

into the United States could endanger the American people by radicalizing others or providing financial support for terrorism. Director Mueller's testimony appears to undermine the claim that sending detainees to the United States is a safe alternative to Guantanamo.

Yesterday, the Senate spoke with near unanimity, by a vote of 90 to 6, against sending terrorist detainees to U.S. soil—a vote that mirrored a vote 2 years ago on the same question. The Senate also expressed its view yesterday that Congress expects its relevant committees to be briefed on the threat posed by the terrorists at Guantanamo. So it is clear that Senate Democrats do not believe circumstances have changed over the last 2 years in such a way that would warrant releasing or transferring terrorists into America.

If the President believes circumstances have changed, then he has an opportunity to explain those changes this morning. The American people are asking the administration to guarantee that any terrorist it releases or transfers will not return to the battlefield. This is particularly urgent in light of a New York Times report this morning that says one in seven detainees already released has returned to terrorism. The President has an opportunity to reassure the American people that future releases will not lead to the same result. If he is not able to provide specifics about his plan for terrorist detainees at Guantanamo, he could still provide this assurance by simply revising his policy. The President has already shown adaptability on military commissions, on prisoner photos, on Iraq, on Afghanistan, and on Pakistan. Here is an opportunity to show more of that flexibility on Guantanamo.

ENERGY

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, Americans have noticed a steady uptick in the price of gasoline over the past few weeks, and it is only going to get worse during the summer driving season. The economic downturn may have caused gas prices to fall from last summer's record highs, but as the economy recovers, \$4 gasoline could well return and Americans will want answers.

Fortunately, many of us have been busy putting together a balanced, sensible solution that gets at the root of our energy crisis and addresses the concerns of everyone involved in this debate, including some who traditionally have been at odds. We believe it is possible to build a bridge to the clean energy future all of us want without introducing crippling taxes on consumers or on industry. So this morning, with Memorial Day fast approaching, I would like to briefly outline this balanced approach.

The first step is to admit we have a serious problem. Something must be done to reduce America's dependence

on foreign oil. America uses more than a fifth of the world's supply of oil, much of it from countries that do not like us. If we start by using less, we will need a lot less from other countries. So conservation and increased efficiency are certainly necessary. It is something on which everyone can agree. We need to use less.

But conservation is only half the equation. Even as we use less energy, we need to produce more of our own. America sits on an ocean—a literal ocean—of untapped oil and natural gas and vast stores of coal and oil shale. Our geography also makes us rich in renewable energy sources such as wind, solar, and geothermal. Taken together, these resources are the perfect complement as we move toward the day when cars and factories can run on cleaner, more efficient fuels. But we have to be realistic about how far off that day is. We have to admit there is a gap between the clean renewable fuel we want and the reliable energy we need. So as we invest in technologies that will bring us cleaner, more efficient energy, the only way we can expect to truly reduce our dependence on foreign sources of oil is to produce more American energy and use less. This may sound like a simple proposal. The best solutions usually are. Unfortunately, the idea of finding more energy at home and using less is needlessly controversial because some are unwilling to admit that a gap exists between the energy we need now and the energy we want, and still others do not like a number of our proposals for finding more domestic energy.

Here is what we have proposed. We propose building 100 new clean nuclear energy plants as soon as possible. We propose offshore exploration for natural gas and oil. We propose making plug-in electric cars and trucks half of all new vehicles sold in 20 years. And we propose doubling research and development on energy to make all of this possible. These and other proposals, including the development of clean coal and coal-to-liquids technologies, constitute a balanced, comprehensive approach that would do all the things we need to reduce our dependence on foreign oil, help reduce our consumption, and build the bridge to a cleaner, more efficient energy future.

This approach would strengthen our economy by preserving jobs in existing industries even as we create new jobs by investing in new technologies. It would enhance our security by reducing our dependence on foreign suppliers. And it would help the environment by embracing the cleaner, more efficient energy sources of the future.

All of us recognize we should reduce the amount of energy we use. We also recognize the energy we use should be as clean as possible, as reliable as possible, and as inexpensive as possible. Our balanced approach of finding more American energy and using less would bring about all these things without

hurting the economy or disrupting our lives or hindering security.

So as the summer driving season continues, Americans will be reminded, once again, that our Nation's energy crisis has not gone away. But the approach I have outlined addresses that crisis head-on. Republicans will continue to speak out about the produce-more, use-less model. We hope our friends on the other side recognize it is the only sensible approach to a crisis that must be addressed.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

SIGNING AUTHORITY

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the majority leader be permitted to sign any duly enrolled bills and joint resolutions during today's session.

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

Mr. PRYOR. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

DEALERSHIP CLOSINGS

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Madam President, I wish to give sort of a progress report on the amendment I introduced yesterday and is pending still, but after closure it will be in a different category, of course. I wish to say I have had a very productive opportunity to talk to the president of Chrysler and the people at Chrysler to try to make headway for the Chrysler dealers, the 789 that have gotten the notice they will be shut down as of June 9. I think there is a way forward here. It is not set in concrete, but I think there is going to be a result that I believe will make it a much better situation. That is what I am working for because these dealers right now are facing bankruptcy themselves—every one of them. We are talking about 40,000 employees in these dealerships. So as the Government is certainly backing the automobile companies and they are trying to have as soft a landing as possible for all those involved in this very serious situation we are in, I want the dealers to be part of the soft landing.

I don't think it is Government's position to go in and change the decisions that have been made by Chrysler, but I do think it is our responsibility to assure that those dealers have the ability to have some accommodation for all the inventory they have—the cars, the special equipment, the parts—that after June 9, they will not be able to use. They will not be able to sell a Chrysler car or use the Chrysler logo. Although General Motors has given notice to its dealers, they have given them until the end of 2010 to work things through. But Chrysler I think is trying to stay as strong as they can going into the merger that has been approved, so they want a quick ending, which we all understand and support. I do. I want Chrysler to emerge in a stronger situation. I think we all do. But I also want the dealers that are suffering all over this country right now, having had 3 weeks' notice to shut down, sometimes a dealership that has been in business for 90 years or 50 years or 25 years—we can't walk away from that. Chrysler can't walk away from that. I believe, from talking to the president today, they agree with that.

We are trying to get something definitive. I will report, again, on this. I am going to support cloture because we must provide the supplemental funds for our troops who are in harm's way. That is the premier purpose of this supplemental appropriation. I am very pleased this Senate has acted decisively to stop the funding for moving prisoners from Guantanamo Bay into our country or letting them go into other countries, where we fear we might see them again on the other side of an IED or some other disruption. I am very pleased with the action the Senate took yesterday on that. We must fund our troops who are in harm's way and their families and their quality of life, giving them the equipment and the training and the support they need to do their jobs.

At the same time, the reason I brought this amendment forward is because it, too, is an emergency. While it is not a taxpayer expense, it is a situation that I think is untenable and that is the people who are under the gun until June 9. My message is that I believe the Chrysler people are going to try to do the right thing. I believe the White House can help us make that happen. We are going to work with the White House and the task force. The Senators from Michigan, I think, are also being very proactive here. I wish to say I appreciate the cosponsors of my amendment. Senator MIKULSKI, on the floor last night, was added as a cosponsor, along with Senator MENENDEZ and Senator BROWN.

I ask unanimous consent, at this time, that Senator CASEY and Senator LAUTENBERG be added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1189.

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

Mrs. HUTCHISON. We were adding sponsors just about every few minutes

as people began to see the plight of these dealers and hear from them.

My message is we need to vote for cloture. We need to go forward with this supplemental appropriation for our troops, but we must—we must—take care of these dealers in the best possible way and not leave them stranded in a situation which was not their doing. Yet they are paying the highest of all prices.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amendment No. 1144 be considered in order postcloture in addition to the requirements under rule XVI, rule XXII, and the adoption of the Inouye amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. DURBIN. Reserving the right to object, this amendment from my friend, Senator CHAMBLISS, would preclude the U.S. Attorney General from allowing detainees at Guantanamo to even be tried for crimes in the United States. I think it goes too far, and I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Madam President, the assistant majority leader is exactly right. My amendment is going to prohibit any Guantanamo detainee from being brought to the United States. The assistant majority leader made a comment yesterday that he thought it was somewhat foolish on the part of the minority to think this President would even allow terrorists to be brought into the United States. The fact is, this administration is already proposing that some of the terrorists who are held at Guantanamo be brought into the United States and be freed because the court has determined that 17 Uyghurs ought to be free. The administration is talking about freeing those Uyghurs inside the United States.

The press reported this morning that President Obama intends to bring a Gitmo detainee, Ahmed Ghailani, to New York to be tried in our criminal courts. I fear this is the start of a long process of transferring detainees to the United States where, I believe, legal technicalities will ultimately allow some of them to be freed into the United States.

The Senate voted yesterday to prevent any detainees from being brought

here and has been very outspoken on this issue this week. Despite this, the President has chosen to ignore the will of Congress and bring Ghailani to the United States. Instead, he is acting quickly to bring him here before he signs the supplemental bill into law.

I don't know how the President thinks he can try this detainee in our courts. Ghailani is not just any terrorist. He was a high-value detainee in the CIA's detention. Bringing him into a U.S. courtroom will open a floodgate to challenges on his detention, his treatment, and any evidence obtained from him.

Additionally, if we were able to obtain any evidence on Ghailani from any other terrorists, that information would likely not be admitted in U.S. courts because it would be considered hearsay. If not, the prosecution would be required to bring additional terrorists to New York just to testify in Ghailani's trial. This alone will make a conviction much more difficult.

There is too much at stake to grant the unprecedented benefit of our legal system's complex procedural safeguards to foreign nationals who were captured outside the United States during a time of war. Allowing these terrorists to escape conviction or, worse yet, to be freed into the United States by our courts because of legal technicalities would tarnish the reputation of our legal system as one that is fair and just.

Prohibiting the detainees from entering the United States, as my amendment does—the assistant majority leader is exactly right—is one small step in the right direction.

Further, if these individuals, such as Ghailani, were to be brought to the United States by President Obama to be tried in our article III courts and not convicted, the only mechanism available to our Government to continue to detain these individuals would be via immigration law. However, current immigration laws on our books are insufficient to ensure these detainees would be mandatorily detained and continue to be detained until they can successfully be removed from our borders.

Although I am adamantly opposed to bringing any of these detainees to the United States, and I do not believe the President has independent authority to do so, I do believe we need legislation to safeguard our citizens and our communities in the event they are brought here. To that end, my amendment makes mandatory the detention of any Gitmo detainees brought to the United States.

It is imperative the Senate consider my amendment before the final adoption of this supplemental bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The assistant majority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, in response to my friend, the Senator from Georgia, he has obviously forgotten the name Zacarias Moussaoui. He was accused of being the 19th or 20th