

projects to help them meet that goal, they would receive funding to build those projects. Eligible projects are anything that is proven to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, including transit, freight or passenger rail, sidewalks and bike lanes, carpools and vanpools, intelligent transportation systems, congestion pricing measures and coordination of development and transportation plans.

Ten percent of auction proceeds might sound like a lot. But as I mentioned before, the transportation sector is 30 percent of the problem and growing faster than any other sector. In addition, these projects that would reduce greenhouse gas emissions will save Americans money and create jobs.

The American Public Transit Association recently found that people who use transit regularly save \$1,800 a year in transportation costs. The Surface Transportation Policy Project has found that those who live in areas with access to public transportation incur significantly lower costs than those who do not. This is incredibly important in a weak economy or when gas prices are high. Most people do not realize that transportation is the second highest expense in most American households—more than health care. For some, transportation costs are even higher than their mortgage or rent.

Last spring and summer, when gas prices went to \$4 a gallon across the country, Americans sought ways to save money by driving less. Many of them found that their transportation options were quite limited. Their neighborhoods had no sidewalks and there was little or no transit service. Those who had options, exercised them. But those who didn't either had to pay the price of gas and skimp elsewhere or reduce their quality of life. This is unacceptable.

We fund our transportation system through a gas tax, which is to say that we pay for roads and transit by burning gasoline. When people drive less, our transportation budgets dry up. So states and localities that seek to reduce oil use, lower greenhouse emissions and save their constituents money, get their budgets cut. CLEAN TEA reverses that by sending money to states and localities based on how much they reduce emissions.

As we develop a climate change bill, we must consider how every sector of the economy can play a part in lowering greenhouse gas emissions. When it comes to the transportation system, we—right here in Congress—have a lot to say about how that system is developed, how efficient it is and how polluting it is. We should make sure that, as we tell American businesses to get their houses in order, we clean up our act as well.

Through CLEAN TEA, we have the chance to make progress addressing many problems at once—finding additional funding for transportation infrastructure, building money-saving

transportation alternatives and lowering greenhouse gas emissions from the transportation sector.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition to comment on my cosponsorship of the Clean, Low-Emission, Affordable, New Transportation Efficiency Act, CLEAN TEA.

This bill, which I introduced along with Senator CARPER, would establish a fund for transportation initiatives designed to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The fund would be supported by 10 percent of the proceeds of any future cap-and-trade system established by Congress to address the issue of climate change. The funding could be used by States and local planning organizations for the development of projects such as rail, transit, transit-oriented land use and other initiatives designed to reduce emissions from the transportation sector. It is important to note, however, that the bill is not focused solely on providing alternatives to auto use. Highway operational improvements such as demand management programs and intelligent transportation systems would also be eligible if they reduce emissions by utilizing highway capacity in a more efficient manner.

These are important steps in lowering our Nation's greenhouse gas emissions, reducing our dependence on foreign oil and promoting transportation mobility. Since transportation accounts for one-third of greenhouse gas emissions, it stands to reason that revenue generated from a cap-and-trade system should be devoted to creating a more sustainable transportation future.

#### WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I am proud to help celebrate Women's History Month today. This is a time to celebrate the contributions of women throughout our history and to recognize the work of so many to secure women's rights and fulfill our Nation's promise of equal justice under the law.

My own State can be proud that so many Wisconsin women have made critical contributions to the movement for women's suffrage, to education, and to countless other areas of American life. Wisconsin achieved extraordinary things to pave the way for suffrage and social progress for generations to come. According to the Wisconsin Historical Society, in 1919 Wisconsin was the first State to ratify the 19th amendment to grant women the right to vote. Sixty years before that historic moment, one of the great leaders of the suffrage movement, Carrie Chapman Catt, was born in Ripon, WI. Catt's lifelong effort to pass the 19th amendment, especially her leadership of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, was vital to the Amendment's ultimate success. And Catt didn't stop there. Once the amendment was ratified, she founded the League of Women Voters to continue

and build on the momentum for change that the women's suffrage movement created. Catt's lifetime of persistence and dedication—as a leader for change and, earlier in her life, as the only woman in her graduating class at Iowa Agricultural College and Model Farm—reminds us how hard women throughout our history have worked to secure our rights and freedoms.

We also remember the amazing Wisconsin women who have enriched their local communities, including Margaret Schurz. Schurz started the first kindergarten in the Nation in Watertown, WI, in 1856. Her efforts led to the implementation of kindergarten and early-education programs throughout the United States. Her legacy is a great example of the impact Wisconsin women have had in bringing about progressive change in education and many other areas.

This month we also know that we must continue to advocate for fundamental fairness and equality for women. The enactment of the Lily Ledbetter Fair Pay Act of 2009 to help ensure protection from pay discrimination represents another step forward, but there remains a long road ahead of us. In addition to passing the Fair Pay Act, Congress needs to do more to ensure all of America's citizens receive equal pay for equal work. Wage discrimination costs families thousands of dollars each year. This is hard-earned money that working women simply cannot afford to lose. I am a proud cosponsor of the Paycheck Fairness Act introduced earlier this year. This legislation strengthens penalties for employers who violate the Equal Pay Act and requires the Department of Labor to provide training to employers to help eliminate pay disparities.

I applaud President Obama's announcement that he will convene a White House Council on Women and Girls to ensure that the Federal Government is coordinated in its response to the challenges facing women and girls in our country. As we commemorate Women's History Month, we must continue to honor the tremendous contributions women have made, and renew our commitment to advancing the rights of women everywhere.

#### REAL STIMULUS ACT

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I have cosponsored Senator VITTER's legislation, The REAL, Resources from Energy for America's Liberty, Stimulus Act of 2009. It is crucial that this Nation realize the need to develop our oil and natural gas resources from the Outer Continental Shelf and ANWR, enact the kind of responsible streamlining of government to not hinder that development, and provide important regulatory relief.

I have consistently highlighted the amounts of U.S. reserves, and I think it is important to continue to point out the amount of reserves in the United States. The OCS holds 14 billion barrels

of oil and 55 trillion cubic feet of gas, which is equivalent to 25 years worth of imports from Saudi Arabia. ANWR holds 10 billion barrels or 15 years worth of imports from Saudi Arabia. Today we would have 1 million additional barrels of oil a day coming from ANWR had President Clinton not vetoed legislation in 1995 to authorize that production. Production from ANWR is entirely responsible. Compared to the size of Alaska, ANWR's 19 million acres is about the same size of South Carolina, and of that area, we propose opening about 1.5 million acres to exploration which is roughly 6 percent of ANWR. Of those 1.5 million acres, only 2,000—an area the size of Washington's Dulles International Airport—would be devoted to drilling. This is only one example of new production which can occur in an environmentally exacting manner.

The legislation also includes important regulatory reforms which outside the energy production components of this bill would be referred to the Environment and Public Works Committee for consideration. Some of the EPW related provisions include streamlining environmental considerations in the leasing of the OCS and ANWR and streamlining reviews for new nuclear power plant licensing. The bill includes language meant to ensure that Federal projects and actions are not needlessly delayed, and therefore made more costly, by required environmental reviews. Too often the NEPA mandated environmental review process is used as the means to slow or stop projects, not based on substantive environmental grounds but, rather, simply because selected individuals oppose the projects. We need to reduce the ability of these not-in-my-backyard interests to continue to manipulate Federal law this way. Too many jobs and economic resources are at stake.

The bill importantly excludes greenhouse gases from the definition of pollutant and prohibits the EPA Administrator from granting waivers to enforce their own tail pipe emission standards. Granting these States a waiver will only result in a patchwork of State regulations and compliance will vary greatly depending on product demand in each State. The U.S. auto industry, already on life support, faces a \$47 billion burden this year due to increased national fuel economy standards, according to the National Automobile Dealers Association.

Finally, the bill keeps activists from using the Endangered Species Act from hindering crucial energy exploration and production. Activists' efforts to list species and restrict human activities based on climate change are backdoor attempts to regulate greenhouse gas emissions under the Endangered Species Act. Directly linking species threats to climate change under ESA means that any increase in carbon dioxide or greenhouse gas emissions anywhere in the country could be subject to legal challenges due to arguments

that those activities are harming any species that is in decline. It allows endless litigation on major activities that are funded, carried out, or authorized by the Federal Government. The economic impacts of regulating greenhouse gases under ESA are enormous. For example, any permit for a powerplant, refinery, or road project in the United States could be subject to litigation if it contributes to total carbon emissions. ESA prompted lawsuits and bureaucratic delays could even extend to past fossil fuel-linked Federal projects if they could increase greenhouse gas emissions or reduce natural carbon dioxide uptake. The ESA is over 30 years old. Its only real success has been to provide full time employment for the radical activists and the trial bar. Most importantly, despite billions of Federal dollars spent, millions of acres of property rights restricted, and the years of red tape delays, barely 1 percent of listed species have actually recovered. If that is not justification to restructure an outdated, ineffective law, I don't know what is—there has to be a better way.

I have long said America is not running out of oil and gas or running out of places to look for oil and gas. America is running out of places where we are allowed to look for oil and gas. The American public has got to demand that the Democrats in Congress allow us to produce from our own resources without unnecessary and burdensome Government regulation.

#### IDAHOANS SPEAK OUT ON HIGH ENERGY PRICES

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, in mid-June, I asked Idahoans to share with me how high energy prices are affecting their lives, and they responded by the hundreds. The stories, numbering well over 1,200, are heartbreaking and touching. While energy prices have dropped in recent weeks, the concerns expressed remain very relevant. To respect the efforts of those who took the opportunity to share their thoughts, I am submitting every e-mail sent to me through an address set up specifically for this purpose to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This is not an issue that will be easily resolved, but it is one that deserves immediate and serious attention, and Idahoans deserve to be heard. Their stories not only detail their struggles to meet everyday expenses, but also have suggestions and recommendations as to what Congress can do now to tackle this problem and find solutions that last beyond today. I ask unanimous consent to have today's letters printed in the RECORD.

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

Thank you for the opportunity to provide opinion on our current problems. I work at the site, and was named the outstanding researcher for 2006. By way of further background, I hold a PhD in chemistry, and I have heretofore always voted [conservative].

It seems to me that the key question to be addressed is "what is the role of the Federal government guiding and fostering energy development and usage in the United States?" If I could ask one question of yourself, Mr. Risch, Mr. Obama, and Mr. McCain, that would be it.

It further seems to me that the de facto energy policy of our party is "the private sector will do it." I believe that what we have proven over the past 40 years is that this is incorrect. The current cost of energy supports my position: \$4 gasoline (with \$5 in sight), rising food prices (fueled by a nonsensical corn to ethanol policy), plus the cost of the war in Iraq (Alan Greenspan is correct; it is all about oil). Certainly the cost of electricity and other energy sources will follow suit. While the private sector has proven extremely adept at maximizing profits over a 3 month quarterly-reporting time frame, that appears to be the limit of their time horizon. It is sadly ironic that decisions made in 1974 by France regarding nuclear power and by Brazil (a dictatorship at the time!) in 1975 regarding ethanol, were vastly more far-sighted than what our country has chosen by abrogating energy leadership to the private sector.

Alternatively I believe that strong interaction lead by the Federal government and involving the private sector can solve the problem. While I understand that sounds socialistic, that is exactly how we were able to harness our power to address the challenge of the second world war and the cold war.

I would recommend that you set a goal to have the country be free of imported oil in 15 years. To accomplish this, we will need to find another way to power the transportation sector, and electricity is the only viable alternative. The government should subsidize mass transit and utilization of electric cars and development of next-generation electric cars should be subsidized. Financing for subsidies should come from taxes on the egregious profits realized by oil companies, which we are subsidizing in the form of military defense of the middle east. Clearly the supply of electricity will need to be greatly augmented, and nuclear fission is the best answer for this. While I do not believe that wind or solar have the efficiency to supply the amount of electricity needed, research into improving these technologies should be fostered.

In the process of implementing these policies, a highly desirable collateral effect would be to greatly spur American science. Federal support for basic and applied research would stabilize the funding base, and improve the desirability of the scientific disciplines, which are not in favor with young Americans, because the return on mastery of the fields of math, biology, chemistry and physics are not currently commensurate with the investment required to learn them. To fund this, you will have to figure out how to reign in health care, another item which will require forceful government intervention.

While I am encouraged by your interest in my opinion, I am dismayed by the timing. At this point, the horse is long out of the barn, and if you have done anything to address the situation, it has been invisible to me. Yet, you still have a good fraction of your term remaining, enough time to start acting in the best interest of the United States and her institutions, and to start de-prioritizing those of [individuals] who are only interested in their bottom lines.

Best regards and good luck.

GARY.

To quickly preface my story, I am a professional that nets a salary of roughly \$38,000/year with a small family. We have made the