

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I am certainly not going to object, may I inquire how long my colleague will speak?

Mr. INHOFE. It will not be more than 15 minutes.

Mr. CARDIN. I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized immediately after the Senator from Oklahoma.

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

#### CAP AND TRADE

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, this morning we had the first of 3 days of hearings we are having on the proposed Kerry-Boxer climate bill. It was one I never quite had an experience such as that before. Senator KERRY came in, was given 30 minutes to talk about the same thing Al Gore has been talking about for the last 15 years, without any chance to rebut.

What I would like to do is take a few of the statements. It is a very confusing issue we have because we do not have a lot to work with. We were given a draft of a bill with some analysis. I think it was a couple days ago—not time to get into it. But the bottom line is, it is going to be the same thing, according to the EPA, as the Waxman-Markey bill.

So what I would like to do is use them interchangeably, since that was the response we got from the EPA when we made a request that we be given time to get an analysis, an EPA analysis of the bill. I think the words were: You do not need an EPA analysis of the bill because it is the same bill, for all practical purposes, as Waxman-Markey.

So that is what we have. I would like to go over it point by point. Senator KERRY is correct that cap and trade will impose higher costs in the form of higher prices for electricity and gasoline. I think we do know these costs are there.

According to the National Black Chamber of Commerce, the bill—which I will refer to as “the bill,” it could be Waxman-Markey, it could be Kerry-Boxer—the bill would increase gas prices by 19 cents a gallon by 2015, 38 cents a gallon by 2030, 95 cents a gallon by 2050. Also, electricity bills would rise by about 4 to 5 percent in 2020.

I say this because the head of the National Black Chamber of Commerce was an excellent witness. He brought the point home. Not only is this bill—this cap-and-trade bill—expensive, it would be something that would be regressive because the percentage of expendable income by a poor person is far greater than a rich person on such things as home heating and driving your cars. So his whole point was it was a regressive tax.

In a recent Energy and Natural Resources Committee hearing, Senator JEFF SESSIONS asked the government witnesses—the government witnesses were CBO, EPA, EIA, and the CRS—

whether anyone disagreed with the finding that the net effect of cap and trade would be to reduce jobs. None did. Again, this morning, most of the witnesses responded in the same way.

Then Senator KERRY talked about the NASA scientists. “The best experts we have,” he said, “tell us that the last 10 years have been the hottest in decades on record.”

Of course, we know that we have—in fact, just the other day, last week, BBC, which is certainly no friend of skeptics, in their lead story said: What happened to global warming? This headline came out as a bit of a surprise; so, too, might the fact that the warmest year recorded globally was not 2008 or 2007 but 1998. It went on to say that for the last 11 years, we have not observed any increase in global temperatures. In fact, we have actually had the indication we are starting another cyclical cooling spell.

Senator KERRY said: That is why countries of the world, including India, China, and the United States, have agreed to limit the global rise in temperature to just 2 degrees Celsius. In fact, this is not true. I am sure he thinks it is true or he would not have said it. But China is the world's leading emitter of CO<sub>2</sub>. India is No. 3. India has been moving up. We have a quote from the top environmental minister in India, whose name is Jairam Ramesh: “India will not accept any emissions reduction target, period.” He went on to say: “This is non-negotiable.” You cannot get any more emphatic than that.

At the same time, when you talk about China, they may give you some lip service. Let's keep in mind, though, that China is cranking out coal-fired generating plants at two a week right now. So that does not show there is much interest in China to do anything close to what has been represented. The next statement made was that the pollution reduction measures in this bill are tightly focused on maximum impact.

Only companies emitting 25,000 tons of carbon each year are covered, 98 percent of America's businesses. The bill still covers three-quarters of America's carbon pollution. So what he is saying is that three-fourths, as near as I can determine, of the carbon that is emitted comes from only 2 percent of America's businesses.

The fact is, the Kerry-Boxer bill or “the bill,” I will say—because it could be Markey or the same—contains no provision to stop the EPA's endangerment finding, which would trigger a flood of regulations under the Clean Air Act. As such, all the sources Senator KERRY mentions would be covered in some form of regulation under the act.

Second, Senator KERRY ignores the fact that the sources he mentioned would be severely impacted by higher energy prices, declines in productivity, fewer jobs in the sluggish economy that would arise because of Kerry-Boxer and Waxman-Markey.

I mentioned what the National Black Chamber of Commerce had said about that. I think that should stand. He stated: Third, climate change and our dependence on foreign oil are a threat to our national security. I agree with that. We are dependent upon foreign countries for our ability to run this machine called America.

Unfortunately, this is a very partisan subject because it is the Democrats who insist on having a moratorium on offshore drilling. The problems we are having right now—we have something, and this came out just last week. The new report from the Congressional Research Service reveals that America's combined recoverable natural gas, oil, and coal reserves are the largest on Earth.

We keep hearing people say: We do not have these reserves. We do. Far greater than Saudi Arabia's; they are No. 3. No. 4 is China. That is not even talking about including America's immense oil shale and methane hydrate deposits. So we have the largest reserves and the capability, I believe, and I will make this statement and, hopefully, someone will refute it because I cannot find anything to the contrary; that is, we are the only country that will not develop its own natural resources.

They say we are dependent on other countries. Well, yes, we are because politically they will not let us develop our own resources. I would say that between the oil and gas and the coal—and of course we are all concerned about nuclear, we want to do everything we can to overcome the obstacle that such a small percentage of our energy comes from nuclear. However, that is not going to be here tomorrow. We need to start working on that now.

I am talking about things where we can get energy produced right in the United States and stop—we could actually stop our dependence on foreign oil just by developing our own natural resources.

Then Senator KERRY talked about 11 former admirals and high-ranking generals who issued a seminal report warning that climate change is a threat multiplier.

They talk about famines and catastrophes. These assertions, which were first made by Al Gore back when he did his science fiction movie, have all been refuted. Consequently, when I hear 11 former admirals and generals out of 4,000, if they could only find 11, I think they have a problem.

The other thing is the fact that the bills would do virtually nothing to stop the pandemics, droughts, floods, and the like. According to an analysis by Chip Knappenberger of Master Resource:

No matter how the economic and regulatory issues shake out, [Waxman-Markey] will have virtually no impact on the future course of the earth's climate.

He went on:

By the year 2050, the Waxman-Markey Climate Bill would result in a global temperature “savings” of about 0.05 degrees Celsius.

That reminds me, back in the 1990s we had an analysis by, at that time, one of the top scientists around. This was done by then-Vice President Al Gore. The guy's name was Tom Wigley, a top scientist. Vice President Gore gave him the chart. He said: If we were to sign on to the Kyoto Treaty, if we complied with its emissions requirements, how much would this reduce the temperature in 50 years?

The answer was 0.07 degrees Celsius. That is not even measurable. He didn't use that afterwards, but we found the report. Nonetheless it was there, and it is quite obvious.

Stop and think about the fact that we have gone through these natural cycles year after year. We have the cycles, and they show what we are going through. It reminds me—and I am old enough to remember—of the middle 1970s when the same publication, *Time* magazine, and the rest of them, many of the same scientists said we would have to do something about global cooling because another ice age was coming, and we have to address it.

We have to keep in mind there is a lot of money in these statements. People like to think a disaster is occurring because there is a lot of money in it.

That reminds me of something else said this morning by Senator KERRY. He talked about Duke Energy and others. There are about five major corporations in America that joined a group called CAP USA. These were corporations that came in and said: We are stewards of the environment. We want to do something. We embrace cap and trade.

Then we stopped and did an analysis of the five that appeared before the committee only to find that without exception, each one of the five, if we were to have some type of a cap and trade—and it doesn't matter whether it was the Markey bill or the current Kerry-Boxer bill—if we were to do that, we know what the results would be because we have gone through this before over and over again. The idea that we could have something like this and not have the problems come has been disproven for a long period.

Let's go back to the Kyoto Treaty. We actually have had five debates on the Senate floor. We had the Kyoto Treaty, then in 2005 the McCain-Lieberman bill, then the 2003 McCain-Lieberman bill, then the 2008 Warner-Lieberman bill. In each case we had analyses done by the Wharton School of Economics, by MIT, and other groups. They all agreed it would be an expensive proposition. They said it would cost the American public between \$300 and \$400 billion a year.

I know that is difficult for people to understand. How does that impact me? But we do have an analysis that breaks that down. For the average family, it would cost about \$2,000 a year. In my State of Oklahoma, it would be more than that because the price would be higher in the central part of the United States than it would be on the east coast or the west coast.

The cost is going to be there, and it doesn't seem to make too much difference which of the five different approaches we soundly defeated in the past is under consideration. Senator KERRY also claims that India is working on its own domestic legislation to reduce carbon pollution. I already read what their top people have said. They have no intention of doing it. In fact, I have talked to people who are from China, people who are saying: We are sitting back and are kind of hoping maybe America will do this because, if they do, American manufacturers have to go someplace to find their energy.

Since we have rationed it in this country, if we should pass such a cap-and-trade bill, then that would send more manufacturing jobs to places where there is no rationing.

I appreciate very much Lisa Jackson, the new Director of the EPA. Several weeks ago—she was there again this morning—she was on the witness stand. I asked a question: If we were to pass one of these bills like the Waxman-Markey bill, and we were to pass it unilaterally, how much would that reduce emissions globally?

The answer was, it wouldn't. I would go one step further. It will not reduce them unless we include Third World countries, the major emitters—China, India, Mexico, and these other countries. If we don't do that, then we will chase our manufacturing bases where there are no restrictions, and that would have the effect, common sense would dictate, of increasing CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.

We have gone through this now for 10 years. I think it is going to come to a climax in Copenhagen. Once every year the U.N. has this big party, and they have all these countries come in and say what they are going to do to try to stop emission of greenhouse gases.

I had one—I will not mention his name, but he was from the West African country of Benin—who was there the last time I attended one of these conferences. It was in Spain at that time, I believe. Milan, Italy. I went up to this individual and I said: You and I have talked about this before. You know there is no relationship between greenhouse gases and global warming.

He said: Yes, but this is the biggest party of the year. So you are going to have a lot of people to go to Copenhagen in December who really aren't strongly behind the effort of the United Nations.

One last time, it all started with the United Nations, the IPCC, the Intergovernmental Climate Change Program. It started there. They are the ones who are perpetrating this thing. As we get into the debate—and we will have more hearings tomorrow—I hope we will be in a position, before we send a bill to the floor from the Environment and Public Works Committee, to analyze it.

We have called upon the EPA to give us an analysis so that we will have something and we will know more spe-

cifically, is this just a warmed-over bill that passed the House, the Waxman-Markey effort, or is this something that is different? According to the EPA, it is about the same. I suggest it is about the same as it was back in 2005, 2003, and back during the Kyoto discussion.

We will move forward. We have seen certain incontrovertible truths that have come up. One is there is no question that if something like this is passed, something like the draft form we are discussing and having hearings on right now, if this should become a reality it would be the largest tax increase in the history of America. The last large tax increase we had was in 1993. It was called the Clinton-Gore tax increase. It increased marginal rates, inheritance taxes, gasoline taxes, capital gains taxes, all the rest. We were pretty outraged at the size of that increase. That was a \$32 billion tax increase.

According to all the analyses we are looking at now, this would be 10 times the size of that tax increase.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. I ask unanimous consent that Senator KYL be recognized when I have completed my remarks.

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

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, let me respond to my friend in regard to the global climate change bill that was introduced by Senators KERRY AND BOXER. Today Chairman BOXER started hearings before the Environment and Public Works Committee on the climate change bill. I agree with my colleague, we want to make sure we get this right. This is an important issue, and we want to take the time necessary to make sure this bill does what it needs to do.

There is a sense of urgency for many reasons. We can look globally at what is happening with climate change and the impact on the stability of countries. We now have climate migrants, those forced out of their homes because of rising sea levels.

I don't have to take my colleagues to Asia or Africa or Europe. I can take them to Maryland on the Eastern Shore, Smith Island is disappearing. The residents are concerned as to what is going to happen to their homes. I can show them in my own State the urgency of dealing with global climate change by talking to watermen who tell me the Chesapeake Bay is warming too quickly. As a result, the sea grasses are not surviving and juvenile crabs cannot survive, affecting the waterman's livelihood. There is a sense of urgency for the sake of our environment, for the sake of America being an international leader on this issue to move forward with global climate change.

Let me offer a reason with which I think everyone will agree: We need an energy policy that not only allows us

to lead on the environmental issues but also helps us on the economic front. Clean energy will mean new jobs, good jobs in America. We developed the technology for alternative and renewable energy sources. Let's keep the jobs in America. These are good jobs. This bill means more jobs in America by investing in technology that other countries are now investing more in than America. They understand the future is going to be in wind power and solar power and, yes, in nuclear power. This bill allows us to move forward so we can keep jobs in America.

Lastly, I think everyone will agree that from a strategic point, we need to use less energy and produce more in America. The bill Senator KERRY has brought forward will help us achieve those goals.

I look forward to debating global climate change and energy policy. I hope we can come together for the sake of the Nation, for the sake of the future, and develop an energy policy that not only will keep us safe, will not only help our economy, but will be responsible on international environmental issues and be an international leader.

#### UNEMPLOYMENT EXTENSION

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, shortly we will be voting on a cloture motion on the motion to proceed to the unemployment compensation issue. Senator DURBIN addressed this issue a few minutes ago. I want to underscore how important it is for us to move forward.

Yesterday I had the opportunity to visit one of our employment offices in Maryland. We have a one-stop location where people looking for work can come and get the services of not only governmental agencies but nonprofit organizations to help them find employment. I have been to these offices in the past in Maryland. I have had a chance to talk to people who are seeking employment.

When I walked into that office yesterday, I was shocked to see how many people were there. It was hard to get through the door. People were coming in desperate to try to find jobs because there are no jobs out there for them to find. They are desperate to be employed, not only for the sake of having income but for the dignity that comes with employment. We have a problem out there. I think we all understand that.

I will give you two people with whom I talked yesterday: Bernice from Anne Arundel County, a resident who worked for a mortgage company until it went out of business, she has been unemployed since September 2008. She is about ready to lose her UI benefits. She talked about how difficult it was for her to talk about this, how difficult it was for her to tell her story. All she wants is a job. She wants the dignity and income of a job.

Charlene from Baltimore talked about being employed by Business Manager for Watermark Media. She

lost her job in September 2008 when the company went out of business. She is a very qualified individual. Yet she cannot find employment. Her UI ran out on October 25. Her husband is expected to lose his job this week, and it is possible she will lose her family home.

That is what we are talking about, people in our communities who are unemployed and cannot find employment. We now know there is about 1.9 million Americans who will run out of unemployment benefits by the end of this year unless we act, unless we take action. That includes about 25,000 Marylanders who will find themselves without any benefits. Currently, there are over 15 million Americans who are unemployed and over 200,000 Marylanders who can't find jobs. We need to act. We need to act on behalf of Bernice and Charlene and the literally hundreds of thousands of Americans who shortly will be running out of their unemployment benefits.

The bill before us is an extension of an additional 14 weeks of benefits for every State in the country. The original bill that came over from the House had a trigger mechanism of 8.5 percent unemployment. I brought this chart to show my colleagues why it is important to extend benefits in every State in this Nation. I think Maryland is a typical State.

Our unemployment numbers may be a little bit lower than the national average. We are in the 7 percent unemployment rate. But look at the orange counties in my State of Maryland: Cecil County, 8.6 percent unemployment; Caroline County, 8.8 percent unemployment; Dorchester County, 10.9 percent unemployment; Somerset County, 9.5 percent; Washington County, one of the growth counties not far from here, 9.4 percent unemployment—some of those people commute to Washington to work—and then Baltimore City, the center of our State, 10.6 percent unemployment.

I thank the leadership for bringing forward an unemployment compensation proposal to extend benefits that apply to every State because we need it in Maryland. I could talk about minority unemployment and the fact that the African-American unemployment rate in this country is around 15 percent. The Latino unemployment rate is around 12 percent. There are pockets of unemployment in all of our States that are at extraordinarily high numbers, and that is why we need to extend the unemployment benefits.

Let me also point out that these are not benefits that aren't paid for. These are insurance benefits. They are paid for by the current workforce. They pay into a fund so we have money available in a recession to help those who lose their jobs and can't find employment. That is why it is called unemployment insurance benefits. It is there for this circumstance.

Is there anyone here who denies that we are not in a tough time if you are looking for a job? We all know that. So

now is the time to extend unemployment benefits so people have income in order to be able to literally survive until our economy can rebound.

Let me also point out, I know there are a lot of us who are always looking for bills on which to put amendments. I understand the frustration of some of my colleagues. Here is a bill, it is a tax bill, let's put a provision on it. Quite frankly, I have a few provisions I would like to see enacted into law. This is not the right bill to do it on. If we put amendments on this bill and let it go back to the House with issues that are unrelated to unemployment compensation, it could take a long time to reconcile those differences.

We already have some differences with the House with regard to the States that qualify. Let's reconcile that quickly so that individuals such as Charlene, who currently are losing their benefits, know soon that they are going to be able to continue to get these unemployment benefits. It is important that we act quickly to get the job done.

One last point for my colleagues. This is important. It is the right thing to do. It is what government is here for—to help people who are literally out of luck because of no fault of their own but the economy. It is what we are supposed to do as far as the right type of social programs to protect people during tough economic times. But there is a tradeoff that helps our economy. This money goes directly back into our economy. Every dollar we pay out in unemployment insurance benefits will come back and have a multiplier effect of more money than we give in benefits in helping our economy grow. So this is the right remedy to help our economy. It is the right thing to do for the 1.9 million Americans who otherwise would lose their benefits by the end of the year.

We have a chance in just a few minutes to move this bill forward so it can be reconciled with the House quickly, and then we can assure the people of our community that, indeed, we responded and provided the appropriate type of relief for those who cannot find employment today.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

#### AFGHANISTAN TROOP REQUEST

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I believe it is now time for President Obama to move forward with General McChrystal's plan for executing the war in Afghanistan and to fully support his troop request.

The President has correctly called Afghanistan a "war of necessity." The counterinsurgency strategy that he announced last March is a good one, and it has been widely accepted. Having read General McChrystal's August report, I believe it may represent our only chance to successfully implement