

the Czech Republic would house a narrow beam midcourse tracking radar that is currently used by our missile defense system in the Pacific. These are things we know work.

I am very concerned about it. I have not heard the statement from the White House, but I have a feeling we are going to hear the same thing we heard back in 1998, and it is very troubling. This is something that can be—should be an act of desperation in terms of Western Europe at this time.

CAP AND TRADE

Having said that, this is some good news. That was the bad news. The good news is we have notice this morning that the Democratic caucus, as reported in Politico, is split over the bill, the cap-and-trade bill we are talking about, with coal-, oil- and manufacturing-State Democrats raising concerns that a cap-and-trade system would disproportionately spike electricity bills for consumers and businesses in their regions.

There is a recognition now that this thing we have been talking about ever since the Kyoto treaty—the threat at that time that they were talking about is now. Everyone realizes that is not what it was. Science has changed dramatically and most scientists now are saying this is something that was overstated that one time.

The cost, though, is the big thing. I quit arguing about the science a long time ago. I gave a speech from this podium not too long ago. If anyone is interested, I ask my colleagues to go to the Web site inhofe.senate.gov, where we listed 700 scientists who were on the other side of the issue who are now on the skeptics' side, recognizing the science is not there. David Bellamy from Great Britain is one who was always talking about—he was on Al Gore's side on this thing. After going through and restudying and reevaluating the science, he agreed everything wasn't there.

The same thing is true with leaders in France and Israel. But what we have now is something people do understand and that is the cost of this, the consistent cost. Kyoto's cost, if we lived by the emission standard, would be somewhere, according to the Wharton Econometric Survey, I think it was called back during the Kyoto days, would be between \$300 billion and \$330 billion every year. As bad as the stimulus was, at least that is a one-shot deal and the people would not have to pay for it every year. This will be every year.

Then along came McCain-Lieberman in 2003 and 2005 and the same estimates came about that it would be a \$300 billion tax increase. I remember 1993 when we had the Clinton-Gore tax increase, which was the largest tax increase in three decades.

During that time we looked at it, it was a \$32 billion tax increase: increasing inheritance taxes, marginal rates, capital gains, and all of that. That is only \$32 billion. This is 10 times that size.

Well, the White House was trying to say, and several of them on the other side in our committee—in fact, the chairman of our committee—it is going to cost a postage stamp a day. People are willing to pay for that.

Those postage stamps must be getting pretty expensive. Now we have found out there is an analysis released by the U.S. Department of Treasury that was held down, not released. Now we know what it is. They said the cost would be between \$100 and \$200 billion a year.

The cost—this is according to their figures now—to an American household would be an extra \$1,761 a year. This is their analysis. I think that is right. In fact, we have seen the CRA report that shows the cost of this—and MIT agrees with this, I might add, because they evaluated the Warner-Lieberman bill 12 months ago—right now being closer to \$366 billion a year, with a cost per family, the study has shown, in my State of Oklahoma and in the State of Texas, we would be the highest taxed. It would be \$3,300 a year per family. That is huge. I know the east coast and the west coast is a little bit more than half of that, but still it is a huge tax increase.

Finally, this report that was put together by the Department of Treasury has been released. And they admit it. So we can quit talking about some of these things that are not realistic.

We know what the cost is. We know also the likelihood of it coming up this year is most unusual. I do not think it is going to happen. The Senate majority leader stated, I think 2 days ago, that the Senate may not act on comprehensive energy and climate change legislation.

Senator BEN NELSON from Nebraska, a Democrat, I might add, said: We have enough on our plate at the moment. With the fight over health care reform, it is questionable to open another front.

The Senate majority whip, DICK DURBIN, last week added that: It is a difficult schedule. Members are already anxious about health care reform. So I do not think it is going to come up. And I frankly will be ready here to fight to make sure it does not come up when the new year comes in.

I do not think there are too many people in the Senate who want to go into their reelection in 2010 having voted for the largest tax increase in the history of America. This is exactly what it would be. Let's keep in mind, what was the largest tax increase in the history of America was the 1993 tax increase. This would be 10 times greater than that. And the people now realize that. That was good news today.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR MEL MARTINEZ

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I wish to add my comments to a few other comments on Mel Martinez whom we all loved so much. I do not

think I have ever seen anyone since Jesse Helms who was loved by so many people as Mel Martinez. He had a way of smiling, and in talking about things in a way that others did not understand. My colleagues have already come to the floor and talked about his escape from Cuba and how he came over and how then he was able to get his father over. It is a story that America will always remember. It will always be in our history books.

He was always such a great guy. He will be missed around here.

One of the things that was not said much about him was his sense of humor. I have to say I enjoyed being around him because he was, in his own subtle way, a very humorous person. I can remember, and I have had the occasion, probably more than any other Member, going into the areas in Iraq and Afghanistan and Africa where there were hostilities. But I was making probably my 12th or 14th trip into Baghdad on a C-130. It happened to be Mel Martinez's first trip. So we were talking about: Once you get out, you are going to run over to the helicopter, and they are going to take you to the Green Zone, all of the things to anticipate. I said to him: One of the problems we are going to have is that when we leave, we have these old C-130E models. They should be re-engined. We should have J models, but we do not. Because of the cuts in the military, we have not been able to upgrade those systems.

So I said: When we climb out of here, it is going to be in a C-130E model. We are not going to be able to climb as high and as fast as we want, and there are surface-to-air missiles out there that we have to be concerned about. And, of course, they are all set up. We have very capable pilots and crews in these C-130s. So I said: We will be well taken care of if something happens. Sure enough, it happened.

The first thing you do when you get out of your helicopter in Baghdad to get on a C-130 to come back to Kuwait or wherever you might be going is you take your helmet, your life jacket, your vest off, because they are so heavy and uncomfortable—you get in there and you take them off. Well, we all did that.

I was sitting up with, as I do quite often, the pilots, when all of a sudden the explosion came, the light was there, and we deployed the heat-seeking devices that are on a C-130. Of course, that is already very loud. Someone who has never gone through that experience before would assume we were about to go down.

I ran downstairs and I saw Mel Martinez sitting there without his helmet, without his protective vest by him; he had put them back on. I said: Mel, what are you doing putting your vest and your helmet back on?

He said: Well, I assumed that we were going to be shot down. And if Kitty—that is his wife—if she found out that I did not have my vest and my helmet on, she would kill me.

Well, that is Mel Martinez. He had all of those jewels. I think he is going to be missed by a lot of us for all of the reasons we have articulated on the floor.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALEXANDER. 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.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, how much time is remaining in morning business?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is 12 minutes remaining.

CZARS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Thank you very much. Would the Chair please let me know when I have 1 minute remaining.

Monday on the Senate floor, I expressed my concern about the number of so-called czars in the White House and in the administration. I said then that the number of czars—I believe the number is now 32—is an affront to the Constitution. It is anti-democratic. It is a poor example of what was promised to be a new era of transparency. It is a poor way to manage the government. And it is the most visible symptom of this administration's 8-month record of too many Washington takeovers.

Yesterday, the White House blog and a White House press secretary objected to what I said on Monday, pointing out that I had supported manufacturing czars and AIDS czars 6 years ago. Of course I did; I acknowledged that in my remarks on Monday. As I said Monday, there have always been some czars in the White House and in the government since Franklin D. Roosevelt was President. Some of them were appointed by Presidents, some of them were created by statute, and a few of them were confirmed by the Senate. There's never been anything like we've seen with this administration.

Also on Monday, I joined in a letter from Senator COLLINS, Senator BOND, Senator CRAPO, Senator BENNETT, and Senator ROBERTS, making clear that not every czar is a problem. In that letter, we identified at least 18 czar positions created by the Obama administration whose reported responsibilities may be undermining the constitutional oversight responsibilities of Congress or express statutory assignments of responsibility to other executive branch officials.

In this letter from Senator COLLINS, in which the rest of us joined, we said: With regard to each of these positions, we ask that you explain: the specific authorities and responsibilities of the position, including any limitations you have placed on the position to ensure that it does not encroach on the legiti-

mate statutory responsibilities of other executive branch officials.

Second, the process by which the administration examines the character and qualifications of the individuals appointed by the President to fill the position.

And, third, whether the individual occupying the position will agree to any reasonable request to appear before, or provide information to, Congress.

The letter goes on to say:

We also urge you to refrain from creating similar additional positions or making appointments to any vacant czar positions until you have fully consulted with the appropriate Congressional committees.

Finally, we ask that you reconsider your approach of centralizing authority at the White House. Congress has grappled repeatedly with the question of how to organize the Federal Government.

We went into some detail about that, and asked respectfully that the President consult carefully with Congress prior to establishing any additional czars.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter from six senators be included in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. Senator COLLINS and the five of us who joined in her letter were not the only Senators to be concerned about this issue. On Wednesday, Senator FEINGOLD, the Democrat from Wisconsin, questioned President Obama's policy of policy czars and sent a letter to the President, just as we did. In that letter, Senator FEINGOLD urged the President to release information about the role and responsibility of these czars, which is what we asked him to do in our letter as well.

Senator HUTCHISON of Texas, in the Washington Post on September 13, wrote an excellent op-ed describing how the system of checks and balances is upset by an excessive number of Washington czars who are unconfirmed and unaccountable to the Congress, and who do not answer questions from those of us who are elected to ask such questions.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator FEINGOLD's letter to the President be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. On Monday, I pointed out that not only Senator HUTCHISON and Senator COLLINS and the other Republican Senators have these concerns. Now Senator FEINGOLD from the other side of the aisle has raised questions about these czars.

I mentioned this Monday, but I want to repeat it in case the White House press office missed it: Senator BYRD, our President Pro Tempore, widely considered by all of us in the Senate to be the constitutional conscience of this

Senate, was the first to write the president expressing concerns over the increasing appointment of White House czars.

In his letter he said:

Too often I have seen these lines of authority and responsibility become tangled and blurred, sometimes purposely, to shield information and to obscure the decision-making process.

Senator BYRD went on to say that:

The rapid and easy accumulation of power by White House staff can threaten the constitutional system of checks and balances. At the worst, White House staff have taken direction and control of problematic areas that are the statutory responsibility of Senate-confirmed officials.

Senator BYRD continues:

As Presidential assistants and advisers, these White House staffers are not accountable for their actions to Congress, to cabinet officials, and to virtually anyone but the President. They rarely testify before Congressional committees, and often shield the information and decision-making process behind the assertion of executive privilege.

In too many instances, White House staff have been allowed to inhibit openness and transparency, and reduce accountability.

Finally, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD following my remarks a list of 18 new czars created by the Obama administration.

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

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. I want to make it clear to the White House Press Office that we are focused on those 18 new czars. We recognize there have been czars before, that for the reasons Senator BYRD, Senator HUTCHISON, Senator COLLINS, and others have described. We believe this is too many, and we take seriously our responsibilities under Article II of the Constitution to confirm officials who manage the government, to ask them questions, to approve their appropriations, and to withhold their appropriations when it's appropriate.

We have these positions in the Executive Office of the President; there are 10 of them: central region czar, Dennis Ross; cyber-security czar, domestic violence czar, economic czar, energy and environment czar, and health czar. Those are some of the biggest issues facing Congress, and here are these czars with authority for policy close to the President but unaccountable to us. We have a senior director for information sharing policy, urban affairs czar, WMD policy czar, a green job czar, who resigned recently. Those are the positions in the Executive Office of the President, 10 new ones. Then there are eight more that are in departments or agencies, including: Afghanistan czar, auto recovery czar, car czar, Great Lakes czar, pay czar, Guantanamo closure czar, international climate czar, and the border czar.

I described on Monday, as Senator BYRD has said more eloquently, the problems with too many czars. The first problem is the constitutional