping garner support for it among other Senators and key constituencies. I cannot thank them enough for their help and for the trust they have placed in Senators WARNER, BOXER, and myself.

Senator WARNER and I introduced the Climate Security Act for a very simple but serious reason. It was to protect the environment, economy, and national security of the United States of America from the worst effects of man-made climate change.

Is it a problem, climate change? Well, just last week the Bush administration itself released a scientific report confirming that if we as a nation fail to take strong action now to cut our emissions of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases, then the resulting climate change will impose severe hardship on the American people.

The administration's Climate Change Science Report finds that over the next 25 to 50 years increased temperatures will result in slower economic growth and lower yields for staple crops such as corn, soybeans, wheat, and rice. That is slower growth of those crops and lower yields. Arid regions of the United States will face more frequent wildfires, which will be made worse as fire-resistant plants are replaced in the natural order by more combustible grasses.

In the American West, the mountain snows that provide a steady flow of water for irrigation and reservoirs will dwindle. Rainfall will come at times in

amounts that will make it hard to manage. The sustained temperature increases will stress livestock, slowing their reproduction and growth rates, thereby decreasing their milk production and increasing the time to market for animal products.

Across the Nation, an increased frequency and severity of heat waves will lead to more illness and death, particularly among the young, the elderly, the frail, and the poor. The climactic changes will allow animal, water, and food-borne diseases to spread in the Nation or to emerge in areas where they have been limited or had not existed.

These are the findings of a report of the Bush administration.

Unfortunately, our failure to take any action to reduce or even stabilize our greenhouse gas emissions since the 1980s, when scientists first began to warn us about it, means that some part of the negative impacts described by this administration's Science Report are now inevitable. That is the reality. Greenhouse gases don't go up and dissipate; they accumulate. They are there now, and some consequences are inevitable. The scientific community tells us that we can still prevent the situation from reaching much worse, even catastrophic proportions, if we take the lead now in reducing emissions of greenhouse gases.

That is what this Climate Security Act would do. The bill, beginning in 2012—remember, that is not now, in 2012. So if we begin by passing this legislation now, we are going to have some time to work with it if people find reasons to fix it as we go along before it goes into effect. So beginning in 2012, this legislation would place a cap on the aggregate greenhouse gas emissions of the 2,100 facilities in America that are responsible for 85 percent of those emissions in this country. This is a very important point.

People out there may wonder: Oh, my God. Does this mean in my little business, in my factory, on my farm—am I going to have to start to fill out a lot of paperwork and get involved in this cap-and-trade business? No. This is an upstream piece of legislation. Only 2,100 facilities in America will be part of this cap-and-trade proposal. The bill would tighten the caps slowly and steadily, such that the aggregate emissions of those sources of greenhouse gases would be down to about 30 percent of the current level by 2050. That would be a substantial accomplishment.

Making conservative assumptions about actions by other nations; that is, assuming other nations, including the rising great economic powers such as China and India—frankly, don't do much. The administration, through another agency, has determined that the emissions reductions achieved by the Climate Security Act would prevent atmospheric greenhouse gas concentrations from reaching the level to which scientists ascribe a high risk of catastrophic impacts.

In other words, assuming that a lot of the other big nations don't do much of anything, this bill will make sure we fulfill our responsibility to protect our citizens. In fact, it would keep global emissions below the catastrophic level.

Now, some say it will cost money. It will cost money. But what is the cost? Remember, this sets up a system where money is raised through the auctioning of allowances. But that money, a lot of it—that is, a lot of the money that will be raised—is immediately reinvested in research and development of new energy technologies, in subsidies to protect people and businesses that are going to be most likely affected. We have to understand as we consider this bill that it will not only deal with the problem of global warming; this bill is the energy independence, energy security act that America, in its right mind, should have adopted 30 years ago. People have said we need a Manhattan Project; we need an Apollo Moon shot project to make America energy independent, to break our dependence on foreign oil. This legislation will invest more than six times the amount of money that the Apollo project and the Manhattan Project combined spent. We need to do it to free ourselves—free America—from dependence on foreign oil, from tyrants in places such as Iran and Venezuela.

Senator WARNER and I asked the Energy Information Agency—a section of the Department of Energy of this administration—what would be the cost of our legislation. They responded that the Climate Security Act's impact on the Nation's economic growth would be negligible. The fact is, under our bill they say America would continue to grow robustly until 2030, which is the period they measured, and would hit a level just 0.3 percent lower than under a business-as-usual scenario.

Mr. President, those are my opening comments. With great honor and gratitude, I yield to my friend and partner and cosponsor from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. I thank my colleague. I will have further words about my colleague. The chairman of our committee, on behalf of the Senate as a whole, has some information which, certainly, I find very heartwarming. So I wish at this time to yield to the chairman on a matter that is unrelated to the pending legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARDIN). The Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to read this e-mail and then to add 2 minutes to Senator WARNER's time.

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

SENATOR KENNEDY'S PROGRESS

Mrs. BOXER. This is the statement of Dr. Allan Freidman, who is Senator KENNEDY's surgeon:

I am pleased to report that Senator KENNEDY's surgery was successful and accomplished our goals. Senator KENNEDY was awake during the resection, and should

therefore experience no permanent neurological effects from the surgery. The surgery lasted roughly three and a half hours and is just the first step in Senator KENNEDY's treatment plan. After a brief recuperation, he will begin targeted radiation at Massachusetts General Hospital and chemotherapy treatment. I hope that everyone will join us in praying for Senator KENNEDY to have an uneventful and robust recovery.

Mr. President, I share that with all of our colleagues. I think we should take just 10 seconds to think about the Kennedy family and pray for them—just 10 seconds.

Thank you so much.

I thank the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished chairman of our committee and our colleague and friend for bringing that to the attention of all Senators. I have been privileged to know Senator KENNEDY for many years. His brother and I were in law school together at the University of Virginia in 1949. I recall then meeting the Senator for the first time when he visited the campus on occasion. But he has been a very dear and valued friend, an absolute tower of strength in this body which he loves so much: the U.S. Senate. So I commend my colleague.

I also wish to thank my dear friend, Senator LIEBERMAN. We have been together on so many legislative measures through the many years we have been here together, particularly as it relates to national security. He is a pillar of strength in his own right on this bill and in many other ways. I admire the independence of the Senator. I admire his commitment, his fortitude, and the strength which he has been tested on so many times. He is a great credit to this Nation and this institution.

Mr. President, I was indeed brought to this moment as a consequence of national security measures as there are implications with regard to global climate changes.

I don't use the term "warming" because it is, to me, a complexity of different climate variations—not only temperature but weather patterns manifesting in drought, patterns manifesting in floods, patterns manifesting in hurricanes, and all sorts of other things, such as tornadoes.

I have had the privilege of living a little bit longer than most in this Chamber. Indeed, in my lifetime, I have never seen such a complexity and changes in weather. Certainly, the evidence seems to be compelling every day that human activity and increasing carbon dioxide emissions are the causes. It is now time to deal with that situation.

I belong to the school of thought in this debate that we simply cannot do nothing; we cannot constantly postpone. Senator LIEBERMAN and I, over a period of almost a year now, have put this bill together. It represents what we deem a consensus—I guess you would say a middle-of-the-road position. We could not satisfy all those who want stronger controls put in, more immediate corrections; nor could we

satisfy those who sort of say let's wait and see. We felt we should put this together, bringing together the thoughts of so many of our colleagues. I would say that several dozen colleagues contributed to this bill. One is Senator SPECTER. In our bill, we relied on much of the good work included in Bingham-Specter Low Carbon Economy Act.

Most significantly, our legislation includes provisions from their bill that protect U.S. manufacturers from competition with other countries not curbing emissions. Second, we also "borrowed" their idea for providing "bonus allowances" to facilities that adopt carbon capture and storage. This incentive is critical. The third point I will highlight is that we tried to provide the price certainty envisioned by their "safety value" by including a "rainy day account" of extra allowances that would be released to the market if a certain price point is hit. I thank those Senators for their very important contributions in improving this bill.

Mr. President, another reason I am drawn to working to address the issue of global climate change is that there is a great feeling all across America by people in small towns, large cities, and in State legislatures that we must move and move now; that we simply must do something. In my view, doing nothing is not an option. We simply must do something.

I believe the American people will be the final factor in this bill that is now about to be pending in the Senate, as to whether sufficient votes are garnered to send the bill eventually to the President after we have a conference, hopefully, with the House of Representatives, which I am certain, if this is passed by 60 votes here, the House will quickly put together their own thoughts—they have done a lot of work—and we will have a bill that will go to the President. That will be largely owing to the public, as they follow this debate and read about it, as they discuss it among themselves. They will send back a message to this institution that doing nothing is not an option. Do the best you can. In crafting this legislation, we have done the best we can. If my fellow Senators have ideas to further improve the legislation, I ask them to bring them forward.

I commend the distinguished ranking member. He pointed out that he will support going forward with this bill this afternoon and also that there should be a number of amendments, hopefully, to strengthen it from the perspective of the ranking member and a number of colleagues on this side of the aisle. Let's show the American public that this institution can work and address a complicated subject and try to reach common ground and understanding. To do nothing is not an option.

In the substitute amendment, we significantly improved the bill by giving the President of the United States emergency authority to modify any requirement of this bill in the event of a

national, economic or energy emergency. In addition, Senator LIEBERMAN, Senator CARPER and I will be offering an amendment with respect to nuclear power. I ask unanimous consent that this section of the substitute amendment, and my amendment with Senators LIEBERMAN and CARPER be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

(See Exhibits 1 and 2.)

Mr. WARNER. Again, the first provision I refer to deals with the authority of the President of the United States. The Committee reported bill, I felt, did not give sufficient protections to the Nation for unforeseen things that could occur while this law is being met across the Nation. So we give to the President the authority to change any provision in this bill that he—or possibly she—deems appropriate. And then it is up to the Congress to determine whether they support what the President has done or not. I say that because we have drawn on a procedure that has been time tested by the Senate, and indeed the Congress, to give such power to the President regarding legislation. Supposing that, as a consequence of the legislation, it is shown it is damaging our ability to recover from what appears now to be a weakened economy? Then the President can readjust the timetable or the provision which he deems is contributing to that problem.

Now, we ask the power industry—most notably those segments of the industry dependent upon coal—coal is our largest natural resource of energy. This bill does not in any way try to damage coal. It, in fact, is a bill that will help that industry—our power industry—which requires coal as a source of energy for our daily needs. Give us time to explain to the coal industry how this is done. But if technology, in terms of capturing the CO₂, conveying, transporting it to a repository for sequestration—if that technology is not in place in a timely way, the President can step in and readjust the timetable.

If there are national security implications from this bill that the President deems harmful, he can readjust this bill. So there are more than adequate safety measures in here to protect this Nation, and the President has full authority to implement them.

The Warner-Lieberman-Carper amendment relates to nuclear power. We looked at this in the course of the deliberations in the committee, and at that time, it simply was not feasible to include provisions. The distinguished colleague from Oklahoma and others brought forward a number of provisions about nuclear power during the mark up, which we could not accept at that time for reasons I think are apparent to all. But I am happy to bring forth an amendment now, joined by my distinguished colleagues, Senator LIEBERMAN and CARPER, to look at the absolute essential requirement that we rely on nu-

clear power as a growing and a more important daily source of energy for this country.

Mr. President, I hope that when this debate has concluded, if it is shown that the proponents of this legislation have not met the majority requirements of this body as to what is to be done legislatively now—not in the future—to deal with this global climate change, then I hope that another legislative proposal will be brought forward via amendment, or perhaps even by a substitute bill, to replace ours. If it is the will of a majority to take that substitute, so be it. I hope I can support it. But to do nothing is not an option, Mr. President.

How much time do I have under the 10 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One minute remains.

Mr. WARNER. I yield that back to my colleague from Connecticut to wrap up for the two of us—in 1 minute, 1 year's work.

EXHIBIT 1

Subtitle B—Presidential Emergency Declarations and Proclamations

SEC. 1711. EMERGENCY DECLARATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If the President determines that a national security, energy security, or economic security emergency exists, and that it is in the paramount interest of the United States to modify any requirement under this Act to minimize the effects of the emergency, the President may make an emergency declaration.

(b) CONSULTATION.—In making an emergency declaration under subsection (a), the President shall, to the maximum extent practicable, consult with and take into consideration any advice received from—

- (1) the National Security Advisor;
- (2) the Secretary of the Treasury;
- (3) the Secretary of Energy;
- (4) the Administrator;
- (5) relevant committees of Congress; and
- (6) the Board.

SEC. 1712. PRESIDENTIAL PROCLAMATION.

After making an emergency declaration under section 1711, the President shall declare by proclamation each action required to minimize the emergency.

SEC. 1713. CONGRESSIONAL RESCISSION OR MODIFICATION.

(a) TREATMENT OF PROCLAMATION.—A proclamation issued pursuant to section 1712 shall be considered to be a final action by the President.

(b) ACTION BY CONGRESS.—Congress shall rescind or modify a proclamation issued pursuant to section 1712, if necessary, not later than 30 days after the date of issuance of the proclamation.

SEC. 1714. REPORT TO FEDERAL AGENCIES.

Not later than 30 days after the date on which a proclamation issued pursuant to section 1712 takes effect, and every 30 days thereafter during the effective period of the proclamation, the President shall submit to the head of each appropriate Federal agency a report describing the actions required to be carried out by the proclamation.

SEC. 1715. TERMINATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), a proclamation issued pursuant to section 1712 shall terminate on the date that is 180 days after the date on which the proclamation takes effect.

(b) EXTENSION.—The President may request an extension of a proclamation terminated under subsection (a), in accordance with the requirements of this subtitle.

(c) CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL.—Congress shall approve or disapprove a request of the President under subsection (b) not later than 30 days after the date of receipt of the request.

SEC. 1716. PUBLIC COMMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—During the 30-day period beginning on the date on which a proclamation is issued pursuant to section 1712, the President shall accept public comments relating to the proclamation.

(b) RESPONSE.—Not later than 60 days after the date on which a proclamation is issued, the President shall respond to public comments received under subsection (a), including by providing an explanation of—

- (1) the reasons for the relevant emergency declaration; and
- (2) the actions required by the proclamation.

(c) NO IMPACT ON EFFECTIVE DATE.—Notwithstanding subsections (a) and (b), a proclamation under section 1712 shall take effect on the date on which the proclamation is issued.

SEC. 1717. PROHIBITION ON DELEGATION.

The President shall not delegate to any individual or entity the authority—

- (1) to make a declaration under section 1711; or
- (2) to issue a proclamation under section 1712.

Subtitle C—Administrative Procedure and Judicial Review

SEC. 1721. REGULATORY PROCEDURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), any rule, requirement, regulation, method, standard, program, determination, or final agency action made or promulgated pursuant to this Act shall be subject to the regulatory procedures described in subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) does not apply to the establishment or any allocation of emission allowances under this Act by the Administrator.

SEC. 1722. ENFORCEMENT.

(a) VIOLATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall be unlawful for any owner or operator of a covered entity to violate any prohibition, requirement, or other provision of this Act (including a regulation promulgated pursuant to this Act).

EXHIBIT 2

On page 164, strike line 15 and insert the following:

(c) EDUCATION AND TRAINING.—For each Beginning on page 181, strike line 1 and all that follows through page 183, line 3, and insert the following:

SEC. 536. EDUCATION AND TRAINING.

(a) DEFINITION OF APPLICABLE PERIOD.—In this section, the term “applicable period” means—

- (1) each 5-year period during the period beginning on January 1, 2012, and ending on December 31, 2047; and
- (2) the 3-year period beginning on January 1, 2048, and ending on December 31, 2050.

(b) NUCLEAR SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING EDUCATION.—For each applicable period, the Secretary of Energy shall use ½ of the amounts made available under section 534(c) for the calendar years in the applicable period to increase the number and amounts of nuclear science talent expansion grants and nuclear science competitiveness grants provided under section 5004 of the America COMPETES Act (42 U.S.C. 16532).

(c) NUCLEAR ENERGY TRADES TRAINING AND CERTIFICATION.—For each applicable period, the Secretary of Labor, in consultation with nuclear energy entities and organized labor, shall use ½ of the amounts made available under section 534(c) for the calendar years in

the applicable period to expand workforce training to meet the high demand for workers skilled in nuclear power plant construction and operation, including programs for—

- (1) electrical craft certification;
 - (2) preapprenticeship career technical education for industrialized skilled crafts that are useful in the construction of nuclear power plants;
 - (3) community college and skill center training for nuclear power plant technicians;
 - (4) training of construction management personnel for nuclear power plant construction projects; and
 - (5) regional grants for integrated nuclear energy workforce development programs.
- (d) CLIMATE CHANGE SCIENCE AND POLICY EDUCATION.—For each applicable period, the Secretary of Education shall use $\frac{1}{3}$ of the amounts made available under section 534(c) for the calendar years in the applicable period to support climate change policy and science education in the United States.

On page 292, strike line 22 and insert the following:

SEC. 901. FINDINGS; SENSE OF SENATE.

- (a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—
- (1) more than 40 years of experience in the United States relating to commercial nuclear power plants have demonstrated that nuclear reactors can be operated safely;
 - (2) in 2007, nuclear power plants produced 19 percent of the electricity generated in the United States;
 - (3) nuclear power plants are the only base-load source of emission-free electric generation, emitting no greenhouse gases or criteria pollutants associated with acid rain, smog, or ozone;
 - (4) in 2007, nuclear power plants in the United States—
 - (A) avoided more than 692,000,000 metric tons of carbon dioxide emissions; and
 - (B) accounted for more than 73 percent of emission-free electric generation in the United States;
 - (5) a lifecycle emissions analysis by the International Energy Agency determined that nuclear power plants emit fewer greenhouse gases than wind energy, solar energy, and biomass on a per kilowatt-hour basis;
 - (6) construction of a new nuclear power plant is estimated to require between 1,400 and 1,800 jobs during a 4-year period, with peak employment reaching as many as 2,400 workers;
 - (7)(A) once operational, a new nuclear power plant is estimated to provide 400 to 600 full-time jobs for up to 60 years; and
 - (B) jobs at nuclear power plants pay, on average, 40 percent more than other jobs in surrounding communities;
 - (8) revitalization of a domestic manufacturing industry to provide nuclear components for new power plants that can be deployed in the United States and exported for use in global carbon reduction programs will provide thousands of new, high-paying jobs and contribute to economic growth in the United States;
 - (9) data of the Bureau of Labor Statistics demonstrate that it is safer to work in a nuclear power plant than to work in the real estate or financial sectors;
 - (10) while aggressive energy efficiency measures and an increased deployment of renewable generation can and should be taken, the United States will be unable to meet climate reduction goals without the construction of new nuclear power plants;
 - (11) modeling conducted by the Environmental Protection Agency and the Energy Information Administration demonstrate that emission reductions are greater, and compliance costs are lower, if nuclear power plants are used to provide a greater percentage of electricity;

(12) the United States has been a world leader in nuclear science; and

(13) institutions of higher education in the United States will play a critical role in advancing knowledge about the use and the safety of nuclear energy for the production of electricity.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE REGARDING USE OF FUNDS.—It is the Sense of the Senate that Congress should stimulate private sector investment in the manufacturing of nuclear project components in the United States, including through the financial incentives program established under this subtitle.

SEC. 902. DEFINITIONS.

On page 293, line 14, insert:
 “(D) establishing procedures, programs and facilities to achieve ASME certification standards”

On page 294, strike line 10 and insert the following:

- or low-carbon generation, including—
- (A) a technology referred to in section 832(a); and
 - (B) nuclear power technology.
- On page 294, line 11, strike “902” and insert “903”.
- On page 294, line 16, strike “903” and insert “904”.
- On page 297, line 5, strike “904” and insert “905”.
- On page 297, line 7, strike “903” and insert “904”.
- On page 297, line 10, strike “905” and insert “906”.
- On page 297, line 14, strike “904” and insert “905”.
- On page 297, line 18, strike “906” and insert “907”.
- On page 297, line 19, strike “906” and insert “907”.
- On page 298, line 4, strike “907” and insert “908”.
- On page 298, line 17, strike “909” and insert “910”.
- On page 299, line 16, strike “908” and insert “909”.
- On page 301, line 11, strike “909” and insert “910”.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Virginia. I thank him for an excellent statement. I think his point is well taken. Let's have a full and open debate and in the classic way and in the best Senate tradition. Let amendments come forward. We believe strongly that this problem is too real and too urgent to keep saying no, no, no.

We have come some distance in the Senate's consideration or discussion of the Senate floor about this. We are now at the place where almost nobody says this is not a problem, that climate change is not occurring; just about everybody agrees it is.

Now the question is, What do we do about it? We have tried to fashion—I like what Senator WARNER said—a balanced, kind of middle-of-the-road response to the problem of global warming. In dealing with global warming and climate change, there will also be the energy independence declaration program that America needs to secure our future. You cannot cut greenhouse gas emissions unless you cut dependence on oil, and most of that oil comes to America from abroad. This is an opportunity to deal with a big problem with a big solution and truly to secure

and better the future of our country and its people.

I often say, when people ask why Senator WARNER decided to join in on this, that he responded with remarkable brevity for a Senator. He said two words: Science. Grandchildren.

The science speaks loudly that we have a problem. He wants to feel, on his watch, as we all should, that he did something to protect his grandchildren and all our grandchildren from that problem. That is what this legislation gives the Senate an opportunity to do.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.
 The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I commend my colleagues for their fine remarks about the need to cut carbon emissions. I agree with them on cutting carbon emissions. I think that is important. But I think it is timely that we have this discussion now about the cost of it because we should pursue cutting carbon emissions, but we cannot slash family budgets, knock farmers and workers out of jobs and out of productive revenue.

At a time when Americans are suffering record pain at the pump, high energy costs, a mortgage crisis, and a soft economy, I am very concerned about raising energy prices on our families and workers.

I just returned from a six-city energy tour in my State of Missouri. Did I learn something. From Joplin in the southwest of my State, to Palmyra in the northeast, families, businesses, farmers, and truckers are suffering from record-high prices. Drivers are fed up with gasoline prices approaching \$4 and diesel prices even higher. One pump in Joplin is \$4.75 for a gallon of diesel.

These truckers and small businesses are saying how they are struggling now. Some are being forced out of business and don't know how they are going to meet their fuel costs and still employ people and carry the goods we need to get to market. When they pay higher prices, we all pay higher prices for everything because transportation costs are a critical element. They are squeezing farmers already. Do we want to vote to make this misery much worse?

I fear that this bill, as currently drafted, will make our suffering families and workers much worse off. The sponsors of the substitute tell us this bill will raise, between now and 2050, over \$6.735 trillion. I apologize that there are nine zeroes on the charts; so you have to have two panels to have all the zeroes in that trillion-dollar figure. It would not fit on one poster board. That is what this bill would cost. Do you know where that cost goes? Similar to lots of stuff, it rolls downhill. This would roll down on the consumers. They are the ones who will pay for it in energy prices—millions of families and workers across the Nation.

Now, some may claim they are trying to hit energy companies with the cost

of this program. Does anybody think energy companies will continue to produce if their costs go up this much? The first thing they do will be to pass it along to all of us, and we will feel it. Energy consumers and producers will have no other choice. That is because the technology to meet deep-and-fast carbon cuts, without massive economic disruptions, doesn't exist today; and as I talk to scientists in my State, as we look at projects on which we are working, they will not be ready for another 15 to 20 years.

We are working on some things that will work now. Biofuels is making a small dent—a small, small dent. We can expand that a little more. But even the advanced cellulosic ethanol processing is not economically feasible now. Thus, the impossible mandates of Lieberman-Warner will be a massive tax increase for all Americans.

To sum it up, cap and trade is a taxation, a massive taxation without technology. Cap and tax is what it was called in an article today.

The \$6.7 trillion cost would hit my Missouri constituents particularly hard. Experts at the American Council for Capital Formation predict Missouri will lose 76,100 jobs by 2030 if we enact Lieberman-Warner. The average Missouri household will face a \$6,852 extra cost per year. Energy cost for electricity will be 153 percent higher. Gasoline cost at the pump will be 140 percent higher.

The Lieberman-Warner bill, regrettably, has a particularly unfair and harsh impact on America's heartland. This chart shows how much bills will go up depending on where one lives. In the Northeast, it is 40 percent. In the Midwest, it is 137 percent. In the South, it is 104 percent. In the Great Plains, it is 113 percent. In Mountain/West, it is 87 percent. And the West Coast, not much. I mean no offense when I say that it is easy when you look at the chart to see that the primary proponents of this measure, in the Northeast and the far West—the pain will be focused primarily on the coal-dependent manufacturing jobs, heavy Midwest, South, and Great Plains.

Perhaps the most disturbing feature of this debate is that for all the pain on families and workers, for all of its \$6.7 trillion pricetag, it will have no measurable impact on world temperatures. That is right; the Environmental Protection Agency estimates that if China and India do not institute similar plans to the same extent we do, as they have already told us they will not, this bill before us will have no measurable impact on world temperatures. That means \$6.7 trillion in pain for American families and workers for no gain in global temperature lowering.

I will have more to say about this issue during this debate in the coming days. I also look forward to debating how we can cut carbon without cutting family budgets or worker payrolls. There is so much we can do to reduce

carbon emissions by increasing nuclear power production, and we do need to get more nuclear power. Do we have the scientists, the engineers? No. Do we have the basic vats that are needed? No. We need to develop that industry in the United States. We need to do something about reprocessing spent fuel. Right now we are limited, we are constrained by our inability to get rid of spent nuclear fuel. We need to reprocess it and reduce it by 95 percent.

We need to expand coal technology, coal to liquid, coal gasification. These are very important. But what do we do with the carbon? That is why we are working on a project in southwest Missouri, for which I got an earmark 4 years ago, to try sequestration underground. Is it going to work? We don't know. That is why it is a demonstration project.

We need to expand our domestic manufacturing supply base for more advanced batteries to get more hybrid cars and trucks on the road. We worked with companies in Missouri to help them build better batteries. I would love to see the day when we have a full-size automobile, not a golf cart, that we can plug in at night when power demand is lowest, charge the battery, commute to work and back without ever having to stop at a gasoline pump. We are not there yet. We do not have the batteries.

We need more next-generation work on cellulosic biofuels. I was talking to the top scientists in Missouri on Wednesday. I was talking about biofuels. We have hundreds and hundreds of square acres with as much as 4,200 tons of green wood that need to be cleaned out of the forest to make it healthy.

I said: Congress, in its wisdom, has already mandated we produce 16 billion gallons of cellulosic ethanol by 2022. I said: By the way, how is the technology to convert wood to cellulosic ethanol?

They said: We are not there yet. We haven't found a means of converting wood to ethanol in an efficient, economically viable way.

I said: When do you expect it?

They said: We don't know.

I said: That is Congress; we passed a law saying you have to produce 16 billion barrels, and we forgot to ask the scientists when we were going to get that conversion.

We are working on it, but we are not there yet.

In each of these areas, I am proud to say that Missouri is leading the way to look for ways to reduce our carbon emissions. We want to do that. Set aside the arguments over the international impact and what the impact is. We will join with you in reducing carbon emissions, but, please, friends, let us develop the technology and not impose taxes when we put on caps without the technology. Caps without the technology is a \$6.7 trillion tax increase.

We can all be leaders in clean energy for the future. We need to do so with-

out ruining our economy, which this bill would do.

I look forward to discussing this issue in a constructive manner with all my colleagues in the coming week, and I assume in the months and years to come.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. MCCASKILL). The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, Senator DOMENICI is on his way, and I want to yield some time to him. He has been a real hero in our pursuing one of the forms we are going to have to have if we are ever going to run this great machine called America, and that is nuclear energy.

I was glad to hear the comments made by the Senator from Virginia who had complimentary things to say about nuclear energy and what is necessary if we are going to be able to continue to do this.

Before the Senator from Missouri leaves, he was referring to a chart that showed the increase in the price of gasoline. I don't know whether he still has that chart or if he has it in his notes. The Senator from Missouri went over it so fast. To me that is the focal point, at least in my State of Oklahoma.

Mr. BOND. The price of gasoline—

Mr. INHOFE. One hundred forty percent.

Mr. BOND. We said 140 percent. There are various figures that would add \$1.44 to \$1.45. This one is from the National Association of Manufacturers. I believe the EPA figures say \$1.40, \$1.45. I can tell the Senator that we are looking at significant increases in the price of gasoline. The low number would be \$1.40, I believe, from the EPA.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I ask the Senator from Missouri also to comment on the predictions as to what it would cost to the average household. In my presentation—and the Senator was in our caucus when we had a meeting—I had one chart that showed the United States. It showed how much it would cost an average household. My State, Oklahoma, and Texas were the largest hit. The increase for each family would be \$3,300. Missouri was in the next tier down, which I think was around \$2,800. That is something I think is very significant.

Mr. BOND. We have \$6,852 on the average Missouri household. Our source for that is National Association of Manufacturers, March 13, 2008. Obviously, these costs are only estimates. When you realize that those States, such as Missouri, which depend on coal—and no telling what the grand czars will allocate, the unelected bureaucrats will allocate for coal production or utilities burning coal. They are right now \$13 a ton on carbon emissions. I think some are trading three times that high in Europe. These numbers are all, at best, estimates. We can tell you that there is no way this won't have a significant impact.

Mr. INHOFE. I suggest to my friend from Missouri that I am sure Missouri

is not that different from Oklahoma and it is the major concern people have. That is all, when I go around the State, people are talking about now.

Many different economic studies show gasoline prices rising significantly under this bill. Madam President, \$1.50 is just an estimated range. One of the Government EPA studies shows gasoline prices going up by \$1.40. Another independent agency study, the independent Energy Information Administration, predicts it will go up by 41 cents a gallon to \$1 a gallon by 2030.

As gasoline prices continue to rise and set new record highs every day, this bill would only keep prices rising. The Energy Information Administration study predicts that gasoline prices will increase anywhere from 41 cents per gallon to \$1 per gallon by 2030.

We are waiting for a Senator. How much more time on the opposing side do we have at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 31 minutes.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, before the Senator yields the floor, I wonder if I may ask him a question.

Mr. INHOFE. That will be fine on the time on the other side.

Mr. WARNER. Fine. Of course, whatever the case may be. Because our colleagues are listening to these statistics, I think we better with greater specificity explain from where those numbers are coming. The Senator made a comment about the possible increase in the cost of gas. But is that not over the life of the bill, which is 20 years?

Mr. INHOFE. No.

Mr. WARNER. It is not tomorrow or the next day.

Mr. INHOFE. I am talking about by 2020 and some of the figures used are by 2030. An article in *The Hill*, just the other day—of course, that was before we had our recess—said that the Senate debate after Memorial Day could add up to 50 cents to the price of a gallon of gasoline, according to the study. They didn't say the timeframe. That was one of the more objective groups.

Here is another one that talks about that. *Investors Business Daily* says the bill essentially limits how much gasoline and other fossil fuels Americans use.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I asked the question, but I will finish it up. Let's be candid, we are talking about a bill that is 20 years ahead of us. Look how much gas has risen, 26 increases in the past, I think, 90 days. It has nothing to do with this bill. This bill has all types of checks and balances that the President can move in and stop these provisions from being invoked if he is concerned.

I listened patiently to my colleague from Missouri: This is wrong, that is wrong, this is wrong. All right, folks, who is going to come forward in this Chamber and say this is what is right, here is the better approach? And let us be careful in the representation about these incredible increases and so forth.

Give the time period and then contrast that to what has happened in the last 90 days, which has nothing to do with this bill—nothing.

What has an impact is if this bill eventually becomes law, then it will put in place the mechanism by which to relieve the crisis we are faced with today—these repeated 26 increases in the cost of gasoline.

I yield the floor.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, how much time remains on either side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 28 minutes 19 seconds for the opposition, and 18 minutes on your side.

Mrs. BOXER. I yield 5 minutes to Senator KLOBUCHAR, a wonderful member of our committee and, by the way, author of the carbon registry portion of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I thank Chairwoman BOXER for her great leadership of our committee.

Today, we begin a discussion of a historic opportunity—an opportunity to restore American leadership on something that is so critical for the future of our country and of the world.

I just came back, Madam President, from Minnesota, where I spent the last week. People are glad that spring is here, but I was surprised by the number of people who came and talked to me about the climate change issue. They knew this debate was coming. It is not just kids with penguin buttons anymore. It is hunters in Hibbing who have seen the changes to our wetlands, people who ice fish, and little city councils in places such as Lanesboro, MN, that changed out their light bulbs to save money. And it is business people in Duluth who have seen Lake Superior at historic lows over the last 80 years. People in our State are seeing the changes, and they are concerned about the changing weather patterns and the frequency of changing weather patterns—with tornadoes, with floods, and with fires.

Local communities all over this country are taking action. My State of Minnesota has one of the most aggressive renewable standards in this country. We don't view this as a partisan issue. We view this as a bipartisan issue. Everyone from our Republican Governor to our Democratic legislature to independent city councils all over the State want to see action on climate change from Washington.

Just a year or two ago this Senate was debating whether climate change existed, and now, finally, today, with a vote on this motion, we can start debating how to solve it. We had an event today where people from all over the country talked about the effect it had in their communities—global warming. Someone from Alaska joined us to describe the way climate change has affected whale populations and fishing traditions that support her community.

It actually made me think of my own State of Minnesota where fishing is

very important. I would love to ask the Presiding Officer if she knew how much money we spend on bait and worms alone in Minnesota every year, but, of course, the rules prohibit her from answering. In fact, the answer is, in the State of Minnesota we spend \$50 million a year alone on worms and bait. It gives you a sense of how important, in the land of 10,000 lakes, fishing and outdoor recreation is to the State.

A total of \$1.8 billion every year is spent on angling alone. That is why everybody from snowmobilers to hunters, to people who fish, to everyday citizens, care about this issue in my State, and why it is so important to move forward on this legislation.

The other piece of interest is that our State is third in the country with wind. We see the potential for jobs. If we set the standards in this country, the investment will follow. Think of what happened when we raised the gas mileage standard years ago: we saved money. Now we are doing it again this year.

Think about when John F. Kennedy stood and challenged this country to put a man on the Moon. We won that space race, but we did more than that. By drawing that line in the sand, by saying this country was going to move forward, we produced endless amounts of technology just from that one moment we said we were going to put a man on the Moon.

We produced weather satellites, solar technology, digital wristwatches, ultrasound machines, laser surgery, infrared medical thermometers, programmable pacemakers, satellite TV broadcasts, high-density batteries, high-speed, long distance telephone service, automated insulin pumps, CAT scans, radiation blocking sunglasses, and my personal favorite, those little chocolate space sticks that my family used to take on camping trips in the 1970s.

That was all because someone in the Nation's Capital said we were going to move in a new direction; we were not going to let other countries be the first to put a man on the Moon; we were going to be first.

That is what we have the opportunity to do with this legislation. We have the opportunity to start moving and doing something about climate change. Many people around the world are waiting for us to act, to go first, as we have so many other times. Other countries have done things, but our country, the United States of America, making a statement on this matter, will make a difference for the rest of the world. We need to set our expectations high. We need to set our standards high. And we have to remember, while climate change is a challenge—and I don't believe it is any longer seriously disputed in terms of the science on global warming—it is also an opportunity.

I look forward to the debate that we will have in the coming days, and I thank Chairwoman BOXER again for her leadership.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I yield to the Senator from New Mexico whatever time he consumes.

Before I do that, I say to my good friend from New Mexico that I commented earlier on his being a real champion for nuclear energy, and the recognition that we can't resolve the process we have without a very bold nuclear program. And I would say this: We have over 30 applications now in the process, of people saying what they want to do. So I look at this, as I characterized it a few minutes ago, as a nuclear renaissance that is taking place, largely due to the efforts of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, has time been yielded to the Senator from New Mexico?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, whatever time the Senator shall consume.

Mr. DOMENICI. Let me comment on your observation. First, I thank you for indicating that I had something to do with the rise of nuclear power, which we are all glad to call a nuclear renaissance. I did have a lot to do with it, and I am very proud of that.

I think the Senator knows I will not be here very long because I have decided to retire after 36 years, and that means this January. But I am very confident that even leaving in that short time from now we have set the seeds for the nuclear renaissance. It will be in the world, not just in America. But it would always have been short of what it could be and should be if America was not part of this renaissance. If America wasn't a part, the world somehow would not feel right about nuclear. And since we started it, and then we unpropitiously stopped producing it and stopped all the leadership we had, we are starting anew. So there is great excitement in the American nuclear community, which is expanding dramatically.

Universities are establishing new nuclear physics courses. I think the Senator from Oklahoma knows that. We have put money in the energy and water bill, \$10 million to \$15 million a year, for universities to get started and bring them up where they were, and that is going to be very exciting. But have no doubt, since the United States knows how to produce the very best nuclear powerplants—the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is of the highest quality—they are not going to approve licenses unless they are absolutely certain of plant designs and that locations are absolutely the best. And that is going to take a little while.

We had, I think 33 or 34 is the number that are in the process of applying, with about 7 or 8 firmed up, completed, and all the process they need to submit being done. That is so exciting when you consider that in 20-plus years we had zero, not a single one, until we passed the Energy Policy Act. And the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma was not on the Energy Committee, but

he was very helpful at every step as we produced this Energy Policy Act, which included, as everyone agrees, all of the ingredients to cause American nuclear power to have a renaissance, and it is doing that.

Now, there is no way we are going to effectively clean the CO₂ we produce in the use of power without nuclear power. It is the one big source of power that has no CO₂ emissions attached to it, so it is good we are moving there. But today we have a bill before us that has to be discussed, debated, and amended, as I see it, for such a long period of time for the American people and the Senators to understand its implications, that today I choose to just speak about one little part—the impact of this bill on oil and gas prices.

This is a bill that purports to put America on a path of producing less and less CO₂, but it has some real difficult hurdles to cross as we move there. In the meantime, there is no question that it has an impact on a lot of things, and we have to consider whether it is worth all the ramifications, considering what the bill will or will not do.

So, Madam President, let me remind Senators that we are all coming back from our home States. I am returning from my home State of New Mexico, where I visited constituents and listened to their concerns. In every town I visited, at every event I attended, and during every meeting, I took the same issue and put it before the people and discussed it with them. They asked the same questions over and over: How will Congress deal with the rising gas prices? I expect that most every Senator had similar experiences during his or her recent recess travels.

This morning, the price of gasoline was, on average, a record of \$3.98. Now, I used an average, and I got that from an appropriate official. In many places it has already passed the \$4 mark, but it averages \$3.98. At the start of this Congress, the average was just \$2.33, meaning the cost of gasoline has jumped by 70 percent in just 18 months.

Record gas prices are causing tremendous pain for Americans. In one recent survey, 40 percent of workers said the high price forced them to change the way they get to and from work. Many have stopped driving altogether. Public transit ridership is at an all-time high. Others have traded their vehicles in for smaller ones. But most importantly, many are feeling the impact on the family budget. They are just feeling like they can't make it because they only have one way to go to work. They have to work, and if there are two workers in the family, when you add the price of gasoline to that, it becomes an expense they can hardly bear.

The impact is not limited to transportation. It affects nearly every aspect of American life and ripples throughout our economy. As fuel costs rise, as I indicated, family budgets are stretched. Millions have canceled vacation plans and cut down on shopping

trips. For those living paycheck to paycheck, the price at the pump is the difference between being able to pay their bills on time and going into debt. Runaway energy costs also hurt our businesses, as evidenced by recent announcements from Ford Motors and American Airlines.

High gas prices even impact the quality of education that our children receive. A school district in Minnesota has already announced that schools will move to 4 days a week to avoid budget shortfalls. Schools in North Carolina are planning fewer field trips for their students, which are often among the most memorable experiences that our children can have.

As these examples illustrate, the consequences of high energy prices are widely felt, far-reaching, and difficult to overcome. We must take real steps to ensure that these are properly addressed and that we are not telling these same types of stories in the future.

After hearing our constituents plead for relief from high gas prices, it was my hope that Senators would rededicate themselves to reducing the cost of oil and gas. Instead, by bringing up a bill to establish a cap-and-trade regime, which we will hear much about in the ensuing days, the majority has chosen to go in the opposite direction from reducing gas prices or holding them steady for our constituents.

As the summer driving season begins, and oil prices remain at near all-time record highs, it is simply incredible that the first measure debated in this session will not be a bill to lower energy prices by producing more of our own energy but a bill that will, in fact, substantially increase energy costs.

By assigning a cost to the carbon content of traditional fuels, there is no question this bill will increase the cost of gasoline. According to EIA, gas prices could rise by 41 percent in the year 2030. The EPA places this figure as high as a \$1.01 per gallon by the year 2030.

Every policy has a price, but as we continue to face record energy prices, the costs of this bill are simply unacceptable, no matter which version is up for debate. An economist at the Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas recently told the New York Times that:

Every one-cent increase in gasoline means Americans pay \$1.42 billion more a year for gas.

An absolutely incredible number. You wonder why the economy is being affected by these enormous price increases of gasoline and diesel fuel. At a time when they can least afford it, this will translate to even greater pain at the pump for consumers. At a time when the strength of our economy is already a serious concern, it will lower the bottom line of American business and jeopardize their global competitiveness.

When recesses end and we make our way back to Washington, it is our obligation to do our best to resolve the

concerns of our constituents. Right now we should be working to find a way to reduce energy prices. Instead, as we begin to debate a cap-and-trade regime which may not work, it is clear there is a fundamental disconnect between many in this Chamber and the American people who simply cannot afford to pay more for energy. As the Boxer bill proves, there is much Congress can do to raise these prices and we are setting about to do that.

I commend my colleagues for trying to tackle the task of reducing carbon emissions to address global climate change. However, the American people are facing higher costs and tough economic concerns. They are worried about their family budgets and about their jobs. This bill will make these worries greater and increase those costs even more.

I will be speaking at great length as we consider this bill in the coming days and I will speak of many other issues besides the one today, for there are many more. I speak of only one today which I think we should start with, and know what we are dealing with in terms of the side effects of legislation that is controversial. It is not only controversial but many are quite certain it will not do the job.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I am anxious to see action on this issue, but I keep asking myself, are we doing the right thing for the wrong reasons, or the wrong thing for the right reasons? Either way, I cannot support proceeding at this time. The Senate is not yet ready to consider this vastly important and highly complex legislation. Its ramifications are too unknown.

In December 2007, after several hearings and with written comments, the Environment and Public Works Committee reported S. 2191, America's Climate Security Act. It includes a hefty 334 pages of legislative text. Since then, a new bill has been drafted and placed on the Senate Legislative Calendar—S. 3036, the Lieberman-Warner Climate Security Act—which is what the Senate will consider if the motion to proceed is adopted. And yet another bill—a third bill—is expected to be offered as a substitute amendment by the chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee. That bill includes 491 pages of legislative text. That is three bills, in 6 months, totaling 1,167 pages of legislative text. This new bill was circulated only days ago before the Memorial Day recess, and with an additional 157 pages that was not considered by the Environment and Public Works Committee—no hearings, no economic analysis.

In early April, after months of examination, the Congressional Budget Office produced a cost estimate on S. 2191, outlining the \$1 trillion impact of that measure on the Federal budget, and the \$90 billion annual impact on the private sector. Incidentally, this legislation would put hundreds of billions of dollars on automatic pilot, allocated by unelected, unaccountable

boards, with little congressional oversight. However, no complete estimates exist for the substitute amendment that the Senate might consider. In addition, the Environmental Protection Agency and the Energy Information Administration at the Department of Energy have produced their economic analysis of S. 2191, outlining the impact of that legislation on different sectors of the economy. But, again, no complete estimates exist for the substitute amendment that the Senate might consider if it proceeds to the underlying bill.

Industry and environmental experts differ widely on how these bills will impact the American economy and energy prices. Without better independent analysis of the facts, there is little to prevent Senators from simply talking past one another. This being a presidential election year, the atmosphere is already highly charged. There is already too much political posturing on this complex, albeit popular, issue. This Chamber, the world's greatest deliberative body, must investigate further in order to render an informed decision. There are all kinds of parliamentary tactics that can be used on both sides of the aisle to limit debate and amendments on this bill, or to force votes on dangerous measures. The process can get out of hand very quickly and very easily.

I am haunted by another election year debate, when the Congress was rushed to judgement in voting for war in Iraq. And last year, it obviously did not adequately consider the consequences of a fuels mandate, which has contributed to international crisis and famine. In both cases, the result has been far different and far worse than what was thought and said at the time.

We must not be rushed to judgement on this vital issue. If not properly drafted, climate change legislation could bring unilateral devastation to critical sectors of the U.S. economy. It could cause massive increases in energy prices for American consumers. If not properly drafted, such legislation could well result in more harm than good.

The language of this measure is obviously still evolving, and the American people must know what is being asked of them before the Senate commits to mandatory emission caps. Otherwise, we cannot expect them to long endure the consequences that will surely follow. Without long-term public support, any effort to address this issue will eventually, and quite certainly, unravel.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, while I am willing to proceed to the climate security bill so that the Senate can debate and amend it, I am opposed to this bill in its present form. I am hopeful that the Senate will amend this bill and significantly improve it as we move forward.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, let me ask how much time is remaining on the opposing side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. STABENOW). Just less than 16 minutes.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I think it is the wish of the majority to have us use our time so Senator BOXER will have the remaining time, which is fine. I invite any Members who are around—I know several will want to speak tomorrow, but we do have time right now if they want to come down.

As I said in my opening remarks, this is not a discussion about science. That is something for another day. We have been talking about that now, the lack of science, for a number of years. I have to go back to then-Vice President Gore, who had a study done by a very prominent scientist—his name was Tom Wiggly. In this study, back when he was Vice President, he said: If we were to have all of the developed nations—not developing, not China, not Mexico, not India, but the developed nations—to sign on to, to ratify the Kyoto treaty and live by its emission requirements—of course they wouldn't do that anyway because the emission requirements are not complied with in some 15 Western European countries; only 2 are living within their emission requirements, but he said assuming all developed nations did sign on to Kyoto and live with the requirements, how much would it reduce the temperature in 50 years?

Do you know what his answer was after he did this massive study? Tom Wiggly, the scientist for Al Gore, said it would reduce the temperature by 7/100th of 1 degree Celsius. This is after all the economic pain.

I think what I might do is use a little of the time, if no other Members come down, to talk about how other people are looking at this. The Las Vegas Review Journal—I am hoping the leader of the Senate would be reading the Las Vegas Review Journal—said:

Consumers are already struggling with gasoline approaching \$5 a gallon and other utility costs that have been moving steadily higher for the past few years. New mandates placed on producers in the name of "global warming" will only make matters worse.

That was an editorial in the Las Vegas Review Journal a few days ago.

From the State of Ohio, The Plain Dealer—I know we are going to have Senator VOINOVICH taking a very active part in this debate. He is another one of the leaders bringing us into a renaissance for nuclear energy in America, which is desperately needed. I have to say, as we approach hopefully the solution—not having anything to do with this bill, but the energy crisis in America—I agree we need all sources. Oklahoma is very busy right now and very effective in their research on biomass—cellulosic biomass. Both the University of Oklahoma and Oklahoma State University, the Noble Foundation, are very active. We want that. It is not here now. That is better, to me, than the ethanol mandates that merely use up the market for corn to the extent that my livestock people in Oklahoma are paying a lot more now for feedstock

than they did. You won't have to do it with feedstock in the future because you will be able to do it with biomass and other forms. When it gets down to what the solution is to the energy crisis, we do need to have all these in the future: Wind, solar, and all that, when the technology is here. But right now we are 53 percent dependent on coal for our ability to run this machine called America.

As the Senator from Virginia stated, we will have to have coal as well as nuclear energy. Clean coal technology is out there. We have to keep that going. A lot of people fear this bill is going to put an end to coal.

The one ingredient we have to have, of course, is natural gas. That performs well. A lot comes from my State of Oklahoma. But one thing that will be necessary to pursue in the future is nuclear energy. Right now some countries such as France are 80 percent dependent upon nuclear energy. We are down around 20 percent. That is an area where we can do something.

Up in Ohio, The Plain Dealer newspaper, in their editorial, said:

The bill, as conceived, will just bore new holes into an already battered economy.

In Pittsburgh, the Pittsburgh Tribune-Review:

If there indeed is a second Great Depression to come, this will be the government measure that guarantees it arrives with a devastating gut punch.

That was an editorial called "The Climate Security Act? Reject The Ignorami" in the Pittsburgh Tribune-Review.

San Francisco Chronicle—this is kind of interesting—from the State of California:

The Senate debate on the climate bill probably will focus on its impact on energy prices and the economy, which in the short run could be considered significant.

The Associated Press recently said:

With gasoline at \$4 a gallon and home heating and cooling costs soaring, it is getting harder to sell a bill that would transform the country's energy industries and—as critics will argue—cause energy prices to rise even more.

The Wall Street Journal—there are a couple of them. I quoted already from the Wall Street Journal. This one was a few days ago.

This is easily the largest income redistribution scheme since the income tax.

I think it is interesting when people realize what we are talking about here is redistributing the wealth from the people who are the poorest, very poorest people. A CBO report found recently, quoting from that report:

Most of the cost of meeting a cap on CO₂ emissions would be borne by consumers who would face persistently higher prices for products such as electricity and gasoline. Those price increases would be regressive in that poorer households would bear a larger burden relative to their income than wealthier households.

We are going to hear from the chairman of the committee stating, I am sure, in the future: We are taking care

of that because we are redistributing some of the \$6.7 trillion, redistributing \$800 billion of that to some of the poorer families.

Wait a minute, that is \$1 out of \$8. That is not a very good deal.

I think there are so many reports that talk about how devastating this is going to be to all of America but particularly those individuals, the elderly and poor people, because these are the ones who are spending a large portion of their spendable income on energy. It is very appropriate I think to say this is easily the largest income redistribution scheme since the income tax.

The New York Post:

The only thing that will cool is the United States economy.

Talking about this bill.

In effect, the bill would impose an average of more than \$80 billion in new energy taxes every year.

That is the New York Post, entitled "Cap-&Trade: Why It's Tax & Spend," of June 2.

Robert Samuelson:

... let's call it by its proper name: cap and tax.

George Will:

Speaking of endless troubles, "cap-and-trade" comes cloaked in reassuring rhetoric about the government merely creating a market, but the government would actually create a scarcity so government could sell what it had made scarce.

This is a rather interesting thing. I recommend this. It was published in the Washington Post under "Carbon's Power Brokers."

Charles Krauthammer had several good editorials. He said:

There is no greater social power than the power to ration. And other than rationing food, there is no greater instrument of social control than rationing energy, the currency of just about everything one does and uses in an advanced society.

That was Charles Krauthammer, "Carbon Chastity," an editorial in the Washington Post on May 30.

There was a very good one, another from the Wall Street Journal that I have already quoted here. This is a different one than I quoted a minute ago. The Boxer climate tax bill:

... would impose the most extensive government reorganization of the American economy since the 1930s.

Investors Business Daily—this is something in an op-ed piece, an editorial piece they had on May 29:

The bill essentially limits the amount of gasoline and other fossil fuels Americans can use, as Klaus puts it—

referring to the President of the Czech Republic—

in the name of the planet. A study by Charles River Associates puts the cost (in terms of reduced household spending per year) of Senate bill 2191—

which is the Senate bill passed out of the committee

—at \$800 to \$1,300 per household by 2015, rising to \$1500 to \$2,500 by 2050. Electricity prices could jump by 36 percent to 65 percent by 2015 and 80 percent to 125 percent by 2050.

This was an editorial in Investors Business Daily.

It is interesting, I was noticing when Senator BOND from Missouri was making his very well-stated remarks, the study he had showed it would be closer to \$6,000 a household. I do know in my State of Oklahoma and in the State of Texas, of all the States that will have the highest increase in taxes, it will amount to a minimum of \$3,300 per family.

As I go around my State of Oklahoma—and I am back there every weekend; I am never here in Washington on weekends—I talk to people. They stop and think about what they do with \$3,300 a year—it is not just a lot of them want to have another pickup truck or a bass boat or other things, but most of them are having real problems right now meeting expenses. This will be something they wouldn't want to have to try to endure.

We have had quite a few of the editorial writers around the country talking about it. Several have talked about the raising of gas prices and the effect that would have. I think we are all aware of that. I think probably the biggest issue should be the job-killer issue. The Independent Energy Information Administration says the bill would result in a 9.5-percent drop in manufacturing output, and even higher energy costs. The fact that it would grow Government—stop and think about it. This is interesting. The figure the other side uses, the promoters of the bill, is \$6.7 trillion.

Then they say some of this is going to be going back into the economy. It comes down to about \$4.2 trillion—\$4.2 trillion, and one of the basic disagreements Senator BOXER had with the Senator from New Hampshire was that he wanted to return that to the taxpayers as opposed to having Government programs. It appears there will be, hopefully, not a majority—in fact I don't think there will be a majority of people in this body who are going to put themselves in a position where they say we want to have a \$4.2 trillion increase in the bureaucracy.

If there is anything that does not need to be increased, it is the bureaucracy in America. It frightened me to think about what types of governmental agencies there are, what, 45 new entities and agencies that would be provided by this bill? Tomorrow we are going to parade before you some charts to show the various increases in the size of the bureaucracy. It is going to be something that will be frightening to most people.

However, there is a mentality of many people in the Senate—I respect every Member of the Senate—that somehow you must increase the size and the magnitude and the authority and the power of Government to make things happen. That is not the way our forefathers thought it would be.

I would suggest to you that we want to look at this increase in Government, \$4.2 trillion over this period of time, as something that would be devastating to this country and its economy.

I see that my time has expired, and the remainder of the time will be used by my chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, the junior Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank my colleague. Today we are going to vote on whether we want to continue the status quo when it comes to energy policy and when it comes to ignoring the great threat to our planet that scientists tell us is very serious.

Now, we can vote no, we can weaken this bill. It seems to me that is every Senator's right. But, frankly, this Senator and I know my colleagues who have worked so hard on this bill, Senators LIEBERMAN and WARNER, feel deep in our heart that this is a moment for us to come across party lines as we go back and remember we have tripartisan legislation, a Democrat, an Independent, and a Republican.

Again, we did not agree with each other on every detail. Lord knows we did not. But for the good of this country, for the good of the world, for the good of future generations, we came together.

I ask the Chair to let me know when there is 4 minutes remaining so it can be equally divided by these wonderful cosponsors. Would the Chair let me know when 4 minutes remains.

Let me take this little time I have to say I do not mind debating on the facts of our bill. But I have heard so much fiction that I had to go over to both Senators WARNER and LIEBERMAN and say: Did I hear them right? First of all, they are using numbers that are coming out of the air by groups that oppose our bill, that have no validity, that are not based on any modeling.

We have numbers based on modeling. Then I hear now the new thing. My dear friend Senator INHOFE—we are dear friends—says the Boxer tax bill. There is no tax in this bill. This bill is modeled on the acid rain bill, I say to my friend.

Polluters pay. This bill has one of the largest tax cuts in it that we have seen around this place in a very long time. It has a big piece of consumer relief. So I say to my friends, do not get up here and say: Boxer tax bill. Point to where there is a tax in this bill. There is no tax. I will point to where there is a tax cut and a set-aside, a huge one, almost \$1 trillion, and a huge pot of almost \$1 trillion in consumer relief which will be given, if necessary, to consumers if the cost of the electricity goes up.

So here we have a bill that takes care of our consumers, takes care of our taxpayers. Then we hear from Senator DOMENICI and Senator BOND: Oh, we cannot do this bill because oil prices, gas prices at the pump are going to go up.

They put out a number that they pull out of the air. The modeling shows, worst-case scenario, worst case, gas prices would go up 2 cents a gallon per year until 2030. By the way, the mod-

eling that Senator LIEBERMAN has shows that the automobile fuel economy bill we passed will negate all that.

So this bill will bring no higher cost at the pump to our drivers. But let's look at what has happened under the last 7 years. Here is the status quo, folks. We have all lived it; now let's look at it. Gasoline prices have gone up 250 percent in the last 7 years. The source: U.S. Energy Information Administration. That is this administration's own energy department.

So without a global warming bill or a climate change bill, call it what you will, we have seen a 250-percent increase in the price of gas. What we do in our bill will get us off foreign oil, will get us off big oil, will lead to new technologies which will free us, will free us from these prices.

So those people who say: Do not vote for this bill because it is going to raise gas prices, only in a humpty-dumpty world, where you are over on your head could you come out with that. It makes no sense.

Let me show you the job growth that people are telling us we can expect from the Boxer-Lieberman-Warner bill. First of all, look at Great Britain. They have reduced their greenhouse gas emissions by 15 percent. They have grown their economy by 40 percent, and they have 500,000 jobs in the last 5 years in these new green technologies.

A report by the Apollo Alliance—that is a beautiful organization here in America—says this bill could create over 3 million new American jobs over a 10-year period, stimulating \$1.4 trillion in new gross domestic product and producing over \$280 billion in net energy savings.

We are going to get off foreign oil. I do not want to see a President have to run over to Saudi Arabia and hold hands with the Prince anymore. I am tired of that. It has to be the end of the status quo. This is an opportunity to do it.

Let's take a look. Job growth will follow strong legislation. In California—I mentioned this before—450 solar companies are now putting electricians and carpenters and plumbers to work where the construction industry is laying them off because of the housing crisis we are facing.

The top manufacturing States for solar are Ohio, Michigan, California, Tennessee, and Massachusetts. That comes from Solar Energy Industries. So we already are seeing it. Here is the labor support for the Climate Security Act. The Sheet Metal Workers, the Journeymen and Apprentices of Plumbing and Pipefitting, the United Union of Roofers, the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, the International Association of Heat and Frost Insulators. And it goes on. The Building and Construction Trades Department of the AFL-CIO, the International Union of Operating Engineers, the brick layers, the elevator constructors. Why are they supporting this bill?

These are the workers that my colleagues on the other side are scaring.

They are smart, they read the bill. They understand the many billions of dollars that are going to go into new technologies. And these technologies will heat our homes and they will cool our homes and they will run our cars and they will run our businesses.

The green jobs that will come are going to be jobs that can only be filled in America. Time is of the essence. Time is of the essence. Sir Nicholas Stern, former chief economist of the World Bank, found that by spending \$1 now to address global warming we will save \$5.

We know we cannot afford to wait. The time is now. People say: Why are you doing it before a Presidential election? Why this? Why that? This is above politics. This is above partisanship. If somebody told you, if somebody told you that if you brought your child to the supermarket on a very warm day and say it was your grandchild, because I know you are a proud grandma, and you said: Well, I have to run in there just for a minute, can I leave my child alone? Well, obviously you would never do it. The fact is, we would not lock our child in our hot car in front of a supermarket.

We cannot consign the next generation to a hot planet that is going to be inhospitable to our grandkids. We cannot do it. It is wrong. That is why we find Tony Blair saying: America must lead. He says the legislation sponsored by myself, JOE, and JOHN matters. It shows America will act. It will allow the United States to say to others: You must act. We are not going to sit around and wait for India and China. Since when do we do that? This is America.

I wish to go to the faith community. I think people ought to understand who is backing our bill. I see the Senator from North Dakota, who has been weighing this very strongly. The Evangelical Environmental Network and the Evangelical Climate Initiative, the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, the National Council of Churches, the Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism, the Jewish Council for Public Affairs, the Interfaith Power and Light Campaign.

Let me close by saying why. All you have to do is read, read from the Scriptures, read from some of the great writings:

See my handiwork, how beautiful and choice they are. Be careful not to ruin and destroy my world, for if you do ruin it, there is no one to repair it after you.

This is, it seems to me, the moral reason we must act. I thank you very much. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut and the remainder of the time to Senator WARNER.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Madam President, the first thing I would say, in response to Senator BOXER's eloquent faith-based conclusion, is: Amen, Sister.

Secondly, in this last 2 or 3 hours that we have begun this very important debate you can see the different

arguments forming. There are serious arguments. They are important arguments. So I appeal to our colleagues on both sides of this issue, regardless of whether you have decided to support the bill, vote for cloture on the motion to proceed so we can finally have the kind of debate from which we will all learn and from which the American people will take some encouragement that we are dealing with this problem.

It is obvious that one of the main arguments, perhaps the main one, will be its cost. This is an important issue which we want to discuss. The part that I respectfully take issue with is those who call this a tax increase. It is not a tax increase.

Senator WARNER and I had some choices to make. One was to do nothing. We rejected that. I suppose if you still feel we should do nothing, that, of course, you will want to come out and argue for that.

But we decided we had to do something. We had three choices. One was a carbon tax. We rejected that. One, because we do not think it is viable here. Two, it does not guarantee that you are going to reduce carbon emissions.

Second, we had an old-fashioned command-and-control option; mandate that this happens, control everything. We rejected that as well because it is inflexible.

The third choice was a market-based choice. Set the general ground rules, mandate a reduction in the cap, and leave it to the market. The fees that are raised under this bill are voluntarily accepted by people who decide they need to buy allowances. This is not a tax increase. We rejected a tax increase.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I am pleased to be here today for the opening debate on global climate change and the Lieberman-Warner Climate Security Act.

The issue of global climate change is a pressing one that has ramifications far beyond our imagination. It is my firm belief that we need to temporarily put aside what we do not know about climate change and its potential impacts and to focus instead on what we do know in order to begin to address this critical problem.

We know that the science is clear. Some might respectfully disagree, but they are in the minority. In fact, the science is so clear and the observations on the ground are so convincing that more than half of the States of this great Nation and more than 800 cities have taken the bull by the horns and have enacted or are working to enact legislation to reduce carbon emissions.

I am the strongest supporter of states rights and I commend these States for their vision and their leadership absent Federal action. But we cannot have a patchwork approach to addressing climate change. Federal leadership is now warranted in this case.

We know that allowing global climate change to go unchecked will re-

sult in increased threats to global security. In April 2007 the Center for Naval Analysis Corporation issued a report, "National Security and the Threat of Climate Change," which detailed the numerous threats posed by climate change.

The report found that global climate change does pose a significant threat to America's national security. The extreme weather and ecological conditions associated with climate change have the potential to "disrupt our way of life and to force changes in the way we keep ourselves safe and secure."

Some of the destabilizing impacts described in the report include: reduced access to fresh water, impaired food production, human health emergencies, and displacement of people. These are hardships that the globe will have to face.

These serious implications of climate change will have security consequences for the United States. For example, there will be an increased potential for failed nations and growth of global terrorism.

Another serious implication of climate change is the mass migrations of people that are likely to occur. Lack of water and food will force the movement of people. In the United States, the rate of immigration from Mexico is likely to rise because the water situation in Mexico is already marginal and could worsen with less rainfall and more droughts.

In addition to these indirect risks to national security, there are also direct impacts on U.S. military systems, infrastructure and operations. Climate change will add stress to our weapons system, threaten U.S. bases throughout the world, and have a direct effect on military readiness. As stated in the CNA report:

As military leaders, we know we cannot wait for certainty. Failing to act because a warning isn't precise is unacceptable.

We know that the fate of the copious coal resources within our borders hinges on Congress providing regulatory certainty. Have you seen the record of late? Permit after permit for coal-fired powerplant is being declined. In fact, 54 percent of coal capacity ordered since 2000 has been canceled or put on hold in the last 2 years, in part due to uncertainty about climate legislation. The way to ensuring coal remains a viable resource for the future and allowing coal to continue to provide more than half the power in the U.S. is to give regulatory certainty so that investors will once again finance the building of coal-fired powerplants.

With that said, I know that the coal industry doesn't support this bill. But we have done our best to provide more than the financial support the industry says is necessary to fund the technologies such as carbon capture and storage that are going to allow coal to remain viable. But inaction is not an option for our Nation, and it is not the best path forward for coal.

The concept of mandatory, by law, cap-and-trade is proven to work. Cap-

and-trade harnesses the best of free market power and brings in industry, as partners, in solving the energy and emissions challenges in the future. With all due respect to those who support the carbon tax approach, I believe while the administration of such a new tax may be simpler, there is no guarantee you get the environmental benefit that consumers are paying for.

The very suggestion that there will be some huge increase in gas prices due to capping pollution is false. It is a scare tactic. Absent any program, gas prices have gone up about \$1.10 this year alone. What the increases show is that the status quo of laws are not working.

The United States will be hostage to the price of oil until we reduce our demand—and a cap on carbon is the most effective step we can take toward that goal. This bill provides a very large incentive for the private sector to receive the investment so they can create improved and new alternative sources of energy. It funds advanced vehicle technology, efficient hybrid fleets, advanced biofuels and mass transit that will transform the transportation sector and reduce our dependence on oil.

Modeling suggests that the Act would reduce imports by 8 million barrels per day by 2025, more than the entire amount currently imported from OPEC. Overall, it reduces oil imports by up to 58 percent.

We also know that the cost of inaction is much more likely to hurt American families and the American way of life more than the potential costs of action.

Not addressing climate change is not going to keep energy bills low. Increased demand for energy will drive prices up, without the incentives for expanding the use of alternative energy sources or providing a safety net for consumers, as my bill would do.

I relish this opportunity to debate climate change legislation in the Senate. It is my hope that we will have robust debate. I want my colleagues, both those who agree with my bill and those who don't, to have ample opportunity to offer amendments. If we are going to be serious, serious consideration must be given to all members who want to have their say in this landmark debate.

In closing, I look forward to the time ahead spent on this bill, and I am available to address any questions, concerns, or issues my colleagues wish to raise with me.

Madam President, once again, I think as we debated this afternoon, the bill has been passed out, put on each desk. I hope that represents the majority of our colleagues will agree to letting this bill go forward, because it is not just the bill, it shows the American people we are doing their business.

We are trying, through a debate, well-intentioned individuals on both sides, to solve one of the most difficult problems ever facing America, our energy shortages, our increased prices of

energy, carbon emissions, how it has affected our environment, all those things.

Here it is. This is our joint effort, together with the chairman and members of the committee. If there is a better idea, bring it forward. This is the function which our Founding Fathers established this institution for. Bring forth our ideas and let us produce something and show the American people we can solve their problems.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from 20 different prominent, well-known industrial firms, confirming that this bill is necessary, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

DEAR SENATOR: The undersigned companies and organizations urge you to vote in favor of the Climate Security Act, S. 3036 (formerly S. 2191), which is expected to be considered by the full Senate beginning June 2. This is a very important vote on a bipartisan plan to address climate change. Prompt action on climate change is essential to protect America's economy, security, quality of life and natural environment.

The Climate Security Act, as revised in the manager's substitute amendment released last week, sets forth a sound overall framework for reducing America's emissions of greenhouse gases. Most notably, it establishes an emissions cap that steadily reduces greenhouse gas emissions from current levels at a rate of about 1.8% annually. The bill creates a flexible cap-and-trade system to achieve these reductions at lower cost by tapping the power of free markets. It includes an unprecedented national investment in zero- and low-carbon technologies, and includes important policies to advance energy efficiency and alternative energy sources. The bill provides assistance to small energy consumers, including low-income families, to ease the transition to a low-carbon economy. And the bill protects American industry to ease the transition to a cleaner future.

We all support the framework and approach contained in the Climate Security Act. However, we also recognize that there is continued work to be done to refine the details of the legislation through the amendment process in the Senate and as a bill is taken up in the House. Some of the undersigned groups have already communicated with you on amendments and will continue to do so and others may do so later.

However, we think it is notable and a testament to the work of the bill's sponsors and contributors that such a diverse group of interests are united on the following essential issue:

A "yes" vote for the Climate Security Act represents historic leadership to advance bipartisan solutions to climate change; a "no" vote will slow progress and maintain the status quo, which only increases the risks of unavoidable consequences and potentially greater economic costs that could result from the need for even steeper reductions in the future.

Sincerely,

Lee Califf, Director, Government Affairs, Alcoa.

Yvonne A. McIntyre, Vice President, Federal Legislative Affairs, Calpine Corporation.

Elizabeth Thompson, Legislative Director, Environmental Defense Action Fund.

Betsy Moler, Executive Vice President, Government and Environmental Affairs and Public Policy, Exelon Corporation.

Chris Bennett, Executive Vice President, FPL Group.

Ann R. Klee, Vice President, Corporate Environmental Programs, General Electric.

The Rev. Canon Sally G. Bingham, Founder and President, The Regeneration Project, Interfaith Power and Light Campaign.

Newton B. Jones, International President, The International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, Blacksmiths, Forgers, and Helpers.

Scott Kovarovics, Conservation Director, Izaak Walton League of America.

Thomas B. King, Executive Director of Electricity Distribution and Generation, National Grid.

Mark Wenzler, Director, Clean Air and Climate Programs, National Parks Conservation Association.

Jeremy Symons, Executive Director, Global Warming Program, National Wildlife Federation.

David Hawkins, Director of Climate Programs, Natural Resources Defense Council.

Steven Corneli, Vice President, Market and Climate Policy, NRG Energy, Inc.

Phyllis Cuttino, Director, US Global Warming Campaign, Pew Environment Group.

Melissa Lavinson, Director, Federal Environmental Affairs and Corporate Responsibility, PG&E Corporation.

Eric Svenson, VP of Environment, Health and Safety, Public Service Enterprise Group.

Steve Moyer, Vice President for Government Affairs, Trout Unlimited.

William P. Hite, General President, United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipe Fitting Industry of the United States and Canada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. INHOFE. I have 1 minute 50 seconds remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. INHOFE. I have to do this pretty fast. Let me respond to some of the things the majority stated.

First of all, when they make the statement that this, talking about the price of gas, all this happened during the Republican administration, let me assure you this happened because of the Democrats in the Senate voting against any increase in supply.

Now, if anyone has any doubt about that, go to our Web site www.epw—thatstandsforEnvironmentandPublicWorks—epw.senate.gov/minority. Look that up. You will see that I have documented the votes all the way back to the middle 1990s, when we have tried to increase our supply of energy or our refining capacity.

Secondly, the statements that this is not a tax bill, I would only read to you the total revenue generated through carbon sales auctions for consumers of power, heating, cooling, and gasoline: \$6.7 trillion. That is their figure, not my figure.

The maximum potentially rebated to consumers would be \$2.5 trillion. That leaves \$4.2 trillion. If that is not a \$4.2 trillion tax increase, I don't know what it is.

Thirdly, the fact that all labor seems to be for this. I suggest that Senators talk to the United Mine Workers, who are very much opposed to it, the United Auto Workers, who are opposed

to it. As far as the various communities on the chart shown by the junior Senator from California, there are many of evangelical associations. We had a press conference. They all showed up. They are all very much opposed to this, and all these are Scripturally based.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. INHOFE. Has all time expired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

CLOTURE MOTION

Under the previous order, pursuant to rule XXII, the clerk will report the motion to invoke cloture.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close the debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 742, S. 3036, the Lieberman-Warner Climate Security Act of 2008.

Barbara Boxer, Richard Durbin, Byron L. Dorgan, Charles E. Schumer, Sheldon Whitehouse, Bill Nelson, Amy Klobuchar, Dianne Feinstein, Joseph Lieberman, Daniel K. Akaka, Christopher J. Dodd, Tom Harkin, Daniel K. Inouye, Max Baucus, Ron Wyden, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Harry Reid.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S. 3036, a bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish a program to decrease emissions of greenhouse gases, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN), the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. OBAMA), and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN) would vote "yea."

Mr. KYL. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITEHOUSE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 74, nays 14, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 141 Leg.]

YEAS—74

Akaka	Durbin	Murray
Alexander	Ensign	Nelson (FL)
Bayh	Feingold	Nelson (NE)
Bennett	Feinstein	Pryor
Bingaman	Graham	Reed
Bond	Grassley	Reid
Boxer	Gregg	Roberts
Brown	Hagel	Rockefeller
Brownback	Harkin	Salazar
Cantwell	Hutchison	Sanders
Cardin	Inouye	Schumer
Carper	Isakson	Smith
Casey	Johnson	Snowe
Chambliss	Kerry	Specter
Cochran	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Coleman	Kohl	Stevens
Collins	Leahy	Sununu
Conrad	Levin	Tester
Corker	Lieberman	Thune
Cornyn	Lincoln	Vitter
Crapo	Lugar	Voivovich
Dodd	Martinez	Warner
Dole	McCaskill	Webb
Domenici	Menendez	Whitehouse
Dorgan	Mikulski	

NAYS—14

Allard	Craig	Kyl
Barrasso	DeMint	McConnell
Bunning	Enzi	Sessions
Byrd	Hatch	Shelby
Coburn	Inhofe	

NOT VOTING—12

Baucus	Kennedy	Murkowski
Biden	Landrieu	Obama
Burr	Lautenberg	Wicker
Clinton	McCain	Wyden

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 74, the nays are 14. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. DORGAN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I do not see the ranking member on the floor, but I do see Senator MCCONNELL here. So if I could get Senator MCCONNELL's attention for a brief moment.

I understand from my colleagues on the other side that they do not intend to filibuster. So I would inquire, based on the vote we have just had, can we now agree that following morning business tomorrow we can begin consideration of the legislation?

I ask unanimous consent that following morning business on Tuesday, June 3, all postcloture time be yielded back, the motion to proceed be agreed to, and the Senate then proceed to the consideration of S. 3036.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, the Republican side certainly intends to use the full debate time and, therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I wonder if I modified my request to provide that following the official Senate photograph on Tuesday, all postcloture time be yielded back, the motion to proceed be agreed to, and the Senate proceed to S. 3036.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KYL. Objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, let me say, I am a little disappointed. First, I thank my colleagues from the bottom of my heart, and I know Senator LIEBERMAN and Senator WARNER are very gratified by this vote. We are going to move forward. We are challenging the status quo. We want to get us off foreign oil. We want to begin to move toward energy independence and a clean and healthy environment and green jobs and all the rest. So this is a great start.

But I am a little disappointed we cannot move to begin the real debate which comes, obviously, after cloture on the motion to proceed. I am sorry that is the case. But I say to my colleagues here, on both sides, we look forward to a very important debate on this legislation. This is a matter that is bigger than any one of us here. I think the fact that you have a Democrat, an Independent, and a Republican bringing you this legislation speaks to this issue. I think this is an issue that has to leap over those differences.

I hope we can all show up tomorrow. Since we are going to have this time—I am disappointed we cannot get to the amendment process, but we will take advantage of the time. I know Senator KERRY will be here in the morning. He is a national leader on this issue, and I intend to yield as much time as he would want. I hope Senator FEINSTEIN will come tomorrow. Looking around, Senator CANTWELL, Senator KLOBUCHAR, and Senator LINCOLN have all played such a major role in the part that dealt with making sure our consumers who are in need get help. Senator COLLINS just went on the bill. We have a great number of people here whose voices need to be heard, so I look forward to that debate tomorrow.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, we, too, look forward to the debate. I won't list all of the Members on our side who have asked to be recognized to speak on this bill, but obviously both sides have a lot of Members who wish to speak to the bill before we even get to the amendment process. That is the reason we want to utilize the full time that is available under the rules for that purpose, not intending to filibuster the bill. But I think it is also going to be important that we do proceed to amendments when that 30 hours is used. You will find the Republicans most anxious to go to amendments which can be offered and then debated and considered. So we will hold the other side to the proposition of getting votes on lots of amendments on this legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I can't let that go by. I mean, we are ready to start the amendment process now. We are ready to start work on this bill now. There is no reason to wait 30 hours. I think colleagues in the course of offering amendments can speak for as much time as they want. It is disappointing to hear that we do have to delay. We are ready, willing, and able to get to the amendment process.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, might I just make one other comment in response to the Senator from California?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. KYL. This is one of the most dramatic—or would be, if passed—one of the most dramatic changes in law, as one publication pointed out, since the 1930s in terms of increasing the scope of Government. Surely we can spend 30 hours debating this important legislation. It is massive in its intent, in its goals, in its scope, and in its effect on the American people. According to the Congressional Budget Office, it would result in a tax increase on the American people of over \$900 billion and a gas tax increase of 53 cents per gallon. Surely, the Senate, the greatest deliberative body in the world, can take 30 hours to debate something of this magnitude before we begin the amending process. I thank my colleagues for appreciating that point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I would politely point out to the Senator from Arizona—and I think he knows this full well—that the first amendment that comes up is subject to endless debate. There is no limit. The notion that we have to have 30 hours before we can get to a debate on an amendment—each amendment is subject to endless debate; the bill itself is subject to endless debate. So the concept of coming out here and saying: Oh, we have to have 30 hours—this bill will be debated, every amendment will be debated. But it would serve the Senate's purpose to actually get to an amendment now and then we could spend 30, 40, 48 hours, a week—we all know this is going to take a while—legislating an important bill does take a while here. But this notion that we have to spend 30 hours without any amendment just to talk about the bill when the bill will be exhaustively talked about in the context of any amendment is, frankly, specious.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I would just add to this debate about the 30 hours that it is going to be a reality, and I would say this: Senator BOXER, Senator WARNER, and I are going to be on the floor. This is an important matter. I think most important to the reality we now face of the 30 hours of debate is that our colleagues, no matter what their position on this legislation, should come to the floor, let's debate

it, and then let's go to the amendments. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I was in my home State last week, and I can tell my colleagues that the American people have a very low knowledge of this bill, certainly the vocabulary in it. I think 30 hours that we will spend on this floor talking about a bill that is so important—so important to the environment, so important to energy security, at a time when gasoline prices are where they are, combined with the fact that people care deeply about the environment—is most appropriate, and my guess is that we are going to have a lot of technical amendments using language that most people in this body do not use. We are going to be talking about an auction process that has never been put in place in this country, an allocation process that will be allocating trillions of dollars to people around this country. I think for us to spend 30 hours talking about that so that all Senators are fully aware of what this bill says prior to voting on amendments is most appropriate. I would think that people who have spent a year putting this bill together would relish the time to talk about what this bill actually does and what it says. I look forward to being a very active participant in that. I thank the sponsors for bringing this forward.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thought it would be a good time to thank you, since you are here in the chair today, for all of your hard work on this bill. This has been a long time in coming. When you got on the committee, when you came as a new colleague, you worked so hard. You and AMY KLOBUCHAR and BEN CARDIN and BERNIE SANDERS, all new Members, became my right arm on this issue.

I wanted to make that note. Also, I want to say specifically that the Senator's work on the wildlife and enforcement sections, to name two, I think is really important because we are going to push hard to make this bill the law of the land right now. If we don't achieve that, eventually we will have a bill that will be the law of the land. The Senator's work will be present in all of those iterations going forward. So I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I am waiting for the closing script, and I will do that when it arrives. I was taken by the Senator from Tennessee, Mr. CORKER, who has been a very interesting member in terms of this issue. He went with our committee to Greenland and saw the

ice melt. I have to say to those who haven't been, it ought to be required if you really care about this issue. It is extraordinary. You can actually sit and watch the ice move and melt—the ice up there in Greenland. The average age of these enormous icebergs is 9,000 years.

Mr. President, from the minute that ice starts moving, it is a year until these enormously beautiful icebergs melt to nothing, leaving the sea to rise as they melt. Senator CORKER was very taken by that. He will speak for himself, but he has problems with this bill. I don't agree with him in the way he is interpreting the bill, but that is all going to come out. He talked about the importance of debating. I have to smile because today we had to debate, and we should not have to debate a motion to proceed. That is ridiculous. We should just proceed. We had a 74-to-14 vote to move to the first step.

Let's get to the bill. I have never seen a situation where you force more debate time when you really are interested in doing a bill. You usually force debate time when you are interested in slowing down the bill. This is the way it is here. If you want to move forward, then you don't say: I need 30 hours.

It will be interesting to see what happens tomorrow. As Senator REID said, I will be on the floor of the Senate all day. I encourage my colleagues—particularly those who worked hard on the bill—to join me. Let's see how many from the opposing side come over here. We need to debate them and refute them because already, I say to my friend from Rhode Island, we had charts on this floor that you would not believe. We had charts that had numbers that were out of the air, predicting a 140-percent increase in gasoline, when I can tell you right now, we looked at every model, and it is nothing like that.

As a matter of fact, we know the slight increase in the cost of gasoline that could occur—2 cents a year—from the impact of the bill will be entirely offset by the energy efficiency bill we just voted for and is now the law.

What we know is that this bill is going to get us off foreign oil, move us away from the status quo. Go out on the street and ask the average American: Are you happy with big oil, the record profits for them and their executives, and we are getting killed at the pumps? They will say: No—unless they are related to one of them.

If you say: Do you think it makes us look good when President Bush goes to the Middle East and kisses dictators and holds their hand and begs for oil? Does that make America look strong? They will say: No.

Next, if you ask them: Would you support legislation that will lead us to energy independence once and for all—and, by the way, we will clean up our environment, the greenhouse gas pollution, and we will save the planet? They will say: Yes.

So our opponents have a very tough job. They have to fight for the status

quo. I can say from their presentations today—and they worked hard on them, believe me—in order to fight our bill, they have to distort it. One of them said it is a tax increase. There is no tax increase in this bill. There is a huge tax relief fund for tax cuts in this bill. There is another almost \$1 trillion in a fund to give consumers relief.

If today was any indication, we are going to have a spirited debate. I only ask my colleagues to debate the bill that is on the Senate floor, not one that came to them from some special interest groups that oppose this and don't want us to go to energy independence.

I wish to read from a statement from former Vice President Al Gore. Since Senator CORKER is from Tennessee. I thought it would be interesting to put his statement in the RECORD:

I want to commend Senator Boxer for her leadership of the Environment and Public Works Committee. We have the first global warming bill in history that is comprehensive, bipartisan, and that enjoys support across the country, from labor and agriculture, to the business and the environmental community.

Then he says he wants the bill to be stronger, but then he says it is vital that Congress begins to act.

I think this last line is so important:

While it is important that people change their light bulbs, it is even more important that we change the laws.

I think that says it all. We are so late to this issue. We are so late. My Governor, a Republican, and my State legislature, Democratic, crossed party lines and passed laws. We now have just in the last year or so hundreds of new solar energy companies that have moved into the State, and they are hiring people who are hurting because of the crisis we have in the housing and construction business. So we believe a P-32—they have told us this—the bill leading the way in the country, is restoring economic renaissance to our State which otherwise is hurting very badly because of the recession we are all experiencing. We owe this to our grandkids, to our kids. We know the Conference of Mayors has acted, so have the State legislatures, along with Governors reaching across party lines, city councils, and boards of supervisors. Companies are saying we should do this. Labor unions are saying we should do this. Environmental and religious groups are saying we should do this. So there is no question that we need to act.

When somebody gets up on the other side and says they are not slowing it down, but they are going to require 30 hours of extra debate before we get to amending this bill, excuse me, but I have been here long enough to know they are trying to slow-walk this bill. The other side is slow-walking it.

I want them to read the scientific records, listen to the religious leaders, and listen to the venture capitalists coming forward and saying we need a signal now. Listen to Tony Blair,

George Bush's best friend internationally, saying we must act because America is pivotal. So we have our time tomorrow, after we wait here for people to come and talk, and at some point maybe they will give us permission to start the amendment process.

Our children want us to act. I have to tell you that one of the great moments was when Senator WARNER came to me and said: My daughters really care about this issue. I knew if they were talking to him, he might be open to this issue. He saved the day in committee. He is a man who has such a great legacy already. He didn't have to do one more piece of legislation. He has his place in history on national security. He understood that global warming is a national security issue. Our Navy intelligence officials tell us that, and we will have some quotes tomorrow.

This is a win-win bill for national security, for our kids. It is a win for clean air, and it is a win for our consumers and for our workers and our businesses. Anything to the contrary—I believe this so much—is just scare tactics.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I want to thank my colleagues for holding the vote open as long as they could. Unfortunately, both of the trains I hoped would get me here were late, and I missed the vote by 10 minutes. I wish I had been able to get here in time to deliver this statement in support of cloture on the motion to proceed to the Climate Security Act, and to vote aye.

Mr. President, this is a historic moment. For the first time we have before the Senate legislation to slow, stop, and reverse greenhouse gas emissions in the United States.

When such a plan is finally passed, signed and enacted, we will look back on this day as the beginning. Let us commit ourselves to that goal.

And let us begin this historic process today by allowing the Senate to take up the Climate Security Act.

In our own country, and among our fellow citizens on this planet, we face a common threat. Now is the time for us to fashion a common response.

I introduced climate change legislation over two decades ago, in 1986, at a time when this issue was just on the horizon. It called for the establishment of national strategy to understand and respond to the emerging threat of global warming.

Even at that early date, this was a bipartisan effort.

I was joined by Senator Mack Mathias, a Maryland Republican. In those early days, Senators KERRY and Gore were also leaders, along with John Chafee.

This remains a bipartisan effort today. In fact, on the legislation laid down this afternoon, the Boxer-Lieberman-Warner bill, we have all three political parties represented.

This debate would not be happening without leadership from both parties over the years. Senator MCCAIN joined

Senator LIEBERMAN in introducing the first Senate cap-and-trade legislation.

Senator WARNER has made climate change the issue that will cap his already distinguished career in the Senate.

We would not be at this point today, without the leadership of Senator BOXER, who has made global warming the signature issue of her Chairmanship of our Environment Committee.

Later in this debate, I intend to offer an amendment, with Senator LUGAR, along with Senators KERRY, WARNER, MENENDEZ, and SNOWE, calling for renewed leadership by the United States in international climate change negotiations.

I make these points because we all know that this debate hangs now in a delicate balance between the best, bipartisan instincts of the Senate, on the one hand, and the temptation, so strong at this time in an election year, to score partisan points.

I hope that we do not succumb to that temptation. Global warming is real, it is happening now, and the American people look to us for the political will to fashion a solution.

We know that our physical climate is changing. And we all know that the political climate in the United States is changing, too.

For too many years, the United States has stayed on the sidelines of international efforts to combat global warming.

We have missed the chance to turn the impending threat of catastrophic climate change into an opportunity to reduce the security threat of our dependence on oil, to reduce the health threat from pollution, to reduce the sheer waste and inefficiency in our economy.

And we missed the chance to do what many of the leading businesses in this country know we should do—capture a leadership position in the global competition for the next generation of clean technologies.

With this debate, we are taking the first steps toward meeting our responsibilities and seizing those opportunities.

The physical consequences of global warming are right before our eyes: the shrinking polar ice cap, retreating glaciers, changing growing seasons, animal migration, and rainfall patterns.

In my own State of Delaware, our coastlines are threatened by rising sea levels and the threat of stronger storms from warmer ocean temperatures. Our wetlands, crucial to wildlife, water quality, and fisheries, are threatened as salt water intrudes on the richest biological zones in our State.

The groundwater we depend on is similarly threatened by saltwater. As we draw from our aquifers, rising levels of sea water seep into the water table, accelerating their depletion.

This is not an abstract threat—it is right here at home, where we live.

Our national borders, our cities, our cultures, are all built around patterns

of rainfall, arable land, and coastlines that will be redrawn as global warming proceeds.

Even the richest nations, the historical source of the emissions behind global warming, will face huge costs coping with those catastrophes.

The poorest nations, whose economies have contributed little or nothing to the greenhouse gases in our atmosphere, will be hit the worst, and will have the fewest resources with which to respond.

And now a third category has emerged: the rapidly expanding developing nations which will be the leading sources of greenhouse gases in the future.

Those nations must be part of the solution. But the United States must be willing to lead.

In the course of becoming the wealthiest nation in history, we became the greatest historical emitter of greenhouse gasses now in the atmosphere.

Now, other nations are following our path to wealth, and will become the next generation of major emitters.

It is no answer to say that we must now wait for poorer nations to act before we take steps to lead the way to a global solution.

That is not the leadership this global threat demands, Mr. President.

We must first reach agreement here on our domestic approach to global warming. That is why this debate is so crucial.

There will be honest differences on the best way to move to a low-carbon economy. But no serious analyst of this issue believes that the world can sustain business as usual.

This is a global problem, that demands a global solution. But that solution will be built on the commitments of each individual nation to do its part.

For too long, our differences have been stressed at the expense of the global good. Our constituents look to us to reconcile those differences, to find a way to respond in the name of the common good.

We are now engaged in the search to define and secure a truly global common good. I urge my colleagues to vote for cloture, to join in a constructive debate, in the best tradition of the Senate.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MORNING BUSINESS

REVERSAL OF THE HARTNESS V. NICHOLSON DECISION

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, on April 24, 2008, the Senate passed S. 1315, the proposed Veterans' Benefits Enhancement Act of 2007. Although the bill passed the Senate by a vote of 96-1, there are some who oppose it, expressing the belief that provisions in the bill misallocate VA pension benefits to reward nonveterans. I seek to set the record straight on S. 1315.