

Oklahoma. I told them to come down and talk about anything they wanted to. They talked about the same things we have talked about over the last three debates on this bill. Is this a perfect bill? It absolutely is not. Farm bills are always massive pieces of legislation. It is a 5-year bill. It spends \$600 billion over 10 years. I had my staff check, though, and while I appreciate the comments of the Senator from South Carolina, the 2002 farm bill spent \$800 billion over 10 years. So we are \$200 billion below the 2002 farm bill on a 10-year basis.

Again, it is not perfect. But what it does do is provide a school lunch program to needy kids as well as kids who can afford to pay. We are providing food stamps to people in this country who would go hungry otherwise. We are providing a food bank supplement to our food banks around the country that provide such great, valuable services to hungry people in America. We are providing the right kind of tax incentives in the form of reforming the Endangered Species Act in a positive way. We have been trying to reform the Endangered Species Act in all of my 14 years in Congress. This is the first time we have been able to do it. We did it with 250 organizations supporting it. We have good tax provisions that allow the perpetuation of land so it can't be developed forever. My children and my grandchildren will have the ability to enjoy farmland in my part of Georgia that they might otherwise not have the opportunity to enjoy.

So is it a perfect bill? No. Do we provide a safety net for farmers? You bet we do. Prices are not always going to be high. We depend today on foreign imports of oil for 62 percent of our needs. We can never, ever afford to depend on importing food into this country in the same percentage that we import oil today.

While it is not a perfect bill, while there are things that, if I had to write it by myself, I might not have written it this way, overall it is a very good piece of legislation. It covers a broad swath of America, from farming to hunger to conservation to measures involving good tax policy.

With that, I ask for passage of this bill. On behalf of Senator DEMINT, who is not here—and I know a lot of my folks would like to have a voice vote, but because I know Senator DEMINT wants the yeas and nays, unfortunately, I will have to ask for the yeas and nays on behalf of Senator DEMINT and ask for a recorded vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, first of all, let me just speak as a conservative as we address the farm bill. First of all, I have been ranked as the most conservative Member, so I don't think I should have to prove my credentials.

Here is one of the things that people should understand: They should under-

stand that the vote today on the farm bill was not a vote on this farm bill or another farm bill; it was a vote on this farm bill or reauthorizing the 2002 farm bill.

A couple of things that are in here that people should know in a conservative way are, No. 1, under the previous farm bill that would have been reauthorized, a farmer could be making up to \$2.5 million and still get subsidies. This takes it down to a half million.

Secondly, the three-entity rule is out in this farm bill. Previously, someone could be claiming these benefits under three different farms; now they can't do that. So there are many reasons to vote for this bill other than those things that people have been talking about during the debate. I believe that is a conservative vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 6124) was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The yeas and nays are ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. OBAMA), and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WEBB) 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 New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

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

The result was announced—yeas 77, nays 15, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 144 Leg.]

YEAS—77

Akaka	Crapo	Lincoln
Alexander	Dodd	Martinez
Allard	Dole	McCaskill
Barrasso	Dorgan	McConnell
Baucus	Durbin	Menendez
Bayh	Enzi	Mikulski
Bingaman	Feingold	Murray
Bond	Feinstein	Nelson (FL)
Boxer	Graham	Nelson (NE)
Brown	Grassley	Pryor
Brownback	Harkin	Reid
Bunning	Hutchison	Roberts
Burr	Inhofe	Rockefeller
Cantwell	Inouye	Salazar
Cardin	Isakson	Sanders
Carper	Johnson	Schumer
Casey	Kerry	Sessions
Chambliss	Klobuchar	Shelby
Cochran	Kohl	Smith
Coleman	Landrieu	Snowe
Conrad	Lautenberg	Specter
Corker	Leahy	Stabenow
Cornyn	Levin	Stevens
Craig	Lieberman	

Tester	Vitter	Wicker
Thune	Warner	Wyden

NAYS—15

Bennett	Ensign	Murkowski
Coburn	Hagel	Reed
Collins	Hatch	Sununu
DeMint	Kyl	Voinovich
Domenici	Lugar	Whitehouse

NOT VOTING—8

Biden	Gregg	Obama
Byrd	Kennedy	Webb
Clinton	McCaIn	

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it appears at this time, for the knowledge of all Senators, we are going to try to have a vote as early in the morning as possible on cloture on the global warming bill. Unless someone has some real concerns, we will probably try to do it around 9 o'clock in the morning so people can leave at a relatively early time tomorrow. That should be the only vote we are going to have. We were going to try to do a judge, but the committee's meeting was objected to today, so I didn't believe that was appropriate.

So we are going to do the vote in the morning, and we will have a couple of votes Tuesday morning. Monday is a no-vote day. Hopefully, tomorrow we won't be in too late, but we will be here as late as anyone wants to be here to talk about anything they want.

I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

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

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

CLIMATE SECURITY ACT

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I stand this evening to speak about the Boxer substitute to the Warner-Lieberman carbon cap-and-trade bill. I have had an opportunity for several days now to hear discussion from both sides. I think coming from a State such as Alaska where we can see the effects of climate change on the ground in my home State, it is a very important issue for me, and so I feel compelled to share with my colleagues some of my thoughts about what we are seeing up north.

We appreciate that there is not quite a consensus in Alaska about what is causing the change we are seeing. Most Alaskans, however, do seem to agree that something is happening. We are seeing a change in the north, and we have been seeing it for a period of decades. The results are having a significant impact on the lifestyle of Alaskans.

One of the things we are seeing in a northern State, an arctic State such as Alaska is that our winters are warmer. We are seeing breakup come earlier in the spring, although this spring it has been actually extra snowy, so it is tough to say that it is always that way, but we are seeing breakup coming earlier. Our summers seem to be hotter. The storms we are seeing, particularly along the coastline, are stronger. We are seeing a migration. We are seeing wildlife habitation and migration patterns that are different. The oceans, the lakes, the river ice—we are seeing this form later in the year. We are also seeing that it forms and it is weaker than we have seen. It is melting sooner in the spring. We are seeing permafrost thawing in some places. All of this has an impact on hunting, on fishing, on the roads as we travel, certainly, on the construction that is underway in the State, and sometimes on our very way of life.

Last week, the National Science and Technology Council released its latest assessment of what has been happening due to climate change. While this report has already been mentioned by several on this floor already, I wish to concentrate on its findings for Alaska. In that report, it finds that temperatures in the State of Alaska have increased 3 to 5 degrees Fahrenheit on average, and in the winters, what we are seeing is that the winters are 7 to 10 degrees warmer over the past 50 years. That warming has a number of impacts.

Mr. President, these are important for all Members to hear. When we talk about the ice in the Arctic sea ice pack, the pack ice up north has shrunk by an area which is twice the size of Texas. This reduction in the ice has occurred since 1979. So within this time period, about 30 years, we have seen an area shrunk that is twice the size of Texas. Between the years 2005 and 2007, 23 percent more of the ice has melted. More important, what we are seeing is that the thick, multiyear ice has been steadily thinning, having reduced by about 3 feet from 1987 to 1997, which means more of the Beaufort Sea is open by late summer, which increases the danger of the coastal erosion from the storms. More troubling, it helps to warm the water and thus the environment even more.

We have nearly a dozen coastal villages in the State of Alaska that need major assistance. In some cases, it is more than assistance in shoring up an eroding coastline, it is relocation of whole villages to higher ground. This is at a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars per village. Ask the residents of villages such as Shishmaref, Kivalina, Unalakleet, and Newtok—to name four—about the changes they have witnessed in the climate over the past two decades. We are seeing that on the coastline.

The report says the permafrost base in Alaska has been thawing at a rate of up to 1.6 inches a year since 1992. This

thawing of the permafrost impacts the base for roads, pipelines, houses, sewer lines, and other surface features. We also know our lakes are drying up. This is probably because the permafrost that holds their water is melting.

We know the Alaskan tree line is creeping northward, moving about 6 miles over several decades. The Federal report, while it predicts more summer precipitation in Alaska, also predicts more summer heat. That is increasing the threat of Alaska wildfires, increasing the threat of high stream temperatures that could harm our salmon, and increasing the threat of new types of diseases entering Alaska.

Scientists who have worked on the U.N. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change believe the ultimate cause is an increase in manmade carbon dioxide and other so-called greenhouse gases added to the atmosphere since the dawn of the industrial revolution.

Yet there is also a great deal of natural variation—Mother Nature at play here—which affects the Earth's climate. In April, the *Journal of Nature* printed a study suggesting that rising atmospheric temperatures are slowly, and perhaps have already stopped, rising—at least temporarily—and may remain that way for up to 7 more years as the natural variation cycle toward colder weather masks the heat.

It may seem counterintuitive to be arguing that climate change is intensifying after a very cold and snowy winter in Alaska. But I look at climate change legislation as an insurance policy, as a policy to take action to cut carbon emissions where we can, without harmful costs to our economy and way of life.

The fact that I am a cosponsor of the Bingaman-Specter carbon cap-and-trade bill is proof that I am willing to take action but not necessarily action at any price. I am not afraid of a cap-and-trade system, but let's make sure we have it right.

I do support the cap-and-trade concept because I believe it offers the opportunity to reduce carbon, at the least cost to society. The signal about future prices sent to electric powerplant operators will hopefully stimulate spending on low- and zero-carbon renewable energy plants now.

A price signal will make gasification technology more attractive as a means of producing petrochemicals for the future. It will spur research and new technology to allow for the commercial-scale plants needed to capture and store carbon underground. I believe a price signal will also generate new technology and new jobs—hopefully, more than will be lost in fossil industries and from an overall slowdown in the economy caused by the potentially high cost of industry buying carbon emissions at auctions and passing the costs on to each one of us.

When you listen to all the suggestions and ideas out there, you may think: What is it I am looking for in a

perfect carbon bill? I guess my perfect bill would set a price signal only high enough to encourage technological change but without driving the poor and lower to middle-income Americans into a state where they cannot afford to get to work or they have to make choices between paying the heating bill or setting food on the table.

My perfect carbon bill would “front-load” the research and technology costs, with the Federal Government picking up a large share of that initial tab, until we perfect that new technology that permits the new energy sources to come on line at only slightly higher costs—prices high enough to encourage energy efficiency and conservation but not so high as to fundamentally alter American society.

My perfect carbon bill would set up clear procedures to help finance that new technology and development. Senator DOMENICI has proposed a clean energy bank concept. This is not included in this measure, but it helps to set up those procedures that can allow us to move this technology forward.

It would encourage all low- and zero-carbon technology, especially nuclear power, which is the only technology we have today at scale that can provide baseload power economically without carbon.

A perfect carbon bill, for me, would set the guidelines for carbon reductions but only standards that we have the technology to meet. It would not set unreasonable, early guidelines simply to punish the carbon emitters. It would have a workable “safety valve” to ease the regulations, if technology cannot come through quickly enough with means for our society to meet the lower carbon standards at a reasonable price. This is where—when you look at the Bingaman-Specter bill and the safety valve they have incorporated in that legislation—it provides for a level of assurance in terms of how bad is the situation going to be in terms of the cost and the impact to the industry. You kind of want to know how bad the bad is going to be so you have a level of certainty.

My perfect bill would generate enough revenue to help States and local governments deal with the costs of adaptation. If the scientists are right on this, the carbon that we have and are going to continue to release into the atmosphere until the new technology can come on line is going to continue to increase for a number of years. There will be costs that come with that.

In Alaska, the University of Alaska's Institute of Social and Economic Research has estimated that Alaska's governmental infrastructure—the roads, villages, ports, runways, and the schools—are already facing about \$3 billion of damage due to coastal erosion and melting permafrost. They anticipate that tally, that cost, will rise to \$80 billion by 2080, just for the governmental structures. Only the Federal Government has the resources to meet those types of costs.

I believe the substitute we have before us is making a major mistake in cutting the funding for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program and in cutting funding for the State-Federal weatherization programs that promote energy conservation. When you look at the current substitute—and I have issues in many areas—these two are ones I am not able to reconcile why, as we are trying to help people around the country deal with high energy costs, we would remove funding for LIHEAP and the weatherization programs.

I am also concerned that the substitute's cost-containment mechanisms are not flexible enough to keep companies from having to bid up the price of auction allowances. That will hurt average Americans who cannot afford the current price of energy, much less the future price of energy.

People around the country are hurting when they go to the pump, when they heat their homes, when they have to fill up with home heating fuel. We don't need to be adding more to their costs unnecessarily.

Regardless, for any climate bill we enact to make a difference, it is going to require that China, which has overtaken America as the world's leading carbon emitter, and India, along with the developing world, participate too. If they are not participating and working with us, the U.S. economy is going to become less competitive, and we will have spent money without any necessary benefits to the global environment. So we have to be in partnership on this initiative.

Already on the floor, we have heard about the varying computer models. They are all over the board. They say the average American will pay either \$446, \$739 or \$1,957 more per household for energy in 2020 or \$1,257, \$4,377 or \$6,750 more come 2030 or 2050. You look at it, and you are almost embarrassed to tell your constituent the range is somewhere between \$446 per household by 2020 or close to \$2,000 per household. We don't know. We simply don't know. My constituents say: LISA, you have to do better than that. You have to give me some idea because, right now, in Aniak, that village's people are paying \$5.53 for their gasoline. It went up this week because the spring barge came in. I am going to say to them we have this legislation that will help reduce emissions in this country, we think, if other nations participate, but I don't know how much it will cost you or how high gas is going to go in Aniak. Right now, you are paying \$6.50 for diesel. I have to be able to provide more to my constituents than that.

What is important is for the Senate to take its time to understand what the Boxer substitute would do and, perhaps, think more about what would work at the least cost and would actually make a difference in the world's climate. The more I look at it, the more I think the original Bingaman-Specter bill, with changes, is worthy of renewed consideration.

I said in a speech last week at home in Alaska that never before have Members of Congress been asked to take action on a bill that could have such a profound effect on our country, with so much difference of opinion about how much this bill is going to cost, and whether it will actually be worth the amount the American consumer will pay because of it. We have to be able to demonstrate that these are the ranges and this is the benefit so Americans can understand what we are doing.

How much this bill will cost Americans is purely dependent upon the forecasts, and the Congressional Research Service said in testimony before the Energy Committee a couple weeks ago that all these forecasts should be viewed with "attentive skepticism," especially in the outyears. That is an interesting way to put it. But whether this bill will cost \$3.3 trillion until 2050, as the bill's sponsor said last week, or more than twice that amount that other models predict, we know this bill will be the most expensive and complex measure ever before considered by any government on the planet.

I do know that, even though my constituents want us to do something in Congress, they are going to want it to be something that works. I don't want to support a bill until I am convinced that measure offers the best possible chance of protecting against climate change impacts but at the least possible cost, while still stimulating new technology—which will make the difference—that is the ultimate solution to carbon emission reductions.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON of Florida). The Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Alaska came to speak because she is at ground zero, and she explained that what is happening in her State is very serious. She knows it. She is close to it. Where I simply don't agree with her is she says our bill is going to lead to higher gas prices. We are back to that same old-same old stuff. The fact is—I will reiterate it; I have said it so much, it is probably extremely boring to those who have listened to me, but I will say it again—President Bush sent down a veto promise on this bill, and in it he said gas prices are going to go up 50 cents over the 20-year period. That is 2 cents a year. That is 12 percent over 20 years. What he didn't say is that because we passed fuel economy standards, all that is offset for our people because the fuel economy standards are going to mean you actually can go farther on a gallon of gas. So there is no increase in gas prices.

As a matter of fact, what is going to happen is, we are going to get the alternatives we need. Senator MURKOWSKI's people, my people, Senator WARNER's people, Senator REID's people, and Senator SCHUMER's people at the end of the day are going to say: Thank goodness, we are finally off for-

eign oil; we don't have to be dependent on a President—this one or the next one—going to Saudi Arabia and begging. That is the whole point of the bill.

The whole point of the bill is to get those technologies, and the bill essentially does this. We say to the people who are emitting carbon: You have to buy permits to pollute. We take half that money—more than half of it goes back to consumers through a tax cut or through the utility companies that give you credit right on your bill.

This is a good bill. This is a bill that will create jobs. This is a bill that will create the technologies.

Senator WARNER got into this whole issue because his legacy is national security. Our leaders tell us we have to act now. To have people come to this floor with a bogus argument that makes no sense is unfortunate. If we vote cloture on this bill, we will be able to amend it and move forward.

I wish to show how many people are supporting us and the groups that are supporting us. We hear a lot of my Republican friends say: We are going to lose jobs. Yes, the miners came out with a statement. They said the bill needed work. So did the UAW, the bill needed work. And we are open to that. Senator WARNER and I, Senator LIEBERMAN, and Senator KERRY said we are ready to meet with our colleagues and fix the bill. But oh, no, all they want to do really is drive this bill off the floor.

I have a list of working people who endorse this bill. So don't come here, I say to my colleagues—Senator MURKOWSKI didn't do this, but others have done it—and say, oh, we are going to lose jobs. You tell that to the International Association of Bridge, Structural, Ornamental and Reinforcing Iron Workers. Tell that to the insulators and the allied workers. Tell that to the shipbuilders. Tell that to the bricklayers. Tell that to the elevator constructors. Tell that to the painters. Tell that to the plasterers. Tell that to the journeymen. Tell that to the sheet metal workers, the teamsters, the operating engineers, and the building and construction trades. They all see what this bill will mean. It means building a new infrastructure for a new day with new energy.

The faith communities are supporting us. I am so grateful to them. It is as if I prayed for help and they came forward—the Evangelical Environmental Network and the Evangelical Climate Initiative, U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, National Council of Churches, Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism, Jewish Council of Public Affairs, the Interfaith Power and Light Campaign. Why? Because they feel so strongly that the planet is threatened and God's creation is threatened.

We cannot wait forever. We do not have a perfect bill. We want to get it started, and we cannot. It is a very sad state of affairs.

I will be happy to yield to my friend. Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

I would just like to say to my distinguished colleague from Alaska, we had a number of conversations in the course of the deliberation on this bill. I first want to say this colleague worked very hard and very conscientiously. There are honest differences of opinion on this subject. Her State, which she is so proud to represent, is quite unique. It has been severely affected by what I believe are some manifestations of climate change that are somewhat unique and without precedent. But I think in this instance, I say on behalf of my colleague, this is a decision where people of good intentions can have different views.

All I know is this colleague worked very hard to deliberate through her thinking process. I will be gone, but I will have to leave it to her, being in a leadership position next year one way or another, hopefully one of the most powerful Senate committees. I know she will apply the same amount of careful thought and consideration when that committee—I believe it is Energy; am I not correct? I am certain it will have a major role and voice in collaborating with the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

I yield the floor. I wanted to make that observation.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I reclaim my time. I thank my colleague. Yes, I have had wonderful conversations with the Senator from Alaska. The reason there is a bit of frustration in my voice is because I don't think we have much time to waste. I am very worried about delaying. I look forward to working with my colleague from Alaska.

I want to put into the RECORD also the businesses that support our bill just as it is: Alcoa, Avista, Calpine, Constellation Energy, E2, Entergy Corporation, Exelon Corporation, Florida Power and Light, General Electric, National Grid, NRG Energy, PG&E, Public Service Enterprise Group.

We have broad support of governments: the U.S. Conference of Mayors; the National Association of Clean Air Agencies; Climate Communities, which is a national coalition of cities, towns, counties, and other communities.

The people in the cities, the counties, and the States, I want to send them a message today: Don't lose heart if we don't win this vote tomorrow. We are building support. We are building support in the community, we are building support in the Senate, and the next President of the United States, regardless of whether it is Senator McCain or Senator OBAMA, supports global warming legislation.

So my friends on the other side of the aisle can say no, no, no, status quo, status quo, and they may win the day. But at the end of the day, they will not win because 89 percent of the people of America want us to tackle this problem.

Let's take a look at what the scientists are telling us. Eleven national academies of science, including the U.S. National Academies of Science, concluded that climate change is real. It is likely that most of the warming in recent decades can be attributed to human activities. The Nobel Prize-winning IPCC concluded in 2007 that global warming is unequivocal; there is a 90-percent certainty that humans have caused it.

Today, Senator WARNER, Senator LIEBERMAN, and I had an amazing press conference with a former general and a former admiral. It was really something to hear them. They said some chilling things in this global warming debate. When they ended it, they said: When we are out on the battlefield, we cannot wait for 100 percent certainty. The scientists have given us 90 percent certainty. You wait, you are going to face danger, trouble, horrible things can happen. They look at it as a campaign to stop something quite dangerous.

Let's look at the human health impacts, I thank my friend, Senator NELSON, who is in the chair, for all the work he has done on this issue. His magnificent State is another place which is ground zero. I flew with my friend—first of all, we went to the Everglades. It was an extraordinary experience and one which I shall never forget. We went with my spouse and Senator NELSON's spouse. We went through this gift from God, which is what the Everglades is. It is impossible to describe. It is like a river of grass. That is what it is called, a river of grass. A remarkable place. When we went up in our helicopter and flew over the State, I held my breath. This magnificent State. But if those sea levels rise? There cannot be enough protection. We couldn't do it. So we have to stop the problem, and that is what the Boxer-Lieberman-Warner bill does.

Look at the human health impacts of global warming in North America: increase in the frequency and duration of heat waves and heat-related illness; increase in waterborne disease from degraded water quality. Why? Because certain amoebas and bacteria can live in warmer waters. As a result, these are new kinds of creatures. We had a child in Lake Havasu get an infection in one of these warmer waters. The infection went to the brain. This is the kind of thing the Bush administration health officials are telling us.

Dr. Julie Gerberding came before our committee. It was mind boggling what she was telling us we can expect. By the way, unfortunately, a lot of her statement was redacted. Even though it was redacted, it was powerful. She basically was saying to us: Please act now.

Increased respiratory disease, including asthma and other lung diseases from increased ozone and smog, and the children and the elderly are especially vulnerable. I say to my brothers and sisters, men and women of the Sen-

ate, children and the elderly are vulnerable. This is America. We take care of the most vulnerable. They cannot do this.

We all believe in our great economic system, the free-enterprise system. There are certain things our Government has to do, which is to make sure people can have healthy lives. Part of it is that the planet be healthy. We have to act now.

I will conclude my remarks in the next 2 minutes and then will yield to my colleague for 2 minutes to do a quick Executive Calendar.

I want to talk about job growth because, again, we heard all along: Oh my goodness, this bill is going to kill job growth. In California, we have a law like this. It has done wonders. For example, we have 450 new solar energy companies. As we see a decline in the housing area—and I know my friend in the chair has seen this in Florida—a lot of the workers who would have been laid off are being grabbed up and going to work in these solar energy companies. We are so fortunate we had that, in a way, a safety net. People are so excited.

If you come to California, if you go to the Silicon Valley, the entrepreneurs there want to invest in new technologies. They will not do it until there are laws in place because they need certainty.

I will close with this: A study of the impacts of my State's law says there will be 89,000 new jobs created by 2020. There are more than 450 solar companies—I mentioned that—hiring electricians, carpenters, and plumbers. And the top manufacturing States for solar are Ohio, Michigan, California, Tennessee, and Massachusetts. That is interesting because we are seeing these new manufacturing jobs being created across America.

In closing, I will show my favorite chart of all and the one I want to end with. Let's say yes for once around this place. Let's say yes to something good, to a clean energy future, to clean green jobs, to science, to clean air, to saving the planet, to consumer protection, to a big tax cut, to a strong economy, and to the Boxer-Lieberman-Warner bill.

I thank you so much, Mr. President, and I really do thank you for your leadership in Florida and here as well.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. I thank the distinguished presiding officer.

Mr. President, I, once again, recognize the strong leadership given by the distinguished Senator from California on this legislation. It comes from the heart and a strong conviction that she thinks we are doing the right thing, and I am pleased to be a part of the team that helped engineer getting this bill prepared and to the committee and to the Senate floor.

And I don't fear the consequences of the vote tomorrow. No one can predict what it will be, but I think both of us

will walk out with a sense of satisfaction we did our best. It may well be we will go on next week. Time will tell, subject to this vote tomorrow. As we say in the Navy: Well done, sir.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF STANLEY A. MCCHRYSAL TO BE LIEUTENANT GENERAL

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 599; that the nomination be confirmed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, no other motions in order, that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate resume legislative session.

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

The nomination considered and confirmed is as follows:

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Stanley A. McChrystal

Mr. WARNER. I thank the distinguished Presiding Officer, a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee. This nomination is for General McChrystal. General McChrystal is well-known to many of us in the Senate. I recall very vividly the period when our Nation was building its force structure to go into the situation in Iraq. And putting aside all of the honest debate on that decision to go in, I think the professional soldiers like McChrystal did their job.

McChrystal used to come every morning that the Senate was in session, at 8 o'clock, and brief Senators in S. 407. I know the Presiding Officer was there on a number of occasions. He was accompanied by COL Bill Caniano, who is currently on my staff, and they answered the questions, kept the Senate informed as to the buildup of that operation as our forces built up tempo and moved into the Iraq situation. A very fine officer.

He has been in Iraq now—well, I don't think you add up the number of tours because he has basically been there almost constantly over 2½ years; one of the longest serving members, whether it is a general officer or a private, in the Iraq theater. He has distinguished himself particularly on his initiatives to take on al-Qaida at any place, at any time of day or night, and to do the very best to eliminate that threat to not only the U.S. forces, Iraqi forces, but the Iraqi people who were brutally treated by that organization. And to the extent that we have reduced that situation of al-Qaida's capabilities in Iraq today, and also Afghanistan—this officer goes back and forth between

those two theaters—then it is, I would say, with a sense of humility he would say: I think I have done my best.

I am very pleased the President recognized his outstanding career, that he has been nominated now to become the chief of staff for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in operating that very essential part of the defense complex in the Department of Defense.

I thank the Senators, I thank the leadership, the Democratic leadership, particularly Senator DURBIN, who worked on it, and Senator LEVIN; and on this side, the Senator from Alabama, Mr. SESSIONS, and others who worked with me on this nomination during the course of last night's deliberations on a variety of matters on the Senate floor.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield the floor.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now return to legislative session.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we now proceed to a period of morning business in which Senators may speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

IOWA TORNADO

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I probably will not be more than 10 minutes, but I appreciate the will of the Senate if I need a few more minutes.

Today, I pay tribute to the victims of the devastating tornado that ripped through northeast Iowa a week ago Sunday. This would have been Memorial Day weekend. That is a weekend that traditionally offers a thank-you to veterans who have given their lives. It is a time of backyard barbecues, and in the Midwest it is when swimming pools open for business. But late afternoon on May 25, 2008, Mother Nature unleashed a tragic beginning to a summer vacation. It was a kind of natural disaster that makes people realize the perils of pettiness and appreciate what really matters the most.

A history-making twister produced winds in excess of 200 miles per hour. It tore across Butler County—that is my home county—Black Hawk County, Delaware County, and Buchanan County. It paved a 43-mile path of destruction. The severe storm system virtually ripped the town of Parkersburg in half. It destroyed 22 businesses, leveled 222 homes, and damaged 408 others in a community of only 2,000. The storm system injured 70 individuals. The fatalities attributed to the tornado have now risen to eight Iowans.

But the statistics don't do justice to the heartbreak and to the hurt. Nat-

ural disasters have wrought havoc on humanity since the beginning of time. In recent years, the 2004 tsunami in Southeast Asia claimed more than 100,000 lives and displaced millions of victims from their homes. In September 2005, a category 5 hurricane ravaged the American gulf coast, causing \$11.3 billion in damages. Last year, in Greensburg, KS, a tornado leveled the entire community of 1,400, causing an estimated \$267 million in damage. The financial estimate of damage from the May 25 tornado in my home area from storms and flooding hasn't been calculated yet, but the pricetag will not do justice to the heartbreak and to the hurt.

Whether it is an earthquake, a hurricane, or a tornado, a natural disaster leaves behind massive debris and destruction. The physical and financial tolls shouldered by the victims arguably pale compared to the emotional scars and personal losses left in the aftermath of a killer natural disaster.

This tornado was what they call an F-5 tornado, the worst they get. It struck terror into the hearts and minds of northeast Iowans over Memorial Day weekend, and it also hit close to home as well. From the lawn on my farm near New Hartford, I watched what I thought was nothing but a dark storm cloud blackening the sky as the tornado made its way across Butler County from Parkersburg—population, as I said, about 2,000—to my hometown of New Hartford, population 600.

It was the first F-5 tornado to strike Iowa since 1976, so tornadoes like this don't happen every day in our State. Maybe they do in Oklahoma, but they do not every day in my State. And it happened to be the deadliest tornado in the State since the 1968 tornado in Charles City, IA. I believe that tornado claimed about 13 lives compared to the 8 so far here.

In some ways, the storm may serve as a wake-up call to those of us who have become somewhat complacent about severe weather warnings. The day after the storm, I visited with residents of Parkersburg and New Hartford and toured the damage, along with Senator HARKIN and Governor Culver, and Congressman BRALEY was there. It was an unimaginable scene.

In Parkersburg, the tornado ripped apart the Aplington-Parkersburg High School. This is a picture of that devastating damage. It will cost \$14 million to rebuild. Thank God they were well insured, I have been told. I haven't heard that directly but indirectly.

It destroyed the Parkersburg City Hall, crushed the town's only gas station, and crumbled the grocery store. If you watched CNN yesterday, you were able to find some pictures from the cameras that guard the bank during the night and over the weekend, and you saw, before they went blank, sucking everything up. And you know where a lot of those bank papers landed, and a lot of pictures from various homes? In Prairie Du Chien, WI, 100