

The outpouring of support from neighbors, friends, and strangers from near and far has given a jump-start to the necessary healing process. It underscores the decency of human nature rising above catastrophic forces of Mother Nature. The selfless sacrifice by literally scores of heroes will help mend the immeasurable heartbreak and hurts that I saw during my visits to these communities.

I say with gladness in my own heart, the F5 tornado did not extinguish the hope and pride of residents of the mid-western communities who call Parkersburg, New Hartford, Hazleton, and Dunkerton home.

I suppose maybe it is a little bit ambitious on my part to take the floor of the Senate to acknowledge this and to praise the Lord for what can be done now, and the people who have not been hurt. I suppose every one of my colleagues, particularly in the tornado channel that I most often hear about, of Kansas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Kentucky, Tennessee, and I guess yesterday damage around here as well—maybe every Senator could tell the story I tell. But, frankly, tornadoes are not as common in my State as they are in these other States and there is a lesson to be learned from this. There is an appreciation to be learned from it. We all ought to remember how lucky—and then we need to remember how unlucky—some people and families are, in our daily life.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I too ask unanimous consent that I might be allowed to speak for as much time as I might consume.

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

THE AMERICAN SPIRIT

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I will want to sympathize with the Senator from Iowa, Senator GRASSLEY. Two weeks before Hurricane Katrina, a tornado came through the town of Wright, WY, which is 30 miles south of the town I live in. It happened to be during a recess so I got to go out there and see what had happened and see what kind of response there was and see what the Government is supposed to do and what they do do. What I was most impressed with is the spirit of community, the way the people got right after it and started cleaning up and helping each other out. People poured in from towns and other States to help.

It is a great country we live in, where people will do that and help out where it isn't any concern of theirs. But they recognize that is what we do in America. I think that is a difference from many other countries, too. I appreciate your sharing that with us.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the legislation we have been de-

bating and that we are going to be precluded from debating, should cloture happen tomorrow. The reason I say precluded from debating is we are not being allowed to do any amendments. The whole stage has been set: One amendment so far; it is a take-it-or-leave-it amendment. My experience in the 11½ years I have been around here is that bills that come to us that way do not pass.

That is what the whole Senate was designed for, to see that take-it-or-leave-it stuff doesn't make it through here, that the opinions of 100 people get to be reflected in legislation. The longer we are here, the quicker we think we ought to be able to get bills done. The longer we are here, the more complicated the issues. This is a very complicated issue. There are things people are doing. There are things people need to be doing. But to make it very prescriptive and to not allow the opinions of 100 people who could point out some of the flaws and some ways it could be better is wrong.

The majority leader and a number of Members on the other side have called climate change the "greatest environmental threat facing our world." I am not hearing big arguments against that. But if that is the case, we should put our heads together and come up with a plan to protect us from this massive threat. We should spend time amending it, ironing out any problems, and determining what we will have to pay.

There is a huge disconnect in America, thinking that we can solve this problem and it will not cost the consumer anything. We are actually promulgating that myth here, now. I heard the fuel economy we are going to get is going to offset any of the costs. I know a few guys out there who are getting ahold of me on a regular basis because they drive trucks. They do contract work. I am pretty sure they didn't put a little clause in there that gave them a fuel escalation break. Some of the big companies might have thought of that. The little companies didn't. So far as I can tell, they are not planning on trading that truck in for a more fuel-efficient truck because they can't afford to do that. New trucks cost more money. They have a contract that limits what they can do. So the offset is not going to pay to the person who is paying the bill. It may go to somebody else.

We do need to encourage better mileage. We need to encourage less travel—although somebody the other day pointed out to me that if we have less travel—for instance, if I rode my bike back and forth from home to work, although I usually walk, that consumes calories. And to replace those calories, I have to eat food. And that food probably is transported in somehow, so I am still adding to the climate problem. It is not solving it just by doing some alternatives. I hadn't thought about that.

But what I am talking about tonight is that the debate has been shut down;

the amendment tree has been filled. That means a little parliamentary procedure around here has already put some amendments, with relatively insignificant changes in them, so nobody else can bring up an amendment and have it voted on. It is getting to be a very common thing around here.

Now, I understand partly why it is being done. The majority has had two people out on the Presidential campaign trail, and now Senator KENNEDY is not able to be with us. That is the loss of three votes. It is a 51-to-49 Senate. So I sympathize with the leader in trying to control votes when some of the people are not here, because with our one Presidential candidate gone and three of their people gone, it winds up with a tie. I have noticed the Vice President usually votes with me.

But what we are trying to do, I think around here, is get bills done and get them done in a logical process and actually finish them. But I do not think that is what we are doing. The amendment tree got filled. The greatest threat of our time, the greatest deliberative body is not allowed to deliberate, to be deliberative. Something is wrong with that picture.

Now, I have some amendments that are important. I think they are important to anybody who might be listening, especially my colleagues. Do not think that not paying attention to or being interested in politics is going to shield anyone from the consequence of this bill if it were to pass. It could change our way of life. The bill is going to cost money, and you have a right to know how much it is going to cost you.

I filed an amendment that requires utilities to include on the bill they send you, the consumers, the amount it is costing to comply with this legislation.

I would like to take a look at a part of the bill that is very significant for Wyoming residents; that is the coal portion. Coal is our Nation's most important and abundant energy source. Wyoming's coal is the cleanest coal in the Nation. We ship to every State in the Nation.

They mix it with their coal to meet the clean air standards. I want the lights to stay on in Wyoming and the rest of the Nation. California relies heavily on electricity from Wyoming. Without coal, that is not going to happen.

Now, China understands energy. China understands that the future economy of the world depends on energy. They have already bought all the oil supply, they have bought up gas supplies, they are in the process of buying up coal supplies.

How do I know about that? They are buying coal in Campbell County, WY, and shipping it to China. Now, a lot of it is in the test burn stage, and I suspect they may be burning that in the powerplants right around Beijing, which will clean their air for the Olympics.

I do not know how long the contracts are, and I do not know how expensive it

will be. But I suspect that coal will be sold, and I know, by the way, because of rotation of the Earth, the direction the wind blows. The powerplants in Wyoming do not put anything in California, but the powerplants in China, of which they are building one a week, it takes longer, but they are opening one a week, that air will blow to California. China is not going to be part of this.

I have had an opportunity to sit down with some of the Chinese delegation who are at the global warming conferences. They do point out they are a developing nation. I have asked them, as a developing nation, is there any point in the future at which they would do something to cut down their pollution? They have assured me they will always be a developing nation and will always come under those provisions. So do not count on China to help out in this.

Now, I filed another amendment with my colleagues from Missouri, Ohio, and Oklahoma that is an approach to making cleaner coal. I have also cosponsored another amendment with my fellow Senator from Wyoming, an amendment, that was filed by Senator DORGAN from North Dakota taking another approach to greening up coal so we can more efficiently harness its power while minimizing its impact on the environment.

I have cosponsored multiple approaches because it is vital we improve the bill by improving the way we use coal. Half our electricity comes from coal. There is no short-term substitute for coal. We need to come together and come up with a real solution, hopefully one that does place a little bit of confidence in the ingenuity of the American people.

If there is a problem, they can solve it; not always immediately and not always without some kind of incentive. There are a number of ways of providing that incentive. We have not gotten to discuss those, and the majority is not going to let us do that today. I cannot even call up my amendments to let other Members debate them because the majority leader has used a parliamentary tactic to prevent us from offering changes to this bill.

The majority leader has decided we cannot fully debate what he calls the greatest environmental threat facing the world. Is he serious? Well, I am. But apparently the proponents of this bill are not. If they were, they would be working to come up with a solution to this problem rather than playing another inning of "gotcha" politics.

This is a complex piece of legislation. I am not sure anybody knows exactly how it works. The bill we originally talked about came through committee. The substitute we are doing now did not come through committee, so it hasn't had the same look everything else had.

Anytime we go to a bill that hasn't been through committee and we invoke cloture so amendments cannot be done, the bills do not make it here. I appreciate

my colleagues' approach on that. I have seen it happen, though, regardless of who was in the majority. That is the way it works. People get upset when they cannot do amendments.

Now, I do know people who buy coal from my State say this bill will be a real punch in the gut. I do know the vast majority of studies say this bill will take money out of your pocket because you will have to pay higher energy prices. These are issues that need to be addressed. But we are not being allowed to address them. There is this sudden urgency that if it does not pass this week, the world will not exist next week. I think that is a lit bit of an exaggeration.

I have a list of people who were supporting this legislation apparently as it is. I think they were generally supporting the concept of cleaning up the environment. But I did notice the list of supporters included those who have figured out a way to make some money off this. That is how it works in America. But it does leave out those who are currently having a job in these areas.

Now, it is baffling to me that we are being precluded, that it is being cut off early. I hope my Senate colleagues will not do that. When the Senate considered the Clean Air Act amendments in 1990, and it was very important for them to consider that, because prior to that time we had a one-size-fits-all approach in the United States. It needed to be corrected.

Those clean air amendments of 1990 passed, and they made corrections to it. They made a system that worked, or at least worked better. There is no such thing as perfect legislation. We spent 5 weeks on the bill. There were 180 amendments that were considered, and 130 were processed.

Usually, we are asked if we cannot get our amendments down to two or three or five. No, you cannot. The reason you cannot is that if you have a series of amendments that deal with the smaller topics, people understand them better.

You will have one section 3 people will object to, another one 11 people will object to, another one 4 people will object to, and pretty quickly you are at 51. It is a pretty good philosophy if you do not want an amendment to pass, you cram them all together, so you can generate enough animosity over each of the parts so it adds up to 51 votes against and it never makes it.

On the other hand, if you are serious about making changes, then you do it such as we did with—I was not here at that time—the Clean Air Act of 1990, where there were 180 amendments and 130 were processed.

We have been debating this bill for less than a week at this stage, with lots of interruptions. We have considered exactly one amendment, and that is the substitute amendment from the Democratic chair of the committee that dramatically changes the bill from what came out of committee.

That is not the way to conduct business in the Senate. It is not the way to

get anything done. But, then again, that is probably apparent that if there was a real desire to get something done, this bill would be debated in the regular order.

When the Senate was less polarized, it was because there was more debating in the regular order. The bill we were debating had gone through committee, S. 2191; but the bill S. 3036 did not. I do not know anyone who believes this bill is going to be signed into law. I am not even sure anybody wants it signed into law considering the process it is going through.

I think it is an effort by the majority saying: Oh, woe is us. We need to have 60 on our side of the aisle so we can cram these ideas down the other side's throat. That is not the Senate. The majority, in fact, is saying, until we have 60 votes on our side, we are not going to let anything pass. They take this approach, even though the energy crisis is the main concern of the American people.

Oh, but that is right, this bill is not going to do anything for energy prices, particularly in the short run. I am disappointed with the situation the majority leader has put the Senate in today that will actually happen tomorrow morning—it is happening at 9 o'clock—which means there is going to be debate before the vote, it will be rather limited, probably between the two leaders.

I do not think this bill is ready for debate, so I voted against proceeding to this bill. However, now that we are on the bill, we do have to consider its merits. That is what I have done on all this. That is why I filed two amendments to it. Unfortunately, we are not truly debating the bill because the parliamentary procedure, the parliamentary tactics are going to cut off all the amendments.

Oh, there will be some conversation about how there will be 30 hours to do things after cloture is done. I follow the proceedings around here. Now, you can stall through 30 hours and make sure not a single vote happens. So anybody who votes for cloture means voting to preclude amendments, and anybody who says: Oh, there will be an open debate on it and an opportunity for amendments, ought to check the history on this and see if they have actually talked to anybody who would allow that to happen because it will be a new one on me.

So the whole purpose right now is to do "gotcha" politics, avoid the committee to bring it to the floor, have a motion to proceed introduced on Friday, we vote on Monday followed by 30 hours, while we are waiting for people to show up to vote during the week because they are out on the campaign trail, and then filing a final cloture motion to make it be a one-size-fits-all, take-it-or-leave-it bill.

I think it is very unfortunate that we have come to this point. I will oppose

further tactics designed to shut Senators out in the cold while the proponents are inside making their own global warming plan.

The "take it or leave it" has never been a successful approach around here. I am willing to bet it will not be a successful approach tomorrow.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANDERS). The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I listened to my friend from Wyoming, and I will tell anyone who was listening, first, he says the bill is not ready for debate. Now he wants to debate.

You know, my friend voted not to go to the bill in the first place. He does not want a global warming bill, neither do most of the people on that side of the aisle, with some exceptions.

Their answer is: No, no, no, no, status quo. That is why they keep losing seats all around the country. Now, 89 percent of the people want us to take up this legislation. Now, you can say you are against this for technical reasons and procedural reasons. I wish to talk about that, I do, because our leader went to the Republican side and said: We are ready to come up with a good plan to move forward on this bill. And he said to the other side: Let's start off with doing two amendments a side.

No, that wasn't good enough.

OK. Let's make an agreement for 3 amendments, 10 amendments, germane amendments. No. It was obvious from the start. No. Well, we think it is time to say yes, to stand and tackle the problem of global warming. They do not think it is time.

I don't think they will ever think it is time.

What is really remarkable is that the States out there have started. The western Governors have gotten together. They have signed a western climate initiative. Why? The American West is heating up more rapidly than the rest of the world. That is where my friend comes from. I didn't hear him talk about global warming. I heard him talk a lot about China. I don't know what he was saying, whether he is so happy that China keeps building these dirty coal plants. I will tell him, the people of China can't breathe. There was a whole series about this. We want to have a clean coal future. That is why the Boxer-Lieberman-Warner bill invests heavily in clean coal. We understand there is 200 years worth of coal in America, and we want to make sure we get the technologies moving. That is why we want this bill, so we get to the day where we can have clean coal.

I want to tell my friend, he got up and criticized the way this bill was handled and the rest. I wish to speak about what we have done on our committee.

The Presiding Officer serves on that committee and is an active member who has supported even stronger legis-

lation than this. We are getting attacked because they say it is too strong. The bottom line is—my friend will attest because he was part of this—we had 25 hearings, one of which I remember well which he chaired, since the day I took the gavel, inclusive. The bill was written in the subcommittee. The bill was worked on. It got to the full committee. I remember my friend in the chair was not happy with the bill in the subcommittee. He worked very hard. We changed it. Yes, we changed it, because that is what legislating is about. There isn't one person in this Chamber who has all the answers. I certainly don't. This has to be a collaborative approach.

Then a wonderful thing happened. Senator JOHN WARNER said: I am breaking the stalemate. I have kids. I have grandkids. I am a national security expert. The national security people are saying we need to do something about global warming. It is going to be one of the biggest causes of wars in the future. This is a big issue. Senator WARNER came and said he wanted to work with us. That meant we could get legislation out of the committee. Senator BAUCUS comes from a huge coal State. He took the lead in the coal provisions. We worked very hard.

When the bill came out of the full committee, we took it to our colleagues in the Senate. We did an unprecedented thing. We had open hearings for every Senator. I don't know if Senator ENZI came to any of those. Maybe he did. My staff is sitting here next to me. No, he didn't. I remember Senator BENNETT came. I remember many Senators came. They asked the experts the questions. We had the IPCC, the leading experts. We had the Bush administration come to talk about public health problems. We opened a transparent process to all. We asked Senators: Can I come to your office? I went to probably 30 offices. Senator LIEBERMAN did. Senator WARNER did. Anyone who wanted it did. Transparent. What do you need? What do you think? How can we do this better? How can this work? That is the way legislation ought to be done. That is what leadership is.

This is a tripartisan piece of legislation—a Democrat, a Republican, and an Independent. I will say this: When you say no to this and when you divert attention to gas prices, which have gone up 250 percent under George Bush—250 percent—and when you say this bill is going to make it worse, you don't really know what you are talking about because if you look at the modeling that was done—and George Bush confirmed this—the modeling says under a worst-case scenario, gas will go up 2 cents a gallon per year for 20 years. It is a 12-percent increase attributable to this bill which we know will be entirely offset by the fuel economy. In other words, that 2 cents will be offset by the fuel economy bill. So this bill will lead to lower gas prices. Why? Because it will spur technology. That is the point of the bill.

If we could look at the pie chart, what you see is that most of the money that is generated in this bill from the permits bought by the 2,100 biggest emitters of carbon goes to tax relief for our people, consumer relief for people, deficit reduction, more than half, and the rest goes to investments. A little bit goes to help the emitters in the early years. The rest goes to national security, and international agricultural resources and forestry, low-carbon technology efficiency, and local government action. We want to help local governments. That is why the U.S. Conference of Mayors has endorsed this bill.

I have to say, what amazes me about what I hear from the other side is there is nothing about the issue of global warming or climate change. You don't hear anything, very little except from the supporters of our bill. Senator SNOWE, Senator WARNER, yes, we hear from them. But for the most part, we have heard no words that let us understand where we can sit down and talk.

As far as China is concerned, to hold them up as some kind of model, if that is what my friend was doing, let me say that I don't want to be a party to it. I want to be a party to leading China, leading India, leading the world, not following countries where the people are so sick they can't even breathe. That is not what we want. We heard the same thing when we passed the Clean Air Act, Safe Drinking Water Act, the Clean Water Act, the Endangered Species Act—this is the end of the world. They made all kinds of excuses why we should not act.

Tomorrow, we have a chance. I hope we will get a good vote. I don't know what we will get. But I do want to put into the RECORD some very important letters from our colleagues.

First, I am very touched to tell my colleagues that we have a letter from Senator KENNEDY. I am so happy to say that. It reads:

DEAR CHAIRMAN BOXER: I commend you and Senator Lieberman and Senator Warner for your leadership on the Climate Security Act. At long last, significant legislation long needed to address this growing crisis is ready for Senate action, and I wish very much that I could be there for this landmark debate.

Regrettably, I'm unable to participate, but I hope my colleagues will support the Act by voting for cloture, as I would if I were able to do so.

With respect and appreciation and all great wishes,

Sincerely,

EDWARD M. KENNEDY.

TED, if you or your family is watching, we received this letter with such pride. We thank you so much, and we send you our heartfelt prayers and hopes for a speedy recovery. We miss you so much.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Senator BIDEN:

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

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, June 5, 2008.

Senator BARBARA BOXER,
Chairman, Committee on Environment and Public Works,

U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BOXER: As we discussed, I regret that a longstanding speaking commitment will cause me to be absent for the scheduled cloture vote on your substitute amendment to S. 3036, the Lieberman-Warner Climate Security Act.

I write to make it clear for the record that, had I been present, I would have cast my vote in support of cloture.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.,

U.S. Senator.

Mrs. BOXER. We thank Senator BIDEN. I again thank Senator OBAMA. He sent a similar letter that he would, if he were here, vote for cloture. And a beautiful statement from Senator CLINTON from which I will read in part:

... I would vote for cloture on this legislation if I were able to be present in the Senate. ... The time is now to move forward and deal with global warming, and I urge my colleagues to vote for cloture.

Continuing from her letter:

This bill makes steep reductions in emissions, encourages the development and deployment of clean energy technology, provides assistance for American families, training for workers whom the clean energy industry will demand.

I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD.

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

M. President, the scientific consensus is clear: strong and swift action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions is needed to prevent catastrophic effects of climate change. That's why the debate this week in the Senate about the cap-and-trade bill crafted by Senators Boxer, Lieberman and Warner is so important. This bill makes steep reductions in emissions, encourages the development and deployment of clean energy technology, provides assistance for American families, training for workers that the clean energy industry will demand. I congratulate Chairman Boxer for moving this bill to the floor. It's a first step toward Congress enacting a cap-and-trade bill as part of a broad, comprehensive effort to combat global warming and reduce our dependence on foreign oil, including aggressive steps to improve energy efficiency and deploy renewable energy that will benefit our economy and help create millions of new jobs. I believe that we can and should make this bill even stronger, and I hope that we can do that as we continue to consider the bill. For now, we need to move forward on this important legislation. That's why I would vote for cloture on this legislation if I were able to be present in the Senate for the vote. The time is now to move forward and deal with global warming, and I urge my colleagues to vote for cloture.

Mrs. BOXER. She congratulates us on the bill. It is with great pride that I add these letters to Senator OBAMA's letter.

I do hope my colleagues will give us a "yea" vote. We know that under the rule, we can have amendments. Absolutely, we can. We hope we will get a good cloture vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I compliment the Senator from California for her leadership on the Environment Committee and on this important legislation. It is time to face up to it. One cannot find a more critical environmental issue facing this Senate, our country, or our world than fighting global warming. We need legislation that faces this problem head-on. Inaction here endangers our children, our grandchildren, and future generations who can never understand the opposition and unwillingness of the Senate to deal with this problem. Yet, as we stand here now, Senators on the other side of the aisle are filibustering this legislation. We are losing precious time. The patient is sick, and we have to start providing the meds. We have already lost over 7 years under a President who has ignored science and questioned the very existence of global warming. We have seen other Members of this body do the same thing, even calling global warming a hoax.

As we sit here and wait for leadership from our President and from this Congress, our world is literally paying the price. As temperatures rise, our world suffers. In the United States, the glaciers in Glacier National Park are shrinking. The park's largest glaciers are one-third of their 1850s grandeur. The oceans are being altered. Ocean levels are rising, threatening coastlines far across the globe and here at home, including, in my State, the New Jersey seashore, where the very survival of the State's residents is at stake. Defense experts see security risks from global warming. A Pentagon report says that large populated countries could become nearly uninhabitable because of rising seas. Megadroughts could affect the world's breadbaskets, such as America's Midwest, and future wars could be fought over the issue of mere survival in this new climate.

The American people sent us here to take real action and to confront these problems. We need to take some bold steps to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to match the research of the world's best scientists. This bill would be a critical step forward. It would reduce emissions by 15 percent by the year 2020 and by nearly 70 percent by the year 2050.

It will do so by placing a cap on our emissions and giving industry the flexibility it needs within a cap-and-trade system. We already know that a cap-and-trade system works. We used it in the 1990s to successfully combat acid rain, and we should be doing the same thing now to fight global warming.

I ask my colleagues, please join us in taking this landmark step forward, and do not let politics interfere with our obligation to protect our families.

As we move forward, we have to listen to those scientists who dedicate their lives to the pursuit of fact and truth, not raw politics. We have to make sure scientists in our country can freely do their work and tell the

truth to the American people without having their research suppressed—suppressed—by a President and an administration with a political agenda.

President Bush, his administration, and many here in Congress have squandered precious years, ignoring the reality of global warming. Even worse, they hindered and outright suppressed, as I mentioned, the work of Government scientists who were sounding the alarm about global warming's effect on our planet and all of us who inhabit it.

The United States is expected to be a leader in the world. Yet, while the 2,500 scientists from 113 countries were collaborating on the most recent United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report on global warming, the President of the United States was still unwilling to hear the truth.

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report found that:

Warming of the climate system is unequivocal.

And human activity is to blame.

Beyond the importance of what the report said is the fact that the report relied on uncensored, unaltered science to say so. In contrast to the integrity and accuracy of the IPCC report, the Bush administration has censored the conclusions of the U.S. scientists to advance a political agenda. The administration has blocked or delayed the release of Government reports on global warming. It has deleted key words such as "global warming" from public documents. And it has denied scientists the ability to freely discuss their conclusions with the public.

Mr. Phil Cooney, the former Chief of Staff for the White House Council on Environmental Quality, was one of the architects of this campaign of scientific suppression.

Mr. Cooney—not a scientist—weakened or edited out scientific judgments from Federal climate change reports. These changes made the threat of global warming seem less serious. In the 2002 climate change report "Our Changing Planet," the original text read, "Earth is undergoing a period of relatively rapid change." Mr. Cooney changed that to, "Earth may be undergoing a period of rapid change"—totally altering the significance of this statement. Mr. Cooney later left the administration to go to work for ExxonMobil.

In 2006, 13 other Senators joined me in asking the inspectors general of NOAA and NASA—both agencies—to investigate the Bush administration's suppression of science on global warming. The report from NASA just came out this week and found that political appointees in NASA's press shop had manipulated the work of scientists. The inspector general stated that political appointees at NASA had "reduced, marginalized, or mischaracterized climate change science made available to the general public."

It is incredible to believe. It is simply unacceptable for the greatest democracy in the world to stifle the findings of scientists for political and ideological reasons. It is common sense to listen to the best scientists in the world and to act on their research. And their research is telling us that global warming is getting worse and it is time for us to act.

It is disappointing beyond words that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are preventing us from moving forward with this bill. In this place—the Senate—and at this time, some Members of the Senate are putting special interests and politics ahead of the safety and well-being of our people. We have to act now, and this bill is the right place to start. We dare not let this time pass without action.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

THANKING THE SENATE PAGES

Mr. REID. Mr. President, today is the last day of service for our current page class. On behalf of all Senators, I thank them for the job they do every day for us—running these documents all over the Capitol, rushing around here to make sure amendments are filed appropriately and, for me, often filing cloture motions. They do a lot. The glass of water I have here, as for every Senator, they know whether they want sparkling water, water with ice, cold water, warm water.

These are wonderful, intelligent young men and women. It would have been a wonderful experience to be a page when I was a boy. I hope my vision of the time they have had is appropriate in that they really do have the time I think they are having.

They have seen this body, the greatest deliberative body in the history of the world, debate some very difficult issues. They have seen us succeed at times, maybe not succeed at other times. But I hope they always believe we approach our job with sincerity, of having different views but always striving to make our country stronger.

It is lost on no one that more than a few of our Senators who have served here and served in the House have been pages. Chris Dodd from Connecticut was a Senate page. I talked to him about it today. That was the beginning of his career.

Mr. President, I have in my office right across the hall pictures of my two first grandchildren—two beautiful little girls, little babies. They could not sit up. They were so small, they were propped up against something. One of them was born in September and the other was born in November. Ryan and Mattie—beautiful little babies. But I have in front of that picture a picture of my two oldest grandchildren in their Senate page uniforms. They were Senate pages. Being Senate pages changed their lives, and I am not exaggerating. It was a wonderful experience for my two grandchildren.

I hope the experience for every one of these pages is half as good as for my granddaughters. When I say it changed their lives, I am not joking. Take Ryan as an example. She did not read newspapers. She was not really interested in what was going on in Government. But she now is. She reads, watches the news, and sees people come through the Senate whom she used to work with.

It does not hurt my feelings—and it should not hurt the other 98 Senators—to accept the proposition that their favorite Senator is ROBERT BYRD. Now, ROBERT BYRD is frail and not as strong and vigorous as he was when I first came to the Senate. But the pages, when my granddaughters were here, voted for which Senator they liked most, and it was ROBERT BYRD.

Well, I am confident that as a result of these young men and women being here, they will have a new enthusiasm for public service. I know the Presiding Officer and I believe in government. Government is good. When people are in trouble, where can you go for help? Mr. President, 9/11 said you can look to your God, whoever that might be, you can look to your family, and you can look to government. There are very few places to go other than that. And for government, we need good people, in appointive office and in elective office. I do not think there is a higher calling than public service. I personally feel so fortunate every day to be a public servant. Do we make all the money that people can make on the outside? No. But we make enough money. We make plenty of money. So I hope these young men and women find ways, big and small, to serve and honor the country that we love and they love.

I have the honor in the morning of being able to speak at the pages' graduation. I look forward to doing that. I am going to do that at 10 o'clock in the morning.

But, Mr. President, for today, I wish to enter the names of all of this semester's pages in the RECORD in honor of their service. The first two names I read off tonight are a couple Nevadans: Danae Moser, Sparks, NV; Andrew Solomon, Gardnerville, NV. Alyssa Abraham, Franklin, TN; Brittany Ashenfelter, Redfield, IA; Joanna Beletic, Arlington, VA; Genny Beltrone, Great Falls, MT; Andrew Carter, Madison, WI; Christopher Cary, Parkville, MO; Phoebe Chaffin-Busby, Little Rock, AR; Allie Dopp, Bountiful, UT; Ronson Fox, Waipahu, HI; Jennifer Goebel, Plano, TX; Adrienne Gosselin, Nashua, NH; Mary Margaret Johnson, Madison, MS; Taylor Johnson, Orrington, ME; Jocelynn Knudsen, Missoula, MT; Olivia Konig, Great Falls, VA; James Lee, Fairfax, VA; Ashley Lewis, Canton, MI; Mark Loose, Anderson, IN; Joshua Moscow, Lexington, KY; Danae Moser—again, I repeat in alphabetical order—Sparks, NV; Hamid Nasir, Anchorage, AK; Evan Nichols, Eaton Rapids, MI; Cody O'Hara, Florence, KY; Reed Phillips, Alexander City, AL; Augusta Rodgers, Winona,

MN; Sarah Rosenberg, Chicago, IL; Brandon Skyles, Buckley, WA; Andrew Solomon—I repeat—Gardnerville, NV; Jacob Waalk, Monroe, LA; Ryan Wingate, Montpelier, VT.

I look forward to seeing these fine young men and women at 10 o'clock in the morning, Mr. President.

REMEMBERING SENATOR VANCE HARTKE

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, it is a privilege today to submit to the RECORD an essay by Jan Hartke, my friend and the son of our late colleague, Senator Vance Hartke of Indiana.

William Butler Yeats famously wrote: "my glory was I had such friends." To know Vance Hartke as a cherished friend, as an ally to all who are not just unashamed but actually proud to seek peace, as a fellow Navy man, and particularly as a mentor, protector, and champion for those of us who returned from Vietnam to oppose the war—really, that was all the glory or honor any of us ever really need or deserve.

Vance's passing hit me like a punch to the gut; I was driving in New Hampshire in July of that long hot summer of 2003, in the middle of a Presidential campaign, when the jarring news came to me—and brought back memories of my earliest years as an antiwar activist, and of a public servant who shared our cause and our concerns. Then and throughout his life, Vance was compelling in the absolute sincerity of his character. He was spurred to soul-searching by America's disastrous intervention in Vietnam. He found himself asking, as many now ask of Iraq, not just "How do we end this war?" but "How do we learn from our mistakes and end the mindset that got us into war?"

It was a profound moral compass that led Senator Hartke to work with Senators Mark Hatfield, Jennings Randolph, Sam Nunn, and Spark Matsunaga on legislation to found the U.S. Institute of Peace, whose continued work studying conflict and building understanding has become a testament to the nobility of Vance's aspirations and the life he lived in support of them.

With the groundbreaking of a beautiful new building, the organization built to house Senator Hartke's ideas finally has a home worthy of its founder.

Here, for the Senate RECORD, is a powerful essay—which captures Vance's vision as only his son could—in honor of this historic event.

I ask unanimous consent to have the essay to which I referred printed in the RECORD.

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

NEW PEACE BUILDING ON NATION'S MALL

A new building dedicated to international peace will begin to rise in Washington, D.C. between the Lincoln Memorial and the Kennedy Center at the northwest corner of the