

But it sure doesn't seem that many folks are interested in doing the hard job of creating jobs.

Folks all over Montana have been asking for good-paying, liveable-wage jobs, the kind of jobs that can't be outsourced, jobs that put folks to work in our forests, jobs that build the energy infrastructure this country needs. Right now there are two proposals that will do just that.

First, I would like to talk about my Forest Jobs and Recreation Act. This bill will stabilize the wood products industry in Montana by ensuring a dependable timber supply that will give certainty to loggers in the woods and workers in the mills.

This bill will allow for the restoration of 100,000 acres of national forest lands in Montana, reducing the chances of out-of-control forest fires that could devastate our communities, our watersheds, and our way of life.

Recent data released by the Forest Service shows that wildfires that burn where the trees were thinned were less expensive to fight, they were easier to control, and did less structural damage to neighboring buildings.

This bill also puts people to work by rolling up roads, improving our water quality, and protecting big game habitat. It protects nearly 1 million acres for our children and grandchildren in wilderness and recreation areas.

This is a bipartisan solution, supported by industry and conservationists. It is the product of people who were on polar opposites of the issue who came together to find solutions for how we can manage our forests better. We could take a lesson from their example. They brought those solutions to me to be put into law. This is a bill that will move the country in the right direction with a responsible balanced solution, and it will create jobs.

But rather than getting this bill passed, it has become a political football in the appropriations process. Some House Republicans seem to be more concerned with their own job rather than creating Montana jobs by passing my Forest Jobs and Recreation Act. That isn't fair to Montanans who are anxious to get back to work, to reclaim a life that has been disappearing in a rapid rate. We lost over 1,700 jobs in the timber industry in 2009, more last year, and still more this year.

I would ask folks who are negotiating this final deal right now to think about the folks who are counting on us to set politics aside and do what is right for our country and for Montana.

This same logic applies to the Keystone XL Pipeline. Right now, the President has the power to create jobs by approving this pipeline. He could make the decision to approve this pipeline in the very near future.

Now, let me be clear. He should do it right. Doing it right means approving this pipeline while respecting private property rights. I support the pipeline. But I will never support any corporation—much less a foreign corporation—

given the right to take away property from Montanans or any other American without a fair deal that is negotiated in good faith.

Doing it right also means ensuring that the highest possible safety standards are followed throughout Montana and rural America. I do not believe we should have to wait until January of 2013 for a decision that can create American jobs right now. In Montana, we need the jobs. We need the ability to provide incentives to boost production in places where it makes the most sense, such as the Bakken formation in eastern Montana.

Now, many folks don't know that the Keystone Pipeline will actually include an onramp in Baker, MT. That onramp will tap into the booming Bakken formation, and it will ensure that we are getting the most out of American energy resources. That matters to our economy and it matters to our energy and national security. The Keystone XL pipeline will transport North American oil and will help move this country away from spending billions of dollars per day in Middle Eastern countries that do not like us very much.

At the same time, I am concerned about the way folks on both sides of this issue are handling it right now. We do not need to entangle this issue with a payroll tax in the House bill that would add more than \$25 billion to our debt and that would cut Medicare benefits.

It is time to quit playing politics and start doing what is right, whether it is the Forest Jobs Act or the Keystone pipeline. It is time to move forward, working together to create jobs in this country.

Instead, politicians on both sides are using these important items as political footballs and that is too bad. We should be acting responsibly to create jobs with this pipeline and to put folks back to work in the woods with my bill. Instead, we are watching political maneuvering designed to score points rather than create jobs. We all know this is how Washington acts. The people who lose are the hard-working Americans and Montanans who want to get back to work. They want to build and maintain the infrastructure that powers and protects America.

I am proud to again offer my support for the Keystone XL pipeline and the jobs it will create. We need a quicker decision based on the merits of the project. After setting aside their differences and working together to protect our forests, Montanans also deserve the passage of the Forest Jobs and Recreation Act. Instead of irresponsible partisan fights, it is time that Congress finally takes a page from those who constructed the forest jobs bill. They set aside nearly 30 years of partisan bickering to find solutions where everyone gives a little and gains a lot. It is the right way to do it.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent I be permitted to engage in a colloquy with my colleagues for the remainder of the Democratic time in morning business.

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

GLOBAL WARMING

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I understand that some of my colleagues here in the Senate and in the House as well do not believe global warming is real and they do not want to see our country and, in fact, other countries around the world take the necessary actions to deal with this issue. That is fine; everybody is entitled to their opinion. But it does seem to me to make a bit of sense that we listen to the leading scientists of this world, not only in our own country but throughout the world, and hear what they have to say about global warming and the need to respond.

The National Academy of Sciences in our country, the United States, joined by academies of science in the United Kingdom, in Italy, in Mexico, Canada, France, Japan, Russia, Germany, China, India, Brazil, South Africa, have said "climate change is happening even faster than previously estimated" and the "need for urgent action to address climate change is now indisputable."

They are not talking about whether climate change is real or not real. What they are saying and what scientists all over the world are saying is that climate change is happening even faster than previously reported. Eighteen scientific societies, including the American Geophysical Union, the American Chemical Society, and the American Association for the Advancement of Science said:

Observations throughout the world make it clear that climate change is occurring, and rigorous scientific research demonstrates that the greenhouse gases emitted by human activities are the primary driver. These conclusions are based on multiple independent lines of evidence, and contrary assertions are inconsistent with an objective assessment of the vast body of peer-reviewed science.

That comes from the American Geophysical Union, the American Chemical Society, and the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Further, it is not just scientists in our own country or throughout the world who are talking about climate change, who are talking about the need to respond vigorously to that crisis, but right within our own government, the U.S. Government, we have the Department of Defense saying:

Climate change is an accelerant of instability.

What that means is that when there is drought, when countries around the world are unable to grow the food they need, when there is flooding and people are driven off the land, and when people migrate from one area to another,

this creates international instability, which is of concern to the Department of Defense.

The CIA understands that “climate change could have significant geopolitical impacts around the world, contributing to poverty, environmental degradation, and the further weakening of fragile governments,” as well as “food and water scarcity.” That is from our own CIA.

But it is not just scientists around the world, not just government agencies in the United States; you have a business whose life and death, whose profit margin depends upon understanding this issue and that is the insurance industry. If the insurance industry ends up paying out a whole lot of money when there are disasters, they are going to lose money. They have to understand climate change and the disasters, the weather disturbances that occur from that. This is what they say, in a report from the National Association of Insurance Commissioners. They found there is “broad consensus among insurers that climate change will have an effect on extreme weather events.” These are guys whose profit margins depend upon that analysis.

Many Americans and people around the world are concerned about the future impacts of global warming on our planet and what is going to happen 10 or 20 years down the line, and that is terribly important. We have to understand what climate change is going to do to our planet in years to come. But we do not have to just look at what may happen 20 or 30 years from today; we should be looking at what is happening right now, in the year 2011. The World Health Organization reports annual weather-related disasters have tripled since the 1960s, causing more than 60,000 deaths per year. The National Climatic Data Center shows that 26,500 record-high temperatures were recorded in weather stations across the United States this summer. Texas set the record for the warmest summer of any State since instrument records began in 1895. Oklahoma set a record for its warmest summer, exceeding records set during the Dust Bowl era of the 1930s. Drought in Texas has led to wildfires that destroyed more than 1,500 homes in Texas.

A 2010 heat wave in Russia killed 56,000 people. The heat wave in Europe in 2003 killed 35,000 people. We can look at Pakistan, which in 2010 had a record 129-degree temperature. All of that is consistent with what scientists have been warning us about for years.

NASA’s James Hansen said climate change “loads the dice” in favor of more extreme weather events. Hansen said the answer to whether greenhouse gas emissions are contributing to these extreme weather disturbances is “yes . . . humans probably bear responsibility for the extreme event.”

There is much to be said. I think a number of colleagues are coming to the floor. But I want to yield the floor to a Senator who has been an absolute lead-

er on this whole issue, fighting for the environment, and that is Senator WHITEHOUSE of Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I thank my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TESTER). The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, the statement my colleague has made is truthful and important, but there is absolutely more to this story even than that. At another time I will discuss at greater length the oceans dimension to what is happening to our planet as a result of the carbon pollution we are emitting at literally unprecedented levels in human history. But for now let me say it is very severe, very dire, and to everyone who is listening and paying attention, the ocean is emitting warning signs that we disregard at our peril.

In addition to the threat of environmental harm, connected to the problem of carbon pollution is a huge opportunity and that is the opportunity of clean energy. Clean energy will drive the decades to come. Clean energy jobs can and should be powering our economic recovery.

We are in a race right now. We are in a race for dominance and for pre-eminence in the clean energy economy that is emerging. All around the world, other countries see it. They are competing in that race. They are putting everything they have into winning that race. But because we have a political system that is still listening to the dirty, polluting energy industry and using the politics of Washington to interfere, we are constantly having to fight to stay even. One of the things we are fighting right now to preserve is the section 1603 Treasury grant program, which will expire at the end of this year if we do nothing. This program has been vital for our renewable energy industry. It has leveraged nearly \$23 billion in private sector investment, supported 22,000 projects which collectively power more than 1 million homes. This is big. This is no longer some tiny little cottage industry. The National Renewable Energy Lab estimates the 1603 program has supported up to 290,000 U.S. jobs.

If we look more largely at the renewable energy sector, renewable energy is more labor intensive, creates more jobs than fossil fuel energy per dollar invested, creates more jobs than fossil fuel energy per megawatt generated, and the clean economy as a whole, including renewable energy and energy efficiency and environmental management, employs 2.7 million workers in this country. It is more than the fossil fuel industry, but the fossil fuel industry owns this town and they keep stepping on this larger, growing, clean energy industry.

We are seeing it, unfortunately, out there in real life. Americans invented the first solar cell in 1995. America had 40 percent of the global manufacturing volume. We are now down to 7 percent

of the global manufacturing volume of solar cells.

China is investing \$20 billion more in clean energy every year to accelerate ahead of us. European countries have feed-in tariffs so investors can know what their clean energy product will sell for and that is attracting capital and growth there, and we simply are not keeping up. We are now, in the United States of America, the home to only 1 of the top 10 wind turbine manufacturers. This is an unhealthy place to be and we need to get back into this fight. The mature industries that America leads have demonstrated the important role of government intervention at their early days. Our commercial aviation industry has been the envy of the world through its entire history. The United States of America subsidized airmail to help support this fledgling industry. They purchased planes for military purposes to help support it and supported it with aeronautics R&D.

The same thing should be happening in clean energy, and we need to work very hard to make sure this 1603 Treasury grant does not die on the cutting room floor as we come to the end of this year. If it does, jobs will go with it. There will be an immediate response. Projects will be terminated, people will be laid off, divisions of companies and smaller companies will close, and it is an unnecessary, self-inflicted injury we should avoid.

Let me bring it home. In Rhode Island this project has facilitated solar panel installation on three new bank branches. The TD Bank has opened in Barrington, East Providence, and Johnston, RI. Those projects created jobs, put people to work, and lowered the costs of their electrical energy. Step by step it gets us off foreign oil and these foreign entanglements to defend our supply.

The city of East Providence, RI, is in the middle of planning a 3-megawatt solar project on an old landfill, land that had gone out of use effectively but now will be generating power for that city. Construction has also begun on three wind turbines at the Fields Point wastewater treatment facility in Providence. The turbines will meet more than half of our big water utility’s energy needs.

A company called Hodges Badge—if your child has ever won an award in a track meet, in a horse show, or in a school production, they probably got a ribbon for it, and that ribbon was probably made by Hodges Badge. It is a great Rhode Island company. It has 95 employees. They have gone completely clean energy, and they are doing that to protect those 95 jobs. They are doing it to lower their energy costs, and they are doing it to do the right thing.

I salute Senator SANDERS for his eloquence on the real problem of climate change and the campaign of lies and propaganda that has interfered with our ability to deal with what is a real and emerging problem, and also to

point out that the second step in this is that there are jobs and there is economic success behind the clean energy industry that will lead us out of the predicament we are creating for ourselves because people here are in the thrall of the polluting industries.

I thank Senator SANDERS very much. I yield the floor.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I want to reiterate the very important point that Senator WHITEHOUSE has made. This struggle is not only to transform our energy system, to move away from fossil fuel, and to end the absurdity of importing over \$300 billion a year in oil from Saudi Arabia and other foreign countries and move toward energy independence, this effort is to cut greenhouse gas emissions so that we save the planet. This effort also has to do with creating jobs in the midst of the worst recession since the Great Depression.

I hope that every Member of the Senate is on the side of the American workers in helping us to grow sustainable energy companies so we create the jobs we need in this country rather than let China and other countries dominate those industries.

Mr. President, I am very proud to give the floor over to the chairperson of the Environmental and Public Works Committee, certainly one of the great environmental leaders here in the Senate, Senator BARBARA BOXER of California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, what is the time remaining in Senator SANDERS' block?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 36½ minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. Is the Senator satisfied if I take about 7 minutes?

Mr. SANDERS. That would be fine.

Mrs. BOXER. I want to say how proud I am of the Environment and Public Works Committee. To be chairman of the committee that has such incredible Senators, such as those you have heard from—Senator SANDERS, Senator WHITEHOUSE; we also have Senator CARDIN, Senator CARPER, Senator BAUCUS, Senator GILLIBRAND, Senator MERKLEY, and Senator LAUTENBERG. I hope I am not leaving anyone out. These are the environmental voices, the commonsense voices for jobs, for clean technology, for a bright future for our Nation, so to be the chairman of that committee is an honor beyond my every expectation.

It is not to say we don't work with Republicans; we do on public works matters. We work very well with Senator INHOFE and his team of Republicans on public works, but when it comes to the environment, there is nobody home over there. As a matter of fact, they do harm.

Today I am going to talk about the need to create jobs through this sector, but I also want to say, while my colleagues are here, an interesting development that has happened on the payroll tax cut bill that the House is about to pass. We have a kind of inside-the-

Beltway term when extraneous provisions are added to a bill that will bring down the bill, and we call that a poison pill amendment. I have never said to you when I coined that phrase "poison pill" amendment that it is literal. In this case they have attached to the payroll tax cut—which is on the one hand giving a tax cut to the middle class—a literal poison pill by rolling back a Clean Air Act provision that will require a very small percent of the boilers in this country to cut back on the filthiest of all pollution, including mercury, arsenic, and lead. I will say that again: mercury, arsenic, and lead.

If I were to stop anyone in the street, they don't need a degree in science to know if those are good things or bad things for you. They didn't even have to see the movie "Arsenic and Old Lace" to know that arsenic is bad. Lead damages the brains of our kids. Mercury has horrible impacts, particularly on children. So they have attached a poison pill, literally, because it will kill 8,100 more people than otherwise would have been killed from pollution. They have attached that to the payroll tax cut. How is that for a Christmas gift? Hi, I am your Senator, here is a tax cut for you of about \$1,000, but, sorry, you might die from breathing in too much poison in the form of mercury, lead, and arsenic.

That is what is going on here. Honestly, we have asked for a lot from Santa in our day, but we never asked for lead, arsenic, and mercury.

The reason Senator SANDERS took to the floor today—and the reason I am proud to be here—is because we all say here in this Chamber that we care about jobs. We all say here in this Chamber that we want to be energy independent. We should all add that we want less pollution. Our colleagues on the other side never mention it. We should add that we want less carbon pollution, which is leading us to extreme weather conditions, climate change, but they don't say that. We say that.

How do you do it? Well, there are many ways. One is to enforce the clean air laws we have, by the way, that will help get carbon out of the air. But a very easy way as we extend this payroll tax cut, which we all want for our middle class, is to say we should extend those clean energy tax breaks that allow us to move toward innovation. You hear a lot of talk from the other side about how solar energy is in decline and they talk about Solyndra and the problems there. Let me tell you something, that mindset would mean we never would have made it to the Moon because we know what happened to Apollo 1. It was not good. We didn't walk away from going to the Moon. We expected there would be problems with the program that we put together. That is why we had \$2 billion to offset any companies that might not make it. Do we stop cancer research because a lot of the scientists' leads don't pan out? We don't walk away from cancer

research. But our friends on the other side, the minute they can seize on something to walk away from clean energy, they do. I have come to the conclusion that there is only one reason for it, and that reason is they represent—and this is my opinion—big oil, big polluters, the people who, over the years, have tried to stop us from moving away from those fossil fuels.

All you have to do is read the history books to see how big oil teamed up with the auto industry to take out all the railroad tracks that they could to stop the competition. All you have to see is the movie "Who Killed the Electric Car." You cannot even find those GM cars. They took them and literally flattened them and they bought time for the gas-guzzling cars until finally, with President Obama's leadership, we were able to influence the companies in Detroit to make them understand the very simple fact that if we move to cleaner burning fuels, if we move to fuel economy, they are going to make a lot more money because that is the future.

What we face here instead of seeing an extension of the clean energy provisions to help us move toward solar, to help us move away from fossil fuels, to help us get a better balance of payments, to move away from the Middle East dictators, we see nothing. What do we see? We see another poison pill in another one of their bills over there to repeal the standards for light bulbs. What are these people thinking? They need a light bulb to go off in their own head. We have to move toward energy efficiency. It is a win-win-win.

I am going to talk about California in my remaining time. We have seen great progress there. We have added 79,000 jobs in the clean energy sector in the past 7 years, and that clean energy sector remains one of the most promising industries in our State, and people are happy. We are going to put a million solar rooftops on in California. I know Senator SANDERS has been calling for this for years. California is doing it with Governor Brown leading the way with the legislature. Do you know what that means? It means that people are going to work in California. You cannot be in China unless you have an extremely long arm and put a solar rooftop on in Los Angeles or in Riverside County or San Francisco or San Diego. So we need to reauthorize 1603, the Treasury grant program, which allows developers to receive a grant in lieu of a credit, in lieu of a writeoff. That means they will get the funding and they can move forward with their front. It is leveraged by \$22 billion in private sector investment. If we extend the program, we will be creating 37,000 jobs.

I have to ask rhetorically: What is wrong with the Republican Party that they don't understand that when you extend these kinds of tax credits, you move away from the dictators who control the oil supply and who would turn on us in a minute, and instead you create jobs here at home, the air is less

polluted, the kids have less asthma? There are very few things that we could come to the floor and say are such a win-win-win.

There is 48-C in the manufacturing tax credit, which provides a credit for facilities that make clean energy equipment components. We know there is a demand for these programs.

I want to say to my colleagues on the other side who are on the EPW Committee, I hope they will join me at 2:30 p.m. We are going to have a press conference to talk about the need for protecting the air that we breathe and for the need to see a payroll tax cut that doesn't come over here loaded down with things that are going to lead to riders that are unrelated, that are going to lead to the death of our people.

Simple message: No poison pills that poison the people, please. I hope they will join me there. But I want them to know, and I want to say, Senator WHITEHOUSE organized a letter that was critical to get all of us on this letter. I ask Senator WHITEHOUSE, through the Chair, how many signatures did you get?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. We had over 30. The number is still climbing retroactively—but more than 30 Democratic Senators.

Mrs. BOXER. That is a very large number of Senators to have put their names on a letter. These letters are hard. People are busy. They do not have time. You get 30 names on a letter, and we say: Extend these tax cuts for jobs, for the environment, for all the good things. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter Senator WHITEHOUSE organized printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, December 7, 2011.

Hon. HARRY REID,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.
Hon. MAX BAUCUS,
Chairman, Senate Finance Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Republican Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.
Hon. ORRIN HATCH,
Ranking, Senate Finance Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER REID, REPUBLICAN LEADER MCCONNELL, CHAIRMAN BAUCUS, AND RANKING MEMBER HATCH: We are writing to urge your support for the extension of key expiring clean energy and efficiency tax provisions that create jobs and protect our environment. Allowing these incentives to expire would harm the U.S. economy, eliminate tens of thousands of jobs, and sideline billions of dollars of private sector capital investments. In particular, the renewable energy industry would be negatively impacted by an expiration of provisions.

One of the most critical tax provisions set to expire this year is the 1603 Treasury Grant Program (TGP), which has provided a way to finance renewable energy projects despite the breakdown of tax equity markets and has proven a particularly effective job creation tool. Over the last two and a half years, the TGP has leveraged nearly \$23 bil-

lion in private sector investment for 22,000 projects in every state and across a dozen clean energy industries, including solar, wind, biomass, fuel cell, combined heat-and-power, and hydropower projects. To date, the program has spurred the construction of sufficient new generation capacity to power more than one million American homes and has supported roughly 290,000 U.S. jobs. Allowing the TGP to expire would shrink financing available for renewable energy projects by 52 percent, according to a July 2011 survey by the U.S. Partnership for Renewable Energy Finance. This would kill tens of thousands of jobs across all clean energy industries and states.

We have seen what happens when these credits expire. The biodiesel production tax credit lapsed in 2010, and fuel production dropped dramatically, shuttering dozens of plants and putting thousands of people across the country out of work. Given our nation's urgent need for more transportation fuels from domestic sources that are both secure and environmentally sound, we cannot let that happen again. With the biodiesel tax credit in place again for 2011, domestic production has more than doubled, supporting more than 31,000 jobs and generating at least \$3 billion in GDP and \$628 million in federal, state, and local tax revenues.

We also support additional funding for the Advanced Energy Manufacturing Tax Credit (48C), which has leveraged timely private investments in new, expanded, or re-equipped advanced energy manufacturing projects throughout the country. The program has been able to leverage \$5.4 billion in private investment, boosting growth and creating new U.S. manufacturing jobs producing components and equipment for the burgeoning global renewable energy industry. Applications to the program have far exceeded the program's original allocation, indicating a tremendous potential for continued investment and job creation in the manufacturing sector. Without funding for programs like this, we effectively forfeit clean energy manufacturing to countries like China.

The Production Tax Credit (PTC) has facilitated tens of billions of dollars in new clean energy generating capacity, particularly in the wind industry, which has created thousands of new manufacturing and construction jobs in many of the hardest hit parts of our country. Last year, new wind power represented over one-third of all new U.S. electricity generation capacity. This is an industry in which the United States currently has a trade surplus with China, Brazil, and other fast-growing developing economies. We need a timely extension of the PTC to keep these jobs in the U.S. and provide certainty to investors.

These expiring tax provisions have demonstrated their effectiveness in catalyzing private investment and job growth, spurring U.S. technological innovation, and diversifying our nation's energy mix. In light of the critical role these incentives and others have played in fostering U.S. economic growth, now is not the time to let them lapse, even temporarily. We believe it is important these critical tax provisions be part of any year-end tax legislation.

Sincerely,

John F. Kerry, Sheldon Whitehouse, Barbara Boxer, Jeff Bingaman, Maria Cantwell, Benjamin L. Cardin, Jeanne Shaheen, Robert Menendez, Bernard Sanders, Richard Blumenthal, Dianne Feinstein.

Mark Udall, Sherrod Brown, Ron Wyden, Daniel K. Akaka, Debbie Stabenow, Tim Johnson, Tom Udall, Jeff Merkley, Michael F. Bennet, Mark Begich, Amy Klobuchar.

Jack Reed, Patrick J. Leahy, Al Franken, Joseph I. Lieberman, Tom Harkin, Christopher A. Coons, Frank R. Lautenberg, Bar-

bara A. Mikulski, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Carl Levin, Bill Nelson, Daniel K. Inouye.

Mrs. BOXER. I would yield back to our leader on this important block of time. I would yield my time back to Senator SANDERS. We are determined to get this done right for the American people.

Mr. SANDERS. I thank Senator BOXER very much, not only for her words but for her leadership on the Environment and Public Works Committee.

I wish to reiterate a very important point Senator BOXER made. She reminds us of great moments in the history of this country. This country, with great difficulty but persistence, built a railroad ahead of the rest of the world that went from the east coast to the west coast. It was not easy. This country led the world in putting a man on the Moon. It was not easy, at great expense, difficulties, but we did it. Does anybody not think this country can lead the world in transforming our energy system away from polluting fossil fuels to energy efficiency, to sustainable energies such as wind, solar, geothermal, biomass, other technologies? Can we not lead the world in making our own country more energy efficient, making our air cleaner but also in creating large numbers of jobs as we weatherize our buildings, as we build the solar panels we need to build the wind turbines, as we put more engineers and scientists to work to help us in this energy transformation.

I wish to pick up on a point Senator WHITEHOUSE made a moment ago, which is that while we talk about energy transformation, while we all understand that over a period of years, the oil industry, for example, has received billions and billions of dollars of permanent tax breaks, what we are fighting for right now is to see that the 1603 renewable energy grant program is renewed. As Senator WHITEHOUSE indicated, 1603 allows renewable energy developers to get a grant instead of a tax credit. Since 2009, when this program was enacted, it has leveraged nearly \$23 billion in private investment supporting 22,000 projects in all 50 States and supported approximately 290,000 jobs, according to the National Renewable Energy Lab. Since 1603 was enacted, solar jobs doubled to more than 100,000 jobs.

We have to make sure that before Congress adjourns for the Christmas holidays, we renew 1603. It is enormously important for the renewable energy industry, enormously important for jobs in our country.

With that, I would yield the floor to Senator WHITEHOUSE.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I thank Senator SANDERS. Senator CARDIN has arrived so I will hand off to him in a moment. But to the Senator's point about the imbalance between support for the fossil fuel energy industry and the renewable energy industry; the first being one that hurts our national security, pollutes our air and costs a fortune and

is phasing out and the second being one that is growing, that is clean, and that is the way of the future.

According to the Environmental Law Institute, the U.S. invested almost six times more in subsidies for fossil fuel from 2002 to 2008 than we did in renewable energy. So by a factor of six times, we have our thumb on the scales supporting the old dirty industry against the new, rather than supporting the new the way our international competitors are doing.

I ask unanimous consent that a response from Secretary Chu to a letter Senator SANDERS and I and other Senators wrote to him about the status of and success of our clean energy investments be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE SECRETARY OF ENERGY,
Washington, DC, November 16, 2011.

Hon. BERNARD SANDERS, Hon. JEFF BINGAMAN, Hon. DEBBIE STABENOW, Hon. SHERROD BROWN, Hon. JOSEPH I. LIEBERMAN, Hon. CHRISTOPHER COONS, Hon. SHELTON WHITEHOUSE, Hon. RICHARD BLUMENTHAL, Hon. JON TESTER, Hon. PATTY MURRAY, Hon. MARK UDALL, Hon. PATRICK LEAHY, Hon. TOM UDALL, Hon. JOHN KERRY, Hon. CARL LEVIN, Hon. ROBERT P. CASEY, Jr., Hon. TIM JOHNSON, Hon. MICHAEL F. BENNET, Hon. JACK REED, Hon. DANIEL AKAHA, Hon. JEFF MERKLEY, Hon. KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND,

U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS: Thank you for your October 5, 2011 letter requesting an update on United States investment in clean energy technology and job creation. I strongly agree that the United States faces a critical decision point in our Nation's energy future if we hope to compete in and win the global clean energy economy. As President Obama has said, "The country that leads the clean energy economy will lead the 21st century global economy."

The annual global clean energy market is estimated to be worth more than \$211 billion, up 32 percent from 2009. The global market for solar photovoltaic systems alone represents an \$80 billion market this year. It is estimated that the global renewable energy market will grow to \$460 billion by 2030, with a cumulative investment from 2010 to 2030 of approximately \$7 trillion in new capital. This increased market is being driven by increased global demand and technological advances that are rapidly making renewable energy cost competitive with fossil energy.

The economic stakes are high. However, we are currently at risk of falling behind our global competitors who are seizing the opportunity by investing more heavily and establishing market policies that give them a strategic advantage. The United States currently ranks first in only one of the top ten clean energy benchmarks. Thanks to our world-class universities and national labs, we still hold an edge in technology innovation, but we are falling further and further behind in key areas such as manufacturing competitiveness and exports. Countries like China are moving forward with large investments.

There are some who say that we cannot compete with China. I respectfully disagree. However, time is of the essence. I would like to work with you to establish a comprehen-

sive energy policy that targets all aspects of the energy value chain—innovation, manufacturing, deployment, financing, and markets—to provide the certainty American businesses and entrepreneurs need to compete with their global counterparts. Without a comprehensive, long-term energy policy framework focused on this full energy value chain, American business will continue to move capital and jobs overseas to take advantage of more business friendly policies.

The questions you have posed in your letter are very important to understand America's current position in the clean energy economy, including where we have been successful and where we need to improve. While these questions are very complex, I have attempted to succinctly answer each of them as directly as possible. I also have included additional background information related to each question you raise to provide a fuller understanding of our domestic clean energy landscape.

I know that you care deeply about these issues and that you understand the opportunity presented by the growing demand for clean energy technologies. There is a growing debate in Congress on issues relating to the clean energy innovation chain and the steps we can take to position America to win the clean energy technology race. I want to make sure you know that I am personally available, along with my senior staff and the full resources of the Department to assist you in gathering information and in providing technical assistance on these issues. I am fortunate to have a thoughtful team of professionals who wrestle with these issues every day, and I would be happy to make them available to you.

Thank you for the opportunity to respond and for your commitment to America's energy future. I look forward to working with you and your colleagues to help recapture our leadership role in clean energy by establishing smart policies to win the clean energy technology race.

Sincerely,

STEVEN CHU.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

1. How have the investments that the United States has made over the last several years contributed to the growth in energy efficiency deployment and renewable energy generation, and what projections can you share for the near future?

Jobs: The clean energy sector directly employs nearly 1.6 million people in the U.S. The Recovery Act alone has already saved or created over 225,000 clean energy jobs and is estimated to add an additional 800,000 jobs by the end of 2012. As of August 2011, the U.S. had created over 100,000 solar-focused jobs and at least 75,000 jobs related to wind installation in 2010.

Renewable Energy: Through investments in clean energy, the United States is on track to double U.S. renewable energy generation in four years (from 71 TWh in 2008 to 178 TWh in 2012). For example, the highly leveraged 1603 grant in lieu of tax credit program has led to the deployment of more than 5,000 renewable energy projects across the country. These projects have enough capacity to power more than one million homes.

Energy Efficiency: Over the last two years, the Department of Energy's Weatherization Assistance Program has helped more than 750,000 low-income households save on average more than \$430 per year on their energy bills. The program has supported over 14,000 jobs across the country and thousands of additional jobs throughout the supply chain.

Residential efficiency standards are currently saving consumers about \$25 billion per year in energy costs—a savings of approximately \$250/year per household. A recent analysis estimates that appliance standards have created an industry supporting 340,000 jobs, with expected growth to 380,000 jobs by 2030.

Transportation: Three years ago, American businesses accounted for only two percent of the market for advanced batteries. We are now on track to establish annual production capacity for 500,000 plug-in hybrid electric vehicles, helping support a projected total of 1 million electric vehicles on the road by 2015. New fuel economy standards will save American families an average of more than \$8,000 at-the-pump for cars in 2025 compared to those in 2010. These improvements will reduce America's dependence on oil by an estimated 12 billion barrels, and, by 2025, reduce oil consumption by 2.2 million barrels per day—enough to offset almost a quarter of the current level of our foreign oil imports.

Near-Future Projections: All the trends suggest that the cost of electricity from solar and onshore wind is either already or will soon be cost competitive without subsidies with electricity from natural gas in many parts of the country. This will result in sharp increases in renewable energy deployment. Between 2010-2030, estimates suggest a 7.9 million cumulative net job-years of direct and indirect employment to be created as a result of this electricity supply forecast. The renewable energy and energy efficiency sectors are estimated to see a 6.4 million net job-years increase (an 80 percent share of total increase) during this period, with the rest of the increase mostly coming from natural gas.

2. In particular, how is clean technology playing a role in rebuilding our manufacturing base, and creating jobs in construction and manufacturing supply chains?

Roughly 26 percent of all clean energy jobs lie in manufacturing. On average, clean energy manufacturing exports represent roughly twice the value of traditional exports on a per job basis (\$20,000 versus \$10,000). Between 2003 and 2010, technology manufacturing produced explosive annual job growth rates (e.g. 18.4 percent for solar thermal, 14.7 percent for wind, 10.7 percent for solar photovoltaics, etc.).

3. How do our policies and investments in clean technology compare to foreign competitors, how would proposed reductions in clean energy research and development funding impact American competitiveness, and do American manufacturers have a level playing field?

The table gives a global score card for clean energy investments. The U.S. has fallen behind China and other nations in total clean energy investments. Venture capital investments are largely focused on technology innovation, and the U.S. is the overwhelming leader. However, technology innovation is a lagging indicator of prior investments in science and engineering R&D, the majority of which is government sponsored. In 2008, the U.S. invested only 0.03 percent of its GDP on public energy R&D, which ranks behind China, Japan, and Canada and is tied with S. Korea. Finally, U.S. public energy R&D investments have declined by a factor of four since the late 1970s. While the U.S. is currently the leader in technology innovation, increases in Chinese investments in energy R&D suggests that U.S. leadership in the future is not guaranteed.

Categories (Year)	Top Rank	Number for Top Rank	US Ranking	US Numbers
Total Clean Energy investments (2010)	China	\$54.48	3	\$34B
Clean Energy Investments as Fraction of National GDP (2010)	Germany	1.40%	9	0.23%
Five Year Growth Rates in Clean Energy (2010)	Turkey	190%	11	61%
Venture Capital Financing (2010)	USA	\$6B	1	\$6B
Public R&D Investment as a fraction of GDP (2008)	China	0.11%	5	0.03%

In relation to China alone, the U.S. leads China in only 1 of the 6 key clean energy investment indicators. In particular, China is outpacing the U.S. by over 2 to 1 in clean energy asset financing, which typically produces the largest number of jobs.

Chinese trade practices are also having a significant impact on the ability of U.S. clean energy manufacturers to compete in the global marketplace.

4. How do current incentives for renewable energy compare to support for other energy technologies when those technologies were first emerging?

The success of fuels and technologies in the energy market depend on a wide range of factors, one being subsidies. The Environmental Law Institute found that between 2002 and 2009, fossil fuels received more than double the amount of subsidies (approximately \$70 billion) than renewable fuels (\$29 billion) over the same period. Moreover, their report suggests the most significant portion of the fossil fuel subsidies are in the form of Foreign Tax Credits, indirectly supporting the overseas production of oil.

Over the longer term, another report suggests that the historical average of annual energy subsidies is roughly \$4.86 billion for oil and gas (1918–2009), \$3.5 billion for nuclear (1947–1999), \$1.08 billion for biofuels (1980–2009) and \$0.37 billion for renewables (1994–2009). Accordingly, for the first 15 years since the birth of each technology, non-hydro renewables for electricity generation seem to have received lower subsidies in equivalent dollars than the other technologies.

In energy R&D alone, federal spending since 1978 on fossil fuel and nuclear energy sources has significantly outpaced spending on energy efficiency and renewable energy: nuclear energy (37 percent); fossil energy (26 percent); renewable energy (16 percent); energy efficiency (14 percent).

5. What is the potential for continued growth in energy efficiency deployment and renewable energy supply, and job creation in these sectors, over the next 10 years and beyond?

The current world market for renewable energy is projected to grow from approximately \$195 billion in 2010 to approximately \$395 billion in 2020 and \$460 billion by 2030. The cumulative investment from 2010 to 2030 will be approximately \$7 trillion in new capital. The potential growth for energy efficiency is also significant. McKinsey and Company estimates that the U.S. economy has the potential to reduce annual non-transportation energy consumption by roughly 23 percent by 2020, eliminating more than \$1.2 trillion in energy waste. This would also result in the abatement of 1.1 gigatons of greenhouse-gas emissions annually—the equivalent of taking the entire U.S. fleet of passenger vehicles and light trucks off the roads for one year. The Center for American Progress estimates that retrofitting just 40 percent of the residential and commercial building stock in the United States would:

- Create 625,000 sustained full-time jobs over a decade;
- Spark \$500 billion in new investments to upgrade 50 million homes and office building;
- Generate as much as \$64 billion a year in cost savings for U.S. ratepayers, freeing consumers to spend their money in more productive ways.

FACT SHEET

The U.S. imports roughly 50 percent of the oil we use, much of it from countries that are not always friendly to the U.S., and we pay an estimated \$1 billion per day. Our economy and our people are vulnerable to fluctuations and steady rise in global oil prices, and we do not have much control over them. We are more dependent on foreign oil today than we were at the time of the first “energy crisis” nearly 40 years ago.

We urgently need to develop alternatives for transportation energy that are based on domestic, clean and sustainable resources. The U.S. invented the lithium ion battery that is used in plug-in hybrid cars, and in 2009 it had only about 2 percent of the world’s manufacturing volume. We need to innovate to regain our lead; otherwise we will become importers of batteries instead of oil.

Between 2003 and 2010, the technology-focused “cleantech” sector produced explosive job gains in the U.S. and the clean economy has outperformed the overall nation’s economy. Roughly 26 percent of all clean energy jobs lie in manufacturing, compared to just 9 percent in the broader economy. On average, clean energy manufacturing exports represent roughly twice the value of traditional exports, on a per job basis (\$20,000 versus \$10,000). The renewable energy sector is estimated to see a 5.7 million net job-years increase (a 72 percent increase) between 2010–2030, with the rest of the increase mostly coming from natural gas (1.6 million job-years). This is a fast-growing sector to create new jobs in the U.S.

The cost of renewable energy has fallen dramatically (solar over 70 percent in the last three years) and these costs will continue to decline. Renewable energy costs are competitive with conventional energy costs in many parts of the world and will be in the U.S. within several years. Therefore, the current world market for renewable energy grew 30 percent between 2009 and 2010, and is projected to grow from approximately \$200 billion in 2010, to approximately \$400 billion in 2020 and \$460 billion by 2030. The cumulative investment from 2010 to 2030 will be approximately \$7 trillion in new capital. Other nations are positioning themselves to avail of this massive opportunity because this will create new domestic jobs.

The U.S. invented the modern solar cell, and had more than 40 percent of the global manufacturing volume in 1995. Today, it has about 7 percent of the manufacturing volume. This is a rapidly growing industry, and we are falling behind.

The global competition for clean energy jobs is fierce. China ranks first among all nations in overall investment, clean energy asset financing, and the use of public markets to invest in clean energy. The United States currently ranks first in only one of the top 10 clean energy benchmarks—3rd in overall investments, and 9th when it comes to investment as a percentage of GDP. Trends in 5-year investment growth rates in clean energy show that U.S. does not appear among the top 10 countries.

America faces a choice about what to do with the opportunity presented by the global clean energy race. We can compete in the global marketplace—creating American jobs and selling American products—or we can buy the technologies of tomorrow from

abroad. I believe all Americans would agree that the U.S. should compete to win the future.

How can we win the future? We must leverage our Nation’s strengths and core competencies to simultaneously address the five components of our energy value chain—innovation, manufacturing, deployment, finance and markets.

1. We have the world’s best and most innovative universities, national labs and small businesses in clean technologies. We must double down with smart and sustained investments in R&D to unleash our unique capacity to innovate clean energy technologies.

2. We must provide long-term predictable support for American entrepreneurs and businesses so that they can catalyze private sector investments to translate these innovations into manufacturing and jobs. This will enable these technologies to become globally competitive, affordable worldwide, and to be sold without subsidies.

3. American entrepreneurs and businesses need access to low-cost, long-term, and large-scale capital if they are to be globally competitive. We have the world’s largest capital markets. We must find ways to leverage this strength by unlocking this capital to finance clean energy investments for both manufacturing and deployment.

4. Finally, innovation, manufacturing and deployment occur only if there is a demand for these technologies here in the U.S. Just like the new fuel efficiency standards are creating a market for domestic innovations in transportation, policies such as the Clean Energy Standard can create demand for clean electricity from renewables, nuclear and clean fossil fuels produced in the United States, and provide certainty for American entrepreneurs.

The stakes are too high to wave the white flag and surrender. It is a fight we can and must win.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I yield to Senator CARDIN.

Mr. CARDIN. Let me thank my colleague for yielding. I wish to thank Senator SANDERS, Senator WHITEHOUSE, and Senator BOXER, who were on the floor on this issue.

I just wish to underscore the point that was just made about having a level playing field, where we have tilted the scales in favor of fossil fuels over renewables. My colleagues have already talked about the direct difference in our subsidies. I would like to add an additional element; that is, when you look at the subsidies we give to the fossil fuel industries, they are permanent. They are in the Tax Code. They do not go through the annual exercise of an extender.

What does that mean? That means the lack of predictability in sustainable energy means there is a higher cost for investment. It tilts the scale in favor of oil and gas, rather than on sustainable, renewable energy sources. I would just mention three. The Congressional Research Service did a report on this, just three of the provisions that benefit the oil industry: the excess of

percentage over cost depletion, the expensing of exploration and development costs, and the amortization of geological and geophysical expenditures. Just those three provisions that are permanent in our Tax Code, between 2010 and 2014, will cost the taxpayers over \$10 billion.

We are subsidizing the oil industry, and we should not be doing that. We should be encouraging a transformation to sustainable energy issues as my colleagues have pointed out for the purposes of national security. It is good for our environment and it is good for jobs. This is about jobs. That is why we cannot go home until we have extended the tax provisions, particularly 1603 but others of the energy-related, sustainable energy provisions.

I wish to talk for one moment, if I might, about the production tax credit we need to extend because I want to talk about one specific project in Maryland, on a brownfields site that we are dealing with that relates to energy. Some might say: OK. That does not expire until 2013. But here is the problem. You have to have it in production by that date. Our waste-to-energy projects—it is not going to be in production by that date. So if we do not extend it this month, the project will be at a standstill in Baltimore.

There are 1,900 jobs at stake—1,900 jobs are at stake on just that one project which, by the way, helps our environment, helps our energy, and also helps our economy. That is why it is critically important that before we leave, we extend these sustainable energy tax credits, so we can get the investment.

Quite frankly, I would like to see us make some of these permanent. We make them permanent, we get predictability. We get predictability, it is less cost, it encourages more activity in this area. That is what we should be about, creating jobs for our country. The wind energy credit alone would allow us to create another 54,000 jobs. So this is about job growth for America. It is about our energy security, and it is about a cleaner environment. It is about America's future.

That is why we have taken the time to point out to the American people that Congress needs to make sure it is active on these areas before we adjourn for the year. We owe that to the people of this country.

With that, I will yield to my friend from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I wanted to thank the Senator from Maryland not only for his important remarks now but for, year after year, the strong work he is doing in trying to create jobs in America in sustainable energy.

I would like to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island for his thoughts.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I thank Senator SANDERS. I wish to go back to this question of the jobs and the economic value we get from clean energy. The Department of Energy reports that the

clean energy sector alone directly employs nearly 1.6 million people in the United States. So nearly 1.6 million families are depending on the paychecks they get from the clean energy sector.

Within that, it is growing. The United States has created over 100,000 solar-focused jobs—100,000 solar-focused jobs—and at least 75,000 jobs related to wind energy installation in 2010. In Rhode Island, we are seeing that coming on. The newspaper today, the Providence Journal, reported on a permit application for the cable that will connect an offshore wind facility that is going in off Block Island back to the grid onshore to bring the power from that installation back and into the New England energy grid.

But when it gets going, think of the jobs that are going to be involved in that. Senator REED and I worked very hard to shore up—get money to shore up the waterside, the side of the pier at Quonset so it would be capable of dealing with very heavy-duty installation barges and things such as that.

So the Quonset Point facility is now ready for this construction. We have the trains and new highways that bring in the pieces of those big turbines. The turbines are so big you cannot build them in China, in Europe. We have to assemble them onshore and put them right on the barge. So the assembly of them will take place in Rhode Island, right at Quonset, and that will mean a lot of jobs.

Then we have to barge them out and we have the barge operators and the barge captains and the tugs. Then we sink the base, and we have to have divers and builders and people who are experts in that kind of marine construction.

Then we put them up. We have to operate them. We have to maintain them. What they do is they contribute clean energy to the grid. They are a constant supply because of the wind over the Atlantic being such a powerful resource, and it is kind of a win-win situation. So we see the need to get behind this in an immediate way in Rhode Island.

It would be one of the great tragedies if we let the Chinese and the Belgians and the French and the Dutch and whoever else get ahead of us in this competition. We do not need to. It is wrong. We are taking ourselves out of a race we should be winning when we do that. I commend Senator SANDERS for his effort to bring us together to continue to make this point. There are jobs here. There is an energy industry that is going to lead the economy of the next decades of this world, and we want America to be at the front of it and not to have sand thrown in our gears by the dirty, polluting energy industry that is on its way out as its last contribution to the damage it is now doing to our economy and to our environment.

Mr. SANDERS. I wish to thank my friend from Rhode Island for his remarks and for his extraordinary effort

in fighting for jobs and protecting our environment.

If we read some headlines today in the media, we might think, especially the rightwing media, that renewable energy in America is on the verge of collapse. Quite literally—this is quite literally the case. A recent headline from FOX News said: "Entire solar industry on brink of collapse."

The reality is quite the contrary. The fact is, not only is the solar industry not on the verge of collapse, the reality is the American solar energy industry is thriving, as is the renewable energy industry more broadly. We have doubled the number of solar jobs in America since 2009. It does not sound to me like that industry is collapsing. It sounds to me like it is doing extraordinarily well.

Today, more than 100,000 Americans work in the solar industry, at more than 5,000 companies in every single State in our country, and that includes manufacturing, installation, and supply chain jobs.

Mr. President, last year we installed nearly 1,000 megawatts of solar power in the United States—more than double the amount installed in 2009. That doesn't sound like an industry that is collapsing to me. With the solar industry growing at a rate of 69 percent annually, it is one of America's fastest growing industries and is creating jobs all over our country. The cost of solar panels has fallen 30 percent over just the last 2 years, continuing a long-term decline in the price of solar and making it more and more competitive with other energy technology.

(Mrs. HAGAN assumed the Chair.)

Madam President, everyone, from Walmart to the U.S. Marine Corps, is looking toward a future in solar. Walmart is installing solar panels at 130 stores in California, and they say:

Walmart has reduced energy expenses by more than a million dollars through our solar program.

The military—the U.S. Department of Defense—is using solar energy with battery storage to fully power forward operating bases in Afghanistan.

Marine COL Bob Charette said:

For the Marines, renewable energy is about saving lives by reducing the number of dangerous fuel convoys needed for resupply.

The reason I am making these points is that many people don't know the extent to which we are already making progress in sustainable energy. We are on the verge of something extraordinary. But it is important to understand where we are today and to refute those people who suggest that solar and wind are not the technologies for the future.

In terms of wind, that technology is growing rapidly. Texas alone has more than 10,000 megawatts of wind energy installed. That is equal in capacity to 10 nuclear powerplants—in Texas alone. Iowa now gets 20 percent of its electricity from wind. There are 75,000 wind energy jobs in America today and more than 400 manufacturing facilities

in 43 States. The price of wind energy has dropped by 90 percent since 1980, and wind electricity today is competitive with fossil fuels at 5 to 6 cents per kilowatt hour. At the same time, we are increasing American manufacturing of wind turbines, and now 60 percent of turbine components installed in the United States are made in America, up from 25 percent in 2005.

In the midst of this horrendous and painful recession, the story of renewable energy in the United States is actually a rare good news story. It is a good news story. Renewable energy is helping to cut pollution and greenhouse gas emissions, it is making our country more energy independent, and it is creating hundreds of thousands of jobs.

But all of this could be significantly slowed down if we do not continue Federal support for the renewable energy industries at a fraction of the kind of support we are giving to fossil fuels. It is absurd that we even have to fight to extend renewable tax credits and grants when fossil fuel industries enjoy permanent subsidies. Mature industries, such as oil and gas, continue to reap billions every year in Federal subsidies and massive tax breaks that never expire, despite the fact that the top five oil companies earned nearly \$1 trillion in profits over the last 10 years. So here we are struggling to help wind and solar—new technologies—and we are giving massive tax breaks to mature industries that are incredibly profitable.

Contrast what we do for renewable energy to what we do with fossil fuel and specifically with regard to the production tax credit for wind energy, which was allowed to lapse three times in recent years—1999, 2001, and 2003—leading to an average dropoff of 81 percent in new wind energy installation each time the credit expired. The wind credit is set to expire again in 2012.

The point here is the one Senator CARDIN made a moment ago. Unless there is predictability, unless the industry knows these tax credits will be there, they are not going to start investing or working on new projects only to have the rug pulled out from underneath them. They need stability and predictability, which is why we have to move not only to extending these tax credits but to making them permanent.

I also want to say a word about the Keystone XL Pipeline, and that is to say there are some in the House and some in the Senate who want to use year-end legislation to tack on a rider that says to the State Department: You have to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline within 60 days.

Let's be clear about what we are talking about in terms of the Keystone XL Pipeline. What we are talking about is a 1,700-mile oil pipeline from Canada to the gulf coast that would carry tar sands oil. Tar sands oil is not like regular oil. It requires an energy-intensive process to get it out of the

ground, extract it, and, in fact, to refine it. That means it emits approximately 82 percent more carbon emissions when produced compared to regular oil, according to the EPA.

Tar sands oil is also hard to clean up when it spills. Refining tar sands also produces more toxic air pollution compared to conventional oil. A tar sands spill in the Kalamazoo River in Michigan that happened in 2010 is still being cleaned up, at a cost now exceeding \$700 million.

In my view, the last thing we need is to eliminate the environmental and safety reviews now taking place and fast-track approval of this pipeline.

I also note to my colleagues who want to fast-track Keystone XL that I, along with several other Senators and Congressmen, asked the State Department inspector general to look into allegations of conflicts of interest in the preparation of the environmental impact study of Keystone XL. The contractor the State Department used for the impact study, Cardno Entrix, has financial ties to the project developer, TransCanada. Those ties need to be investigated to ensure that the Federal environmental and safety reviews were done correctly and without bias. That inspector general special review is under way right now. I think it is completely inappropriate to try to fast-track this pipeline when we have not even heard back from the inspector general about potential conflicts of interest. I urge my colleagues to allow that special review to play out before any decisions are made.

I will conclude my remarks this morning by thanking my colleagues for joining me—Senators WHITEHOUSE, BOXER, and CARDIN—who speak for many other Members of Congress and I think who speak for tens of millions of Americans, who see an energy future in this country in which we break our dependence on foreign oil, in which we no longer spend over \$300 billion a year for oil from Saudi Arabia and other foreign countries; who see a future in this country where we move toward energy independence; who see a future in this country where the United States is a leader in reversing global warming by not only cutting greenhouse gas emissions in America but providing technology and expertise for countries all over the world, for them to do the same; and also understand that, as we move to energy efficiency—and I have to tell you that in Vermont we are leading the country in energy efficiency. What we are seeing as we weatherize homes is fuel bills going down for the middle-class, working-class people by 30, 40, 50 percent. We are investing in weatherization, and the payback is pretty good. It takes place over a very few years, when you cut fuel prices 30 to 50 percent.

In Vermont, we are probably doing as well as any other State in that area, but we can and will do a lot better. Tens of thousands of homes in our State can be weatherized. When we do

that, we not only cut greenhouse gas emissions, we not only reduce the need to import foreign oil, we also create jobs. We create jobs for those people who are producing the insulation, the new doors, the windows, and the new roofing that makes homes and buildings more energy efficient.

Furthermore, in our State and around the country, we are seeing, as I indicated a moment ago, significant progress in moving to sustainable energy—the solar industry, growing very rapidly; wind energy, growing very rapidly; other technologies, growing very rapidly. As a nation, we should be proud of the change that is taking place. But understand that we have a long way to go to be the kind of energy efficient and sustainable energy Nation we know we can become and to help lead the world in a new energy direction.

With that, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATIVE TO REQUIRING A BALANCED BUDGET—S.J. RES. 24

PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES RELATIVE TO BALANCING THE BUDGET—S.J. RES. 10

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Judiciary Committee is discharged from further consideration of S.J. Res. 10 and S.J. Res. 24, and the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the resolutions en bloc, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 24) proposing an amendment to the Constitution relative to requiring a balanced budget.

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 10) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to balancing the budget.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 8 hours of debate on the resolutions, equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

Under the previous order, the title of the joint resolutions is amended.

The amendments (Nos. 1459 and 1460) are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1459

To amend the title so as to read: