The energy efficiency pays for the retrofit in 4 or 5 years and you can capitalize this and we are finding innovative ways to do that. It pays for itself and you lower our carbon footprint. You use less energy, create jobs, save money. It is win-win-win-win. This is something we have to do. It is insane not to.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. We are proud of what is going on in Rhode Island as well. We plan to meet 16 percent of our energy needs through renewable energy sources by 2020, and that is on top of a goal to cut energy use by 10 percent. So we will cut energy use by 10 percent and, of the remaining 90, get 16 percent of that out of renewable energy sources. Everybody is getting involved—utilities, towns, the State, the private sector. One of our cities, East Providence, is right now converting a brownfield which has been vacant for 40 years, nearly, into New England's largest solar institution. As my colleague says, there will be a payback and they will earn money on that for their taxpayers.

Our State of Rhode Island has been the national leader at how you map and prepare for offshore wind development. In the State and Federal waters off the coast of Rhode Island we are positioned to lead the country in offshore wind siting, with all the jobs that building those giant wind turbines and assembling them and erecting them offshore creates.

We have exciting companies such as BioProcess Algae, of Portsmouth, RI, which opened a spectacular facility in Iowa, which takes the exhaust from ethanol plants and runs it through algae farms and creates biofuels. They are at the cutting edge of that technology.

When you see these great technologies and these great opportunities—in this colloquy, we are ending on what I hope is a very strong, positive note for the economy. If we can pull away from the lies and the phony science and the polluter-paid nonsense that has so far distracted us from doing our duty as a nation, we can get into the race that is going on in this world for the energy future. The economy of this century is going to be driven by the $6 trillion clean energy industry. We do not want to fall out the back of that race and leave it to the Chinese and the Europeans. We want to be winning that race and the jobs and the economic success that can bring that not only can power our homes and our factories, it can power our economy back to security for all Americans.

I thank Senator FRANKEN for inviting me to join him in this colloquy. I think our time is coming close to expiring, so I yield the remainder of our time to you, and I ask unanimous consent Senator FRANKEN be allowed as much time as he needs to conclude. This has been a wonderful opportunity for me.

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

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for his leadership. Algal—by the way, algal is the pronunciation of this. Algal energy is amazing. We are fueling jet fighters with jet fuel made from algae.

Both the President and Energy Secretary Chu have said we are in America's Sputnik moment. They are absolutely right. Fifty years ago we were in a global space race. Today we are in a global clean energy race. Whichever country takes the most action today to develop and make clean energy technologies will dominate the global economy in this century.

That means supporting financing for clean energy and energy efficiency projects. It means tax credits for clean energy manufacturing, providing incentives for retrofitting residential and public and commercial buildings. It means supporting basic research and keeping alive initiatives that support clean energy technology innovation. These need to be our priorities as we make energy policy and budget decisions.

We can pay for these investments by cutting expensive, outdated subsidies for oil companies that are making record profits. There is a lot more to be done if we are going to win this global clean energy race, but it is not going to be easy. It means unifying as a country and starting to do things differently than we have been doing them.

Albert Einstein said:

> We can't solve problems by using the same kind of thinking we used when we created them.

I am convinced we can win this race. No other country is better positioned. But first people need to understand the stakes. Climate change is real, and failure to address it is bad for our standing in the global economy, bad for the Federal budget, and bad for our national security. We can do better than that for our children and our grandchildren and posterity.

Mr. President, I thank Senator WHITEHOUSE and I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CARPER. Will the Senator withhold?

Mr. FRANKEN. I take that back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

BOILER MACT

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, there is not the absence of a quorum, but I appreciate my colleague mentioning that. I said to him earlier today, maybe yesterday, Senator FRANKEN is a joy to have around here. Some of us know he brings a real special touch for trying to infuse some civility into this place again. He came up a year or two ago with the idea of a secret Santa exchange. We actually did it this year. I was not going to mention it tonight. My secret Santa turned out to be the Senator from Alaska, Senator MURKOWSKI, the colleague of the Presiding Officer. She gave me a most wonderful handmade gift that she and her staff created.

Delaware is the only State that doesn't have a national park. What they did is they created, on a sheet of paper like this—only it was a firm sheet of paper, not a regular sheet of paper, but they literally—this was the State of Delaware and they created a national park so we have a pop-up national park with a bus going around and our pictures riding along in the bus. I don't care what else I get for Christmas, that is going to be the best Christmas present for this year. I don't see how anybody tops that.

But that provides not only some civility but also some levity in a place that could use both, so I thank the Senator for all his contributions, but especially that one.

On something more serious. What I want to do is talk about the regulation EPA has been working on for a while. It is called the boiler MACT. The idea is maximum achievable technology here. If you go back in time, go back to about 1990—in 1970, in this country, Congress passed and the President signed—Richard Nixon actually signed—the Clean Air Act of 1970, a Republican President who had a Republican head of EPA. That was able to be implemented at the time we had the Cuyahoga River up in Cleveland, OH, that actually was on fire. There were lots of terrible things happening in our environment in this country.

Better things started to happen, not just cleaner water, wastewater treatment, and cleaner air, but it led in 1990 to the passage of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990. One of the requirements of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 was in that legislation the Congress directed EPA to finalize regulations to reduce what are called air toxics from boilers by the year 2000. So the Clean Air Act was adopted in 1970. In 1990, 20 years later, the Clean Air Act Amendments were adopted, and in the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 Congress said: EPA, we want you to finalize regulations to reduce air toxics from boilers by the year 2000, 10 years.

The year 2000 came and went without any action. The Bush administration, George W. Bush administration, finalized a rule. I think it was in the year 2004. But they excluded many industrial boilers from having to comply. As it turned out, there are a lot of boilers in this country. I was stunned to find out there are about a half million boilers in this country. A lot of them are fairly small—schools or churches or smaller buildings, hospitals. But a bunch of them are pretty good size.

In any event, the Bush administration in the year 2004 came up with a rule, proposed a rule, but they excluded many industrial boilers from having to comply. In fact, the rule may not have been just proposed, it might actually have been finalized.

But, as a result, the regulation was vacated in 2007, 3 years later, by the Circuit Court of Appeals right here in the District of Columbia. So, 2004, EPA

finally gets around to finalizing the rule that they were called to do some 14 years earlier by the Congress. And 3 years later the DC Circuit Court of Appeals knocks it down and vacates that ruling on boilers.

It was not until June of 2010—and that is a full 10 years after the congressional deadline for action—it was not until 2010 that the EPA issued a proposal for boiler air toxic rules that addressed all the major emitters.

As with most air pollution regulation these days, EPA was under court order to finalize the rule by a set date. The court had said to EPA: We want you to finalize the rule by a set date. That date was the beginning of this year, January of 2011.

During the public comment period, the EPA received thousands of comments and new information from, among others, industry. In fact, they received so much in the way of comments and new information, in December of 2010—that was a month before the date set under the court order to finalize the rule—a month before that date was to occur, EPA asked the courts, a month before the January 2011 deadline, to extend the deadline for promulgating the final air toxic standards to April of next year, to April of 2012.

The courts said: No, don't think so. They said: EPA, you have had enough time to finish. They allowed EPA only until January 21 of this year to go ahead and actually promulgate these regulations.

Even though EPA didn't have a lot of time to process the comments, EPA was able to finalize a rule in February of this year that yielded the same benefits—I think this is pretty interesting—a rule that realized the same benefits in terms of reducing toxic emissions, mercury and arsenic, lead, that kind of thing—the same level of reductions in those emissions as in the June 2010 proposal that they made, but they cut in half the cost of compliance. That is pretty impressive, isn't it? They cut in half the cost of compliance, got the same amount of reductions in emissions of these air toxic substances for half the cost. However, EPA did not stop there. Wanting to address industry's concerns, the EPA opened public comment yet again to consider a reproposal of their regulations.

I know some people think EPA has been guilty of a rush to judgment in this regard. I think if you go through the chronology objectively, this is not a rush to judgment. I hope, if nothing else, to convey tonight that the EPA has moved deliberately, some say way too slowly, in order to address this. There are others who think way too fast, still too fast.

Anyway, last month the EPA proposed the boiler MACT regulation to try to address stakeholder concerns and I think they have done a workmanlike job, a good job. In this new proposal, of the 1½ million boilers in the United States, less than 1 percent would be affected—less than 1 percent would be affected by these emission limits.

I have a chart to show what it looks like. This is a good way to actually think of this.

The pie represents the 1.5 million boilers in the United States. Some are very small, and some are large industrial boilers. Less than 1 percent need the technology to meet the emission limits prescribed by EPA. That is the red tiny slice here. About another 13 percent of the 1.5 million boilers in the United States would need to follow best practice standards in ensuring that the emissions from those boilers are in order. And the rest—1.3 million boilers or a vast majority of boilers, a little over 85 percent—are not affected by the rules.

Not everybody likes the fact that less than 1 percent of the boilers are affected by these rules, and some of our friends in the environmental community understand that we have been very unhappy with how slowly this whole thing has proceeded.

The last thing I want to mention here—maybe two more things—in terms of moving from this point forward, how long would these less than 1 percent have to comply with the regs that have finally been promulgated? I am told the sources would have up to 4 years to comply. The EPA is still taking public comment and hopes to finalize this regulation by late spring.

The bottom line is that we have delayed long enough. Only 1 percent of our largest sources will need to clean up. The EPA has certainly tried to address many problems—maybe not all the problems but most problems—and they are still taking public comments. I am not sure we need to delay this boiler MACT any further.

There are a lot of people who sneeze during the course of their lives, as I have just done here on the floor. That was just a coincidence, but a lot of people in this country suffer because of the quality of our air. We have made great improvements in cleaning up the quality of our air. We still have too many people who suffer from asthma and other respiratory diseases. The kinds of problems and emissions we are talking about here deal less with asthma and respiratory diseases; we are talking about substances that can kill people. In the case of the substances we are talking about here, they have the ability to kill more than 8,000 people a year.

We don't have many large towns in Delaware. In Wilmington, we have about 75,000 people. In Dover—the central part of our State—we have about 30,000 people. And if you take 8,000 people, that is about as many people as live in any of the—well, Newark, where we have the University of Delaware, has about 30,000 people. But other than that, we don't have a lot of large towns. For us, 8,000 people could be the fourth or fifth largest town in my State. That is a lot of people. At the end of the day, even if these rules are fully implemented, we are not going to save all of those 8,000 people, but a lot of those lives will be saved in the coming years, and we need to do that.

We need to let this process go forward and do our dead level best—the EPA has tried to be responsive to concerns that have been raised—to provide for a cleaner environment and not to dampen our economic recovery.

The last word I would add is that I think the idea that we have to choose one over the other is a false choice. We don't have to do that. We can have a cleaner environment and we can have jobs. If you look at the growth of our Nation's economy since 1970, when the Clean Air Act was adopted, or 1990 when the Clean Air Act amendments were adopted, we have seen dramatic growth in our budget. We have seen growth in our economy, and we have seen the quality of air become a lot cleaner over that period of time. So one does not preclude the other.

While some serious concerns have been raised about the earlier proposals by the EPA, a lot of those concerns have been addressed. I think we need to get on with it.

With that, Mr. President, I think we are going to wrap it up here around 7:30, which is in another 10 minutes or so. I am looking around, and I don't see anybody else waiting to speak, so I will note the absence of a quorum and bid you good night.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the period for morning business be extended until 8:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT GENERAL PATRICIA D. HOROHO

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, today I rise to congratulate LTG Patricia D. Horoho on becoming the U.S. Army's 43rd Surgeon General. This is a momentous time for military medicine, with two historic firsts for the U.S. Army and for the Department of Defense. On December 5, 2011, General Horoho became the first woman and the first nurse to assume command of the U.S. Army's Medical Command. Then, just 2 days later, she became the Army's 43rd Army Surgeon General, making history again by becoming the