

arbitrarily kick Head Start students out of class or rob college students of their Pell grants—both cuts resoundingly rejected yesterday—and I mean cuts that don't pull the plug on renewable energy jobs or cuts that fire thousands of workers at community health centers across the country. Republicans should be willing to look at our country's substantial budget and find cuts more worthy than those that would weaken law enforcement and border security to keep us safe. I hope they will.

I hope they will join Democrats in saving money by attacking waste, fraud, and abuse. I hope they will join us in making tough choices and avoiding the temptation to make counterproductive cuts. Let's come together to cut in a way that strengthens our economy and doesn't weaken our economy. Let's cut in a way that makes our neighborhoods, our schools, and our borders stronger, not weaker.

As the negotiation process begins anew, I remind my Republican friends that time is short. I also remind them that the deadline we face—a week from tomorrow—is the deadline they set. We didn't set it. Democrats warned from the start that the process would take a month. Republicans would agree only to a period half as long as that—2 weeks. Those 2 weeks are up, as I said, next Friday.

So my message is this to my Republican colleagues: You set the deadline, and the responsibility of meeting it is as much yours as it is ours. Both parties also share a responsibility to be reasonable. So let's get to work. We cannot negotiate this in the media. We cannot negotiate this if we are unwilling to give any ground. We cannot be stubborn and expect a solution. It is time to negotiate in good faith, it is time for all political posturing to end, and it is time for pragmatism, which is long overdue.

I would also say to my friends in the House that the Senate has produced two very strong jobs bills. One is the FAA reauthorization, which is long overdue. That was a bipartisan bill. It passed overwhelmingly here in the Senate and would save or create 280,000 jobs—a pretty good step in the right direction. Just in the last 24 hours, we passed the patent reform bill. That will create 300,000 jobs. These two jobs bills need to be completed by the House of Representatives so we can send them to the President. These two jobs bills are important. The House should focus on jobs, not these arbitrary cuts they have been making. So I hope the House would right away work on the jobs bills that have already passed the Senate—patents and, of course, the FAA bill.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

DOMESTIC ENERGY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, throughout the week I have pointed out that our Nation faces a day of reckoning on entitlements such as Social Security and Medicare, and I have expressed my disappointment about the White House's failure to lead on reforms that would save these programs at an opportune moment like our own.

The best time to solve the kind of fiscal crisis we face is when the two parties share power in Washington. Everyone knows we either address these problems together or they won't be addressed at all. Everyone knows the President has to take the lead. That is why Presidents from both parties have done just that during periods of divided government in the past. That is why many of us are calling on this President to do the same for the good of the country now.

But when it comes to job creation, the President isn't just failing to lead; in many cases, he is actually blocking the way. Nowhere is this more evident than in the area of energy exploration.

Americans looking at the price of gas at the pump these days are justifiably upset. What they may not realize is that some in the administration are actively working to prevent us from increasing our own oil production here at home. So this morning, with gas prices on the rise, I would like to step back for a minute and quickly review what the administration is doing to inhibit energy production right here at home. Taken together, it would be a pretty long list, including delays and suspensions and revocations and outright cancellations of lease permits, which translates into higher prices and fewer American jobs. So I will just list a few of the highlights.

The administration started by canceling oil and gas leases for domestic exploration. Immediately after taking office, the Secretary of the Interior, Ken Salazar, canceled 77 oil and gas leases in the State of Utah. One year later, the administration suspended 61 more leases, this time in Montana. Shortly after canceling the Utah leases, Secretary Salazar extended the public comment period to renew offshore drilling by another 6 months, dragging out an already lengthy process even further.

Then, immediately after the gulf oil spill began last April, the administration imposed a 6-month moratorium on offshore drilling in the gulf even as it canceled energy exploration that was set to take place thousands of miles away from the spill in the gulf up in the Arctic. Two Federal courts on three separate occasions have declared the moratorium in the gulf unjust. The administration has ignored them. It has kept the ban in place despite these rulings, forcing the drillers who have been affected by it to relocate their rigs—and the thousands of good-paying jobs they supported—to other parts of the world.

So if one is wondering where the jobs are, a good place to start is the admin-

istration's efforts to block American energy exploration. Senator MURKOWSKI points out that U.S. oil reserves at just three sources in Alaska—just three sources in Alaska—could replace crude oil imports from the Persian Gulf for nearly 65 years. Three sources in Alaska, currently shut down, could replace crude oil imports from the Persian Gulf for 65 years. Yet all three are off limits due to decisions made by or continued by this administration.

Behind all these actions is a complete disconnect. At a time when gas prices are climbing higher and higher, pinching pocketbooks and threatening an economic recovery, Democrats in Washington would rather ignore the fact that Americans will remain dependent on fossil fuel for decades to come. But we shouldn't be surprised by it. Two months before the President was elected, the man he ended up choosing as his Energy Secretary told a reporter how he would go about reducing America's dependence on oil. He said: "Somehow, we have to figure out how to boost the price of gasoline to the levels in Europe." And if that was the strategy, Secretary Chu seems to be getting his wish. And the administration is doing just about everything it can to keep them there.

Now is the time to be asking what we can do to increase domestic energy production, not proposing ways to squeeze American families even more. That is why all of these actions by the administration, along with the tax hike on energy production some have proposed that will only be passed on to consumers in the form of even higher gas prices, are the very last thing Americans need right now. We should be looking for ways to lighten the burden on American families, not saddling them with a minivan tax.

There is a better approach. Rather than squeezing the public and killing jobs with artificially higher prices, we should be looking for ways to increase domestic production even as we promote alternative sources of energy for the future. An all-of-the-above approach to energy production—and the jobs that come with it—of the kind Republicans have been advocating for years would capitalize on the abundant resources we already have right here at home while at the same time looking for alternative sources of energy and new technologies that will free us from dependence on fossil fuels down the road.

This is a responsible approach. It protects existing jobs and creates new jobs at a time when Americans need them. It would reduce our dependence on foreign sources of oil. It honors the concerns Americans have right now about the rising price of gas, and it respects the reality that most of the cars in this country will run on gas for many years to come. But higher prices at the pump and fewer American jobs is the wrong answer.

TRIBUTE TO DAVID BRODER

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, sadly, we lost David Broder yesterday. A lot has been said in the last 24 hours about that distinguished journalist. I wish to add just a brief word of my own.

I will not pretend to have known him well, although we did talk from time to time over the years. I admired him greatly. One could not help but admire him, and a few things truly stand out. First of all, in a city that is full of people in a rush to make an impression, David was the guy who took the time to get it right, day in and day out, without bombast or pretense.

He wasn't looking to make an impression as much as he was trying to do his job and to do it well. The notoriety, of course, took care of itself. He was a workhorse first and foremost—a reporter who seemed to enjoy the work more than any attention he got for it.

Everyone who ever worked with him seems to have a story about watching him knocking on doors while he was in his late seventies or earnestly listening to a Midwest voter out in the cold. It all points to a sort of sturdiness of purpose and to the old virtues of patience, fairness and hard work and a sense that other people's opinions were at least as valuable as his own.

Add to that a deep curiosity and thoughtfulness and a childlike appreciation for the mechanics of democracy, and we have a pretty good model for what political reporting is all about.

I hesitate to say he was conservative in temperament, if not in his politics, but that is what came through.

It became commonplace to say David Broder was the dean of American political reporters. But I think it is worth understanding what people meant by that. It doesn't mean he was the most exciting guy in the room—he wasn't. It doesn't mean he had the most scoops—I am not sure he did. I think what it means, aside from the sheer length of his career, was that more than most people, his life came to take the shape of the profession he chose in life. It became sort of an extension of himself.

That is what seemed to give him so much joy and satisfaction in his work, along with the respect and admiration and maybe even a little bit of envy of so many others.

Republican or Democrat, liberal or conservative, young or old, we could use a few more David Broders.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning

business until 2:15 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

ENERGY

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I was hoping to have a little bit more time, so I will cover this a little faster than I normally would. It is so critical.

I just got back from the Middle East, and I know the problems that are over there. A lot of people are saying the gas prices that are going up are a result, partially, of what is happening over there, but the real problem is a political problem.

First of all, let me talk about the commitment this administration has to cap and trade. Some people who have been around for a while can remember that way back at the Kyoto treaty I kind of led the opposition to ratifying that treaty. Later on—for the next 10 years—they tried to pass cap-and-trade legislation. Since I chaired the committee of jurisdiction at that time, we thought this was not going to work, even by the admission of the EPA. If we were to pass something such as this in the United States, it wouldn't have any effect on reducing greenhouse gases.

I still say this. Something is happening this morning in the House. They are looking at this issue, and we have introduced legislation that has said the EPA doesn't have the jurisdiction to regulate greenhouse gases. I will get to that in a minute.

My message is simply that higher gas prices are simply a product of this administration's goal. The minority leader, a minute ago, said something. He quoted Steven Chu, the Secretary of Energy. He said: "Somehow we have to figure out how to boost the price of gasoline to the levels in Europe."

In the United Kingdom, gas is \$7.87 per gallon; in Italy, it is \$7.54; in France, it is \$7.50; in Germany, it is \$7.41.

That is what this administration wants to do with gas prices. They have a motive for doing that. I cannot stop talking about the cap-and-trade agenda until we realize how it does affect things. You might remember that back during the campaign, President Obama stated in 2008—when he was running for office—and he has stated it several times: "Under cap and trade, electricity prices would necessarily skyrocket."

He had it right. The whole point of that is, it would skyrocket if we were to pass it. That also has an effect on all forms of energy. The House Energy and Power Subcommittee is voting this morning on the Energy Tax Prevention Act, which I introduced in the Senate, and it was introduced by Congressman UPTON in the House. The bottom line of the Energy Prevention Act is to make it so EPA doesn't have the jurisdiction to do what they could not do legisla-

tively. Starting with the Kyoto treaty and all the way up to the following 10 years, they tried to pass—in 2003 and 2005 and 2008 and 2009—a similar type of cap and trade.

What is the cost of cap and trade? The cost would be—and this goes back to the Kyoto treaty and when we had the estimates from the Wharton School and MIT—between \$300 billion and \$400 billion a year. In Oklahoma, that translates to \$3,000 a year for each family who files a tax return. What do we get for it? By the admission of the Obama EPA and Lisa Jackson, in response to a question I asked live on TV—I asked: What effect would this have on worldwide emissions of CO₂? The answer was it would not because that only affects the United States. In reality, it could actually increase it, as our jobs go overseas, to places such as China and Mexico and other places where there are fewer emission controls. So it could have the opposite effect.

Nonetheless, I say this because there are people wandering around out there who say we should do something about emissions. Yet I wish to make sure they are listening. Even if we did this, it would not have any effect. They hope, if we restrict enough supply, the price will increase and we can simply shift to what they call green energy.

I think it is important people understand that the Republican position on this is, yes, we want green energy, renewables, but we also want coal and natural gas and nuclear and oil. These are the products that can run America today. This is what we are doing. Back in Oklahoma, there are logical people. They ask: What would it be if they don't want oil, gas or coal? How do we run this machine called America? The answer is, we can't.

Let me state this—I don't have the time. It is not just the administration or Secretary Chu but others in the administration, such as Alan Krueger, Assistant Secretary for Economic Policy, who said: "The administration believes that it is no longer sufficient to address our Nation's energy needs by finding more fossil fuels."

They are antifossil fuels. They admit the tax subsidies are currently provided in the oil and gas industry, and they lead to inefficiency by encouraging overinvestment in domestic resources in this industry.

This is critical. This is an administration official, Alan Krueger: "The small change in domestic producer costs [which I call a tax increase] could cause some production to shift from domestic to foreign suppliers."

There it is, folks. That means we would have to depend on the Middle East—import more of our energy from the Middle East. By the way, I think it is important to note the Congressional Research Service—and I think we all respect their work—came out with a report, and they stated—and nobody has been able to refute this yet—that the United States of America now has